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ADDENDA - AN APPRAISAL OF ARCHIBALD M'LEAN (R.D.M.) 17PP.
SECTION I.

THE GENERAL BACKGROUND

SCOTLAND IN THE 18th CENTURY
A. THE GENERAL BACKGROUND

The eighteenth century could be called a "Golden Era" in the history of Scotland. That title is well applied to the material interest and progress of the times, but in the figurative sense, it is also applicable to Scottish letters, thought, philosophy, science and religion, because of the galaxy of glittering names which at that period brought international honour to the name of Scotland.

It is a glorious story of the marvellous change wrought to a poverty stricken, famine ridden, backward, rather isolated, provincial nation, by the application of new methods, native intelligence, inventive genius, and ability to adapt to new circumstances. For the material resources of Scotland at the beginning of the century were so slender as to make the gaining of a living a tedious, tiresome, and disheartening task. Almost all of the population was rural, dependent for food upon an antiquated, medieval method of agriculture, which yielded at the best a pitifully lean harvest, and in poor weather conditions failed entirely to support even the farmer. The chief export trade was the shipping of cattle to England, surely a precarious trade - for the cattle were starvelings, fodder unobtainable in the winter, the cold bitter, the frost severe. The main centres of population - Glasgow, Edinburgh, Dundee, etc. - were places of a few thousands, for the industries which cause the groupings of large numbers of people in one place were not then in existence. What few industries
there were, were carried on in the homes of the people - flax
spinning, hand-loom weaving, and primitive manufactures of
that sort. Money was exceedingly scarce, coins and small
notes far below the demand, so that travellers were under the
necessity of carrying in saddlebags ready cash enough to pay
the expenses of their journey. (1) The small gentry shared
in the general poverty, and in lieu of money, received roughly
two thirds of their income in kind, - Sir John Preston of
Prestonhall, for example, receiving £68 in coin, and the rest
of his income of £230 per annum being paid in grain, straw,
and poultry. Sir David Threipland of Fingask had an income
of £537, all but £147 being paid in grain, yarn, geese, hens
and chickens. (2).

In agriculture, certain of the progressive nobles and
lairds took the first steps toward progress when they
lengthened the leases of their tenants, broke up the open
fields, enclosed the land in walls and dykes. They introduced
wheat, roots and stored fodder; they drained and manured poor
soil; they planted forests of fir to shelter men and beasts;
and bred their sheep and cattle in scientific manner for meat
and wool (sheep) or meat and milk (cattle). By these
measures the threat of hunger and starvation was lifted from
the minds and hearts of the poor. (3)

(1) H.G. Graham, Social Life of Scotland in the Eighteenth
Century, p. 31.
(2) J. Murray, York Buildings Company, p. 121.
(3) I.F. Grant, Everyday Life in Old Scotland, Part III,
pp. 307, 308, 309.
Free trade with England, the development of roads and transport facilities in North and South Britain, put markets at the door of the productive Scottish farmers, the home weavers, the tobacco traders, - and enormously stimulated the forward movement of Scottish prosperity. The civilization of the riding-horse and the pack-horse gave way to the stagecoach and the waggon, and at the beginning of the next century, to the railroad. The sailing ship was replaced by the steamboat, distance was lessened and wealth poured into Scotland from all sides. Invention produced the machines which gave birth to the factories, and these drew the people to centres of industry, so that Glasgow increased in population from 12,000 in the year 1700 to 80,000 in the year 1800. Thus industrial Scotland came to be. In the one hundred years from 1700 to 1800 the revenue of Scotland increased until it was fifty times what it had been at the start. In that same length of time, the total population increased by only 500,000 from 1,100,000 to 1,600,000 souls. (1) Gone were the days of poverty, of hunger, of isolation and distance, of almost inaccessible localities on main roads, of the monotonous round of daily fare, of home spun and home brew, of blue bonnets and braid Scots tongue, - for Scotland had come out of the moors and the mists, and was now a competitor for world markets.

Many Englishmen discovered to their surprise that the Scots, whom they had despised and abused as needy adventurers, were a peculiarly intelligent and highly educated people.

(1) G.M. Trevelyan, 19th Century and After, p. 34.
Even the farmers whom they had regarded as clods proved capable of becoming not less but more progressive than the English farmers themselves. In the age of Sir Walter Scott, England discovered once and for all that she was linked with a partner not inferior to herself. (1)

Without unduly stressing the subject, it must in fairness be noted that one of the lessons which had to be learned by both North and South Britain after the Union of the Parliaments in 1707, was how to live together. Scotland and England had been "auld enemies" so long, and were separated by so many factors in their national life and interests, that intercourse and amity between the peoples was a slowly developed, intermittent, and rather fragile offshoot of the progressive eighteenth century. Scots were Scots, and English were English, so that it was the double honour of a man overcoming the serious handicap of his nationality when a Scottish man of letters was appreciated and approved then by English critics. Though Scots might applaud from national pride or sentiment the productions of Scottish writers, Scottish authors who were praised South of the border had been passed through the fires of testing in a hostile camp, and had been approved on merit alone. (2) To the credit of Scottish letters in the eighteenth century, a respectable number of Scotsmen passed such testing, - each one marking a new epoch in his particular

(1) G.M. Trevelyan, 19th Century and After, p. 34.
(2) J. Ramsay, Scotland and Scotsmen, i., p. 48.
field. David Hume, with his TREATISE OF HUMAN NATURE marked out new fields of speculative thought. Dr Thomas Reid with his INQUIRY INTO THE HUMAN MIND marked a new epoch in philosophy. Other epoch-making works, acknowledged internationally, were Adam Smith's WEALTH OF NATIONS, in Economics; the Histories of Hume and Principal William Robertson; as well as the book which drew the eyes of Europe to Scotland beyond any other - James Macpherson's epic poem, OSSIAN.

Says P. Hume Brown: "Add to these productions in philosophy and literature the scientific discoveries of Black, Leslie, Hutton, Cullen, and John Hunter, and we have a tale of intellectual effort the more surprising when we remember that the total population of Scotland did not then amount to the number of two millions. 'It is an admirable result of the progress of the human spirit,' wrote Voltaire, 'that at the present time it is from Scotland we receive rules of taste in all the arts - from the epic poem to gardening.' The words were meant ironically, but they point to what was an indisputable fact, the intellectual activity of Scotsmen in every important sphere of thought and their original contribution in each of them." (1)

Coincident with the rise of material progress there can be discerned a number of evidences of a change in the intellectual "atmosphere" of Scotland. One of the dominant factors in the thinking of Scots from the time of the Reformation had been the predominance of religious and ecclesiastical questions and discussions in the affairs of state. The battle against Popery and then against Prelacy had engaged the attention and loyalties of the people to a marked degree. Now, with Presbyterianism established by law as the Church of Scotland, with the stirring issue of...

(1) P. Hume Brown, Surveys of Scottish History, p. 112.
Establishment settled, the minds of people became more engrossed with material and secular matters concerned with the rise of trade and the new sources of prosperity.

One striking example of the rise of the secular spirit in Scotland is the history of the ill-fated Darien expedition. Scots of all classes and position rushed to invest what was in many cases their entire life savings in the doomed enterprise.

"What a change from the visions which had inspired the men of the 'Covenants' was this vision of golden profit to be made on the pestilent shores of a distant land! This fever for gain was a new development in the history of Scotland, and betokened a change in the nation's ideals." (1)

As the material issues became more and more important, the religious matters inevitably were pushed more and more into the background. Certain it is that though religion still played a part in the life of the people in the eighteenth century, it did not sway the decisions of statesmen as in the seventeenth. For better or for worse, the transfer of the legislative body to London in 1707 marked a decline in the influence of the Church in the policies of the legislators, and secular considerations took precedence in their deliberations. The power of the Church to enforce its discipline by reference to the magistrate was weakened by the Toleration Act and the Patronage Act passed under Queen Anne. The seeds of discord and dissent within the Church itself were sown by these laws in particular.

Scottish literature gave evidence of a new attitude of

(1) P. Hume Brown, Surveys of Scottish History, p. 106.
mind, among certain coteries of the educated classes at least, toward the rigid pietistic outlook of their fathers. Poems such as Allan Ramsay's "Gentle Shepherd", in which the lives, loves and adventures of men and women were treated in a purely "natural" strain without reference to any of the doctrines of the Christian revelation, found acceptance among a group of leading minds in Edinburgh at the start of the century. Later, Burns advocated liberal opinions in church matters, caricatured the practices of the "unco Guid", and in general satirised the rigid type of piety which had been acceptable to large numbers of his fellow countrymen at the beginning of this new era. Scott completed the process in his historical novels, with much space devoted to the glorious scenery of Scotland, and to eulogy of her great historical traditions.

The first half of this century which thus saw a new departure in material prosperity and in literary thought, also saw a new departure in a sphere in which Scotland was to make a grand name in the world, - the sphere of speculative thought. From 1720 onwards, Ramsay of Ochtertyre tells us, metaphysical speculation began to take the place of theological and political controversy, (1) and clubs were formed for the discussion of questions which it would have been perilous to raise not many years before. As recently as 1697, the divinity student, Thomas Aitkenhead, with the approval of the majority of the Edinburgh ministers, was executed for airing certain views on

the Trinity. But the questions now raised went far beyond the speculations of Aitkenhead: the existence of God, the trustworthiness of human reason, the immortality of the soul; these and other kindred questions were debated with a freedom and publicity which less than half a century before would have caused drastic official action to be taken against the adventurous disputants. Hume, who was a member of one of these debating clubs, only systematized and gave precision to modes of thought which were current in Scotland in the earlier half of the eighteenth century when he produced in 1739 his TREATISE OF HUMAN NATURE. (1)

It was natural that religious thought should also be influenced by the currents of thought swirling through the country at the time. Throughout the seventeenth century, speculation in Europe had raised questions which touched the very foundations of the Christian revelation. During that century the Copernican theory, which deposed the earth from its central place in the universe, had taken full possession of the minds of European thinkers, and fundamentally influenced their speculations. Could Christianity, as it had hitherto been understood, hold its own in this overturning of the accepted order of nature? It became incumbent on the champions of Christianity to discover new defences which they might set up against the attacks of enemies. Theirs was a double task: to justify Christianity both as a

(1) P. Hume Brown, Surveys of Scottish History, p. 111.
theology and as a religion. The movement took different names in different countries: Bangorianism or Latitudinarianism in England, the Aufklärung or Enlightenment of Germany, and Newtonianism in France. Now that these questions were coming to the fore in Scotland, it was natural that some group in the Church should attempt to synthesize the new thinking and the Christian religion. It was now that the type of religion began to assert itself, which, under the name of Moderatism, was to attain its full fruition in the latter half of the century. In its essential spirit, Moderatism was an attempt to adapt Christianity at once to the tone of existing society and to the current thought of the time. Perhaps Moderatism was partly due to reaction against the Covenant theology, but that reaction was itself traceable to currents of thought of which Moderatism was but a manifestation. With reference to the two main problems - Christian Theology, and Christian Religion, - Moderatism attempted to adapt Christian Theology to human reason as the arbiter of all beliefs which the human mind was bound to accept; and therefore Christian mysteries had to be reduced to a minimum, and first place given to the ethical system derived from the Christian books. In the case of the Christian religion and its code of conduct for believers, accommodation was again the keynote, and the standard of Christian living must be such as was compatible with the pleasures of the world, it being assumed that asceticism and spiritual excitement were the most dangerous enemies of a reasonable faith. It must be noted, in the most
certain terms, that the Moderates were not allowed to depart from the "orthodox" doctrines in such a way as to threaten the throne of Calvin, for the witch hunters and heresy seekers were too numerous around them. But the fact remains that the preaching of Alexander Carlyle of Inveresk, the man mentioned as the "typical Moderate", was likened by Hume to Cicero's Academics. Blair's sermons are moral essays. The Moderates were accused by the Seceders of having departed from the faith. David Hume, the sceptic, was on intimate terms socially with many of the outstanding Moderates. The change in their thinking is shown more by what they omitted to stress, than by their announced divergences of doctrine from their fathers.

Thus the eighteenth century witnessed a gradual change in religious use and wont. In some ways it was a change for the better, though it greatly distressed the minds of the old-fashioned who strove to keep alive the religious fashions and forms of an older time. The sternly pietistic form of creed and life was losing its hold on the educated classes especially. Superstitions like witchcraft and ghost appearances were fast becoming relics of past beliefs. In the important field of the ministry, men who had in their Arts course attended the lectures of professors like Hutcheson and Adam Smith, Adam Fergusson and Thomas Reid were better educated and more liberal and sensible than their predecessors. This clerical type gradually displaced the narrow remnant of Covenanting days. The name attached to this more liberal-
thinking section - the Moderates - is significant of the broader spirit in the Church, which presented such a contrast to that of the previous century. Even that party which in theology championed the old doctrines, and was known as the "Evangelicals", shed the extreme narrowness of former days in some things. The softening influence is apparent in the relaxation of ecclesiastical discipline, with its obtrusive and tyrannical methods. Church discipline was losing some of its harsher features when Bums arose to satirise it and the theological narrowness with which the iron grip of the Kirk was associated. The reaction to which he gave such telling expression had many representatives among the more cultured clergy. Religion thus became more human; the Sabbath less of a tyranny and a terror. It gained in charity what it lost in fervour and severity.

On the other hand, the preaching of the Moderates, even as represented by the polished and formal oratory of Dr Hugh Blair, failed to make the pulpit the potent force in popular life that it had been in less enlightened, but far more explosive days, when religion was a real, if to some extent a misdirected, power in both public and private life. From this point of view, there was force in the reproach of the Evangelical party that Moderatism with its commonsense morality ("legalism") was tending to deaden the spiritual life based on the more experimental apprehension of the Gospel. Certain it is that, if the services became more decorous and refined, the churches were far less crowded than
formerly. It will be our purpose in the second part of
this section to investigate the manner in which the disputes
between these opposing groups came to be a contributing cause
which filled many churches outside the pale of the Church of
Scotland.
B. RISE OF DISSENT IN THE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND.

When Queen Anne came to the throne in 1702, Presbyterians had some doubts as to the future under this Episcopalian Queen, for it was her intention to carry through King William's project of a closer union between England and Scotland. This Union was very unpopular at the time in both countries. William Carstares, the Principal of Edinburgh University, and a leader of the Church of Scotland, was of great help to the Queen in removing objections to the Union. In return, the Presbyterians were given many assurances of a conciliating nature. The Act of Security provided that the existing constitution of the Church of Scotland should continue "without any alteration in time to come"; every sovereign on accession was to swear that he would maintain and preserve it. (1)

Yet even in the year of Union, the Assembly of the Church of Scotland noted that innovations were being introduced into worship in Scotland which were "contrary to our known principle, which is, that nothing is to be admitted in the worship of God but what is prescribed in the Holy Scriptures." (2)

And in the case of James Greenshields, the Church had a fore-taste of the loss of power over the civil authority, which was to influence greatly the shape of things to come. (3) Greenshields was a Scotsman who had been a curate in Ireland. He opened a chapel in Edinburgh, directly across from St. Giles.

(1) Anne, Parl. i. Sect. IV.: Chap. VI.
(3) Thomas Somerville, Own Life and Times, p. 469.
and there used the English prayer-book. The Presbytery of Edinburgh forbade him to preach; the magistrates put him in prison till he should give security to desist from his ministry; the Scottish Court of Session upheld the magistrates. But when an appeal was made to the House of Lords in London, that body gave judgement for Greenshields, with expenses. (1)

In 1712, Jacobites and Tories who wished to make mischief for the government, (2) introduced into the Union Parliament at Westminster, two bills which gave great concern to Presbyterians as they threatened the unalterable constitution of the Presbyterian Church. The first was the "Toleration Bill", which made it henceforth lawful for those of the Episcopal persuasion in Scotland to meet and worship in their own manner, provided that their pastors were ordained by Protestant bishops, that they took the Oaths of Allegiance and Abjuration, and that their assemblies were not held with closed doors. It repealed the act against irregular baptisms and marriages, which act had subjected the Episcopal priest who baptised a child, or married a couple, to perpetual imprisonment or exile; and it provided that no civil pain should follow excommunication. The second was the "Patronage Bill", which proposed to restore the rights of patrons to present parish ministers, on the allegation that the mode of appointing ministers introduced in 1690 had led to heats and disturbances. Despite strong opposition by the Presbyterians,

(2) Lockhart, Papers, Vol. i. p. 225.
and even by five Anglican bishops, both these bills were passed. To make matters even worse, another bill restored the "popish festival" of the Christmas holiday of the law courts. The Church of Scotland now found definite proof that her power to influence the legislators of Westminster was indeed slight. The all-dominating authority of the Church even in her own establishment was being weakened. (1)

Inside the Church at this time, certain groups were being formed, and sides taken upon matters of doctrine. Before the end of Anne's reign, James Webster of Edinburgh, a fervid Calvinist, called attention to the teaching of John Simson, Professor of Divinity at Glasgow. Simson was chiefly accused that he "attributed too much to nature". The charge was that of Arminianism. The case against Simson was prolonged to 1717, by the intervention of the Rebellion of 1715, but at the close the Assembly recorded a cautious deliverance that the Professor had vented some unnecessary opinions, used some unfamiliar expressions, so that he was prohibited from teaching or preaching such opinions, but no other action was taken at this time. (2)

At the same Assembly, the Presbytery of Auchterarder was dealt with for daring to set up a formula to which candidates for license must give consent. The idea seems to have been to preserve the purity of doctrine, but the wording of the

"Creed" as it was named, is rather ambiguous and most unfortunate in its implication. The candidate was required to sign a proposition that "it is not sound or orthodox to teach that we must forsake sin in order to our coming to Christ." In this peculiar statement of the Christian doctrine of grace, the Presbytery exceeded its powers by establishing a new test. The Assembly at length came to a resolution, prohibiting Auchterarder or any other presbytery from requiring subscription to any formulas except those approved of by the Assembly, and declaring their abhorrence of the proposition referred to "as unsound and most detestable". The Presbytery was appointed to be cited before the Commission to explain what they meant by it. (1) A suitable explanation was made. (2)

Here too, was laid the seed of the "Marrow Controversy". Thomas Boston of Ettrick happened to mention to Mr. Drummond of Crieff, who sat beside him, that a book he had discovered, called the "Marrow of Modern Divinity", ably discussed the topics which had been debated in the Auchterarder case. The book was recommended to others, and was so well regarded that it was decided to republish it. Mr. Hog of Carnock wrote a recommendatory preface to this edition of the Marrow which appeared in 1718. (3)

When Mr. Drummond of Crieff was brought before his

(2) Ibid, p. 522.
(3) J. Cunningham, Church History of Scotland, Vol. II. p. 249.
presbytery in 1718, charged with preaching a sermon teaching gross Antinomianism, the Marrow Controversy was really launched. Though Drummond made apologetic explanations, it was found that others shared his views. (1) Principal Haddow of St. Andrews, a leading "Moderate" of the time, preached before the Synod of Fife a sermon in which he attacked the "Marrow of Modern Divinity". This sermon was published. Hog of Carnock replied: (2)

The Assembly of 1719 instructed the Commission to inquire if the prohibition imposed in the Auchterarder case had been observed. Books and pamphlets contrary to the Confession of Faith were to be sought out, and recommenders examined. (3) So the Commission appointed a committee "for the preserving of the purity of doctrine", which called before it Hog of Carnock, Warden of Gargunnock, Brisbane of Stirling, and Hamilton of Airth. Their answers were deemed satisfactory, (4) but the "Marrow" book itself, when looked over by a sub-committee, yielded "five distinct heresies", as well as a defence of six Antinomian paradoxes. (5)

The Commission made report on the book to the Assembly of 1720. Acting on this report the Assembly condemned the "Marrow", with but four adverse votes. The friends of the "Marrow" did not let the matter drop, but brought in a

---

(1) R. Wodrow, Correspondence, Vol. ii. pp. 399, 508.
(2) J. Cunningham, Church History of Scotland, Vol. II. p. 250.
(4) Thomas Boston of Ettrick, Memoirs, p. 361. (1776 ed.)
Representation at the next Assembly, seeking to have the act repealed. (1) These men, called the "Representers", (or the "Twelve Apostles", because of their number,) even dared to condemn an act of the Assembly touching the preaching of catechetical doctrine. (2) As a result, after long discussion and debate, the Act was upheld, and the Representers rebuked by the Moderator in the name of the Assembly. (3) These Representers were: James Hog of Carnock, Thomas Boston of Ettrick, John Williamson of Inveresk, John Bonar of Torphichen, Gabriel Wilson of Maxton, James Kid of Queensferry, Ebenezer Erskine of Portmoak, Ralph Erskine of Dunfermline, James Wardlaw of Dunfermline, Henry Davidson of Galashiels, James Bathgate of Orwell, and William Hunter of Lilliesleaf. (4) They protested at the hands of a notary, and went on preaching as before. A nucleus had now been formed which did not see eye to eye with the majority of the Assembly.

The divisive influence was maintained in the renewal of Professor Simson's troubles. Now he was accused of Arianism. The case dragged from 1726 to 1729, when, though the Professor abjured the errors imputed to him, he was finally suspended from teaching. (5) The Marrow-men thought he should not only have been deposed from the ministry but suspended from teaching and deprived of his salary as well. For eleven years

(3) Ibid, pp. 548-556.
(4) R. Wodrow, Correspondence, Vol. ii. p. 553.
he continued to draw his salary, and no arrangement was made to supply his place. (1)

About this time another case was coming through the Presbytery of Dundee, to the Synod of Angus and Mearns, and finally to the Assembly itself. This was the case of John Glas, minister of the parish of Tealing, near Dundee. He was called before the presbytery for protesting against the Covenants as unscriptural, and against the need for a National Establishment as opposed to the spiritual nature of Christ's kingdom. What ultimately caused Glas's deposition from the ministry of the Church of Scotland was his continued ministry after his suspension, for the charge of "contumacy" was more quickly dealt with than had been the charge of heresy. He was deposed in 1730, and went forth to start a number of small churches from which came other groups outside the pale of the Church of Scotland. His protest against National Establishment, (2) was the seed from which came many of the Independent churches in Scotland. Dissidents within the Church were shown that the dread ban of the Church had lost its sting, and that a religious group COULD exist outside the Establishment.

Conditions within the Church were growing ripe for some kind of definite cleavage. The Church had voted them down, but the "Marrow" men and their adherents had not been convinced that their doctrines were unsound. But troubles

(1) R. Wodrow, Correspondence; Vol. iii: p. 467.
(2) Ibid, p. 458.
about doctrine were slight compared with troubles about patronage. Ever since its enactment, the Patronage Act had been a cause of difficulty. In several places, civil and even military force had to be called upon in support of an unpopular presentee, against a crowd gathered to prevent the induction. Presbyteries under the control of ministers of the Popular party would refuse to carry out the settlement. In 1729 the Assembly appointed a committee to "concur" with a recalcitrant presbytery in affecting a settlement, and for many difficult cases, this expedient of a "Hiding Committee" proved useful to the Assembly. (1) In spite of their strong support among the people, the opponents of Patronage weakened their case by protesting against a number of things which they had no power to alter. They objected to toleration, considered the Union with England as a national sin, and were convinced that the laws against witchcraft must be retained.

