

ed when the epistle to the Romans was written. It was said that, as it was by degrees that light as to this broke in upon the Church, it might be found that while one man believed that he might eat all things, another being weak would eat herbs; and it was added that it was with respect to cases such as these that the Apostle says "Let not him that eateth despise him that eateth not"; &c.—After mentioning some particulars concerning "the Essenes, a remarkable Jewish sect," Mr. Trotter says, that "No reasonable doubt can be entertained that the passage refers *particularly* to them." Notwithstanding this assertion, the writer, with many much abler critics than either himself or Mr. Trotter, ventures to think, not that the passage contains nothing that was applicable to the Essenes, but that they were not *especially* intended. The Essenes were not accustomed to live in towns, but in the wilderness; and yet, as Olshausen, on the passage, remarks, "The particularity with which St. Paul treats these ascetics leads us naturally to suppose that they lived in Rome, and that the manner of behaving towards them had been a subject of discussion there". The truth is, although the Jews were not required to abstain from all animal food, yet many of them, who were not Essenes, did so abstain, when living among heathens, lest they should in any way be contaminated. Daniel and his companions are referred to as instances of this; and Josephus, in the third section of his life, tells of certain priests of his acquaintance, who, having been sent to Rome to defend themselves before the emperor against certain charges, "were not unmindful of piety towards God, even under their afflictions; but supported themselves on figs and nuts". But let Mr. Trotter be gratified, by having it understood that he is more accurate in referring the statements of the apostle, not to Jewish converts at large, who might still adhere to Jewish observances, but to the Essenes; what difference does it make? The Essenes never had a Divine command enjoining the abstinence which they practised. The partial restraint under which the Jews had for a time been laid was removed. In so far as the Divine authority was concerned, both were at liberty to eat, if they pleased; but both were also at liberty to abstain if they pleased. *Is the forbearance which the different parties were to exercise towards each other in cases as these, to be held up as a rule to be followed where God*

*has issued a commandment, and has not so left men at liberty to do as they please?*

3. Mr. Trotter lets us know that he is quite startled at what to most people would seem the very simple, intelligible, and credible doctrine "that there are a number of points in regard to which *we are at liberty to do as we please*." He goes on, indeed, to say, "As the Professor cannot possibly suppose that the points referred to were regarded in the light of secular matters, but were really deemed sacred," &c.; but he says this in the face of the following plain statement in the Article to which he professes to reply, "It is true, the Apostle, in the cases referred to, recommends mutual forbearance; but it was not upon the ground that the matters involved were 'minor points of religion', but because in reality they involved *no religious point whatever*". Why, after having read such a sentence as this, he should have said that the Professor could not possibly suppose the very thing which he had so plainly intimated that he believed, it is not easy to understand; unless the reason may be that, had Mr. Trotter done common justice to the Article to which he was replying, he could have had no pretence for the charge which he goes on to bring in the very next words: "this is a cognition of the very fundamental principle of Roman Catholicism, and direct opposition to the Word of God in the Westminster Standards; and I sincerely hope that it will not be long before it is instilled into the minds of the ministry in the Free Church as Mr. Trotter may keep his mind may to the Free Church students, that not be amiss for him to teach the principles of Roman Catholicism are not instilled into the minds of our people."

4. What, for instance, is the doctrine which he teaches in the passage we have just quoted? "The convert who had attempted to do what? Had they not left them at liberty to eat all food as abstained from the use of alcoholic matter of taste or to object to it; but they were not, the important observance as ordinance of tance of a doctrine by which to do the Christ, and, insisted their more same, they even declining to enlightened brethren Rom. xiv. 4, join them in then cannot have 10, 13. The 4th then as the enjoined forbearance