

ment, to be the terms of union with her, and by so doing, became a great sect, and body of heretics." "Christ is the Head of his church. There is no true church but his, and it is one. Its members are his disciples. The great question is, what qualifications are necessary to constitute a disciple of his. What does he, our Lord and Master, say on this point? In addressing his disciples, shortly before he suffered, he says, 'Ye believe in God; believe also in me.' Here then we have, in a brief space, the character of a true disciple of Christ. The same is expressed, in the same summary manner, in 1 Tim. iii. 5. 'There is one God, and one Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus.' This, with much greater propriety than the formulary usually so called, might be denominated 'The Apostles' Creed. For whoever exercises a true faith in this one God, as God, and this one Mediator as Mediator, must be a christian, a disciple of Christ, and a member of his church. This truth, I am confident, no well informed member of any sect will now deny. If then this is the faith of Christ, and Christianity, it follows that whatever body of people, calling themselves Christians, whether under the jurisdiction of the Pope, or of the Prelacy, or of the Presbytery, insist on any other terms, as conditions of union and communion with them, they in so doing plant themselves on another foundation than that unity of faith on which the one universal church of Christ is built, and erect for themselves a standard of heresy, or sect—for they are the same—and encamp apart from 'the sacramental host of God's elect.'" pp. 16, 17. Again: "The church of Rome made many and very absurd additions to the foundation laid by Christ; additions which it required, indeed, a great 'humility of faith,' on the part of her members, to receive: other churches—sects, I should say—have made fewer, and more plausible additions, and which, to receive, does not require such a total prostration of the powers of the human understanding; but still, they are additions, and the authority to make them is usurpation: and this usurpation it is, which has produced sect—heresy." *ibid.*

Dr. Wylie has long been a distinguished minister of the Presbyterian Church, and a Professor in their colleges. Of late

years he has been suspected and stigmatized, as a heretic; and has been called both a Unitarian and Universalist. (See first page of the preface to the work above mentioned.) He himself says, "For four years of my life, I was rendered the most unhappy of mortals by believing certain opinions of the character and government of Almighty God, which I have since been compelled to either lay aside or greatly modify; and if I am not much mistaken, my faith has been strengthened by it." p. 35. And at page 130, speaking of Calvinism and Arminianism, he says, "I adopt the views of neither system. The truth lies often between both." This, of course, will constitute him a heretic, in the estimation both of Calvinists and Arminians. He quotes with approbation from Dr. Dick, as follows: "How could God offer salvation to men, if he had excluded them from it, by an immutable decree? And how can God in sincerity invite, beseech, and expostulate with men—although he knows infallibly before hand, that they never will change? I know not what may be said in answer to the objection; but I confess my inability to give complete satisfaction to myself, or you. Let us suspect our own views of the subject, rather than suspect the sincerity of God. Of the latter, we are certain; it is essential to his moral character, and is the foundation of our faith in his testimony, and our dependence upon his promises. We can never be certain that we understand the subject of predestination so well as we understand that God is sincere." pp. 54, 55. This may serve to give us a clue to Dr. Wylie's meaning, when he said he was compelled greatly to modify some of his views concerning "the character and government of Almighty God." For four years he was rendered the most unhappy of mortals by the dismal character of his Maker as exhibited in the schools of theology; and it is probable that the sectarian fathers will be disposed to insist that he ought to have endured this mental unhappiness to the end of life, or even to all eternity, rather than "modify" the least jot or tittle of the orthodox creed. To return from this digression.

The question now before us, is this: was Dr. Wylie correct in saying, "No organization of men has the right to make a creed to be enforced authoritatively upon