In 1732, the Assembly, despite argument about the use of the Barrier Act on this occasion, enacted that where a patron failed to present, and the right of presentation devolved on the presbytery, the procedure of 1690 should be followed. (2) The minority asserted the "right" of the congregation to elect their minister. Ebenezer Erskine, whom we remember as one of the Marrow Men, brought matters to a head by preaching a sermon before the Synod of Perth and Stirling, in which he attacked in forceful terms the Act which had just passed the

---

Assembly. (1) The Synod, by majority, censured the sermon, and in May 1733, Erskine was formally rebuked at the bar of the Assembly. (2) He wished to read a protest, signed by himself and William Wilson, one of the ministers of Perth, Alexander Moncrieff of Abernethy, and James Fisher of Kinclaven. The protest was refused, but left upon the table. When the wording of the protest was noticed by some who glanced it over, the Assembly became aware that the paper was a defiance of their authority - which they regarded as the cardinal sin. The case was remitted to the Commission, with power to suspend the four from the ministry if they did not retract their protest at its meeting in August, and power to proceed to a higher censure if they had not obeyed the suspension before the meeting in November. (3) There was no retraction. In August the four were suspended. In November, they appeared before the Commission, read a paper of Secession, and went forth. (4) On the 6th December, 1733, the four met at Gairney Bridge near Kinross, and constituted themselves into the Associate Presbytery. Shortly afterwards they issued their "First Testimony to the Government, Worship, and Discipline of the Church". The four were regarded by their congregations, and by the people, as champions of their rights; their congregations clung to them all the closer that they now regarded them as confessors and martyrs; and when the

(4) First Testimony of the Associate Synod, p. 32.
ministers who had been appointed to intimate their sentence from their pulpits appeared, an excited multitude forcibly withstood them. A violent reaction began. (1) The Church of Scotland became alarmed at the strength of the Seceders, and attempted conciliation. (2) But the Seceders would have none of it, for Erskine drew attention to the "difference to be made betwixt the Established Church of Scotland and the Church of Christ in Scotland; for I reckon (says he,) that the last is in a great measure driven into the wilderness by the first". (3)

The inconvenience of patronage was now so obvious that in 1735 a deputation from the Church of Scotland went to London asking for its abolition; (4) but the great landowners persuaded the Government that their patronage enabled them to influence the Church in favour of law and order. The Church was not to be delivered from the turmoil of disputes over patronage for many long years to come. Hence the only sensible policy was for her to make terms with the fact that the statutes on patronage must be observed. The departure of the Seceders, and the accessions they received from time to time, now left the Moderate party with a very slight majority in the Assembly. As we read of close votes and narrow decisions, we realize that the Secession played a great

---

(3) D. Fraser, Life of Ebenezer Erskine, p. 399.
part in the affairs of the Church for the rest of the century. Had they been in the Church, the Seceders might have turned the tide, but as vote after vote went against the Popular party, more men were estranged from the Church, and the moderate control grew stronger. (1) But we must follow the story of the Seceders in the eighteenth century to a conclusion, ere coming to the remainder of the tale of the Church of Scotland under the Moderates.

The Seceder movement spread rapidly, for now had appeared a solution to the problems of the parishes faced with an "intruded minister". Evangelicals dissatisfied with the teaching of a Moderate minister could appeal to the Associate Presbytery for "supply of sermon", a preacher would be sent, a church built, and in this way new groups arose outside the Church of Scotland. Yet these particular groups were Presbyterian in government, and very orthodox in doctrine.

In 1741 George Whitefield, the great English evangelist, spent part of the year in Scotland. He was brought into contact with the Seceders, of whom Ralph Erskine of Dunfermline was now a member. It is rather amusing to read of Whitefield's meetings with the Seceder worthies, for they accepted him at first, and were desirous of making him into a member of their number, inasmuch as they wanted him to preach to the "Lord's People" in Scotland, - namely, themselves. But Whitefield was more interested in the "Devil's people", and

annoyed at the laxness of his views, the Seceders had doubts about him. (1) These doubts were strengthened when the preacher returned in 1742, to take part in the great revival work at Cambuslang. The Evangelicals and their supporters thought this work an outpouring of the Spirit of God, but the Seceders were certain that it was a delusion of Satan, for Whitefield was to them an "idolater" and member of an idolatrous church. (2)

By 1744 there were three presbyteries in the Associate Synod. But immediately there arose the question of the Burgess Oath which was required to be taken by office-holders in Edinburgh, Glasgow, and Perth. The Seceders wanted to determine if a Christian man could "profess and allow the true religion presently professed within this realm" - for the religion of the Church of Scotland was no "true religion" to them. (3) Happily for the peace of the Synod there was an interruption which called for united action. On the 10th August, 1745, Charles Edward unfurled the standard of King James at Glenfinnan. The Seceders wanted nothing of a return of Popery, and volunteered in such numbers to fight against Charles that there was talk of forming them into a regiment. Even Ebenezer Erskine appeared at Stirling in uniform. (4) The Moderates of the Church of Scotland were also in the Hanoverian ranks, so that the Rebellion reconciled men whom

(2) Ibid, p. 317.
religion could not unite.

In April 1747, after the Rebellion had been crushed, the Associate Synod met at Edinburgh, and after an acrimonious session was split into two groups, - for and against subscribing to the Burgess Oath. Those opposed to the oath, calling themselves "Anti-Burghers", retired to the house of Adam Gibb, their spokesman, and there resolved that THEY were the Associate Synod, and that no presbytery was lawful unless subordinated to them. The Erskines, who were "Burgher", they regarded as rebels against the true Church, and handed them over to Satan. (1) A bitter contest ensued, in which families were separated into Burgher and Anti-Burgher members, and churches were divided. Minorities refused to leave the meeting-house, and litigation resulted in the civil courts having to define the principles of non-established churches. Reams of bitter invective were printed, in which opponents reviled each other, and would not budge an inch. Anti-Burghers were wise enough, however, to reject a suggestion of Alexander Moncrieff when, in 1759, he proposed that they remind George II that he was an uncovenanted king. Adam Gibb interposed here, and explained the Covenants in a voluntary sense. The Anti-Burghers took a step in the right direction when, in 1763, they voted £50 in aid of a mission to Red Indians, but they would not co-operate with Burghers, even as far away as the colony of New York. (2)

But now to return to the Church of Scotland. In 1752 six ministers of the Presbytery of Dunfermline were dealt with for refusing to settle an unpopular presentee at Inverkeithing. In this case there appears for the second time in the Assembly the then minister of Gladsmuir, William Robertson, who had made a great impression in spite of his youth when he spoke in favour of a motion in the Torphichen case the year before. (1) Now he and his friends come forward as dissenters to a vote of "No censure" by the Commission to the Presbytery of Dunfermline for their failure to induct the presentee at Inverkeithing in 1751. (2) When the case came before the Assembly in 1752, the eloquence of Robertson was heard, pointing out that the Commission had not carried out the instructions of the Assembly. The Presbytery were ordered to induct. When they did not, they were called before the bar of the Assembly. The Assembly resolved that one of the mutineers should be deposed, and the fact that he had read a "Humble Representation" in his own defence, turned the lot to Thomas Gillespie of Carnock. He was deposed from the ministry "for repeated acts of disobedience, adhered to tenaciously when at the bar". (3) Gillespie was in a way a scapegoat for the sins of his predecessors. The troubles about patronage prior to this case had shown that the law must be obeyed; the rights of patrons respected; and presbyteries compelled to carry out the

(1) Morren's Annals, i. 211. D. Stewart, Life of Robertson, p. 171.
(2) Morren's Annals, i. 230.
sentences of superior courts. Older men, accustomed from their youth to refractory presbyteries and riding commissions, might have shrunk from such a step as deposition, but young men had sprung up with strong wills, decided opinions, and with abilities which enabled them to be heard and respected. It is not too much to say that William Robertson, Hugh Blair, and John Home were the master spirits in the movement. (1)

It looks as if the Moderate party of which these three were members had been determined to crush the party opposed to them. They accomplished this end, and achieved a decisive victory; but it was at the expense of a second schism in the Church, for Thomas Gillespie soon after became the father and founder of the Presbytery of Relief. (2)

In 1757 the parish of Jedburgh became vacant, and the people desired Thomas Boston of Oxnam, son of the late Thomas Boston of Ettrick, as their pastor. But the first presentee was a man obnoxious to the people. When he withdrew because of the opposition, another man, even less acceptable than the first, was named. The people of Jedburgh, seeing little hope of having their candidate settled, withdrew from the Church of Scotland, and built a meeting-house to which they called Thomas Boston. (3) When Boston came to Jedburgh, he invited Gillespie, who had been working heroically at Dunfermline, to come and assist him. Thus the two men united in common cause.

(1) Morren's Annals, i. pp. 230, 231.
(2) J. Cunningham, Church History of Scotland, Vol. II. p. 347.
(3) G. Struthers, Hist. Sketch of Relief Church, pp. 261-267.
In 1759 the Earl of Balcarres presented Dr. Chalmers of Elie to the church of Kilconquhar. The Assembly, regardless of the people, ordered intrusion. So, in the populous village of Colinsburgh the people of Kilconquhar built a church, applied to Gillespie and Boston for advice, and on their recommendation called a Mr. Colier from England as their minister. On the 22nd of October, 1761, these three ministers, Gillespie, Boston and Colier, each accompanied by an elder, met at Colinsburgh, and constituted themselves into a presbytery, calling it the "Presbytery of Relief". Thus another dissenting Church was founded. (1)

In 1762 William Robertson became Principal of Edinburgh University, and in 1763 he was Moderator of the Assembly. His fame as a historian reflected credit on his church; his practical ability proved him a worthy successor to great leaders of the past, such as Henderson and Carstares. He was strictly orthodox, and disliked the lax theology expounded from some Moderate pulpits. If respect for the belief of others be a Christian virtue, he deserves a high place in Scottish religious history. In regard to patronage, he stood by the law of the Church. He would protect any congregation against a heretical or immoral presentee, but where a local presbytery was recalcitrant, he brought the matter to the simple issue: if a presbytery may disobey the Assembly, what becomes of Presbyterianism?

(1) G. Struthers, Hist. Sketch of Relief Church, pp. 284-287.
During the years in which Robertson's influence was great in the Assembly, the Church coasted around certain issues which might have been dangerous. In 1755 David Hume's ESSAY ON MIRACLES was discussed, and there was talk of dealing with the author. But inasmuch as Hume was not in the Church, the Assembly contented itself with a general deliverance on infidelity, (1) and the sceptic was left to sit peaceably outside the fold, cultivating friendship with those within. In 1756 the tragedy of DOUGLAS was performed at an Edinburgh theatre, with several Established Church ministers in attendance. A great cry arose against these "dangerous entertainments", and such "seminaries of vice and folly", and to escape deposition from the ministry, John Home, the author of DOUGLAS, resigned his charge at Athelstaneford. Other ministers, including Alexander Carlyle of Inveresk, "the typical Moderate", were censured by their respective presbyteries, but in the Assembly the Church gave a general deliverance, and no severe punishment was meted out to the chief culprits. These two cases are significant in that they show that members of the Assembly were beginning to see that the discipline of the Church is for her own members, and that, even in the case of ministers, it should not be pressed too far. (2) Towards the end of the century it was no longer a crime for even ministers to be seen at the playhouse, and when Mrs Siddons came to Edinburgh, the General Assembly was half

deserted by its members. (1) In spite of pulpit denunciations, dancing assemblies also became fashionable. Music, both vocal and instrumental, had many amateur devotees in Edinburgh, who performed at the concerts given in St. Cecilia's Hall in the Cowgate.

In 1766 the Assembly considered the report of a committee appointed to consider the growth and the causes of dissent. There were now 120 meeting-houses, attended by 100,000 persons. The abuse of patronage was named among the causes of secession, but this reference to patronage was struck out by a vote of 99 to 85. (2) William Robertson had great influence with patrons and ministers, and he at least was satisfied with the working of patronage as an institution, inasmuch as he knew that any proposal for a change of this law would be defeated at London. It is possible that he regarded the Secession as a useful outlet for the less tractable Presbyterians. He fostered peace and quiet.

Eloquent and powerful he might be, but in the matter of toleration toward Catholics he was up against prejudices too strong in Scotland to be moved. After several attempts in London to introduce a law for the relief of Scottish Catholics had caused tumult and riots against "Popery" in Scotland, Robertson, who had used all his influence to stem the tide of intolerance, (3) was himself accused of being a pensioner of

---

(1) Alex. Carlyle of Inveresk, Autobiography, p. 322.
the Pope and a tool of the Government in London. His house was attacked, and though his evangelical and anti-popish colleague in the Assembly, Dr. John Erskine, tried to persuade the mob to retire, the dragoons rode up just in time. The threatened Bill was dropped, and the Assembly of 1779 recorded a resolution asserting the inexpediency and the danger of repealing the penal laws. (1) Robertson found himself out of sympathy with many earnest Protestants in regard to the theology propounded by some members of his party, for he was afraid that they would move to abolish subscription to the Confession of Faith. (2) His firm stand against intolerance was the last and most memorable incident of his leadership. He resigned, in 1780, and the leadership of the Moderates went to Dr. George Hill of St. Andrews. Before his death in 1793, however, Robertson had the satisfaction of hearing that a Bill for the relief of the Catholics was on the point of being passed.

By 1788 it became plain that no spiritual provision had been made on an adequate scale in the west of Scotland for the large population called into existence by new industries. In the Assembly, the Popular party had failed in two attempts to raise the patronage question. In 1796, associations of religious groups were being formed to aid foreign missions. Dr. John Erskine took part in the work, (3) with the powerful assistance of a young minister, Sir Henry Moncrieff. When the

(2) D. Stewart, Life of Robertson, appendix, pp. 297, 298.
Assembly met, there were overtures asking the Church of Scotland to co-operate, but Dr. Hill, the Moderate leader, was coldly critical, so that the overtures were rejected by 58 to 44, and a colourless resolution was passed, recommending to all members of the Church, in their different stations, that they take every competent method of promoting, within the sphere of their influence, the knowledge of the gospel, and a just sense of the inestimable blessings it conveyed. (1)

Just at the close of the century, the Haldane brothers, Robert and James, posed another problem for the Established Church. The Haldanes had desired to set up a mission in India, but had been unable to gain the consent of the East India Company. Then they turned their attention to the "heathen at home". James, assisted by others of the group - Mr. Simeon of Cambridge, John Campbell (then an ironmonger of the Grassmarket, Edinburgh), and later, Rowland Hill, went on journeys through the land, preaching and distributing tracts. They were not always complimentary to the authorities of the Church of Scotland in their bold attacks on laxness of religious observance. (2) As a result, bad feeling was engendered in different parts of the country, and found vent in the Assembly of 1799. Upon complaint of many Synods, the Assembly passed an act to meet the emergency, by which it was declared that none but licentiates of the Church of Scotland were capable of receiving a presentation to any parish within its bounds, and

(1) J. Cunningham, Church History of Scotland, p. 405. Vol. II.
which prohibited the ministers of the Church from employing any to preach in their pulpits besides the authorized licentiates and ministers of the Church, or from holding ministerial communion with any such persons. A pastoral letter was written and prepared for dispersal among the flock to warn them of dangers to which they were exposed. In that Pastoral letter, Sunday Schools were denounced, and the Haldanes reviled. (1) In their tours the Haldanes met with attempts by the authorities of the Church of Scotland to enlist the weight of the civil courts against them, but in each instance, great was the discomfiture of the clerics to discover that the arm of the law was no longer at the beck and call of the Establishment. Toleration was proven by the Haldanes to be a fact and not a theory, and a new era in the history of Independency was ushered in. (2)

---

(2) G. Struthers, Hist. of the Relief Church, p. 404.
C. BAPTISTS IN SCOTLAND BEFORE 1765.

Archibald M'Lean in his "Short Account of the Scots Baptists", published in 1795 in Dr. Rippon's Baptist Annual Register, gives us to understand that, "It was supposed, till very lately, that there never had existed in Scotland a religious society of the Baptist denomination before the year 1765; but it now appears that this was a mistake, and that such a society did really exist there as far back as about the middle of the last century, and which used to meet at Leith and Edinburgh." (1) He goes on to deduce that this church was in all probability composed of English Baptists, soldiers of Cromwell, who were in Scotland as part of the garrison of the Protector. He thinks that it continued in existence till about the time of the Restoration, when, either because of the withdrawal of the garrison, or also due to the persecution experienced under Charles II by the Baptists, the church was dissolved or dispersed. "Be that as it may, there do not appear, as far as is now known, the slightest traces of so much as one single Baptist church in North Britain for more than a hundred years subsequent to that period." (2) M'Lean is aware, however, that the next rise of a PUBLIC profession in Scotland of the Baptist doctrines was not due to the formation of that church in Edinburgh with which he was associated.

(2) Ibid, p. 361.
He continues:

"A little prior to this date (1765) Sir William Sinclair, of Dunbeath, Bart., in the shire of Caithness, baptized a few of his tenants, who united with him for some time. His notions in many things were very singular. He observed the Passover, and after the Lord's Supper he girded himself with a towel, poured water into a bason, and washed their feet, which he considered as a necessary appendage to the Lord's Supper. He died several years ago at Edinburgh, when, it is said, all his adherents, excepting one, returned to the Kirk." (1)

So much for the knowledge of Baptist beginnings in Scotland of which the eighteenth century Scots Baptists were aware. A further and greater light has been thrown upon the misty realms of this period of Baptist history by the studies of two modern Baptist scholars, Rev. James Scott, Ph.D., and the late Mr. Percival Waugh. (2) These gentlemen have verified most of the deductions of M'Lean, and have corrected his impression that the Keiss church (founded by Sir William Sinclair) died out, for Baptist witness has continued at Keiss to the present day.

Scotland of the Reformation was not a hospitable breeding ground for notions of independency, "anabaptism", toleration, and the like. In 1584, Robert Browne, the English Separatist, was hotly withstood by the ministers of Edinburgh when he attempted to establish Independency. Though John Penry, one of the martyrs of the Independent cause, sojourned in Scotland

(2) Dr. Scott wrote his Ph.D. thesis on "Baptist History in the Commonwealth Period in Scotland". Mr. Waugh, the last lay pastor of Bristo Baptist Church, Edinburgh, contributed a chapter to the History of the Baptists in Scotland, on "The Vacant Years".
for a time, and presumably advocated his doctrines there, no trace can be found of any society having been founded by either Browne or Penry. Independency was not wanted by the Reformers, and Anabaptism was even less welcome.

The great increase of Anabaptists and other Independent groups in England in the seventeenth century gave rise to fears in Scotland of attempts to introduce these principles there. The spread of this "pest" was opposed mightily near the borders by Robert Baillie, who in 1647 published a book against Anabaptism. (1) That the threat of such an infiltration of heretical doctrine must have appeared very real, is shown by the fact that the Church of Scotland, in its General Assembly, took notice of the great dangers to the Reformed religion, arising out of the alarming spread of sectaries in England. An Act of the Assembly of 1647, entitled, "A Declaration and Brotherly Exhortation of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland to their Brethren of England," contains the following:

"Nevertheless, we are also very sensible of the great and imminent dangers into which this common cause of religion is now brought by the growing and spreading of most dangerous errours in England, to the obstructing and hindering of the begun reformation, as namely, (beside many others,) Socinianisme, Arminianisme, Anabaptisme, Antinomianisme, Brownisme, Erastianisme, Independency, and that which is called (by abuse of the word) Liberty of Conscience, being indeed liberty of errour, scandall, schisme, heresie, dishonouring God, opposing the truth, hindering reformation, and seducing others; whereunto we adde those Nullifidians, or men of no religion, commonly called Seekers: Yea, we cannot but look upon the dangers of the true Reformed religion in this island as greater now than before..." (2)

(1) Robert Baillie, Anabaptisme, the True Fountaine of Independency, London, 1647.
Another Act of 1647, on "Secret and Private Worship", contains this interesting rule (Section V):

"Let no idler who hath no particular calling, or vagrant person, under pretence of a calling, be suffered to perform worship in families, to or for the same; seeing persons tainted with errours, or aiming at division, may be ready (after that manner) to creep into houses, and lead captive silly and unstable souls." (1)

Nor was the powerful influence of the printed word to instil "error" forgotten, as witness the "Act discharging the Importing, Venting, or Spreading of erronious Books or Papers", (Aug. 1647). (2)

In 1651, Nicoll in his Diary makes mention of the names of the various groups, now in use in Scotland:

"I thought guid to remember how that the names of Protestant and Papist wer not now in use, nor hes bene thir sindrie yieris past, bot supprest: and in place thairof rais up the name of Covenanteris, Anti-Covenanteris, Croce-Covenanteris, Puritanes, Babarteres, Roun-heidis, Auld-hornes, New-hornes, Croce-Pet(it)ioneris, Brownistes, Separistês, Malignantis, Sectareis, Royalistes, Quakeris, Anabaptistes." (3)

Nicoll does not say whether these independent movements had actually spread into Scotland. Definite evidence of one individual being "tainted" is given by Pittilloh, who mentions the fact that Gilbert Gardin of Tulliefruskie was excommunicated in 1642 for his Baptist sentiments. (4)

' Alas for the Church of Scotland, and all their careful plans to exclude "errours" from the realm. Cromwell's army came into Scotland, and with the invaders came a new regime,

(2) Ibid, p. 160.
(3) John Nicoll, Diary, pp. 38, 39.
and new laws to supersede the Acts of Assembly. A Declaration of 1652, called, "A Declaration of the Parliament of the Commounwealth of England concerning the settlement of Scotland," declares:

"First, As to quihat concernis the advancement of the glorie of God, that their constant endeavouris salbe to promote the preaching of the Gospell, and to advance the power of trew religioun and holines, and that God may be worschiped and served according to his mynd reveilled in his word; with protectiones, and all dew countenance and encuragement thairin, to the pepill of that natioun from these in autoritie under the Parliament."

"Explanatioun of the foirsaid Declaratioun, or an Additioun thairunto, by the Commissioneris of the Commounwelt of England for managing of the effaires of Scotland."

"...We declar, that for promoting of holines and advancing the power of godlines, all possible cair sail be used for publiching the gospell of Chryst in all pairtes of this land, and provision of maintenance maid and allowed to the faithfull dispensaris thairof, togidder with such uther incuragementis as the magistrates may give, and may be expected by thame quho damane thameselfis peceablie and becuminglie to the governament and autoritie, by quhich thai resave the same; .........and that such ministeris quhois conscience oblige thame to wait upone God in the administratioun of spirituall ordinances according to the ordour of the Scottis church, with any that sail voluntarlie joyne in the practik thairof, sail resave protectioun and incuragement from all in autoritie in their peceable and inoffensive exercise of the same. As also sail protect utheris quho not being satisfeyed in conscience to use that forme, sail serve and worschip God in ane uther gospell way, and behave thameselfis peceablie and inoffensivelie thairin." (1)

The latter words show that not only the Church of Scotland were to be encouraged in their worship of God, but also "those who shall worship God in any other Gospel way". Thus there was ushered in for the Sectaries in Scotland, a short time in which they could raise their heads and organize societies without the

(1) John Nicoll, Diary, pp. 83, 84.
opposition of the heavy arm of the law. The Presbyterian stalwarts might fume and fulminate against the evils let loose in their midst, but they themselves found that the soldiers of Cromwell were lacking in respect for the cloth when the General Assembly tried to meet in the absence of permission from the Protector or his Commissioners. (1)

Under the protection of this military rule, even the despised "Anabaptists" had the temerity to meet for public worship.

Cromwell's Army of occupation in Scotland was settled in eighteen garrison towns, as well as in four citadels situated at Perth, Leith, Ayr and Inverness. The English army contained many Baptists, so that it is quite reasonable to surmise that nearly all of these places had at least a small Baptist group of soldiers in them. The records are so scarce, however, that traces of a Baptist society can only be found for the larger centres.

At Leith, a church was formed about 1652, as can be ascertained from published correspondence. M'Lean mentions a pamphlet published by this group:

"A Confession of Faith of the several Congregations or Churches of Christ in London, which are commonly (though unjustly), called Anabaptists: Published for the vindication of the truth, &c. ... Unto which is added, Heart-bleedings for professors abominations, or a faithful general epistle (from the same churches) presented to all who have known the way of truth, &c. ... Printed at Leith 1653."

To this edition, M'Lean found prefixed a preface by some Baptists at Leith and Edinburgh, which, however, merely stated

that they were of the same faith and order as the churches in London, and did not give anything of their own history. It was dated, "Leith, the 10th of the first month, vulgarly called March, 1652-3." It is signed, "in the name, and by the appointment of the church of Christ, usually meeting at Leith and Edinburgh, by Thomas Spenser, Abraham Holmes, Thomas Powell, John Brady." This pamphlet also mentioned that the church met on alternate Sundays at Leith and Edinburgh. (1)

Some of the activities of the Baptists in the Leith-Edinburgh area have crept into the record of events in 1653 in Nicoll's Diary, for he makes remark:

"This yeir Anabaptistes daylie increst in this natioun, Quhair nevir nane wes of befoir, at leist durst not avow thame-selffis; bot now many maid oppin professioun thairof, and avowit the same; sa that thryse in the oulk, viz. on Monday, Weddinsday, and Fryday, thair wer sum dippit at Bonyntoun mylne betuix Leith and Edinburgh, both men and women of guid rank. Sum dayis thair wald be sindrie hundreth persones attending that actioun, and fyftene persones baptized in one day by the Anabaptistes..."

and, continuing, on the same page he makes the interesting comment:

"...Divisioun yet increst and daylie continued among the ministrie, sindry of thame mantening strange opinionioues, different ane from another; pairt mantening and defending Anabaptisme; ..." (2)

Lamont in his Diary mentions one of these converts by name as "Lady Craigie-Wallace, a lady in the West Country" in the following entry:

---

(1) Dr. Rippon, Baptist Annual Register, Vol. II, 1795, p. 361.
(2) John Nicoll, Diary, p. 106.
"1653, Mar. - This month, severall peopell in Edenbroughe, and therby, were dipped, or rebaptized by the English, in the water of Leith, amonge whom was the Lady Craige-Wallas, a lady in the west countrey." (1)

Both of these accounts draw our attention to the fact that the spread of these doctrines, and the zeal displayed in the witness thereof, was not confined to the poorer class of society, but that people of quality were found among native adherents.

