

Professor alleges on the ground that they had a right to do what they were doing, but because though doing what was in itself improper, they were doing it with the very best design; and because though wrong, religion would suffer less from it" &c. Instead of troubling the public with his views of the Professor's argument, which he neither states correctly nor seems to understand, Mr. Trotter might perhaps be more profitably employed in considering whether it is really from the Bible he has learned that the end sanctifies the means; and that, where people act with the very best design, they have the warrant of the Apostle Paul for doing what is in itself improper—what is wrong—what God's word has not left them at liberty to do.

The matters referred to were of a complex character. There is, first of all, the simple matter of eating, or not eating—During the time of the Levitical dispensation, the Jews were restrained by Divine authority from eating of certain kinds of meats, and wherever that law was transgressed there was a liability to punishment. Even where the transgression was committed unconsciously, it was still a transgression, it exposed to the infliction of a penalty; and when at length it came to be known, an expiation was to be made for the sin committed in ignorance. At the time when the Apostle Paul wrote, that ceremonial law had ceased to be binding upon the conscience by Divine authority. As formerly stated, the eating, or the not eating, involved no religious point whatever. It is with respect to this eating, or not eating, that the Apostle enjoins forbearance. When, however, the different parties, upon the ground of this simple eating, or not eating, came to sit in judgment upon each others' spiritual condition, and to condemn one another, this was wrong—it was doing what God's word had not left them at liberty to do; and although Mr. Trotter thinks that even in this they were to be the objects of forbearance, as acting "with the very best design"; the Apostle exercises no forbearance. He commands "Let not him that eateth despise him that eateth not; and let not him which eateth not judge him that eateth: for God hath received him. Who art thou that judgest another man's servant?" Neither does he exercise forbearance towards them, when they would ascribe something of a meritorious character to their respective lines of conduct. He corrects their mistake. He tells them,

"the kingdom of God is not meat and drink; but righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost". He presses it upon the Corinthians, "meat commendeth us not to God: for neither, if we eat, are we the better; neither, if we eat not, are we the worse". Still farther, when the abstainers would insist upon others following the same line of conduct which they themselves pursued, as if it involved a religious principle, or something that might be connected with salvation; just as his master before him had denounced those who taught for doctrines the commandments of men, so does the Apostle denounce those who "command to abstain from meats, which God hath created to be received with thanksgiving of them who believe and know the truth."

1 Tim. iv. 3

5. In the First Article of these Remarks, it was said, "The time was when the indiscriminate use of meats, and the neglect of particular days, —— would, by the express appointment of God, have subjected the Israelites to exclusion from religious ordinances". Mr. Trotter's Reply to this is, "The Professor attempts to strengthen his position from the Old Testament, by assuring us that the Israelites would have been excluded from the ordinances of religion had they failed to comply with any part of the law; but I can show the contrary, for there were occasions on which compliance with some of its provisions was dispensed with, in favour of some of whom it is not at least insinuated that their omission arose from conscientious scruples; so that he has no more countenance from the Old Testament than from the New". He then refers to, and quotes, 2 Chron. xxx. 17-19. And what does that passage shew? That the ceremonial law left the Israelites at liberty to join in the ordinance referred to, in their uncleanness—whether that uncleanness was the result of conscientious scruples (!) or not? No: but that when, by doing so, they had committed sin—they had contracted guilt—and appear to have been to a certain extent under a judicial infliction, Hezekiah prayed for those who had thus eaten the passover "otherwise than it was written"; and the Lord, in the tenderness of his mercy, "hearkened to Hezekiah, and healed the people." Does Mr. Trotter think that when God pardons and heals, it is an evidence that no transgression has been committed?—that no law had been violated?—that the parties pardoned had not been subject or liable to the