

sincerity; but now, though I am greatly convinced of the need of heart-acquaintance and employment, yet I see more need of a higher work, and that I should look oftener upon Christ, and God and heaven, than upon my own heart. At home I find distempers to trouble me, and some evidences of my peace; but it is above that I must find matter of delight and joy, and love and peace itself. Therefore I would have one thought at home upon myself and sins, and many thoughts above upon the high and amiable and beautifying objects.—*Richard Baxter.*

REMARKS

On the Violent Perversions and the Dangerous Opinions of Professor MOSES STUART, of Andover, in his late Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans.

The eminence which Dr. Stuart, as a scholar and theologian, has been enabled to attain, gives him a great amount of influence, which, if properly used, might do a great deal of good: but, as things now stand, it will be wielded with deadly effect in bewildering and distracting the minds of men, and perverting and corrupting the faith of the churches on both sides of the Atlantic. So here, in the way of caution to our churches in particular, and the Christian public in general, I shall point out some of his chief errors in as few words as possible.

1. He awfully perverts the doctrine of justification before God, while he makes the good works of the creature an essential condition of the same;—so he asks, p. 506: "But where has Paul taught that a man is justified by faith *alone*, and that evangelical good works are not an *essential condition* of his justification before God." From this it appears that the complete righteousness of Christ will not do: the poor, imperfect works of the sinner must come in for a share of the glory; yea, to help what needs no help, and to complete what was before complete, 1800 years ago. Lest, however, any one should mistake his meaning, Mr. Stuart hastens to add—"Good works are an *essential condition* of our acceptance with God." Is this assertion less heretical than the doctrine promulgated by the false teachers who troubled the churches of Galatia—those teachers whom Paul wished to be cut off, and of whom he affirmed they would bear their own judgment? It is a perversion of the Gospel of Christ. It is another Gospel, as that of which Paul declared, that if an angel from heaven preached it, he should be accursed; and that if any man received it, Christ should profit him nothing. Again Dr. Stuart de-

nies the *imputation* of the righteousness of Christ to the believer, and so plainly contradicts the Apostle. What can we expect after this? Let us hear him: "We may just as well say that we can appropriate to ourselves and make our own the righteousness of another, as his unrighteousness." He lays it down as an *axiom*, that the imputation of sin or righteousness is impossible. "A transfer," he says, "of moral turpitude is just as impossible as a transference of soul." Another grand error of his on this point is, ~~giving~~ the righteousness of Christ, by giving its place to the faith of the creature. Faith is indispensable to embrace Christ and this righteousness; but there is as much distinction between them as between the hand and the gift it embraces. On this, Dr. Stuart says: "Their faith was gratuitously reckoned as equivalent to the righteousness demanded by the law." He observes, p. 177: "To say was counted (*viz.*, their faith) for justification would make no tolerable sense; but to say was counted as *complete obedience*, would be saying just what the Apostle means to say, *viz.* that the believer is gratuitously justified." In this, Dr. Stuart has stepped out of the way of the apostles and prophets, and all orthodox divines, to walk in the dangerous road of German Neologians, Arminius, and Socinus. Dr. Witsius observes: "Arminius, by his subtlety, frames vain, empty quibbles, when he contends that the righteousness of Christ cannot be imputed to us for righteousness, because it is his very righteousness laying this down as a foundation, that which is imputed to us for righteousness, is not properly our righteousness." Let us now turn to Socinus. Dr. Witsius again asks, "How faith justifies? Not certainly in that sense, as if God graciously accepts the act of faith, and new gospel obedience flowing therefrom in the room of the perfect obedience, which, from the *vigor* of the law, we are bound to perform, in order to justification, as the Socinians explain it." This is exactly Dr. Stuart's view of this important point; but it is highly possible, in other expressions, he may contradict himself, and partly allow what he denies, as the *American Theological Magazine*, in a review of his Commentary, says: "Respected Sir, you admit what you deny, and deny what you admit, in such rapid succession, your readers are bewildered."

2. Dr. Stuart fairly denies that the *claims* of the law are maintained in the salvation of men, and so makes *void* the law. So he says: "The law enjoins fully and simply our own personal obedience, and pronounces a curse on us solely when we disobey it. But in every government in heaven and on