Naturally, many of the members of the Leith church were English soldiers belonging to the regiments stationed in that place and at Edinburgh. The presence of the soldiers in this church brought it into friendship with several of the Baptist churches in England, especially with those at Hexham and Fenstanton. Some of the chaplains in Scotland came from Hexham. When these men went north, they visited the Leith church, and the records show that they acted as ministers to the Leith group, by the kind permission of General Lillburne (then Colonel), in addition to their duties as chaplains. (2)

The church at Hexham, on December 20th, 1652, ordained and sent Edward Hickhorngill, one of their number, to be their messenger to Scotland. Shortly after his arrival he was able to visit the church at Leith, where he was invited by the officers of the church to become their pastor. After some

(1) The Chronicle of Fife; being the Diary of John Lamont of Newton, from 1649 to 1672, p. 65.
(2) Records of the Churches...at Fenstanton, Warboys and Hexham, 1644-1720. (Hanserd Knollys Society.) p. 307.
hesitation, he agreed to do so, but later changed his mind regarding payment for ministerial work, which he had discussed with these brethren, and he resigned his chaplaincy to apply for another post. A letter which he sent to the church at Hexham contained the first news which they had received of the Leith church, and in it he also passed on a request from Lillburne that Hexham send some qualified brother to act as chaplain, as there were, "divers honest Scots people about the place that long to be gathered into the same Gospel order with us, but they want a faithful pastor". (1) The church at Hexham immediately sent Thomas Stackhouse, who, after he had been welcomed by the Commander and Baptist friends, ministered to the Leith church for a time, and then returned to Hexham for a visit, bringing with him a letter to that church from the Leith congregation. This was the first communication between the two Churches. (2)

Hickhorngill proved to be a trial and disappointment for a time. He seemed to have lost all interest in religious matters. Mr. Stackhouse in a letter refers to him as a "desperate athiest", "wicked and blasphemous", "who troubles all who have the welfare of Zion". (3) The Leith church was under the necessity of cutting off the transgressor from their fellowship, while Hexham sent Hickhorngill a letter of kindly admonition. This discipline had a favourable effect, for in

(2) Ibid, pp. 324-328.
a letter from Perth, whence he had removed as an officer, he relates to the Hexham church his restoration to the truth. (1)

The letters and fellowship with the English churches were a source of great encouragement to the church at Leith, for they were in the midst of a religious group in Scotland which was on the whole very much prejudiced against their doctrines. It is noteworthy to add that as soon as the Baptist group under Carmichael had been organized in 1765, this fellowship was resumed, by a visit to the new church of messengers from Hexham, and letters exchanged between the churches. (2)

George Fox, the Quaker, met the Baptists at Leith, but in his Journal he classes them as "rude". (3)

In Edinburgh, even in 1651, there were some who adhered to Baptist principles, for it was affirmed at a ministers' meeting there that some of the elders present gave it as their opinion that "children should not receive baptism till they could give a confession of their faith". (4) No record is found of these Baptist sympathizers having a separate meeting, but two years later the Baptist Church at Leith met every alternate Sunday at the Tolbooth in Edinburgh. As there is no record of separate church organization, it is surmised that this meeting was held for the convenience of members resident in Edinburgh. Several State public officials, resident in

(1) Hexham Records, pp. 332, 333.
(2) David Douglas, Hist. of the Northern Churches, pp. 192-195.
(3) G. Fox, Journal, p. 272.
(4) David Douglas, Hist. of the Northern Churches, p. 37.
Edinburgh, were Baptist in sentiment, and these may have worshipped at the services thus provided by the Leith church.

At Perth, the atmosphere was congenial to the rise of a Baptist community, for the Governor of Perth for a time was General Overton, who, being a convinced Baptist himself, would be presumed to favour such an enterprise. That there was such a group is evidenced by the letter written by Lieut. Hickhorngill to Hexham in 1653, in which he speaks of the "brethren of that place being in good health". (1) Fox also met Baptists at Perth, and must have had discussion with them, for he brands them as "janglers and disputers". (2)

Lamont's Diary informs us that at Cupar, Fifeshire, where Colonel Fairfax's regiment was stationed, Mr. Brown, the chaplain, preached the Gospel and baptized several of the soldiers in the river Eden. (3) In the Cupar Kirk Session Records for 1658, it is recorded that "Christina Myllar was excommunicated for persisting in Anabaptism and other errors". (4)

Bishop Burnet in his "History of His Own Time", recalls the coming of the English soldiers to Aberdeen, in these words, "I can remember well three regiments coming to Aberdeen. There was an order and discipline and a face of gravity and piety in them which amazed all people. Most of them were Independents and Anabaptists; they were all gifted men, and

(1) Hexham Records, p. 333.
(2) George Fox, Journal, p. 277.
(3) John Lamont of Newton, Diary, Maitland Club Edition, 1830, p. 49.
(4) Ibid, footnote, p. 49.
preached as they were moved." (1) The celebrated English preacher, Samuel Oates, was the chaplain at Aberdeen, and there is evidence that his principles took a root around that city. Pittilloh declares, "John Forbes, minister of Kincardine, declared himself a Baptist," also William Youngson, minister of Durris; and these may have gathered several Baptist adherents around them. (2) Other Baptists are mentioned in isolated parts of the country. In 1651 we read that "Alex. Cornwall, minister of Linlithgow, baptized old people, for which he was under sentence of excommunication". "Also one called Thomas Charteris of Stonehouse, who maintained Anabaptist doctrines, and would not baptize infants." (3) This Charteris, before going to Stonehouse, had been a chaplain in Edinburgh, where he may have met some of the English Baptists and imbibed Baptist doctrines. He obtained from the English commissioner the rich living of Kilbride parish, where he formed a congregation of about thirty followers. The Hexham Records contain a letter to one of their own number, Edward Limburgh, who was stationed at Jedburgh, it is presumed on garrison duty as a soldier. (4) Baptists seem to have penetrated as far north as Sutherlandshire, for there is a record of a letter written to the "soldiers in the garrison at Holmdell (Helmsdale), in Sutherlandshire, by William Packer."

(1) Bishop Burnet, Hist. of His Own Time, i. p. 58, London, 1724.
(2) Robert Pittilloh, Hammer of Persecution, p. 10.
(3) John Nicoll, Diary, p. 94.
(4) Hexham Records, pp. 301, 302.
A reply to this letter was written in 1656 by "Jonas Dell, Soldier, in opposition to those dipping themselves in water". (1)

At first, Baptist groups had been supported and encouraged by Cromwell, but when he was appointed Lord Protector, there arose such an attitude of opposition to him among officers of the Baptist persuasion, that his policy was changed to active hostility. Included among the members of Leith church were officers of Republican views, and the movement spread to Ayr and Aberdeen. Seditious letters were sent, and clandestine meetings held. Cromwell's spies obtained several of these letters, with the result that the guilty ones were punished by being dismissed or imprisoned. Baptist officers implicated in sedition included General Overton, Major Holmes, Major Harrison, Major Bramston, Captain Hedworth, and Chaplain Samuel Oates.

The whole Baptist cause came under suspicion, with the result that a pamphlet was published on behalf of the "Rebaptized churches at St. Johnstones, Leith and Edinburgh", which contained an address to Cromwell "for their vindication from having any hand in the late design of some officers against your Highness". This pamphlet was printed in 1655 at Edinburgh, under the title of "The Humble Address of the baptized churches consisting of officers, soldiers and others walking in Gospel order at Leith, Edinburgh, and St. Johnstones". Fifteen signatures are appended, none of whom had signed the other

pamphlet ("Hearts Bleedings"). These papers are scarce, but both this pamphlet of 1655 and a letter of reply drawn up by Major Bramston, who was a member of the Republican group, which letter is entitled, "Reasons Against Communion with Those who signed the Address," are preserved in the Clarke Papers. (1)

In continuation of the policy of repression and punishment of seditious Baptist officers, Cromwell struck at the entire Baptist group by ordering the Council of Scotland, in 1658, to "see that no Baptist holds any office of trust, nor practises at law, nor keeps a school". (2) As the Baptist cause went down, the Presbyterian cause went up, for Monk had no love for Baptists, and in their repression found willing allies in the Presbyterian ranks. Guizot says that Monk, "armed with the power of a conqueror, used it with severity. The Anabaptists were repressed: the Presbyterians received full liberty to exercise their worship". (3) Monk purged the army of Baptist officers, and imprisoned many of them in Tantallon Castle. Baptists in public positions were dismissed. Colonel Abraham Holmes, who had signed the Leith Confession of 1653, was a Commissioner for the County of Edinburgh for the levy of a Parliamentary impost in January, 1659, and had been one of the officers joining with Monk in May in a request to Fleetwood to maintain the public liberties and to advance the godly regard-

(1) Clarke MSS. XXVII, p. 33. Clarke MSS. L, 92.
Iesf5 of party, yet a few months later Monk cancelled his commission. (1)

Robert Pittilloh, writing in 1659, gives this picture of the Baptist repression:

"There was but one Commissary (for Ecclesiastical affairs) of the Baptist judgement, Mr. Claude Hamilton, who was first removed from Edinburgh to Striveling (Stirling), and thereafter driven from all. Mr. Dundas, supervisor to the Messengers, a Baptist, was likewise removed without fault. There was but one Sheriff/Clerk and Keeper of...seasings (sasines) a Baptist in all Scotland, Mr. Archibald Weir, and he was pursued for a Drunkard (albeit innocent, and of a blameless conversation) and a contemner of Ordinances; under which suffering in the grief of his spirit he dyed. There was but one Clerk to the Peace of this Judgement, Mr. Alex. Dick, and... he was forced to part with the interest he had in the Clerkship of the Commissariat of Haddington... There was but one schoolmaster of this Judgement, Mr. David Barzog, and he was forced to go for England to purchase a Livelyhood, where in his grief he dyed at Newcastle. There was but one Collector for the Publick, Mr. James Lindsay, of this Judgement, and he was laid aside.

..."Concerning Ministers and such as were Students of divinity, and their relations, this was the consequence: Mr. Rue's (Row) wife, a woman of a thousand for eminence in piety, of the Baptist Judgement, overwhelmed with grief, died under the burden. Mr. Meinzies returned to his old practice. Mr. Youngstone had another minister put in his place... by his Lord Patron; whereupon he was forced to sell a little inheritance he had, and thereafter died of grief... He hath not only secluded the, but also declared in presence of several witnesses, Gilbert Gardin of Tullyfrusckie and William Dundas, late supervisor to the Messengers (both Baptists) incapable of any place whatsoever; of whom the first is known to be pious, and of a blameless conversation, who merely for conscience sake about seventeen years since, suffered the sentence of excommunication by the National Ministry in Scotland; and since for the same cause close imprisonment by their power above a year's space and a half... The other was in office six or seven years formerly without being questioned for ignorance, negligence, or infidelity of office, or blame in his conversation to this day, albeit he be likewise excommunicated for following the light of his conscience." (2)

---

(1) *Hist. of Baptists in Scotland*, p. 36.
By such stern measures, the scattered Baptist communities were weakened and enfeebled. Yet, in July 1659, they took part in a petition to Parliament for toleration in matters of religion, which contained two hundred signatures. This was one of the last public actions of the Baptists before the army left Edinburgh. Their motives were unselfish, for they petitioned not only for themselves, but for "several others in this nation". The petition was unsuccessful.

The decline in Baptist witness in Scotland, begun under the persecutions, was accelerated by the loss of the soldier members of the congregations when the army marched away. When the Restoration of Charles II was accomplished in 1660 active Baptist life in Scotland disappeared. The measures of Charles in respect to Baptists was even more severe than what had gone before. On 2nd January, 1661, proclamation was made at the Mercat crosses of the royal burghs against Quakers and Anabaptists "to apprehend any such persons as shall frequent such meetings". (1) In 1662 it was ordered that the parents of "any child unbaptized after thirty days" should be subject to heavy fines. The sheriff was encouraged to press such prosecution by being allowed to pocket the fines thus collected. The Baptists were thus broken up as communities, driven to flee the country, and those who were left were in the position of sheep without a shepherd. What they might believe as indivi-

duals they were not allowed under pain of law to express in public, or to practise collectively. Little wonder M'Lean was under the impression that there had been no religious society of the Baptist denomination in existence in Scotland before the year 1765. They had been "sunk without trace" so that the new group of Baptists arising one hundred years later were unable to find "the slightest traces of so much as one single Baptist church in North Britain for more than a hundred years subsequent to that period" (1660). (1)

A few individuals of the Baptist persuasion do come to light during Mr. Waugh's study of what he describes as "The Vacant Years". Lady Craigie Wallace died in November, 1663. She was Christina Pringle, a daughter of Pringle of Stichill and widow of Hew Wallace, younger of Craigie, in the Parish of Auchinleck. Her husband died before his father, and therefore the title was merely customary. The father and the husband were at odds with each other, so much so that Lady Wallace had to defend her husband and herself against a charge of robbery made by the father. The husband's mental balance was affected by these broils. Lady Wallace's Christian testimony was maintained to the end, as recorded by Walter Pringle of Greenknowe in noting her death: "My sister Craigie...expressed unto me her assurance of mercy and salvation thro' Jesus Christ." (2)

During the time when frequenters of Conventicles were being sought, and absentees from Parish churches were prosecuted, another Baptist was seized in a strict search in Edinburgh in September, 1684. He was "Thomas Lendon, the Anabaptist", obviously well-known in the city when an eminent judge so describes him. (1) He had been an officer under Lambert, and one of the signatories at Newcastle in the latter part of 1659, to a letter to Monk, then marching on London; remonstrating, against a delay which they thought endangered the lives of their brethren in England. Some years later he is found preventing a frenzied man, Sir James Standsfield, from throwing himself out of a window at the Netherbow Port of Edinburgh, and in 1688 he was one of the jury at the trial of Standsfield's son for the murder of his father. At that time he was described as a merchant.

A romantic story credits the founding of the church at Bridlington, Yorkshire, to a Scottish farmer of Baptist conviction, who met Robert Prudom, a gentleman of property, when this farmer, returning from being baptized at London, was storm-bound at Bridlington. The farmer won over Prudom to his views on Baptism, and Prudom in turn won others, and so founded a Church of 25 members there in 1698. (2)

About 1715, the Baptist cause was almost subject to the intrigues of a deceiver, Thomas Lawrie, a Presbyterian minister

(2) Baptist Magazine, 1821, p. 196.
from Scotland, who was baptized and became a member of the Spitalfields church, London. He came to the notice of the Baptist ministers of London, preached to their satisfaction concerning his knowledge of the Gospel, and produced his certificates of license. Because of his "Scotch pronunciation" it was proposed that he should return to Scotland, where, he assured them, there were several ministers of his mind on Baptism, that there, "where none had been heard of who had openly professed it", he might promote the doctrine. An illness which seized Lawrie at this time prevented this and brought the plan to nothing. (1) Wodrow tells of a Thomas Lawrie, M.A., minister of Closeburn, who had been deposed from the Church of Scotland for immorality, "with very aggravating circumstances", in 1710. Despite his deposition he had continued preaching in the district for some years, the Abjuration oath being his special aversion. (2) The Baptist cause was well spared the services of such a character.

After a lapse of ninety years from the time of its eclipse at the close of the Commonwealth period, the Baptist cause was revived in Scotland. It is noteworthy that the place of this revival was in the far north of the country, and that a gentleman of title was the founder of this little society. Certainly the predispositions were not favorable. Sir James Sinclair, the father of Sir William Sinclair of Dunbeath, Caithness, had

(2) Robert Wodrow, Correspondence, Vol. 1, p. 119.
been created a baronet in 1704, and had sat in the Scots Parliament, but had twice been in trouble with the Court of Session for the illegal exercise of the power of "pit and gallows". Sir William, too, was associated with the army, and that did not auger well for a Christian life. But in spite of heredity and environment, Sir William professed his faith and was baptized. The exact place of this event cannot be ascertained, but he is supposed to have been baptized in London.

After his father died in 1742, Sir William settled on his estate at Keiss in Caithness, and there he preached to his tenants and neighbours in witness of the Gospel he had embraced. He formed a Church of believers who had also confessed their faith in baptism. The traditional date of the founding of the church at Keiss is New Year's Day, 1750. Tradition has it, that since the castle had become ruinous, the church met in a vaulted room now open to the winds of heaven; but Sir William had renovated the house of Keiss, near the castle, and it is probable that the church met at the House of Keiss during his residence there. Soon, however, the financial strain of his rebuilding, made necessary the sale of Dunbeath and Keiss, and then after Sir William left the district the brethren may have had to meet among the ruins.

The landed gentry in the neighbourhood were scandalized by the strange behaviour of Sir William in thus departing from the customary Presbyterianism or Episcopalianism, especially at the
presumption of a layman to invade the realm of religion.

Robert Forbes, Bishop of the diocese, visited his house in August, 1762, and sneeringly dubbed him the Preaching Knight. He calls Sinclair, "A wrong headed man confessedly by all who know him best, for he has taken up that odd way of strolling about and preaching without commission or appointment of any man or any set of men whatsoever, and vents the wildest and most extravagant notions that were ever hatched in the most disordered brain." Bishop Forbes ascribes Lady Sinclair's failing health to her "husband's unaccountable ways of doing", but we must also bear in mind the pressure of finances that were then pressing upon the baronet. The Bishop was also dismayed to see this Preaching Knight remain seated during grace over a "dram" at her Ladyship's bedside. The tales of the neighbours also found a hearing from the Bishop, who was ready to believe them. (1)

According to Mr. Waugh:

"The charge of entertaining 'extravagant notions' was not altogether without some basis. Sir William read his New Testament to purpose and perhaps not always with a discriminating judgement. The Passover had preceded the institution of the Supper by the Lord, and so this feast must be retained in the celebration. The Lord washed the feet of his disciples, and this act also was deemed obligatory. A Love Feast was observed by the early Church, and this, less disputably, was continued. Independent thought has its pitfalls for one's self as well as its reactions on others. Sir William stepped aside from the Churches around him not only in the sacrament of baptism, but also in the sacrament of the Supper by attending to it each Lord's Day, in contrast with the very infrequent observance of the time, and food for censure was abundant."

He went further in an amazing development for the period, for he prepared for the little Church, and published in 1751, a collection of sixty Hymns and Spiritual Songs of his own composition. They are copious in Scripture figure and phrase, but lacking in poetic expression, and at times are bizarre and halting; yet they reveal a soul rejoicing and praiseful. This collection has the distinction of being the first, or almost the first, hymn-book produced in Scotland for a Protestant congregation. (1) The Church in that day numbered some thirty members, but the only names that have come down to us are those of his land-steward, John Budge, and his wife, whom he immersed." (2)

In 1763, Sir William removed to Edinburgh when Keiss and Dunbeath had been sold. There in Edinburgh he came in contact with John Glas and Robert Sandeman, and worshipped with them for a time, but doctrinal differences prevented a union. No evidence is extant to show that he came in touch with the Scotch Baptists who formed the first Church there two years later. He died early in December, 1768, and was buried in Lord Macleod's grave in the Canongate Churchyard.

Keiss Church struggled on after the founder's departure. He himself wrote an affectionate letter from Edinburgh in January, 1764, cherishing the hope of being returned to its fellowship. John Budge carried on as a lay pastor, and it has been discovered that during a visit to Edinburgh early in 1790, he had fellowship with the small group which had adhered to Dr. Robert Walker when he left the eldership of the first Church on the question of the Sonship of Christ. Dr. Walker, writing to Budge after his return north, prays that the Keiss

(2) Hist. of Baptists in Scotland, pp. 41, 42.
Church "may continue to enjoy the Lord's comfortable presence". It was the practice of the Keiss Church not to celebrate the Lord's Supper unless a Pastor was present to administer it. This fact is noted by James Haldane on his first tour. When Haldane preached at Freswick on 5th October, 1797, he discovered the presence of a small society in the neighbourhood which professed Baptist principles, and had been formed into a Church by means of Sir William Sinclair. He notes that they had been without a pastor or Ordinances since Sinclair died; that they met on the Lord's Day to read the Scriptures and pray; that those desiring baptism went to Edinburgh for the purpose, and that the leading men whom he met seemed to be godly persons. (1) A parish minister put their number then at about half a dozen. In 1803 John Campbell, who accompanied Haldane in the third tour of the north, sought out the church, and found it to consist of "about twenty".

This little society has continued to witness until the present day, though long without a settled pastor. John Budge carried on the oversight till his death about 1800. Donald Inrig, who died in 1831, took over the leadership next, and he was seconded by Andrew Rugg. Alexander Bain aided them in their later years, and continued the leadership. Ordinances were provided by the itineration of Edward Mackay, founder of the Church at Thurso. He was supported at first by the Scotch

(1) J. Haldane, *Journal of a Tour*, 1797, pp. 72, 73.
Baptist Churches, and later by the Home Mission, and visited the Caithness churches at Ratter, Wick and Keiss. A Parliamentary inquiry into religious instruction, in 1836, discovered that Keiss had twenty members, mostly cottars, fishermen, and the like, and met in a building made partly of stone and partly of turf, built about forty years before then by the people themselves at cost of £5. The capacity of this church was 80, and the ordinary attendance ranged from 30 to 60, but when Mr. Mackay came four or five times a year to administer Communion, the congregations were so great at his preachings, that they had to be held out of doors, and even among the rocks in the open air. Mr. Mackay died in 1845, but from 1851 Mr. Robert C. Sowerby, another Home Mission representative, visited Keiss from his station at Wick. The first settled pastor at Keiss was the much esteemed James Scott, who was placed there in 1860, and was the instrument of widespread blessing to the county. (1)

Thus, though the story of the Scotch Baptist Churches as revealed later in this thesis, may not mention Keiss very often, we must bear in mind their continued existence as the first outpost of the revived Baptist faith in Scotland.

(1) History of the Baptists in Scotland, pp. 43, 44.
SECTION II.

THE LIFE AND WRITINGS OF ARCHIBALD M'LEAN.
CHAPTER I. -- 1733-1759. "EARLY DAYS"

A traveller to Oban who makes the slight effort required to climb what is known as "Battleship Hill," directly behind Dunollie Castle, will be more than amply rewarded by the glorious view from the topmost point. This vista of infinite beauty, encompassing tongues of water which penetrate between islands and into valleys between towering mountains, is of most direct interest to this paper, for across Oban Bay can be seen the lovely isle of Mull, where, on a small promontory near the lighthouse, stands the ancient castle of Duart, the stronghold and seat of the McLeans of Duart. The eldest son of the chieftain of the McLeans of Duart, who would one day be chief in his turn, was called "Brolus" after another of their holdings. A man, "third in descent from Brolus" (a) is the link between the McLeans of Duart and the subject of our study.

In 1720, this young Highlander, Archibald M'Lean, left the beautiful scenes of his boyhood, and went to settle as a farmer at East Kilbride, -- a small village about eight miles south of Glasgow. He soon married, and brought to his Kilbride farm as his wife, Miss Helen Struthers, the daughter of a respectable farmer. Their union was blessed with a son, Archibald, who was born on the 2nd of May, 1733, and baptized on 13th May 1733. (b)

Poverty, -- a circumstance well known in the homes of Scotland,

(a) A.M'Lean, Sermons on Doctrines and Duties of the Xn. Life Jones, London, 1817. -- Memoir, p.x.
(b) According to the Parish Register of East Kilbride in Register House, Edinburgh. Name is spelled M'Lean there.
stood him in good stead, for though he made progress in intellectual fields, he never enjoyed the possession of riches.

The M'Leans were poor, but not friendless, for whenever Highland acquaintances chanced to be passing their way, these travelling persons were welcome to whatever provision there was to be had at the farm. Hence, when Archibald was about eight years of age, there occurred the visit to his parents of a Highland Laird. This gentleman became interested in the boy, and asked the M'Leans if Archy could accompany him to his home for a time, as companion to his own son, a lad of about Archy's age. The next six months spent at the home of this Laird in the Isle of Mull, were memorable in the youthful experiences of Archibald M'Lean. He was an impressionable child, upon whose imagination the magnificent scenery of his surroundings, the rugged rocks and mysterious caves of the shore, the tempest and the fury of the Atlantic as it surged upon the island in storm, played a vivid part in moulding his ideas of the Creator and Sustainer of all these wonders. Another attainment, which proved to be of great value in later life, was achieved by young M'Lean at Mull. Here he learned to read and speak the Gaelic language. This training proved exceedingly valuable when the time came that he desired to trace the etymology of certain English words and phrases, as well as in the comparison and understanding of the Welsh and Irish tongues and dialects, for they are all derived from a similar source as the Gaelic.
It is to the credit of the Scottish Church and nation that both have taken great interest in the education of the young. Worthy of note, is the fact that even in the early days of the 18th century, an education was available to the children of the poor. M'Lean's parents, though poor, were still anxious to assure the boy of the best education which could be procured. So when he returned from Mull, Archy attended school, first at Cathcart, which was near the farm at East Kilbride, and later at Cucaddins. In these schools the lad acquired the elementary branches of learning -- reading and writing in English, arithmetic, and the Latin language.

Nor was religious instruction wanting in his formative years. The parents who observed and encouraged Archy's aptness to receive and profit by instruction, also made certain that he was well rehearsed in the Assembly's Catechism, for they were staunch Presbyterians. Young M'Lean became conversant with every question propounded in the catechism, with the appropriate answer and proof texts. In this way he imbibed a considerable amount of Scripture knowledge and doctrine, and was well introduced into the religious life and thinking of the Establishment.

The time soon came when it was necessary that a decision should be made regarding the type of work at which Archibald should earn his way as a member of an impoverished household, and at which he could prepare himself for the important task of earning a living. He had always been interested in books, so to
oks he looked for a type of work which should prove both interesting and rewarding. His desire was to become a printer. In he was fortunate, in that such employment was entirely acceptable to his parents, for it seemed to them that his natural bent toward books would be turned to advantage at this trade.

In 1746, therefore, he was articled as an apprentice to a printer in Glasgow. The printer was not long in discovering the worth of the apprentice, and the mutual agreement was highly satisfactory to all parties concerned. Archibald found the work exceedingly congenial, and was both amused and informed by the variety of works constantly passing through his hands. As can be expected from the standard of apprentice training in Scotland, his training was adequate, his intellect keen and ready to learn, so that soon he was well acquainted with all the duties and skills of the printing business.

A boy of fifteen or thereabouts, coming from a farm to work in a city; freed from parental restraint to a certain extent; could be likely to find amusement and diversion in his leisure hours. M'Lean did. He spent much of his spare time in the study of Hebrew and Greek, in order that he might be able to read the Scriptures in the original languages. Certainly no ordinary diversion for an apprentice printer, -- but then M'Lean was no ordinary apprentice! He was not "tutored" in either of these languages, i.e. -- taught by some person, -- but worked out for himself the principles and exercises which would make him
conversant with each tongue. Several Grammars which he thus devised, were, when Jones wrote the Memoir on M'Lean, still preserved in the possession of the family. M'Lean's "College" was the printing establishment; the length of his course was the duration of his apprenticeship; and so well did he apply himself that he not only became a journeyman printer, but had in the interim completed a course of general reading in various phases of theology, learned Hebrew and Greek, and laid the foundation of that extensive knowledge of the Scriptures which is apparent in his "Works". As a journeyman printer, he continued to gain in the respect and esteem of those with whom he came in contact, and Jones informs us, "he was often consulted by authors on the subject of their manuscripts, as a person of correct taste and judgement." (a)

In the factors already observed in the intellectual development of M'Lean, the subject material of his studies gives us to perceive that his nature had a deeply religious trend. In Scotland of the eighteenth century, such a person customarily came to what was termed, a "saving knowledge of the truth." Exactly when M'Lean was brought to this saving knowledge is not certain, but his biographer, Jones, infers that it was brought about by the preaching of the Rev. Dr. John M'Laurin, a distinguished Presbyterian minister of Glasgow. While M'Lean was an

apprentice he was in the habit of attending divine service at
the church of Dr. M'Laurin. There he listened with astonishment
and delight as the great preacher stood, "like a statue in the
pulpit, and pouring out copious streams of the most sublime
doctrine on his favourite topic, 'the glories of the cross of
Christ.'" (a) Dr. John M'Laurin left few writings, but of these
works M'Lean had the highest esteem, and ever after warmly
recommended them to the attention of his friends.

It is known that Archibald M'Lean was a member of a fellow­
ship prayer-meeting in the Established Church when he was a
little more than fifteen years of age. At these meetings he was
noted both for his unassuming manner, and also for the religious
talent which he displayed even at this early age. M'Lean was
fervently pious, and exemplified in his conduct the sentiments he
maintained, so that even the serious minded people of the congre­
gation were attracted to the youth. These meetings, and the
preaching of Dr. M'Laurin were of great benefit to the maturing
of M'Lean's spiritual life. Whether or not he ever cherished the
dream of entering the ministry of the Established Church will
never be known, but certainly his religious training and environ­
ment had prepared him thoroughly for a Christian life.

In addition to the factors already mentioned as influencing
his religious life, note must be made of the impression which had
been made on the lad by the great meetings at Cambuslang, where
he had seen and heard the renowned George Whitfield. The
Cambuslang Revivals were a manifestation of extremely emotional

religion. Thousands of people who crowded to hear the stirring
address of the fervid orator, Whitfield, were swayed by the over­
whelming atmosphere of the meetings into astonishing exhibitions
of repentance for sins, and abject self-surrender. M'Lean was
naturally much affected by the scenes, and though in later years
his mature consideration gave him reason to believe that many of
these incidents were purely emotional hysteria, yet he was so
much impressed by the striking manner and obvious sincerity of
the preacher, that he always considered George Whitfield to be
a devoted servant of God, and an instrument of His Grace, used
to the blessing of many.

We therefore find M'Lean as a young man conversant with
Gaelic, English, Latin, Greek and Hebrew; well read in theologi­
cal literature; and familiar with the Scriptures in the original
languages. His mind has been further developed by years of occu­
pation as a printer of a variety of books. Many of his attain­
ments have been the result of application and diligence unusual
for a youth of his age, yet giving indication of that determina­
tion of character which is often a trait of the self-educated man.
He is now obviously deeply religious, as the process begun at the
family altar in his pious Presbyterian home has been furthered,
and his faith strengthened, by the devout spirit of the fellowship
prayer-meeting, so that the inspired preaching of the Gospel of
of Christ from the lips of Dr. M'Laurin has been enabled to bring
him to "a saving knowledge of the Truth as it is in Christ Jesus."

NOTE: Source of much material for this section - "Memoir" by Jones prefixed to Sermons on the Doctrines and Duties of the Christian Life - Jones, London, 1817.
CHAPTER II - 1759-1768

Archibald M'Lean adopts Baptist Sentiments, and becomes a Pastor of the Baptist Church at Edinburgh.

Archibald M'Lean continued as a journeyman printer for several years in the establishment where he had been an apprentice. Meantime, he fell in love with Miss Isabella Moore, whom he married in the year 1759. This lady was the youngest daughter of William Moore, a Glasgow merchant. She was born in the isle of Arran, on the estate of her grandfather, Hamilton of Cotts, in the house of Drumlaboro, which had been built by her father.

Mrs. M'Lean was related by birth to some of the most ancient and powerful Highland families in Scotland. Her grandmother was the eldest daughter of MacDonald of Sanda. Pride of ancestry has often been demonstrated by those less clearly descended from a famous line than those of M'Lean and his wife. Yet these considerations had no place or value in the lives of either of these two. This is a circumstance all the more remarkable when one considers the strength of such pride in Scotland of the early 18th century.

Mrs. M'Lean brought as her dowry a small property, but it
was sufficient for Archibald M'Laan to be enabled to set up in business for himself as a printer and bookseller in Glasgow. This he did in 1760, and continued in this business until 1767. Unfortunately for the success of his venture as a business man, M'Lean was scrupulously honest, and religiously ethical in his business dealings as well as in his private life. He scorned to use the tricks and artifices of the trade, or to excuse questionable practices as necessary for gain. The printing and bookselling business at the beginning of the 18th century was at best suspect of sharp dealing, and at the worst a flagrant example of dishonest practice. (a) It is therefore no cause for surprise that Archibald M'Lean, wearied of the attempt to earn his livelihood in such a sordid market-place, began to seek another employment more suitable to his taste. The lessons learned in this hard school, however, he stored well in his memory, as examples and admonitions for the benefit of inexperienced brethren of later years.

Shortly after his marriage and commencement in business, Mr. M'Loa'n read with interest a publication by (a)Mr. John Glas, which is commonly known as "The Testimony of the King of Martyrs."

(a) "Throughout the century the publication of books was in the hands of the actual booksellers, and those, if we are to take the opinion of Pope in his 'Dunciad,' were, at the beginning of the period at any rate, hardly distinguished by taste, discrimination, or even common honesty. Publishing was, indeed, a dirty enough game, with its record of piracy, plagiarism, scandalous and disgusting lampoon, and miserable neglect and under-payment of genuine talent, as is instanced in the case of Johnson."

This book so gripped the attention of Mr. M'Lean that he found himself being led to accept the sentiments which it advocated. M'Lean regarded it as "a most judicious and scriptural illustration of our Lord's good confession, which he witnessed before Pontius Pilate, concerning his kingdom, as distinguished from the Jewish Theocracy, the kingdoms of this world, and the false churches that now bear that form." (a) His eyes were opened to the unscriptural nature of the National Establishment of religion. M'Lean did not make decisions lightly, but he was fully convinced upon this subject, and therefore could remain no longer as a member in communion with the National or Presbyterian Church. Therefore, in 1762, he withdrew from the Established Church and became a member of a small society of the Glasites, -- the followers of Mr. Glas, whose book had caused M'Lean to reconsider his church affiliation.

The Glasites were congregational in their administration, and among other principles, which included strict adherence to the primitive apostolic procedure, they believed strongly in unanimity of decision in Church discipline. M'Lean had been a member of this congregation but one year when a case of discipline arose in the church, in which it appeared to him that an individual was being sacrificed out of deference to a ruling faction. Since he could not conscientiously agree with the

decision of the church, Mr. M'Lean withdrew from their fellow­ship. At the same time, and for the same reason, a Mr. Robert Carmichael also left the Glasites. Mr. Carmichael had formerly been a minister of the Anti-Burgher group (very strict Seceders) at Cupar-Angus. When he became convinced of congregational principles, he left this Anti-Burgher church, and joined the Glasites. Now both he and Mr. Archibald M'Lean were in the position of friends without a church connection. During the course of a conversation, Mr. Carmichael said to M'Lean, "What think you of the subject of baptism?" Mr. M'Lean had not fully investigated the Scriptures upon this subject, but he promised to study the matter, and share his findings with Mr. Carmichael.

Shortly after this conversation, which took place in 1763, Mr. Carmichael received a call from an Independent congregation at Edinburgh, as a result of which he removed from Glasgow to that city, where he became co-elder, (or minister) of this group, with a shop-keeper named John McLean. He had not forgotten the subject of baptism, however, and in June 1764, he wrote to Archibald M'Lean requesting him to send his thoughts on that ordinance, in accordance with his promise. This letter induced Mr. M'Lean to examine the scriptures on that subject with greater attention than formerly. He had at that time
never read a line which had been written on that point by any Baptist. His plan was to take the New Testament in his hand and go through every page in it with careful attention, noting down any reference whatever to baptism, and especially looking for any support for the baptism of infants contained therein. As a result of this study he drew up a long letter to his friend, Mr. Carmichael, dated July 2nd, 1764, in which he went through the whole of the New Testament Scriptures on this head, and laid before him the whole subject "as clearly and plainly as ever he could have done at any subsequent period of his life." (a) Mc'Lean's conclusion was that the baptism of infants had no foundation in the New Testament, and that none have a right to that divine institution but visible believers. He thus became a decided Baptist in principle, and sought to communicate these sentiments to his friend.

This letter, while he had to admit that the arguments against infant baptism were very forcible, did not fully convince Mr. Carmichael. In a letter to Mc'Lean, dated September 3, 1764, he informs him that he has baptized the child of Mr. John McLean, his colleague, under the impression that he might be warranted to do so in consideration of the New Testament words, "Suffer the little children to come unto me, and forbid them not," and "Then were your children unclean, but now are they holy."

(a) Memoir - A.M'Lean - Sermons on Doctrines and Duties of the Xn. Life Jones, London, 1817, p. XXI.
Mr. Carmichael was not long in discovering that the people with whom he was connected in the church at Edinburgh were of various opinions. Some held erroneous ideas on the extent of Christ's death, and on the doctrine of the Atonement. His efforts to instruct and bring them together in the unity of the faith merely seemed to serve to excite them to greater contention. Therefore, in May 1765, with seven others of like mind with himself, he withdrew from this group, and set up a separate congregation.

Among the seven, who adhered to Mr. Carmichael, was Mr. Robert Walker, a surgeon in Edinburgh. This much-respected man was very liberal with his means, and since he was the only one of the group able to support their cause financially, a great part of the expense fell to his share. For the use of this congregation, Dr. Walker hired from the Incorporation of Hammermen the historic Magdalene Chapel in the Cowgate. This beautiful little place of worship had been associated with the formation of the Church of Scotland during the Reformation, and had echoed in the past to the voices of Knox, Melville, Henderson, John Craig, and others. It was rented from Whitsunday for the sum of eight pounds. Here Mr. Carmichael ministered to his faithful few. (a)

(a) The Magdalene Chapel is still (1950) in use, as part of the Livingstone Medical Mission, home of the famous "Coogate Doctors."
Soon afterwards, Mr. Carmichael became fully convinced that M'Lean's views on the subject of Baptism were scriptural, so he publicly advocated these doctrines to his group. Five of the seven, still including Dr. Walker, declared themselves to be in agreement with him on this point. These six, therefore, began to consider the manner in which they might be baptized after the scriptural method and formed into a Baptist church. As later research has shown, Sir William Sinclair, founder of the church at Keiss, was then in Edinburgh, but he was unknown to this group as a Baptist. It would seem that for some time even the existence at Keiss of a Baptist society was unknown to them, for in 1795 M'Lean writes, "It was supposed, till very lately, that there never had existed in Scotland a religious society of the Baptist denomination before the year 1765; but it now appears that this was a mistake". He goes on to mention the church at Leith in Commonwealth times, and the Church at Keiss. (a)

The Carmichael group therefore looked to England for one to come to Edinburgh for the purpose of baptizing them and setting the church in order. In June, 1765, at least three letters, -- from an individual not named, from Mr. Carmichael, and from Dr. Walker -- were sent to Dr. Gill at London, requesting him

to come to Edinburgh to officiate on these occasions. Mr. Carmichael related his Christian experience to Dr. Gill. Dr. Walker told of their spiritual enlightenment, and invited the divine to stay at his house on the visit to Edinburgh.

Two letters were received from Dr. Gill in reply to this first invitation. The first was dated July 15th, 1765, and after gratified comment on prospects in Edinburgh, and a word of praise for Mr. Carmichael and Dr. Walker for their spiritual sentiments, Dr. Gill went on to inform the Edinburgh friends that age, infirmity, care of his people, and constant attendance on the press would not admit him to take such a journey. He therefore made the suggestion that Mr. Carmichael would be well advised to come to London, be baptized himself, and then return to Edinburgh and baptize the others. An added incentive for Carmichael to go there was the fact that he would thus be enabled to discuss with Baptist ministers in that City the requirements to be met in settling a gospel church. (a)

The second letter, dated July 16, 1765, was probably an afterthought which had come to Dr. Gill, for in it he made an alternative suggestion that there was a person nearer to Edinburgh who could baptize Mr. Carmichael. This was Mr. David Fernie, a Scotsman by birth, who frequently preached at

(a) Patrick Wilson, Origin and Progress of the Scotch Baptist Churches, 1765-1854, Edin, 1844. Appendix, Note B pp.91,92 (For full letter, see APPENDIX to this thesis, Note A.)
Newcastle and Sunderland, and was usually to be found in the County of Durham. (a)

However, for some reason, the Edinburgh friends were very desirous of having Dr. Gill and Mr. Robinson come to Scotland, and dispatched another letter "insisting on their coming down if possible, because of our present situation and circumstances" as Carmichael writes to M'Lean. A reply did not come to this more urgent request till Monday night on September 16, 1765. By this, they were told that Dr. Gill could not come, and Mr. Carmichael was desired to go to London as soon as possible.

He wasted no time, for he immediately booked passage on Captain Thomson's ship, in which he was able to get the best room in the cabin, with everything convenient. This ship sailed on the Thursday afternoon, September 19th, so Mr. Carmichael had to hasten in his preparations for the long journey. He found time to write a short letter to Mr. M'Lean, informing him of the circumstances, and hoping, "if it please the Lord to return me in safety, we shall have a visit from you at Edinburgh." (b)

Mr. Carmichael reached London safely enough, in spite of the natural apprehensions of these times. On the 6th of October, which was Sunday, he preached, very acceptably to all

---

(For full letter, see APPENDIX to this thesis, Note B.)

(For full letter, see APPENDIX to this thesis, Note C).
concerned, at Dr. Gill's Church in the forenoon. Wednesday evening, October 9th, was the time set for the ordinance of Baptism, which was held in a large church in the Barbican which contained a "baptistery." Over six hundred persons gathered to witness the event, and it is noted that there were a large number of Baptist and Independent ministers in the congregation. Dr. Gill preached the sermon on 1 John v.3: "For this is the love of God, that we keep his commandments." His headings were: 1. Water baptism is a command of Christ. 2. Being a command, it ought to be observed. 3. The commands of God and Christ are not grievous. Mr. Carmichael declared that Dr. Gill, "went through the whole controversy of baptism in a very plain and clear manner" in a "short but most comprehensive discourse" which he hoped to have "printed, and to carry some copies to Edinburgh." (a) The address was indeed printed, (b) as the result of an attack in a newspaper on Dr. Gill, which was the beginning of a great deal of bitter wrangling over the subject of baptism in the area of London.

(a) Patrick Wilson, Origin and Progress of the Scotch Baptist Churches, Appendix Note B. pp. 93, 94
(b) Pamphlet, "Baptism a Divine Commandment to be Observed," by John Gill, D.D. London, 1765. (Outline, APPENDIX, Note E.)
Mr. Carmichael was much impressed with the great decency and solemnity with which the ordinance of baptism was conducted in the presence of the multitude, and found it to be "a most lively sign and representation of the death, burial, and resurrection of our Lord Jesus, and of our communion with him therein." (a) He was further edified and informed as to the manner of performance of the rite, by attending next day, Thursday October 10th, the baptism of three women of Mr. Wallin's church. Their pastor preached and baptized them, and then asked Mr. Carmichael to pray after baptism had been administered.

Carmichael's stay in London gave him opportunity to meet and associate with many Baptist ministers, all of whom treated him with kindness and respect. Dr. Walker had made a proposal about a large wooden vessel for baptizing in, but when this was proposed to Dr. Gill and several other ministers, they all agreed that baptism of the Scriptural mode would require this vessel to be made so that both the person to be baptized and the administrator could be admitted to it. (b)

(a) As in note (a) above, see APPENDIX Note D.
(b) See APPENDIX Note D, to this thesis.
Mr. Carmichael preached again at Dr. Gill's church on the morning of Sunday, October, 18th. In the afternoon he took the service at a church in Devonshire Square, where they had no pastor. He also preached on the Monday evening, October 14, in Mr. Clark's church, and thus the Baptist ministers of London had an opportunity to hear their Scottish brother.

When Mr. Carmichael returned to Edinburgh, he baptized five of his group,—Dr. Walker, Mrs. Walker, Joseph Strachan, Elizabeth Brown and Margaret Harley. (a) On the 25th November, 1765, he baptized two others, probably Joseph Wainwright and J. Harlaw, in the Water of Leith, close to Canon-mills. (b) Thus a new denomination was inaugurated in Scotland by this little group of eight people, — seven members, with Mr. Carmichael as pastor — which was set into church order and met for worship in the Magdalene Chapel.


(b) "On Monday, Nov. 25 an Antipaedobaptist administered the ordinance of baptism to two adults, in the Water of Leith, hard by Canonmills, near Edinburgh, in the following manner. The two persons, being first stripped, were clothed with long black gowns, and then went into the water, along with their minister; who, after repeating some words in their ordinary form, took them by the nape of the neck, plunged them down over head and ears, and kept them for a little time wholly under the water."

Mr. M'Lean, at this time resident in Glasgow, came to Edinburgh a few weeks later, and was baptized by his friend Carmichael. While in Edinburgh for this purpose, he was warmly solicited by the friends to write a reply to the pamphlet which Mr. John Glas had published in 1746, called "A Dissertation on Infant Baptism." This he finally agreed to do. Upon his return to Glasgow he found that his becoming a Baptist was not regarded by his wife as happy news. When first she heard of this, she declared that she could not have been more sorry had he become a Roman Catholic. (However, she soon changed her point of view, became herself Baptist, and was a staunch and faithful member of that group for the remainder of her life.)

There was something of a sensation caused in Glasgow by the news that they had a Baptist in the city. Brown declares, "Some were filled with wonder, others with contempt, and all with a determination to oppose the innovation. Friends and foes were most hostile. He was pointed at with scorn. His business as a letterpress writer went from him." (a) M'Lean, however, persevered in his solitary adherence to his sentiments, and during the spring of 1766 was engaged in preparing another "innovation" in the form of his reply to Mr. Glas. This paper he drew up in the form of Eleven Letters. He sent the manuscript to Dr. Gill at London, for that famous writer's

comment and criticism. Dr. Gill sent him word that his remarks on the part concerning Baptism being to the true Israel who are born of the Spirit, what Circumcision was to the typical Israel who were born of the flesh, should be altered or left out. M'Lean consulted by correspondence with Dr. Walker and Mr. Carmichael on his paper, and this criticism of it. The latter person suggested that with a minor modification the parallel should be included, and left other suggestions to Dr. Walker. (a) The "Eleven Letters to Mr. Glas" were published early in 1767, and since a publication of this type was a novelty at that time in Scotland, the pamphlet aroused much interest in the subject of Baptism. This was especially a powerful stroke in the interest of the Baptist cause, as the Eleven Letters gave a well-reasoned reply to a document which the Glasites had boasted of as being unanswerable. In course of time this pamphlet of M'Lean's had great influence. We even find David Douglas, the author of "The History of the Baptist Churches in the North of England", in 1846 declaring it, "a masterly performance, the reading of which had the effect of convincing the writer, in early life, of the truth of Baptist principles." (b)

Meantime, a friendship and fellowship was commenced early in 1766 between the infant church at Edinburgh and the churches

(a) Memoir to "Sermons on Doctrines and Duties," Appendix, Letter II, pp. cx - cxii. See Appendix, this thesis, Note F
at Marton, Hexham and Newcastle, in the North of England. The first step in this fellowship was a correspondence between these English churches and Mr. J. Harlaw. Then letters were sent to the Edinburgh church itself. In midsummer, there occurred a visit to the Edinburgh group by Mr. David Fernie, pastor of the three English churches, accompanied by his friend, Mr. William Angus, of the Juniper-Dye-House. Mr. Fernie preached, and an "affectionate and Christian interview" was enjoyed by the messengers and the Scots Baptists. Upon his return to England, Mr. Fernie carried a letter addressed to the churches at Marton, Hexham and Newcastle, and "Signed in the name and in the presence of the Church, at Edinburgh, 28th July, 1766, by Robert Carmichael, Robert Walker, Joseph Strachan, Joseph Wainwright and J. Harlaw." A reply to this letter was despatched from Newcastle on 5th August, to one of the brethren at Edinburgh, and signed by Mr. Fernie. Douglas remarks, "It is a pleasing singularity, that an intercourse should take place between the revived churches at Hexham, &c. and Edinburgh, at the present time, such as had taken place between them, one hundred and thirteen years before, in 1653." (a)

The year 1767 saw two changes of location for Mr. M'Lean. His family was increasing on his hands, but his business was not proving successful as a means of support. Therefore he began to consider how best he could obtain a more dependable source of

income. The friends at Edinburgh were anxious to have him settle there, but at first no prospects for suitable employment appeared. Accordingly, he made the decision to seek advancement in London, and on June 18th, 1767, left his wife and children in Glasgow and set off for Edinburgh on the way to London. On Monday afternoon, June 29th, he sailed from Leith. A great storm was encountered on the voyage, so that the ship was in imminent danger of being wrecked. Finally, the distressed vessel was able to bear back into Yarmouth Roads, where a life-boat rescued the passengers, and took them ashore on Monday July 6th (after a week at sea). M'Lean left Lebtoff on Tuesday, and travelled the 120 miles to London by land, arriving on Friday July 10th, at 3 o'clock in the afternoon. The harrowing details of this nightmare journey are set forth in a letter to Mrs. M'Lean, whom he had feared never to see again, this letter being written from London on July 13th. (a) Mr. M'Lean obtained employment in London, and continued there until the month of December that year. At that time he was offered the position as overseer of the extensive printing works of Messrs. Donaldson and Co., in Edinburgh. He accepted this offer, and to the great happiness of all concerned, was able to settle in Edinburgh with his family about the end of 1767, and became a regular worshipper with the little church in Magdalene Chapel.

(a) Letter in "Memoir" pp. XVI-XVIII of Sermons on Doctrines and Duties For Full Letter see APPENDIX, NOTE I.
Mr. M'Lean continued for almost six months as a private member of the church under the ministry of Mr. Carmichael. Then, one Sabbath morning, Mr. Carmichael was suddenly taken ill. The church had gathered as usual for morning worship, when word was brought of the sickness of their pastor. In a discussion of this situation, and as they were unwilling to disperse without worship, some of the members put forth the suggestion that Mr. M'Lean should give them a discourse. At last, with some reluctance, he agreed to do so, and while the others sang the first hymn he meditated upon the passage in 1 Corinthians 3:11 - "For other foundation can no man lay, than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ." Upon this text he preached his first discourse to the church. He divided the subject into two parts, but dwelt so long upon the first heading that time did not permit him to go into the second. In the later part of the day, Mr. Carmichael had so far recovered as to be able to officiate at worship, but the members of the church were so much interested in what had already been spoken in the forenoon, that they requested permission for Mr. M'Lean to finish his subject. He did so, to the exceedingly great satisfaction of all, insomuch that
soon after, in June 1768, he was chosen to the pastoral office as colleague of Mr. Carmichael. (a) Thus the church conformed to the pattern of the apostolic Churches in having a plurality of elders or pastors, - a practice carried on through all the vicissitudes of its history, till the retirement in 1923 of Mr. Percival Waugh, (of the church known as Bristo Place Baptist Church), saw the passing of the last lay pastor of the Baptist Church at Edinburgh.

CHAPTER III - M'LEAN AS LAY PASTOR. (1769-1785)

In the year 1769 several persons resident in places outside of Edinburgh accepted Baptist principles, and came to Edinburgh to be immersed. As they were baptized, they became members of the Mother church, and their meetings together in their own localities were considered as branches of that church, until the time came when they could be set up in church order as a separate group. Individuals from Dundee, Glasgow and Montrose were among these new additions. The Dundee group pressed Mr. Carmichael to come and preach in their midst, as they were convinced that such a visit would prove very successful to the Baptist cause. He went to Dundee, and during his stay there won to Baptist doctrines several converts, whom he immersed. These Dundee Baptists then begged that Mr. Carmichael should remain with them as their pastor. He returned to Edinburgh, but repeated requests were made, both to him and the Edinburgh church, that he should become pastor at Dundee. At length it was decided to comply with this request, and in May 1769, Mr. Carmichael removed to Dundee. The Dundee Baptists were immediately set in church order, and thus became the second of the Scots Baptist churches. A short time later a plurality of pastors was established at Dundee by the calling of Mr. Thomas Boswell to be colleague to Mr. Carmichael in the pastoral office. Meantime, the Edinburgh church filled the
vacancy caused in the pastorate there by choosing Dr. Walker to be co-pastor with Archibald M'Lean.

The Baptist group in Glasgow had been quietly increasing, and early in 1770 received several accessions, which made them numerous enough to contemplate church organization. They therefore applied to Mr. M'Lean, requesting him to come to Glasgow, both to baptize the new believers, and to set them into order as a church. Mr. M'Lean went to Glasgow, and on the 15th March, 1770, officiated in setting the Glasgow church in order. Neil Stuart, a wright, who had previously been baptized at Edinburgh, was chosen as their Elder at this time, and set apart to the oversight of the church by Mr. M'Lean. Next day, 16th March, there occurred an event of exciting interest in Glasgow. This was a public service of Baptism, conducted by Mr. M'Lean. A tremendous crowd gathered on the banks of the Clyde, near the Herd's house, Glasgow Green, to witness the baptisms. Mr. M'Lean approached this great concourse of onlookers; they quietly separated to allow him passage with the candidates; he preached to them on the Green concerning the nature and import of the ordinance about to be administered; then, descending into the river, he immersed the candidates one by one. Mrs. Mary Munro, wife of the newly-elected pastor of the Glasgow church, was the first of the group to be baptized. She is considered to be the
first person to be baptized by immersion in Glasgow. It is not surprising, therefore, that the immersions caused great amazement to the crowd, which had never before witnessed such a scene. The emotions of the onlookers seem to have been of the quiet nature of awe and solemnity, for without the least disturbance, the immense throng dispersed in silent and orderly manner. (a) Shortly after these events, George Begg was elected co-pastor of the Glasgow church with Mr. Stuart.

In the autumn of 1770, a fourth church was added to the Baptist group. A small society of Christians at Montrose unanimously adopted the scriptural view of baptism, and were desirous that Mr. M'Lean should baptize them. Inasmuch as most of them had been connected with the Glasites, they held tenaciously to peculiarities, with which they understood the Scots Baptists would not agree. Several letters passed between them and Mr. M'Lean, as a result of which rather lengthy correspondence, they finally agreed to yield on the points in dispute. In September, 1770, Mr. M'Lean travelled to Montrose, and was joined by Mr. Carmichael from Dundee. M'Lean baptized this group, of seven men and two women, in the River Esk. In the afternoon Mr. Carmichael expounded the

(a) "Glasgow Journal", 15-22 March 1770, and Brown, Rel. Denom. of Glasgow p. 46
Christian doctrine on the subject. (b) At once a church was formed, of which Mr. John Grieg was chosen Elder. Later, Mr. David Mill, and Mr. Thomas Wren were chosen to that office.

(c) Mr. Carnichael, at Dundee, lost his colleague, Thomas Boswell, who died in 1772. Mr. Carnichael was himself in very poor health. He was frequently seized with a profuse spitting of blood. Added to this physical ailment was the grief and discouragement given to him by the unworthy conduct of several members of the church of which he was pastor. These factors together combined to reduce him to such a condition as to be unable to continue to discharge his duties as pastor at Dundee. He expressed a desire to return to Edinburgh. This he did, and soon afterwards he died there, about the beginning of March, 1774.

(b) Scots Magazine, Vol.XXXII, 1770, P.517. "Montrose, Sept. 11. On Sunday last, Mr. Maclean an Anabaptist preacher, baptized seven men and two women, in the water of Esk, by plunging them backwards in deep water. In the afternoon Mr. Carnichael, another of their preachers, preached in favour of their mode of baptism."

(c) This church at Montrose continued for twenty years, but declined and was dissolved. It was revived in 1805, endured for fifty years, then suffered a like fate.
The Baptist cause had spread and prospered between the years 1768 and 1774, but now the churches commenced a short period of discord and testing. The faith, principles, and Christian leadership of Mr. M'Lean were put, as it were, into the crucible, and severely tried, both at Edinburgh, and also in the rest of the connection.

A member of the congregation at Edinburgh began to advocate certain ideas - that it was not the duty of any but real believers in Christ to pray to God; that the office of Elder had nothing peculiar to it, for, he maintained, all the members had an equal right to share in the ruling, public teaching, and dispensing of the ordinances of the church. He argued that Christians were neither bound to observe the first day of the week nor the apostolic prohibition of blood-eating. This member was privately advised, and warned to desist from such disturbance of the congregation, but he would not listen to such advice. The matter was finally brought before the church. Here, it appeared that there was a group of members who were willing to support and stand by him. Much disputing and vain jangling ensued, till a meeting of the whole church was called, at which the offender was excluded. Seven others also withdrew, in sympathy with their leader. This group formed themselves into a separate society, and baptized several persons. Soon, however, they began to advocate
principles even farther away from those of the New Testament than the ones which had led to their exclusion. They denied: that unbelief was a damning sin; that the future punishment of the wicked was eternal; and that Jesus was truly God.

Some of those who had gone with them repented later of their having done so, and returned to the Edinburgh Church. The rest of the group were ultimately dissolved. (a)

In December 1774, another separation took place in the church at Edinburgh, which was more distressing than the former. This was occasioned by an affair of discipline, in which Dr. Walker himself was personally concerned, and as Mr. M'Lean could not altogether approve of his conduct in the matter, which gave offence, nor of his treatment of the brethren who visited to consult with him on that head; it gave rise to a most unhappy difference between the two elders, which resulted in Mr. Walker's leaving the church, drawing off with him a number of the members, and forming them into a separate society. When the other churches heard of this separation, they sent some of their number to enquire into the grounds of it. Both sides gave these messengers a full and detailed account of their view of the dispute, which they reported to their churches. These wrote to Dr. Walker, highly disapproving of his conduct, and declaring they could have no

(a) M'Lean - "Short account of the Scots Baptists" in Rippon's Baptist Annual Register Vol. II. 1795-6. p. 364.
connexion with him or his adherents, till they should repent and return to the church. Inasmuch as Dr. Walker had provided the funds for the hiring of the Magdalene Chapel, the Church found it necessary to withdraw from their place of worship, and meet at the home of Mr. Archibald M'Lean. (a)

About the beginning of the year 1776, the church at Glasgow fell into the Sabellian error, denying the personal distinction in the Godhead. Neil Stuart, the elder of the Church, was the person responsible for propagating this tenet. Archibald M'Lean therefore wrote to him, requesting, in consequence of the Connection between the Churches, that Stuart should give a distinct answer to several questions on the subject of personal distinction in the Godhead. After a considerable delay he returned a long answer. To this Mr. M'Lean wrote a reply, in which the unity of the Godhead was fully admitted, while the personal distinction was clearly pointed out from the very passage which Stuart had adduced to overturn it. (b) As they thus found Sabellian sentiments untenable, the Glasgow Church then shifted ground to Socinianism. Their members admitted that the Father and Son are distinct persons, but affirmed that the Godhead is the person of the Father, and the manhood of Christ the person of the Son; they did not hold the doctrine of

(a) Memoir, p. XXVIII

Christ's pre-existent human soul, so neither did they believe that the Son of God was a divine person, or had any existence at all previous to his conception by the virgin. This was represented to the church at Edinburgh. It was then agreed that Mr. M'Lean should write another letter to them in the name of the church, refuting their heresy, and at the same time informing them, that if this had no effect, they would give up all connexion with them as a sister church. He dispatched this letter, and received the answer that, inasmuch as the Glasgow church realised that they were unable to settle the matter by writing, they had resolved to send two of their number to Edinburgh to converse upon the subject, and therefore requested that no decisive step might be taken till after this discussion.

For several months nothing more was heard from Glasgow. At length they gave notice of the time when their delegates should be at Edinburgh. The persons appointed were their two elders, Neil Stuart and George Begg. These two gentlemen did not come directly to Edinburgh at the time appointed, but went first to Dundee and Montrose. They attempted to disseminate their sentiments at both of these places, and were so far successful that they unsettled the minds of several members at both churches, and some few were entirely subverted.

Finally, Neil Stuart and George Begg arrived in Edinburgh.
The entire membership of the church was convened, and permission given for them to declare themselves without reserve on the matters in question. Neil Stuart made a long speech in which he attempted to prove that the Person of the Son of God was merely human, and that he had no existence before he came into the world; though he had now a peculiar union with God, and was exalted as head over all things. To this speech Archibald M'Lean made a reply, in which he sought to prove from the Scriptures the divinity of the Son of God, and the distinct subsistence of his Divine Person, not only before his incarnation, but before the creation of all things. To shorten the dispute, he asked Neil Stuart to come directly to the point, and show in what sense certain passages were consistent with his scheme, such as John i.1-4. ch.viii.58.ch.xvii.5.Rom.ix.5. Philip. ii.6.7. Col.i.15-18. 1 Tim. iii.16. Heb. i.2.3. In his interpretation of these texts Stuart exposed himself, by making arbitrary and unnatural glosses, which were in plain contradiction to the sense and scope of the scripture passages. Mr. M'Lean pressed this advantage, until Stuart, unable to make a suitable reply, sank into silence. M'Lean then went on to point out how the error espoused by Stuart was of such importance that it affected all the doctrines of the gospel. He also criticized the manner in which Stuart had not only subverted his own group, but had gone out of
his way to subvert others. In concluding, M'Lean reminded Stuart of the account which he must give at the judgement seat of Christ, and earnestly called him to repentance. To all this, Stuart replied that he had taught nothing but what he firmly believed, and that he had much satisfaction in his present sentiments.

The Edinburgh Church then gave it as their unanimous decision, that in their opinion the tenets espoused by Neil Stuart were subversive of the faith. Therefore they could have no church connection, either with him or with those who adhered to him, until God should grant them repentance to the acknowledging of the truth. (a)

Baptist affairs in Scotland at this time were kept before the churches by means of correspondence between the leaders of the several churches. Mr. M'Lean was ever ready by this means to cover with fellow elders the various phases of church life which needed attention, and to indulge in a friendly discussion on scripture topics of interest to his correspondents. We find, therefore, a letter written by him, addressed to John Greig, elder at Montrose, and dated "Edinburgh, February 7, 1776." (b) In this letter, Mr. M'Lean makes reference to


(b) This letter was published in *The New Evangelical Magazine*, Volume IV. 1818, London, Pp. 316-318.
former correspondence between them, and often refers Grieg to a deeper perusal of theological views he has expressed therein. First, he acknowledges receipt of a letter from Greig of the 27th ult. He then distinguishes his view of faith from John Barclay’s (Berean leader), John Glas’s, and the popular doctrine of appropriation. Then he promises Greig another letter upon a different point for his animadversion, if once he can transcribe it from his notes. He then takes up, and clarifies, several "explications" of Mr. Greig upon scripture passages; on Ezek.33.11. concerning God’s punishment of the reprobate, and lack of pleasure therein; next, an explanation of the passage in Luke 6.1. on the "second sabbath after the first", showing that this means the first sabbath after the second day of unleavened bread; then clearing up an objection of Mr. Greig to the expression, "being justified by faith". As this letter shows, there was little of newsy chattiness in M’Lean’s correspondence, but a close attention to this means as a mode of furthering truth and enlightening fellow workers in the Gospel.

There was need for a means of drawing the churches close in mind and spirit, for Baptist affairs in Scotland by the end of 1776 had a very discouraging appearance. The Church at Edinburgh had been greatly reduced in numbers by the two successive divisions. By the defection of Dr. Walker they had lost an elder, who supplied much of their financial
support, and who had rented for them their place of worship. Now, the church at Glasgow, having departed from the faith, was worse than lost to the profession. There was much reason to fear that a number at Dundee and Montrose would soon follow the Glasgow example. Happily, in all three places, matters soon began to wear a more promising aspect.

At Glasgow, George Begg, - the elder who had accompanied Neil Stuart on his trip to Dundee, Montrose and Edinburgh, - after reflecting upon all that had passed, and upon what had been said in his hearing, became convinced that he had accepted, and been party to, the spread of a most dangerous error. He therefore informed his Glasgow brethren of his state of mind. His revelation caused much disputation among them. Finally, Begg, and a few more who agreed with him, left the Glasgow Church, wrote a penitential letter to Edinburgh, renounced their error, and pleaded for restoration into the unity and fellowship of the churches. These few were then received back into the connection.

The next object was to recover these members who were in a wavering state at Dundee and Montrose. Those at Dundee had been rather perplexed than convinced by Neil Stuart's arguments, and soon acknowledged their firm belief in the divinity of Christ. At Montrose, David Mill, their elder, who had been to Edinburgh to attend the conference with
Stuart, discovered, when he returned, that several of the members had embraced Neil Stuart's sentiments. In the end, with the exception of two or three who left them, all at Montrose were recovered to the cause.

Mr. M'Lean had been expecting that his Letters to Mr. Glas on the subject of Infant Baptism would sooner or later bring forth a published reply. At first there was nothing in Scotland, but in 1776 there appeared in England a publication by John Huddleston of Whitehaven, entitled "Two Letters on Infant Baptism". The second of these letters criticised Mr. M'Lean's pamphlet. Then, in 1777, a group of the members of Mr. David Dale's Independent Church at Glasgow, headed by Mr. Archibald Paterson, produced a paper on infant baptism, of which they thought very highly. This paper they published under the title of "Remarks on Scripture Texts relating to Infant Baptism", at Glasgow in 1777. The inside page of the cover states: "The author's name can be no recommendation to the following remarks. If they have foundation in the word of God, the disciples of Christ are bound to receive them. If they have no foundation there, they may safely reject them."

This pamphlet is divided into four parts: Part I. "The little children who make up the Kingdom of God, as it appears in this world, may be distinguished from other little children."

Part II. "Christ's commission to his Apostles, 'Go and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost;' is to be understood according to the prophecies that went before concerning the calling..."
of the Gentiles, and the children who should make up the Messiah's Kingdom as it appears in this world: And those who are dip't in water, or sprinkled with water, are baptized with water, according to the language of the New-Testament Scriptures."

Part III. "The household of Lydia were baptized when she made profession of the faith of Jesus." Part IV. "Baptism is the figure corresponding unto the preservation, and visible salvation of Noah, and seven more in connection with him, in the ark, by water." (a)

Mr. M'Lean wrote an immediate reply to the "Remarks", and included strictures on Mr. Huddleston's "Letters" in the same paper. This was published in May, 1777, entitled "A defence of Believer-Baptism, as opposed to Infant Sprinkling; in a letter to a Friend." In his Preface, Mr. M'Lean writes a strong appeal to the Independents to give up their inconsistency, with their avowed desire to obey the commands of Christ, in their denial of the power of his injunctions to be baptized. He ends this Preface with these words: "Hear his command to all who regard his authority; 'And now, why tarriest thou? arise and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling upon the name of the Lord. (b) Edinburgh, May 29, 1777." He then goes on to deal with the arguments in the "Remarks", dividing his paper into four Parts to correspond with the other's division. In a thorough, closely reasoned exposition, he not

(a) Remarks on Scripture Texts Relating to Infant Baptism - Title Page. Glasgow, 1777.

(b) Defence of Believer - Baptism in Works, Edin.1805, p.128.
only gives an exhaustive reply to Paterson and friends, but takes up in addition to Mr. Huddleston's Letters, some new material given to his hand by the Preface of Mr. Ferrier to a new edition of Glas' Testimony of the King of Martyrs. (a)

In concluding, he mentions a Sermon by Dr. Charles Stuart (former minister of Cramond) on the kingdom of Christ, with which he was exceedingly pleased till that gentleman came to the subject of infant baptism, when, "No sooner does he turn his thoughts to infant baptism, than his views of the kingdom are immediately corrupted..." (b)

This reply staggered the faith of the Daleites at Glasgow, for one of their own number of that day writes that "many of them left the church and were baptized, and amongst these was the chief compiler of the pamphlet in defence of infant baptism, which he had boasted of as being sufficient to confound all the Baptists in the world. (c)

In August, 1777, the controversy, aroused on the subject of infant baptism by the two pamphlets, caused discussion in the Independent church (Daleite) in Edinburgh, and in that month six of the members left the Independents, were baptised, and joined the Baptist church. These were James M'Lean, Robert Wilson, Martin Steele, Thomas Smith, and two women. James M'Lean and Robert Wilson later became deacons of the church. (d)

(a) Ibid pp. 145-147 Notes.
(b) Ibid pp. 210-214
(c) Biographical Dict. (Chambers) Supplement - "David Dale", p. 170.
(d) Patrick Wilson-Origin and Progress of Scotch Baptist Churches, p. 10
About this time it became known that Dr. Robert Walker, and those in connexion with him, were ready to be reconciled, and desired to return to the Church. Some of them plainly admitted this to Mr. M'Lean. He then wrote to Dr. Walker to ascertain his feelings on this matter, assuring him that his reunion with the church would give him the utmost pleasure, and that he would cheerfully co-operate in any proper measure designed to bring about this happy event. Dr. Walker replied that he was in hearty agreement with such a proposal, as he desired to return to the church, and was willing to give any satisfaction in his power with respect to any charge which the church might have against him. At a personal interview which followed this correspondence, it was agreed that Mr. M'Lean should draw up a paper in which he would enumerate the particular matters in which Dr. Walker had offended his colleague and the church, and an acknowledgement of anything in which he found himself blameable. When this was done, Dr. Walker declared his full satisfaction with Archibald M'Lean and acknowledged his guilt in the particulars before him. Those in connexion with him followed his example, and especially confessed their sin in having separated from the church on such grounds. One more preliminary yet remained to be settled. Dr. Walker's connexion had elevated Francis Shand, who had left the church holding the office of deacon, to be an elder amongst them, and had filled the deacon's office with
ther member. The Edinburgh church considered these ointments as pertaining solely to the separating party, and, fact, as part of the measures for which that party was pressing repentance. Therefore the church would not agree to receive back these two holding these offices. Dr. and Mrs. Ker both had a high opinion of Francis Shand as an elder, and were much discomfited by this refusal to receive him as such. They finally yielded upon the condition, that if the church, after a trial of his gifts, should find Shand qualified, he could be reinstated into that office.

"Matters being thus settled, both societies met in one place and joined in fasting and prayer, confessing their sins, particularly those which had occasioned their separation - thanking God for his great goodness and mercy in bringing them together again beyond all their expectations and deserts - beseeching Him to confirm and strengthen their union in the truth, and their love to one another for the truth's sake - and that He would condescend to dwell among them, and build them together as an habitation of His through the Spirit. In conclusion, they saluted one another with the kiss of charity in testimony of their full reconciliation. Thus they were united again after a separation of two years and nine months."(a)

Inasmuch as the separation had taken place in December, 1774, this reconciliation was affected in September, 1777.

At the very time that these negotiations were being carried on, a young man named Henry David Inglis was approaching Mr. M'Lean on the subject of Baptism. He was a person of good family, grandson of Colonel Gardiner of PrestonPans, related to the Erskines, and great-grandson to David, fourth Earl of Buchan.

(a) "Short Account of Scots Baptists" Baptist Annual Register Vol. II. pp. 367, 368.
Under the influence of Mr. Charles Stuart (of Cramond), Inglis, who had been studying divinity at Edinburgh University, had given up the Church of Scotland in the beginning of 1776, and had joined the Independent Church at Edinburgh. Now, feeling that some of their practices were not quite scriptural, he had an interview with Mr. M'Lean, and frankly discussed the problems which perplexed him. Becoming convinced that Baptism of believers by immersion was the appointment of Christ, he withdrew from the Independents, was baptized by Mr. M'Lean in September 1777, and was added to the Baptist Church. (a) In the short space of six months thereafter, most, if not all of the members of this Independent church, to the number of twenty, followed his example, with the pastor, or elder, William Braidwood among the rest. Among this number were included John Campbell, William Dickie and David Oliphant.

The reunion with Dr. Walker did not continue very long. At the end of the year 1777 was begun the controversy concerning the eternal generation of the Sonship of Christ, which clearly resulted in the end of the Baptist Church at Edinburgh. The trouble had various phases in its development, ran through a period of six months, and then was revived in print eleven years afterwards by a pamphlet put out by Dr. Walker. It all started, when, in a conversation about the end of 1777, the doctrine of Christ’s sonship by eternal

generation happened to be mentioned. Dr. M'Lean remarked that he did not like the eternal generation idea. Dr. Walker was given a hint about this sentiment, and immediately questioned M'Lean privately about it. Mr. M'Lean freely told his colleague his views of the subject, at which Dr. Walker opposed his opinions in the strongest terms, and declared his intention of bringing the matter immediately before the church. Realizing that the members of the church were little likely to understand fully the gist of such arguments as would be used, Mr. M'Lean begged Dr. Walker not to rush before the church before he had time to consider the view espoused by M'Lean a little more thoroughly. To enable the Dr. to study his position, Mr. M'Lean proposed that he should write a paper for his perusal, and asked for time to put his thoughts in writing. To this Dr. Walker agreed, but ere the paper was finished, Dr. Walker and Mr. Francis Shand brought the matter before the church. It was first broached in a public discourse during the absence of Mr. M'Lean, and afterwards at a week-day meeting. Mr. M'Lean was not slow to defend his side of the dispute, and the matter was publicly debated at several meetings. At length, the subject seemed to have been discussed at sufficient length, and the voice of the church was called for. It then appeared that the only supporters Dr. Walker and Mr. Shand could muster were their own wives and one other woman. The majority
therefore decided that no further argumentation should be carried on, and proposed that the minority should either agree immediately to forbear the point in dispute, or withdraw from the communion, that peace might be restored to the church. Dr. Walker deliberated for a little, then declared that he bore no ill-will toward the church in spite of difference of viewpoint, that he could cheerfully forbear in this matter, and that he regretted heated expressions he had uttered during the debate. The three women also professed forbearance, but Francis Shand went out without a word. Next Sunday, he was not at morning worship of the church, but came at mid-day and desired to speak to the church. The essence of his speech was that, he did not feel free in his mind to love the church communion because of this difference; he could at present forbear, and have charity to all brethren; but that, after he had read Mr. M'Lean's letter and considered the matter more deeply, he saw cause to change his mind, he would make his position clear, and withdraw. Thus the matter was settled at that time, and the church enjoyed peace for about seven or eight months. (a)

In January 1778, Mr. Robert Moncrieff, elder of the Independent (Daleite) church at Glasgow, with other nine, became convinced of the doctrine of believer's baptism. They left their connexion, and wrote to Mr. M'Lean to come, and baptise them. Accompanied by James M'Lean and Robert Wilson,

(a) Preface to "Review of Dr. Walker's Defence of the Doctrine of the Trinity and Eternal Sonship of Christ" p. 48.
Mr. Archibald M'Lean went to Glasgow, and administered the ordinance of baptism to them upon a profession of their faith. At the same time, they and the few in Glasgow who had renounced Socinian principles along with George Begg, were united, and set in church order. Mr. Robert Moncrieff was appointed their elder. Those in connexion with Neil Stuart were very anxious to be joined with this newly erected society, and applied to Mr. M'Lean for a conference upon the point of difference, in order to prepare the way for such a junction. He and Mr. Moncrieff met with them, and after some argumentation, it appeared that a number of them were doubtful of their Socinian sentiments. Soon after the greater part of them gave up these tenets. Neil Stuart fearing that he would be left alone, began to make some concessions, and at last acknowledged his error. This group now wrote a penitential letter to the church at Edinburgh, signed by all of them. They also applied for admission into the church at Glasgow, renouncing their error and confessing their guilt. All were received back into that Church except Neil Stuart and two others. Mr. James Duncan (a) bookseller, in Glasgow, was chosen fellow-elder to Mr. Moncrieff. Neil Stuart from that time kept up a small separate meeting, which had no correspondence or connection with the other Baptist churches.

Mr. William Braidwood, the aforementioned elder of the Independent church at Edinburgh, in March 1778, left that

(a) Mr. James Duncan had been a fellow-member of the Glasite church at Glasgow with M'Lean and Carmichael.
society, accepted Baptist principles, and joined the church. In May, 1778, Mr. Charles Stuart, who had given up his charge as parish minister of Cramond to adopt Independent principles, was baptized, and added to the church. He commenced the study of medicine, and became a well known physician in Edinburgh. About this time some persons from Largo, Fifeshire, were baptized, and became members of the Edinburgh church. This was the beginning of the Baptist cause at Largo.

The troubles of Mr. M'Lean with Dr. Walker and Francis Shand were not over yet. About the middle of 1778, Dr. and Mrs. Walker began to press to have Francis Shand chosen as an elder. The church, however, was not agreeable to his appointment, and indicated a preference to have Mr. Braidwood elected to that office. Dr. Walker yielded, but Francis Shand was not so amenable. He opposed the election of Mr. Braidwood from time to time, on the grounds that he had not been sufficiently tried as to his qualifications. In private, however, he let it be known that his main objection to Mr. Braidwood was that the latter did not hold the doctrine of eternal generation of the Son of God. This attitude of Shand became known, so that he was questioned. Then it was discovered that far from being in charity with all the church, and forbearing on the question of the eternal generation, Mr. Shand had remained in fellowship with the purpose of forming a party of his own.
this group became strong enough, he planned to put away from the church all those who did not agree with his sentiments on this matter. Had this been mere conjecture, it would have been one thing, but Shand openly avowed this scheme before the whole church, and tried to justify such plotting. There was no alternative for the church but to put him away. His "party" now came to his defence, and Dr. Walker, Mrs. Walker, Mrs. Shand and another woman, in spite of their acknowledgement of Shand's being an offender in this case, and his not hearing the church, pleaded his sincerity and upright character, and would not agree to his being excluded. There was more heated argument, but the final vote of the church was for his exclusion. Dr. Walker and the three women then left the church with him. (a).

This matter continued to be a crisis in the church, however, for some inexperienced members of the church kept up a correspondence with them for some time after. Under the idea of removing obstacles to the return of this party, these members within the fold made accusations, and stirred up jealousies and animosities among the others. This divisive influence and bitter feeling rose so high, and spread so widely in the group, that in spite of M'Lean's warnings and advice, disorder and disorganisation almost wrecked the body. Happily, this brought some of the more

(a) See M'Lean - "Review of Dr. Walker's Defence of the Doctrine of the Trinity and Eternal Sonship of Christ" - pp.50.
serious-minded members to their senses. When they saw the situation into which the church had fallen, they were aroused to serious reflection and regret. Slowly the ferment subsided. Cool investigation showed the main cause of misunderstanding to be plain jealousy and evil surmising. Therefore a few were at first united together upon a profession of repentance and mutual reconciliation. Gradually the others likewise became ashamed and repentant, and were added to this number upon an expression of such a state of mind. This affair was a good lesson to the church in showing them by experience the evil effects of disunion, and made the group much more cautious thereafter about matters which would tend to lead to separations.

Dr. Walker, with the three women and Mr. Shand, formed a separate Baptist Society, and again elevated Francis Shand to be an elder. They maintained public worship till the end of the century at least, though Dr. Walker died in November, 1791. The hearers of this group were few, and they had no correspondence with the other Scots Baptist churches. (a) They did have contact with the Church at Keiss, however, through John Budge.

Early in 1779, William Braidwood was chosen joint-elder with Archibald O'Loan at Edinburgh to fill the place of Dr. Walker. New members were added to the church that year by

(a) "Short Account" p.370 of Rippons Baptist Annual Register Vol.II.
the baptism of some persons from Dunfermline, Fifeshire, and Wooler in Northumberland. A letter from Mr. M'Lean to Mr. Robert Moncrieff of Glasgow on the extent of Adam's First Transgression, is dated August 25, 1779. (a)

In 1780, Mr. George Grieve, who had been minister of the Presbyterian congregation at Wooler, in Northumberland, and had parted with that group when he accepted congregational principles, was baptized and joined the church at Edinburgh. Soon after, he began study for the practice of medicine, and like Mr. Stuart, he became a physician.

In 1782, some persons from Galashiels, in Selkirkshire, and also from Newburgh in Fife, were baptized and joined the church. At about the same time, Mr. Andrew Swanston, a Burgher Seceder, much esteemed for his piety, and highly regarded as a preacher, was baptized at Glasgow. For two years he was able to employ his gifts as a preacher to Baptist churches, especially to the groups at Dundee and Newburgh where there were no elders. (b)

These small societies at a distance from Edinburgh which were not set up in church order, were considered as branches of the church at Edinburgh, as their individual members had been first enrolled in that church. Since it was not possible

(a) This letter was published in the New Evangelical Magazine Volume IV, 1818. pp. 201-205. London.
(b) Two Volumes of Sermons by Andrew Swanston were published,
for these people to travel to Edinburgh every Sunday, they met in their own place, and participated in every part of the divine worship, with the exception of the Lord's Supper. One of the members at Newburgh, named William Hynd, now raised an objection to this exception, for, he maintained, it was the duty of the disciples to observe the Lord's Supper wherever two or three of them could meet together, although they were not supplied with elders, or organised in church order. He was successful in winning some over to his opinion, and among these was Mr. Andrew Swanston. Mr. Swanston was induced to write to the church at Edinburgh, asking that these views should be recognised throughout the connexion. When this matter was laid before the church, Mr. Stuart and Mr. Grieve looked upon it as a doubtful point, upon which the principle of forbearance should be exercised, and that therefore the church at Edinburgh should not interfere or oppose the measure. The elders, Mr. Braidwood and Mr. M'Lean, as well as the rest of the church, did not see it in this light. They argued:

"That the Lord's Supper belonged only to a regular constituted Church, furnished with the necessary gifts and offices, or such an organised body as is described, 1 Cor. xii. - That to such churches it was at first delivered by the apostles as they had received it from the Lord, Acts. ii.42. 1 Cor. x.16,17 ch.xi.2,23. and that no instance can be produced to the contrary, as the apostles ordained elders in every church, Acts. xiv.23. Tit.1.5. - That the example of Christ at its first institution points out the part assigned to the administrator, which is competent to feed the flock - That our Lord's rule of discipline (Matt (a)

(a) "Short Account" p.371. of Rippon's Baptist Annual Register, Vol.II.
xviii.) does not permit us to look upon two or three as a church, since it requires at least that number to go through the private steps of it, besides the church or congregation before which the matter is laid in the last resort. And that the innovation proposed would set aside the solemnity of that sacred institution, tend to wear off the reverence due to it, introduce many disorders, and expose the profession to just censure. For these reasons the motion was rejected.

Mr. Swainston did not press the subject any farther, but Mr. M'Lean noticed that from that time he was less warm in his attachment to the Baptist connexion. William Hynd, however, was not impressed by these arguments, nor by the attitude of the Edinburgh church, for, having started this subject going, he took every opportunity of advocating his opinions to the members at Dundee and Newburgh. To make matters worse, in the eyes of the Edinburgh group, he paid no attention to the efforts which they made to convince and admonish him from time to time, and persisted in his attempt to turn the minds of his fellow members away from the Edinburgh connexion. Three successive letters were sent to Hynd, requesting him to come and appear before the Edinburgh church, but he paid no attention to these epistles. At about this same time, while the Hynd matter was engrossing attention, Mr. Andrew Swanston, then at Dundee, suddenly declared that he wished to be by himself as the Lord's freed man, and that he wanted to preach the gospel at large without regard to any particular connexion. He then left the Baptist fellowship and became an independent preacher. An.
elder and one of the members of the Edinburgh church pleaded with him to change his mind about this course of withdrawal, but he was determined to go his way. This lack of success on the part of their emissaries was reported to the Edinburgh church, and it was then agreed that as Mr. Swanston had separated himself from them, he was to be considered as no longer in the connexion, and held as one who had gone out without sufficient reason. Mr. Stuart opposed this decision, and in reference to it, and the matter of the Lord's Supper, as well as other things, accused the church of having laid a stumbling-block in his way.

The case of William Hynd was next laid before the church. All the particulars were considered; his conduct, his obstinacy, and the evil effects already produced by his stand. It was then agreed that William Hynd should be excluded. Mr. Stuart and another member were strenuously opposed to this decision, and refused to alter their attitude one whit, so the church was under the disagreeable necessity of excluding them also. Mr. Grieve then declared that he could not bear with the Church unless the majority were willing to forbear on the matter of the Lord's Supper, and as there was no indication of this coming to pass, he withdrew from the connexion. These unpleasant events were brought to a conclusion in April, 1784.
For several years thereafter, the church enjoyed a period of comparative quiet and peace.

Some years after this, William Hynd, in order to get into the church at Dundee, made a full confession of his error, disaffection and wilful obstinacy in this matter. He was received into that church, but soon after was excluded again for his factious conduct.

Mr. Stuart, when he left the church, met with four others, and they baptized some. By 1795 they had all returned to the church except two. Dr. Stuart and these two attended the church assemblies as hearers. Later, Dr. Stuart became a warm advocate of Missions, was influential in founding the Missionary Magazine in 1796, was a friend of Mr. Andrew Fuller, and at one time very close to Mr. James Alexander Haldane. Dr. Stuart was a mercurial personality, always seeking after novelty, and yet warmly regarded by the friends with whom he was now close, now distant. (a)

In March, 1783, Mr. M'Lean had correspondence with Mr. Wm. Richards of Lynn. Mr. Richards had published a pamphlet entitled "Observations on Infant Sprinkling." In reply, a Mr. Carter had published seven letters entitled "Remarks" on the Observations. Mr. Richards requested Mr. M'Leans criticisms upon his work and his opponents "Remarks", Mr. M'Lean wrote

(a) Lives of the Haldanes, pp. 139-141, 275, 352, 353, 478, 479, 551, 552, 553.
a letter to Mr. Richards, dated March 27, 1783, in which, with characteristic insight, he pointed out to his correspondent the weaknesses in Carter's position, and advised Richards how best to arrange the material he intended to publish. Though Mr. M'Lean had in this letter expressed the opinion that there would be no need for a publication from himself, in view of Richards' intention, this letter was published in M'Lean's Works under the title of "Some Strictures on Mr. Carter's Remarks, in a letter to Mr. Richards, of Lynn." (a)

Mr. Henry David Inglis was often given the opportunity of using his talents for public speaking, in exhorting the brethren of the church in Edinburgh. These discourses were very helpful because of their comforting and edifying nature. In the year 1783, he felt an earnest desire to preach the gospel in the towns and villages surrounding Edinburgh. This desire he communicated to the elders of the Baptist group, and expressed a wish to have the sanction of the brethren in this enterprise. The elders brought this request before the members, who unanimously approved the measure, applauded his zeal and motives, and with greatest cordiality, because of their previous experience of his qualifications, voted that he should be set apart for that purpose. This was accordingly done, with solemn prayer.

He assiduously devoted himself to this important work. In spite of having to attend daily at the Bill Chamber in his capacity as Deputy Clerk, and also in spite of his regular attendance at all church meetings, he preached two or three times every week, even at a distance of five or six miles from Edinburgh. At one time he had nine preaching stations at which he laboured. He also visited in the prisons, in order to preach the gospel to criminals who were under the sentence of death. In 1783, Mr. Inglis published at Edinburgh an 8 page pamphlet - "A Letter to the Six Men presently under Sentence of Death in the Tolbooth of Edinburgh."

In October, 1784, Mr. Henry David Inglis, by the unanimous vote of the church, was chosen to be a third pastor of the Baptist Church in Edinburgh. He laboured in conjunction with Mr. M'Lan and Mr. Braidwood in that office for a period of nearly twenty-two years. In 1783, Mr. Inglis published at Edinburgh, on 9th February, a 4 page pamphlet - "A Letter to a Gentleman in Edinburgh containing some account of the person who suffered on Wednesday last, From a person who attended him to the Scaffold."

In 1784, several persons from Perth were baptized. This year also marked the revival of the interest in the Baptist cause at Dundee. The Dundee church, which had been long without elders, and had therefore dropped to a very small
number, now received several new members by baptism. In a short time, a considerable number of additions had been made, and the church began to assume a more prosperous appearance.

Meantime, the church at Glasgow, under the inspiration of Mr. Robert Moncrieff's pastorate, had been greatly increased, and was going from strength to strength. Mr. Moncrieff's fellow-elder was James Duncan, the book-seller. Now, in 1785, a third elder was elected, by the elevation of Mr. Robert Walker, one of the deacons, to the office of pastor. (a)

About 1785, it became apparent to his brethren in the church at Edinburgh, that the double exertion of caring for the spiritual needs of the whole Baptist connection, and of earning his living as overseer of Donaldson's printing office, was a greater strain than Mr. M'Lean's constitution could stand. They saw that he took such delight in the study of the Word of God, and was so much immersed in the pursuit of divine truth that he was heedless of his own welfare. Mr. M'Lean had formed the habit of spending practically all of his time when not at the printing office, in study, writing, and correspondence. He ate at irregular intervals, and since he found himself better able to concentrate late at night, seldom got to bed before one o'clock in the morning. Such habits were unhealthful, and gave rise to a series of recurring

(a) Not to be confused with Dr. Robert Walker, of Edinburgh
The brethren knew, too, that much of this midnight labour in the study was brought about by the numerous calls made by societies of the Baptist connection for Mr. M'Lean to advise upon problems which arose in their midst.
The rise of larger groups of Baptists in various places had of late caused several applications to be made from societies even as far distant as England, that Mr. M'Lean should visit them for the purpose of setting them in church order, and to ordain elders among them. His work at Donallson's printing office made it necessary for him to decline such requests, however pressing, or regardless of his own desire to comply with them. Actuated, therefore, by consideration for his health, and by desire to serve the welfare of the Baptist cause, the brethren at Edinburgh proposed to Mr. M'Lean that he should give up entirely his secular employment, and devote his whole attention to pastoral duties, to visiting distant societies, and promoting the good of the Baptist profession in whatsoever way seemed advisable. In return, the church, which was now of a respectable number, agreed to provide for his needs by a salary such as their means would enable them to raise. Finally an arrangement was made, whereby Mr. M'Lean was freed to devote his energies to the Baptist work, by the subscription of a salary of sixty guineas a year from his Edinburgh brethren.
When a rise in the cost of living expenses took place later, the sum was gradually increased, but it never exceeded one hundred guineas a year, which was the amount he was receiving at the time of his death.

This setting apart of Mr. M'Lean for spiritual labours marks a new development, both for the church and for himself. Since the first days of the church in 1765, the labours of her pastors had been without recompense, Mr. M'Lean had served faithfully for 20 years and had given himself unreservedly to the work, while earning his bread as a printer. His colleagues, Mr. Braidwood and Mr. Inglis, were respectively a merchant and a Deputy Clerk in the Bill Chamber. In no other Baptist Church connected with the group ("Scots Baptist", as they were called) was there a salaried officer. The reluctance of both the Edinburgh group, and of the other churches, to follow up this precedent with another such appointment all during Mr. M'Lean's lifetime, shows that he was regarded as an exception among them in this matter of being relieved of the necessity of earning his living by the work of his hands. (a) It is an outstanding tribute to M'Lean that his fellow-members, realizing his worth in full-time spiritual labour, were so ready to allow him the opportunity to use to the full the talents they believed God had given for His service. This decision on the part of M'Lean

and the church marks a milestone in the life of M'Lean so far as we are concerned, as well, for it was from this date of
1785 that he began in earnest his career as an author. From
this time onwards, an increasing number of publications flowed
from his pen, making known, not only to his contemporaries, but
also to us in the present day, the doctrines and practices for
which the early Scotch Baptists stood. M'Lean was set apart
by his brethren to be the voice of their group, as well as
their representative among distant societies, but by far the
most momentous side of this matter was the way in which his
voice was preserved for posterity the many sentiments,
discourses, interpretations, etc., which have been preserved in
the six volumes of his works, and in the magazine and
periodicals in which they were first published.
Well knowing the power of the printing press, Mr. McLean, with his new freedom from the need of earning a living, cast about for a suitable subject upon which to employ his pen. One topic immediately presented itself. The Glasites, because of the writings of Mr. Robert Sandeman, had become more familiarly known, especially in England, as "Sandemanians". The term of Sandemanian had become more of an epithet than the name of a sect, because the early members of the Scots Baptist group had been associated with the Glasites, it had also become a prevalent idea that Scots Baptists could be termed "Sandemanian Baptists" in description of their tenets. One obstacle which Mr. McLean could see to the spread of Scots Baptist principles, therefore, was this impression that the only distinction between them and the unpopular Sandemanians was on the matter of infant or believer's baptism. His first article was a paper on, "The Scotch Baptists not Sandemanians," in which he attempted to clarify this point. It was drawn up in the form of a letter to a friend, and Mr. McLean actually placed it in the hands of a printer for publication. Upon mature deliberation, he withdrew it for the present, intending to
publish it at some future date. Actually it was never
published during his lifetime, but was published in the
"Memoir" by Jones, prefaced to M'Lean's, "Sermons on the
Doctrines and Duties of the Christian Life," published in
1817 by William Jones at London. The only other place
where I have been able to discover it was in the "Memoir"
prefaced to Volume VI of M'Lean's WORKS, published by Jones
at London in 1823. Other editions which include the memoir,
omit the section on Sandemanians.

This paper must frankly be acknowledged to be a clear
indication only of the manner in which the Sandemanians
differed, in their attitude of conformity to the world, from
the way in which the Scots Baptists sought to withdraw from
its contaminating influence. M'Lean objected to the spirit
and manner in which the Sandemanians opposed what they called
Pharisaism, for they regarded a strict and serious religious
appearance as the sign of Pharisee. This spirit, he declared,
led them to form rash and uncharitable judgements of others,
and frequently excited in them a profane spirit of ridicule and
contempt. In seeking to avoid Pharisaism, he thought that they
frequently slid into the opposite extreme of laxness, and con­
formity to the world, by levity and dissipation, attended the
playhouse, held balls, attended routs, and enjoyed merrymaking,
music and dancing. They pleaded that these diversions were nowhere forbidden by scripture, although Mr. M'Lean found scriptures to quote against them. He feared that they were not duly concerned about the salvation of their souls. M'Lean also found the Sandemanians guilty of conformity to the world in the "pride of life", - in regard to honour, pre-eminence and respect given on account of birth, wealth, or a fashionable appearance as displayed in the wearing of gaudy and costly apparel. In a scathing denunciation, M'Lean declared that they were self-righteous in their judgement, condemnation, and despising of others; that they "made laws where Christ had made none"; and that they held a very high opinion of themselves. They talked of themselves in language of self-abasement, which Mr. M'Lean felt was not really their conviction. He concluded with the final criticism that they were marked by a narrow party spirit. His last sentence was:

"And when we also consider how liable we ourselves are to turn aside, instead of glorying over them, it should lead us to take warning by their example, to watch and pray that we enter not into temptation, and not to be high-minded but fear." (a)

There was nothing in this paper on what was the doctrinal difference between the Scotch Baptists and the Sandemanians, so, judging from the things which M'Lean did stress, we must conclude that he believed that the name "Sandemanian" was

(a) "Memoir" by Jones, p.li
unpopular because of the connotation of conformity to the world, and the spirit of laxness and "Pharisaism" which was exemplified by that group. It would seem that, in his estimation, by dissociating the Scotch Baptists from them on these points, he felt that he had shown that the Scotch Baptists were not Sandemanians.

Mr. M'Lean was not the only one of the three pastors of the Edinburgh Church who made use of the published word at this time. His colleague, Mr. Henry David Inglis, had ministered to a condemned housebreaker named William Mills, in the time in which Mills was awaiting execution. Mills experienced an extraordinary conversion in the death cell, so that the events of the night before his execution were extremely touching. Mr. Inglis and several of the brethren from the Edinburgh Church spent the last night with Mills, and were so moved by the events they witnessed that Mr. Inglis noted them down. In 1785, he published his record to the world in the form of a pamphlet, "Two Letters ... on the case of W. Mills, who was lately executed in Edinburgh for the crime of housebreaking, &c." This paper was often reprinted, for it proved to be of very great interest to readers who wished well for the spread of evangelical religion.

During the year 1786, several publications by Mr. M'Lean
including what was probably his best known book were first presented to the public. Two of these papers are letters on the subject of Baptism. The first is called, "A Letter to a Correspondent, showing that ALL the arguments for Infant Baptism are rendered null by Paedobaptists themselves." The second, a letter to the same correspondent, is "Baptism must precede Visible Church-Fellowship." A more ambitious effort on the same subject of Baptism, which resulted from Mr. M'Lean's desire to see the matter of baptism treated from a doctrinal, rather than a controversial point of view, is the first part of his 84 page pamphlet, which bears its title: "The Nature and Import of Baptism, with Its Indispensable Obligations." The second part of this pamphlet is a valuable outline from M'Lean's pen on, "The Church Order and Religious Practices of the Baptists in Scotland."

The book, first printed at Edinburgh in 1786, was "The Commission given by Jesus Christ to His Apostles Illustrated. In three parts." In this book, Mr. M'Lean gave a clear concise, yet thorough exposition of his view of primitive or apostolic Christianity. The contents of this book are worth listing in summary:
CHRIST'S COMMISSION TO HIS APOSTLES ILLUSTRATED

CONTENTS.

Of Christ's power and dominion,
His power and dominion the ground and reason of the commission,
Plain inferences from Christ's power,
Of the apostolic office, and what was peculiar to it,
The commission not confined to the apostles,

PART I.

THE SENSE AND EXTENT OF THIS PART OF THE COMMISSION,
HOW THE APOSTLES EXECUTED IT, AND WHAT IT WAS THEY TAUGHT THE NATIONS.

That MAKE TEL I UL I N signifies to make disciples only by teaching,
The extent of this part of the commission,
How the apostles executed it,
The subject matter of the apostolic doctrine, viz. the gospel,
Presupposes man's guilt and misery,
Various epithets given to the gospel,
A general idea of it from short scripture summaries,
Comprised under a testimony and promise,
The TESTIMONY respects the person, mission, and work of Jesus, viz.
That he is the CHRIST, and what that imports,
That he is the SON OF GOD, and in what sense,
His work; which includes his ministry and example on earth,
His death, which is
That obedience whereby we are made righteous,
A true and proper sacrifice for sin,
By which the new covenant was made and dedicated,
A short view of that covenant,
His burial, and its import,
His resurrection, which demonstrates,
That he is the Son of God,
That his atonement was complete,
That his people shall be raised at the last day,
His ascension, which imports,
His victory over all enemies,
He ascended to bestow the Spirit,
To take possession of his throne and kingdom,
To officiate as high-priest, and
As the forerunner of his brethren,
His second coming to raise the dead and judge the world,

**THE PROMISE of the gospel**, That "whosoever believeth shall be saved",

This promise an essential branch of the gospel,
The salvation held forth in this promise,
The gospel testimony and promise must not be separated,
The nature of that faith which has the promise of salvation annexed to it,
The evil of confounding it with its effects in the matter of justification,
The declaration and call of the gospel is unto all,
The promise of salvation restricted to him that believeth,
All who believe are immediately conscious of it, and so have evidence of their own particular salvation,
The fruits of faith and additional evidence of this to a man's own conscience,
How a man attains to the full assurance of hope,

**PART II**

**THE FORM, SUBJECTS AND IMPORTS OF CHRISTIAN BAPTISM**

That baptizing is,
The element,
The Name into which believers are to be baptized,
The subjects of this ordinance,
Arguments in behalf of infant-baptism answered,
The import and design of Baptism, viz.
To be a sign of regeneration, or the new birth,
Of the washing away of the guilt and pollution of sin,
Of Christ's death, burial, and resurrection,
Of the believer's union and communion with him therein,
Of his spiritual conformity to him, by dying unto sin, and rising again to newness of life,
Of his complete conformity to Christ in the death of his mortal body, and resurrection from the dead to inherit eternal life,

**PART III**

**THE COMMANDMENTS AND INSTITUTIONS OF CHRIST WHICH THE APOSTLES TAUGHT BELIEVERS TO OBSERVE**

Wherein this teaching differs from the former,
The order in which these teachings are placed, not arbitrary,
General import of the words,
The commands and institutions of Christ which the apostles taught the disciples to observe, The eternal rule of righteousness, commonly called the MORAL LAW, The foundation of it, The principle of spirit of it, Written on Adam's heart as the law of creation, Traces of it remaining in the natural conscience of every man, In what sense, and for what end, delivered in the Sinai covenant, Fulfilled by Christ, and delivered in a more excellent manner under the new covenant, The gospel carries the rule of duty to a higher degree of perfection than any preceding revelation, Christ's sayings considered, with respect to Murder, Adultery, Swearing, Retaliation and resentment, Forgiveness of injuries, Love of enemies, Evil judging, Almsgiving, prayer, and fasting, Laying up treasures, not on earth, but in heaven, Anxious carefulness about the things of this life, Self-denial and bearing the cross, Entertaining the poor, Respect of persons, Honour to whom due, and upon what grounds, A summary of Christian duty under three heads, viz. Sobriety, Righteousness, Godliness, The principles influencing the whole, The separation of Christians from the world, Their union in a visible church-state, Scripture idea of a church, The nature and grounds of Christian union, The duties of church members in relation to each other, Christ's new commandment of brotherly love, Why called a new commandment, Its importance and excellence, Has a special respect to the visible churches of Christ, Essential to their union and edification, The practical exercise of this love in a church in the various duties which result from The nature of their union, The variety of their gifts, Their different conditions and circumstances,
The rules of discipline in dealing with offenders,
Of private offences,
Of public offences,
The public ordinances of divine service,
The day appointed for observing them,
Consist of the apostles' doctrine,
The fellowship,
The breaking of bread,
The prayers,
The singing of praise.

The Promise. And lo, I am with you always, &c.
This promise made in the first place to the apostles,
How it was accomplished to them,
Is made also to all his faithful ministers,
And to his Church,
Imports the fulfilment of all the prophecies and promises relating to his kingdom to the end of the world.

"The Commission" could serve as a very useful outline of the writings of Mr. M'Lean. One finds hints in brief form of what later became pamphlets and letters in which he expounded more fully the doctrines summarized in "The Commission." In fact, Part II of this book on - "The Form, Subjects and Import of Christian Baptism", is found to be verbatim the first 59 pages of the pamphlet published in the same year, on "The Nature and Import of Baptism, with its Indispensable Obligations."
The "Commission" was republished in 1797 and again in 1804. It was included in all editions of M'Lean's Works.

Mr. M'Lean commenced at this time what became an annual custom - a visit to each of the societies of Scotch Baptists in England. While on his tour in England in 1756, he baptized at Chester a young man named William Jones, to whom the history of the Scots Baptists came to owe a great debt. In later years, W. Jones, after twenty-five years of friendship with M'Lean, became his biographer, as well as the publisher of many of his
papers in magazines of which Jones was the editor. Jones's edition of M'Lean's WORKS is by far the best of them all.

At the beginning of 1787, the brethren at Dundee extended a call for Mr. William Dickie, then a deacon in the church at Edinburgh, to come to Dundee as their elder. He accepted this call, and in February, 1787, the church at Dundee was again set in order. At this time Mr. James Duncan, one of the members, was chosen colleague to Mr. Dickie.

The church in Glasgow, to which Mr. Robert Moncrieff had drawn a large number of hearers, because of his popular talents and striking manner of delivery, was in 1787 in a very prosperous condition. In the winter of that year, Mr. Moncrieff developed symptoms of consumption, which increased so rapidly that he was advised by his physicians to seek relief in a warmer climate than that of Glasgow. The importunity of his friends, who were deeply concerned about his health, at last prevailed, so that Mr. Moncrieff consented to go to the south of France. For his parting discourse to the Church, the popular pastor chose a subject from 2 Cor. 13:11 - "Finally, brethren, farewell. Be perfect, be of good comfort ... etc." It was a highly emotional meeting, at which the whole church was in tears, because of the hints he gave, and because of their own fears, that they should never see him again. Mr. & Mrs. Moncrieff, attended by a young doctor, set out for France, but when the party reached London, Mr. Moncrieff's condition was so bad that it was deemed inadvisable to continue. He was taken to Lyme Regis in Dorsetshire, where, in April 1783, he passed away and was buried. The loss of Mr.
Moncrieff was a great blow, not only to the Church at Glasgow, but to all the Baptist connection, for he was a faithful, zealous, and active type of elder who was much beloved wherever he went.

Mr. William Braidwood, one of the co-pastors at Edinburgh with M'Lean, appeared in print in 1787, with a 38 page pamphlet, published at Glasgow, called "A Discourse on the Duty of Mutual Exhortation in the Churches of Christ." The Preface is dated, 30th July. Mr. M'Lean published in this year an 8 page letter to a Seceder, written at his desire, entitled, "The Distinction between Justifying Faith and Appropriation," which was printed at Edinburgh. This year also saw the removal of the Church at Edinburgh to a new building erected for it in Richmond Court. Mr. Waugh describes it thus:

"The first place of worship erected for the denomination in Scotland was that for the Edinburgh Church in Richmond Court in 1787, and was acquired on a few-duty of £15. In an economical spirit - for the Church was small - a dwelling house formed the ground floor and the meeting-house, to hold 300, the upper flat. The latter was sold to Christopher Anderson in 1806 for £565, and there in January, 1808, the Church which now meets in Charlotte Chapel was formed. Forty years later it became the meeting-place of the church now in Marshall Street." (a)

The publications of Mr. M'Lean were not unnoticed by other writers, for in 1787 Mr. R. Elliot, A.B. published a pamphlet called, "Dipping not Baptizing," with some remarks on Baptist writers, including Mr. MacLean, (as he spells the name). Mr. Alexander Pirie, of Newburgh, published at Perth in 1787 a 310

(a) History of the Baptists in Scotland, p.50
The Church at Glasgow, having lost Mr. Moncrieff, one of their elders, in April, 1788 by death, lost another in August, when as a result of an affair of discipline in the church, Mr. Robert Walker left them. (a)

The name of Robert Walker occurs again in the life of Mr. M'Lean in this period of Baptist history, for he had not heard the last of his former colleague, Dr. Walker, on the matter of the Eternal Generation of the Son of God. In 1787 Dr. Walker published a pamphlet which he called, "A Defence of the Doctrine of the Trinity and Eternal Sonship of Christ." Several of the discussions held on that subject eleven years before in the Church at Edinburgh, as given by Dr. Walker in this pamphlet, did not appear, from Mr. M'Lean's point of view, to be clearly stated. Accordingly, in 1788, Mr. M'Lean replied to Dr. Walker, by publishing the letter which he had originally read to the Church in 1777. This publication is a 134 page pamphlet, printed in Edinburgh, which Mr. M'Lean entitles, "A Letter on the Sonship of Christ, originally addressed to some of the Members of the Baptist Church at Edinburgh. To which is added, a Review of Dr. Walker's Defence of the Doctrine of the Trinity and Eternal Sonship of Christ." In his Preface, and opening part of the Review, Mr. M'Lean gives more detail of the

(a) Not to be confused with Dr. Robert Walker of Edinburgh.
controversy in 1777 which resulted in Dr. Walker leaving the Church. The Preface is dated May 1st, 1788.

The controversy of these pamphlets was noticed in the "Monthly Review" Magazine, 1789, in the following terms:

"Mr. M'Lean writes like a man of sense and discernment, and seems without doubt, to have the advantage of his antagonist. We must own ourselves astonished at the phraseology sometimes employed by those who plead for what is termed eternal generation, and can consider it as little short of profane." (a)

In republishing this pamphlet as part of his WORKS, Mr. M'Lean divested it entirely of its controversial form, and entirely deleted the "Review" of Dr. Walker's pamphlet.

Dr. Charles Stuart edited in 1789 a book of 344 pages, published at Edinburgh, containing two works of Henry Ainsworth of Amsterdam: "The Communion of Saints", first written by Ainsworth in 1607, and "An Arrow Against Idolatry", first put out in 1611. This volume also contains a biography of Ainsworth written by Dr. Stuart. The biography comprises 60 additional pages.

Mr. Henry David Inglis put out three pamphlets in 1790: "A Discourse on the Conversion of the Ethiopian Eunuch"; "A Discourse on the Supreme Divinity of Jesus Christ"; and "A Letter to Six Men ... under Sentence of Death."

Upon Mr. M'Lean's return from his annual tour to the churches in England, about the middle of November, 1790, he found himself faced with a major domestic tragedy. Mrs. M'Lean

was in very bad health, and it immediately appeared to her spouse that the end was not far off. Three weeks later, on December, 15th, she died. The circumstances are related in the following letter from Mr. M'Lean to Mrs. M'Kinley of Glasgow, sister of Mrs. M'Lean:

"My Dear Sister!

Scarcely had I been a week at home after my return from England, when I began to suspect that the time of my wife's departure was at hand. She continued, however, for three weeks longer under very severe and increasing distress, and now has exchanged the imperfections and troubles of this life, for the blessedness of the dead who die in the Lord. The faith of the Son of God by which she lived during her pilgrimage here, was her support in passing through the valley and shadow of death. She spoke till within a very little of her departure in such a pleasant, joyous, and edifying manner, as deeply to affect a number that were about her, and to take away almost every impression of the gloomy aspect of death. In the sharpest conflict with that last enemy, she with a noble magnanimity triumphed over it, through the faith of him "who liveth and was dead, and is alive for evermore, and has the keys of hell and of death," words which she often repeated. Many of her words and ejaculations were lost at times through inability to speak above her breath; at other times she spoke audibly, and seemed to regret nothing so much as the want of strength to speak more abundantly to the praise of the dear Redeemer. As for myself, my grief is almost swallowed up in the joyful and well grounded persuasion, that she is now with the Lord whom she supremely loved, and with whom she longed to be present. Death had scarcely made a pause in her song here, when she resumed it above with new and unabating ardour, and never-ending rapture and joy. How grand and glorious the transition! the thought of it may well make us forget everything else. But alas! I am yet in the body. Reflections on my loss frequently recur. The dear remembrance of a most tender and affectionate wife, my constant and faithful friend and companion for thirty-two years - a judicious, zealous, and exemplary sister in the faith, who has so often counselled, quickened, and encouraged me in the Christian race - such reflections followed out in all their tender and affecting circumstances sometimes unman me a little in my solitary hours. But I must not indulge this selfish grief. I ought rather to be thankful that she was with me so long. My present loss is her unspeakable gain. Being found in Christ, she is not lost to me. I hope soon to join her in the blessed assembly of the
spirits of the just made perfect, where in connection with all
the redeemed company JESUS and his SALVATION will be the ever­
lasting center of our joy, and the burden of our song.
"Such, dear Sister, is my consolation under this sharp but
merciful dispensation, and such I hope is yours. I feelingly
sympathise with you under your bodily distress, and my prayer
is that your mind may be supported with the lively hope of a
blessed immortality through the meritorious death, and triumph­
ant resurrection of our glorious Redeemer.

I am &c.
Archd. M'Lean."  (a)

When Mr. M'Lean made his annual visit to England in 1791 -
on which occasions he usually visited London, Hull, Beverley,
Chester, Nottingham, and Liverpool, - a sermon was placed in
his hands by the brethren at Kingston-upon-Hull. It had been
published at that place by a dissenting minister there, a Mr.
S. Barnard, and was called, "The Faith of the Operation of God".
Jones declares that Mr. M'Lean,

"considered the principles of that discourse to be
extremely unscriptural, and the tendency of the doctrine
maintained in it to make men undervalue the gospel and all
it reveals as of little or no consequence to their salva­
tion, and to lead them to seek for a foundation of hope in
some operation within them distinct from the influence of
the truth, or some mystical principle wrought in their
hearts by a spirit which does not speak in the scriptures."  
(b)

Mr. M'Lean, therefore, immediately preached two discourses to
the brethren at Kingston-upon-Hull, in which he pointed out the
errors espoused by this sermon, and covered the scripture
doctrine upon the subject. When he returned to Edinburgh, he
was requested to publish his discourses, which he did in the
form of a 57 page pamphlet, in which the two discourses were

(a) "Memoir" by Jones, pp.lxxi, lxxii.
(b) "Memoir" by Jones, p.lviii. See also - M'Lean, The Belief
of the Gospel Saving Faith, Edin.17-1. Appendix, p.50
incorporated in one essay, entitled, "The Belief of the Gospel Saving Faith," and to which was added an appendix containing some strictures on the sermon "The Faith of the Operation of God," by S. Barnard. This pamphlet by M'Lean appeared at Edinburgh in 1791, early enough to be answered by another pamphlet by Mr. Barnard, published that same year, under the title, "The Faith of God's Elect No Duty", which also contained a "reply to A. M'Lean's sermon entitled "The Belief of the Gospel Saving Faith".

In October, 1791, the church at Largo, Fife shire, was set in order, at which time Mr. John Goodsir, Surgeon, and Mr. Thomas Paterson were appointed elders. From this period, the Largo church for a time increased considerably. Dr. Goodsir was a worthy man, of whom little has been written, but a biography of him in the New Evangelical Magazine gives us certain relevant information about the devoted pioneer of the Baptist cause at Largo. He read that:

"Having frequent opportunity, in his younger years, of hearing evangelical preachers in the church of Scotland; he naturally became attached to that church, with which he remained for several years; and while in this situation, he became acquainted with the late excellent Mr. Smith, minister of the parish of Newburn. Mr. Smith is well-known in Scotland, for having given up his parochial charge, with all its emoluments, in order to maintain that purity of doctrine and discipline, which ought to subsist in Christian churches; and for afterwards connecting himself with a few simple-minded Christians, with whom he was united in the faith and hope of the gospel. About the same time, Mr. Ferrier, minister of the parish of Largo,
left his charge for similar reasons. Mr. Goodsir was satisfied with the scriptural views which Mr. Smith held, particularly respecting the gospel of the grace of God, which saves the guilty. He occasionally went to the meetings of the Independent Church, over which Mr. Smith presided, though his mind at that time was much prejudiced against the humble simplicity of the Christian profession, as it appears in the Independent and Baptist Churches in Scotland. He was satisfied with the doctrines he heard, and found himself edified by more regularly attending this small church, or as it was styled, at the time, "Society of illiterate Mechanics." The result was, that regardless of the worldly inconvenience which he might sustain, by taking part with this small flock, he professed the faith, and was admitted a member of the Independent Church at Balchristie, under the pastoral care of Mr. Smith, and Mr. Ferrier; and in this connection he remained for several years. But in the year 1789, he began to enquire into the scriptural authority for sprinkling children, which enquiry ended in his adopting Baptist principles. Shortly after he was baptized by the late Mr. M'Lean, and added to the Baptist church at Edinburgh. After this, he and a number more of the same views, associated for religious worship at Largo, and in October 1790, he and Mr. Thomas Paterson were appointed pastors over the Baptist church at that place, which situation he filled to the satisfaction of the members till the day of his death. (24 Nov. 1816). At the time Mr. Goodsir was appointed pastor, the church consisted of about twenty members, and afterwards increased and diminished at different periods. Mr. Goodsir laboured alone, in the elder's office, during a number of years preceding his death; and from that period, the church at Largo remained for years deprived of elders. It has again been put into the full order of a Christian church, by the appointment of Mr. Robert Kellock and Mr. James Murray, to the elders' office, which took place on the 15th of December 1820. (a)

Since the death of Mrs. M'Lean in December 1790, Mr. M'Lean

---

had been living alone. In early days he had had several children, but only one survived at this time. She was Mrs. Kerr, wife of a deacon in the church at Glasgow, and mother of four sons. Her husband contracted consumption, and left Mrs. Kerr a widow in March, 1792. Soon after the death of her husband, Mrs. Kerr, anxious to do all that she could to care for her father, removed with her four sons to Edinburgh. Her filial devotion is described by Jones, who declares that she did so,

"sacrificing many worldly advantages which were connected with her continuance in Glasgow, that she might minister to his comfort. Nor did her dutiful kindness rest there: she cheerfully contributed of her own property towards keeping a respectable house for her father, and in entertaining his brethren, when his own income was inadequate to meet the expense to which his public station in the church unavoidably exposed him." (a)

In March, 1792, Mr. Henry David Inglis preached a sermon in the Baptist meeting-house, on Sunday, the 18th of that month. It was published at Edinburgh in an 18 page pamphlet, - "A Sermon, proving from the Word of God, The All-Important Doctrine of the GODHEAD OF JESUS CHRIST." That same year, Thomas Pysche Palmer replied, in a pamphlet, "An Attempt to refute a Sermon by H.D. In-lis, on the Godhead of Jesus Christ." Mr. Inglis also produced at Edinburgh in 1792 an 8 page pamphlet, "The Duty of Subjection to Civil Rulers illustrated from the New Testament." (a) Memoir, by Jones, p. lxxiii.
Mr. William Braidwood, the other elder, also appeared in print that year by the publishing at Edinburgh of a series of three sermons which he preached to the church at Richmond Court. This pamphlet was of 71 pages, under the title, "PARENTAL DUTIES illustrated from the Word of God, and enforced by a particular account of the salutary influence therein ascribed to the proper government of children." 

About this time, several Scotsmen in London, who had been in the habit of meeting together for worship in a private house having now reached the number of about a dozen, began to appear as a public body, assembling at Glover's Hall, Beech Lane, Barbican. Mr. M'Lean, who was in the habit of visiting the brethren at London on his tours of England, was asked to set them in church order. He went to London in September 1792 for this purpose, accompanied by Mr. Robert Wilson, one of the deacons of the Edinburgh Church. Mr. James Blackie and Mr. Robert Meek were the elders appointed on this occasion. On this visit, Mr. M'Lean baptized Mr. Sam Jones (brother of William, who wrote M'Lean's Memoir), and Mr. Patton, who later became one of the deacons of the London Church, and was much esteemed for his liberal hospitality. On the return voyage, Mr. M'Lean found himself in company with a number of scoffers at religion, so, embracing the opportunity to declare the

It is worthy to note that the New College copy is autographed: "To Mr. Wm. Anderson from the Author."
gospel, he preached to this group on the text found in Acts xi. 26 - "And the disciples were called Christians first in Antioch. In his discourse, he showed in his usual clear and concise manner how true Christianity was distinguished from the many false forms which prevailed." The eloquence of this exposition may not have been able to convince every hearer, but such was the impression made on the scoffers that they were silent for the rest of the voyage.

One of the elders appointed at the London Church survived his election but one year, for Mr. Robert Meek died in 1793. Mr. Meek had been a member of the church in Keppel Street, or perhaps more properly, Grafton Street, under the pastoral care of Mr. John Martin; but he fell in with Mr. Robert Moncrieff, the elder of the Baptist Church at Glasgow, when Mr. Moncrieff was on a visit to London. Mr. Meek was greatly struck by Moncrieff's powerful discourses, so he resigned his connection with Mr. Martin's church and joined the Scotch Baptists at London. He was a young man of good understanding, and of very promising gifts; and had he been spared, might in time have risen to distinction as an elder; but he died at about the age of twenty-five years. The seat of his complaint was in the head, and his sufferings were exceedingly severe, but their origin was never clearly ascertained. Mr. Meek had been married but two years, and an elder but one year, when death suddenly snatched him away.
In September, 1794, Mr. William Peddie, who had been designed for the ministry in the Secession Church, was baptized and added to the Church in Edinburgh. In 1796 he removed to Kirkcaldy, where he was shortly after called to the pastoral office over the church in that place. In October 1794, Peter Whytock was chosen colleague to Mr. James Duncan in Glasgow, and in November of that year, Mr. David Miller was elected fellow-elder to Mr. William Dickie at Dundee.

As a considerable number from Paisley had been baptized from time to time, and added to the Church at Glasgow, this group was now set in separate Church order in June, 1795. The new church chose Mr. Thomas Watson and Mr. William Marshall to be elders. Under their pastoral care there was a rapid increase in the membership at Paisley.

In the year 1794, while Mr. M'Lean was visiting Mr. William Jones, that gentleman placed in his hands "Calvinistic and Socinian Systems examined and compared", by Mr. Andrew Fuller of Kettering. This pamphlet was of such interest, and gave such satisfaction to Mr. M'Lean, that he asked for other writings by that author. He discovered to his pleasure that the view of faith expounded by Mr. Fuller in "The Gospel of Christ Worthy of All Acceptation" was precisely the same as that which he held himself, and which he maintained in the first edition of "The Commission of Jesus Christ to His Apostles Illustrated."
With this favourable impression in his mind, Mr. M'Lean determined to become better acquainted with Mr. Fuller, and accordingly commenced a correspondence with the latter upon the subject of the Baptist Mission to India. To this letter, Mr. Fuller replied by sending to Mr. M'Lean a copy of the "Periodical Accounts of the Baptist Mission to India", at which Mr. M'Lean indicated his own desire to participate in such a work by promoting the cause in the churches of the Scots Baptist Connection.

Feeling that a better knowledge of the Scots Baptists among the Baptists of England would be desirable, Mr. M'Lean drew up and published in Dr. Rippon's **BAPTIST ANNUAL REGISTER** in 1795, an article entitled, "A Short Account of the Scots Baptists." This paper covered quite thoroughly their history during the first 30 years of their existence, - from 1765 to 1795. It has become one of the best source documents of the early history of Scots Baptists.

In the year 1796, three letters passed between Mr. Fuller and Mr. M'Lean, the contents of which, because they enter into the subjects of the assistance rendered by Scots Baptists to the Mission in India, and also some of the principles of the Scots Baptists as explained to a contemporary, are worthy of inclusion here.

The first is a letter from Mr. Fuller to Mr. M'Lean:
"SIR,

"WHEN I sent you the Periodical Accounts, I do not recollect that I had any expectation of your concurring with us in the work of sending the gospel among the heathen. For though I was unacquainted with any such important differences betwixt us, as should prevent co-operation, yet I had an idea, that you might suppose the contrary. For your unsolicited and generous exertions, accept our cordial thanks. I shall be ready to give you any information, either respecting our principles, or the mission concerns, that is within my power.

"I see by the Baptist Register, that you do not believe in the eternal generation of the Son of God; or which, if I understand it, is the same thing, that Christ was the Son of God, antecedent to all considerations of his assuming human nature. Some of our brethren hereabouts are of your mind. I am not. That doctrine appears to me to be taught in the holy scriptures. I can freely exercise christian forbearance, however, in this case, provided they avow Christ's proper Deity.

"As to our churches, it would be very wrong to plead on their behalf, that they come up to the primitive model ...

"It is not our practice, however, lightly to separate from Churches or individuals. ...

"It is a great fault in some of our churches, to be afraid of exercising faithful discipline upon men of opulence. ...

"You observe 'the Commission of Christ is not fully executed, unless the converts are taught to observe ALL THINGS, WHATSOEVER HE HATH COMMANDED; and are brought into such a state of separation from the world, and of union and order amongst themselves, after the model of the apostolic churches, as puts them in a capacity for doing so.' To the whole of this I freely subscribe, whether we have attained to such a state of things or not. My views, and those of my brethren are much the same as are expressed in Mr. Booth's Essay on the Kingdom of Christ. I am not conscious but that it is my aim to inculcate and practice ALL THINGS, WHATSOEVER OUR LORD HATH COMMANDED. Some of Christ's commands, however, I suppose we interpret differently from you. You, if I am rightly informed, consider the washing of feet, the kiss of charity, &c. as formally binding on all christians; we do not. We consider neither of them as religious institutes; but merely civil customs, though used by Christ and his apostles to a religious end, as whatsoever they did, they did all to the glory of God. They were in use both among Jews and Heathens long before the coming of Christ. The one was a necessary service, the other a mode of expressing kindness. We conceive it was the design of Christ by these forms to enjoin a natural interchange of kind and beneficent offices; even so as by love to EACH one another. The usual forms of expressing this temper of mind
were at that time, and in those countries washing the feet, &c. Christ therefore made use of these forms: much the same as he made use of the customary language of a country, to convey his doctrines and precepts. But as neither of these forms are ordinarily used in our age and country, to express the ideas for which they were originally enjoined, the ground or reason of the injunction ceases, a literal compliance with them would not now answer the original design, but would operate, we conceive, in a very different way. It seems to us therefore not only lawful, but incumbent to substitute such signs and forms, as are adapted to convey the spirit and injunction, rather than to abide by the letter, since that is become as it were a dead letter; as much so as to disuse the original language of scripture, and translate it into a language that can be understood. Herein we think we follow Christ's example: he used the forms and customs of his country, to express kindness and humility; and we do the same. Whether we understand these commands, however, or not, according to the mind of Christ, I hope, nay for myself I am certain, I do not live in the known violation of them.

... ... ...  

"The 'generality of the particular Baptists' do favour our undertaking, though some stand out. Those who disagree in doctrine with us, viz. the High Calvinists, as they are called, or the admirers of Gill and Brine are most cool in the business. Mr. Booth is a hearty friend.  

"The London Missionary Society, who seem by our efforts to have been provoked to a worthy emulation, will no doubt receive a larger patronage than we can expect. They unite all denominations, except Baptists, and possess great wealth. We have however no reason for envy or complaint. There is work enough for us all. We shall neither of us want for money. I have received handsome donations from members of the church of Scotland.  

"You kindly propose to receive occasional contributions for us. If after what I have said, this should be your mind; if you should feel free to co-operate with us; your best way will be to form an assistant society, whose object will be to receive subscriptions, and the Secretary of which will correspond with me, as the Secretary to the primary society. Such societies exist in several parts of England. They print and circulate such accounts in their connexion, as they judge expedient to promote the undertaking; have an annual meeting to adjust their affairs; and transmit their monies to me, or to the Treasurer, Mr. King of Birmingham.  

"We have engaged a young man, to go this spring, as an assistant to Thomas and Carey. ... If you know of any individuals in your connexion, whom you think suitable for such an
undertaking, and they possess a strong desire after it, we should be obliged by an intimation concerning them. Your counsels on any part of the undertaking will be thankfully received, and candidly attended to. With cordial esteem, I am, I trust, your brother and fellow labourer, in the kingdom and patience of Jesus Christ,

ANDREW FULLER.  

To this letter, Mr. M'Lean made reply in April, 1796, in the following epistle, which I include in full.

"SIR,

Enclosed you have a banker's bill for £151.1s. for your Missionary Society, to be applied to the purpose of propagating the gospel among the Heathen. It was collected as follows:

From the Church at Edinburgh £58 4
-------- Hearers---------- £19 10 -- £77 14
From the church and hearers at
Glasgow ------------------ £41 0
From --- Do ------ at Dundee--------------- £10 6
From---- Do------- at Paisley----------------- £10 10
From------Do------- at Largo------------------ £5 5
From some Brethren at Wooler----------------- £4 11
From a few brethren at Galisheels------------- £2 5
£151 1s.

"Since the above collection was made, we have received about £24 more; and having published two small pamphlets upon the subject, if any thing arise from the sale of them it shall be appropriated to the same use. Our fervent prayers are put up for success to your important undertaking, and indeed for all who are engaged in the same glorious cause; and while we approve of the measures pursued and doctrines taught, we shall esteem it our duty and privilege to concur with you as far as lies in our power. We have not as yet formed an Assistant Society, but there are persons appointed to receive occasional contributions.

"I am much pleased with the frankness and candour discovered in your letter, and it gives me no small satisfaction

(a) Complete letter will be found in THE NEW EVANGELICAL MAGAZINE AND THEOLOGICAL REVIEW, Volume II, 1816, pp.39-42. London.
to find that you are not disposed to justify any thing that is amiss among you either in doctrine or discipline, but are rather intent upon a reform. I read your letter to the Church, which upon the whole gave them much pleasure.

"Though you differ from us in several things, yet I suppose we are one in the great and essential doctrines of the gospel, such as the doctrine of Christ's person as truly God and man - his character and work as the Saviour - the nature of his salvation - the absolute freedom of divine grace to the most guilty and unqualified - and the way in which sinners are justified, viz. by faith in Christ without the works of the Law, either moral or ceremonial. Nor do I think we shall differ much as to the genuine effects of the belief of the truth either on the heart or life, though we may not see eye to eye as to every thing that Christ and his Apostles have enjoined.

"The doctrine of particular election, efficacious grace, and the final perseverance of the saints are clearly taught in Scripture; but as I find you disapprove of high Calvinism, I presume you will agree with me, that many have handled these doctrines very injudiciously, and deduced a kind of system from them very unlike the doctrine of the apostles, and in many respects of pernicious tendency. They suppose that election and reprobation had no respect to the entrance of sin - That a covenant of redemption was formally made in eternity, and Christ actually constituted mediator of it while as yet there was but one party existing - That the elect were in Christ before they were in Adam, and were actually justified in eternity before they had sinned or were condemned, &c. It is clear from the word of God, that the whole plan of redemption in all its parts was formed and unalterably fixed in God's eternal purpose before the world began; but it is equally clear that this plan had a respect to man as fallen, and that the actual execution of it did not take place until mankind were in a situation which needed it. Though efficacious grace is absolutely necessary to the real conversion of fallen creatures who are dead in trespasses and sins, yet it does not follow that they are as void of all natural ability as dead carcases in the grave, since this would render them altogether unaccountable, and excusable in their unbelief, and all the outward means of salvation unsuitable and vain; - in which case faith indeed could be no duty, nor unbelief a sin. - The perseverance of the saints unto the end is a scriptural doctrine, and very comfortable to believers; but they can enjoy the comfort of it in their own case no
longer than while they are actually persevering. In a state of decline or backsliding, they ought not to presume either upon their election or perseverance, but attend to the cautions against apostacy, and be excited to repentance and a fresh application of the blood of Jesus as their only safety.

"I find you differ from me in your view of the Sonship of Christ. I always considered that difference as a matter of forbearance among brethren, but was forced into the controversy against my inclination. Did I perceive his eternal generation held forth in Scripture, I should certainly reckon it incumbent upon me to believe it on the authority of God, however mysterious it might appear; but as I conceive that the Scripture gives another account of his Sonship, more consistent than eternal generation with any idea I have of the strict eternity and self-existence of his divine person, I have thought it safest to refer his generation, or begetting, to his incarnation and resurrection from the dead, to both of which the Scripture applies the word begotten, and assigns them as the reason why he is called the Son of God, Mat. i. 20. Luke i. 35. Acts xiii. 33 Col. i. 18. It becomes me however to be very modest on such a subject, as there may possibly be a sense in which he is begotten of which I have no idea at all; but still it must be consistent with his true Godhead which is so clearly revealed.

"You do not consider either the washing of feet, or the kiss of charity, as religious institutes, though used by our Lord and his Apostles to a religious end, as whatever they did, they did all to the glory of God. So far I agree with you: I never looked upon them as religious institutes, nor any part of religious worship; but as expressions of brotherly love upon particular occasions. You argue against these practices, from their not being ordinarily used in our age and country to express the ideas for which they were originally enjoined, and that therefore the ground and reason of the injunction ceases. This reasoning will apply very well to languages, the only use of which is to express and convey our ideas to others, and therefore must be disused when not understood; but it will by no means apply to any needful act of kindness to a brother, nor to any natural token of affection, and especially too if it has the superadded sanction of divine authority. Were a brother to lodge at my house having been fatigued with a journey on foot, and so needing his feet to be washed, which in such a case affords a most sensible refreshment, would it not be understood as an act of kindness in me to perform that office? It might perhaps be thought somewhat degrading to condescend to do this, and perhaps my own heart might suggest the same;
but can any serious Christian read ch. xiii of John's Gospel without determining where the blame lies? I admit that our Lord by this particular instance teaches us in general to serve one another in the most humble and condescending offices of kindness; but how this general instruction should set aside that very act of kindness and condescension which he then most wonderfully exemplified, and so solemnly enjoined, is to me altogether inexplicable. While there is any real need for that service; while the practical exercise of condescending love continues to be a duty; while the example and injunctions of our Lord and Master continue to be the rule of conduct to his disciples: the reasons of this injunction have not ceased, but are still the same as ever. - As to the kiss of charity, I do not think that the apostle grounds it upon the changeable customs of the world. When it is the universal custom of a country to use the kiss in salutation, it is in general a mere form, and therefore may be changed for any other; but even in the countries where it is in general disused, it is still understood to be a token of affection: and I am much mistaken if it has not its foundation in nature. Was it the custom of the age and country which dictated Joseph's manner of expressing his affection when he made himself known to his brethren, Gen. xiv. 14, 15, or which made the father of the returning prodigal receive him in the manner described, Luke xv. 20? I am persuaded that there are few in Britain at this day however unacquainted with the custom of antiquity, who, upon reading such passages, would not both understand and feel them, and consider a hat, a bow, or even a shake of the hand as poor and insipid expressions of affection when compared with the above. It is a kiss of charity, or of Christian love, and not of mere natural affection that the apostles enjoin: a holy kiss, as opposed to all impurity: and while it is the duty of Christians to love one another with a pure heart and fervently, the ground and reason of this injunction must still continue. I am far from thinking that you live in the known or wilful violation of what you esteem the commands of Christ; but I am of opinion that your manner of reasoning on the above points, if followed out with respect to others, would lead you farther than you would wish to go. I do not think that there is much room for reasoning at all upon plain divine commands. If we know these things, happy are we if we do them; and they can neither be lawfully altered nor set aside by reasoning, but by the same authority which enjoined them.

'There are several other practices which we observe, such as eating the Lord's Supper every first day of the week, which we are confident was the practice of the apostolic churches. The feast of Charity, which, when properly conducted, tends to cultivate love, unity and intimacy among brethren - The reading of the Scriptures and the exhortations of the brethren in our
public assemblies. — We do not think that a congregation is compleat in its order without a plurality of elders or bishops — and we look upon the prohibition of blood eating to be binding upon all Christians. I just mention these particulars as thinking it worth your while to consider them with candour; and though I do not place the essence of religion in these observances, any more than in several others which are generally allowed to be binding, yet I think the true spirit of Christianity will lead us to pay a due regard to everything on which we perceive the stamp of divine authority, whether it be precept or approved scripture example.

"We disapprove of all mere honorary clerical titles, as contrary to the spirit of our Lord's words, 'Be not ye called Rabbi, &c:' and as being founded in a kind of silly pride and vanity. The Scripture titles are all drawn from their office, such as teachers, ministers, presidents, presbyters, overseers, &c. - Though we do not despise human learning, but consider it as useful when kept in its proper place, yet we are far from making it essential to the office of an elder or bishop. The qualifications mentioned in the epistles to Timothy and Titus, and other passages, we think are sufficient. We do not find in the New Testament that men were trained at academies or universities to the christian ministry, as to a learned profession, by which they were to gain a living; nor do we think such training qualifies them for membership, far less for offices in the churches of the saints; and our experience has verified the truth of this remark. - I shall just mention another particular. There are many societies the members of which seem to have no other bond of union among themselves than their attachment to a public speaker: the consequence is, that when they happen to be divided in their opinion about him, they frequently separate or split into different societies. The unity of a Christian church is placed upon a very different foundation in Scripture; and where the scripture unity subsists among the members, it will not be dissolved by party contentions about particular men.

"I lately saw a small Catechism of Mr. Sutcliff's of Olney, wherein he distinguishes Christ's obedience into active and passive: and if I rightly remember, ascribes our pardon to his passive, and our justification to his active obedience. I think these distinctions unscriptural, and rather tend to darken than explain the subject. The obedience of Christ's life, or his perfect conformity to the holy law of God, was absolutely necessary to our justification (i.e. pardon and acceptance); but I apprehend that the scripture ascribes our justification more directly and immediately to his death and resurrection, see Rom.iii. 24,25. ch.iv.25, ch.v.8,9,10, ch.viii. 35,34, 2 Cor.v.21. Christ was not merely passive, but voluntary and active in laying down his life, or giving himself
for us, and this was by way of eminence the commandment he received of his Father, John v.18: his will he came to do, and for which a body was prepared him, Heb.x.5-11. It was for his doing this that his Father loved him, and hath most highly rewarded him. John x. 17. Phil.ii.8,9. Justification includes pardon.

"It gives me pleasure to find that you disapprove of that laxness in discipline, and partiality to men of opulence which so much prevail. I am persuaded that true christian unity and brotherly love for the truth's sake will not long continue in churches without the impartial and faithful exercise of discipline as occasion may require. But it is easier to begin and gather churches upon a scriptural plan, than to reduce them to it afterwards. I have often thought that there are some churches in such a state that they cannot be reformed without first dissolving them, and then gathering and uniting such of them as appear to be fit members of a christian church. I am fully of your mind that we ought not lightly to separate either from churches or individuals; and I acknowledge that some among us have run into that extreme: yet I do not think the apostle is tolerating the evils which were in the churches of Galatia and Corinth, but dealing with them, and in this no doubt much pains and patience were necessary. He threatens the rod to the offenders at Corinth, 'having in readiness to revenge all disobedience,' and he wishes they were cut off who troubled the churches of Galatia.

"It is now a considerable time since I saw your book entitled 'The Gospel of Christ worthy of all acceptation,' and perfectly agree with the leading scope of it. There was much need, particularly in England, for such a publication, and I hope it has done and will still do much good. "Then last in England I got a copy of your letters against Socinianism, which I have read over and over again with much satisfaction. Your plan is happily conceived, and far more convincing than if you had followed them through their endless criticisms and various readings of which the generality of readers cannot judge. Our Lord has laid down a plain rule by which to try false teachers, viz. 'by their faults ye shall know them,' and I think you have availed yourself of this criterion in a very masterly manner. I have recommended this book to my acquaintance here, and several have procured it.

"I cannot say that there are any among us at present that we could recommend as fit for the office of a missionary, excepting such as are entangled with families, or are otherways necessarily engaged at home; though I own that a strong desire after it will lead us to break through many entanglements. It requires something of an apostolic spirit. If any such should appear among us we shall let you know. We shall be glad to receive the earliest information from you with respect to the
success of the mission, and shall be ready to give our advice on any thing when it shall appear needful. Meantime I am with sincere affection and real esteem, your brother and fellow labourer in the gospel of Christ.

ARCH. M'LEAN.

Edin. April 1796. ” (a)

The third letter of this correspondence was sent by Mr. Fuller to Mr. M'Lean in the same month. Mr. Fuller writes:

"Kettering, April 20, 1796.

"DEAR SIR,

"I RECEIVED your letter and the bill which it enclosed. For all your labours of love accept our thanks. I was much refreshed by your affectionate and candid letter. The statement of your views very nearly accords with my own. Your observations on the difficulty of reforming an old church are very just, and on its being better in some cases to begin by a new formation. In this way we have proceeded in some places. Carey, for example, when he went to Leicester, found them a very corrupt people. The very officers of the church had indulged in drunkenness, and the rest were discouraged, and so discipline was wholly neglected. After advising with his brethren, brother Carey and the majority of the Church agreed to renew covenant. Accordingly they appointed a day, in which they would consider their former relation as extinct, and the church book should be open for signing to all who had been heretofore members, but upon this condition, that they subscribed at the same time a solemn declaration, that they would in future execute and be subject to a strict and faithful discipline. This measure had its effect; almost all their loose characters stood out; or if any signed, they were subject to a close watch in future. By these means the church was purged, and Carey, before he went to India, saw the good effects of it. A considerable revival in religion ensued, and many were added. Hence you may account for his language to the church at Leicester. Periodical Accounts, No. II. p. 132.

"I think few can have a greater dislike to titles than I have among ministers. That of brother is the most agreeable to me. My Brother Ryland, without his own knowledge, desire

or consent, had a D.D. next to forced upon him. It was announced by Rippon, and then people would call him by it; but I am persuaded, he would much rather never have had it. He is a very humble, godly man; and he now submits to it, because he would not be always employed in resisting a piece of insignificance. For my part I think with you, (but do not know whether any of my brethren think with me,) that it is contrary to our Lord's prohibition, Be ye not called Rabbi.

"As to Academical Education, the far greater part of our ministers have it not. Carey was a Shoemaker years after he engaged in the ministry, and I was a Farmer. I have sometimes however regretted my want of learning. On the other hand, brother Sutcliff, and brother Pearce, have both been at Bristol. We all live in love without any distinctions in those matters. We do not consider an Academy as any qualification for membership or preaching, any farther than as a person may there improve his talents. Those who go to ours, must be members of a church, and recommended by them as possessing gifts adapted to the ministry. They preach about the country all the time, and their going is considered in no other light, than as a young minister might apply to an aged one for improvement. Since brother Ryland has been there, I think he has been a great blessing in forming the principles and spirit of the young men. Grigg and Rodway are two of the first fruits of his Presidential labours. If they had been 'trained as to a learned profession, by which they were to gain a living,' they would never have offered themselves for Africa! But they were plain, modest, godly young men, whose hearts were warmed by the constraining love of Christ. I allow however, that the contrary is often the case in Academies, and proves very injurious to the churches of Christ.

"I have carefully, and if I know my own spirit, candidly examined the New Testament, concerning the time of administering the Lord's Supper; and the result is, that I consider it as wholly discrotional, as much so as the times for various other duties. Such is the form of institution as repeated by Paul 1 Cor. xi. 25, 26. as oft, as often. If any thing can be gathered from Acts ii. 42. it is, that it was done as often as they met together for worship, but this was much oftener than once a week, see ver. 46. From Acts xx. 7 we learn that the disciples met on the first day of the week, for breaking of bread; but it does not follow that this was their practice on every such first day. It might be so, but as Christ left the matter open, I suppose they acted accordingly. At Jerusalem soon after Pentecost, it seems to me, they did it oftener than once a week; afterwards they might do it once a week. But if Christ has not fixed it, neither should we, lest we go beyond the rule appointed us."
"The grounds on which you plead for the washing of feet, I should have no objection to. If you will come and see me, and it be any refreshment to you, I will cheerfully wash yours; and not yours only, but if the meanest Christian needed it, I do not feel that it would at all hurt my pride to gratify him. I have pride, as well as other sins, but I think it does not operate in that way.

"Your remark on brother Sutcliff's catechism, seems at present to be forcible. I will show it to him. My objection to the kiss, is not that it is become so obsolete, that people would not understand it as a token of affection, but being confined in England to express the affection of relations, or of the sexes, it would be understood accordingly. Several Frenchmen, lately meeting with some of their old friends, gave them the fraternal embrace, and a company of English Sailors, standing by, judged them to be #/# and began to stone them. If our brethren were thus to salute the sisters, their husbands who might be unbelievers, would feel jealous, and many reproaches and scandals would be raised. Let such salutations therefore be ever so pure in themselves, we should not be able to abstain from the appearance of evil.

'Since I wrote you, I have received a letter from Carey, of which I subjoin a copy. I have also a letter from Mr. Thomas, which I think of copying in a letter to Dr. Stuart. If you will be so obliging as to read this to him, he will read the other to you, which will save much hard labour. My love to him. Mr. Thornton could not get a passage for Mr. Fountain by the Company's ships, but I have been to London, and engaged him a passage in an American ship, which I hope will sail for Calcutta this week. Mr. Maitland has engaged to stand in Mr. Salvage's place. My Christian love to your colleagues and brethren.

Your affectionate Brother,

(signed,) A. FULLER

P.S. I saw a young man in town last week, one of your members, named Jackson." (a)

This correspondence had the effect of causing both persons to desire a personal interview, so, as Mr. M'Lean found it necessary to pass some time in the Staffordshire potteries, he visited with Mr. Fuller at Kettering, and passed three days with him in the autumn of 1796, on his way to London.

During this visit, the two men had opportunity to converse on various matters, and among the subjects mentioned, the matter of faith was brought up. Some remarks which Mr. Fuller made, led Mr. M'Lean to see that the other had departed somewhat from the simple view of it which he had maintained in the first edition of his, "Gospel worthy of all acceptation." They therefore entered upon a discussion upon the distinction between faith, hope, and love, as these are mentioned in 1 Cor. xiii.13. Mr. M'Lean argued that his friend's present view of faith, which included in it the exercise of the will and affections, must go to destroy that distinction, by confounding faith and love. In reply, Mr. Fuller asked, "Does not hope imply desire, and desire imply love?" "Yes", said Mr. M'Lean, "hope is a modification of love." "Then", said Mr. Fuller, "you have given up your argument." After reflecting a moment, Mr. M'Lean saw that by terming hope a modification of love, he had unguardedly conceded to the other a point on which he should not have yielded. His object, however, in visiting Mr. Fuller, was to cultivate his friendship, so he let the argument go. He
promised to consider the matter thoroughly, and transmit his position to Mr. Fuller in writing, when once he had given it his full attention. (a) This he did upon his return to Edinburgh, but in the meantime Mr. Fuller had written several letters to friends both in Scotland and in England in which he seized upon Mr. M'Lean's concession in private conversation, to proclaim a complete victory over him as an opponent.

Mr. M'Lean saw some of these letters, and was informed of others. As he was then upon the point of publishing the second edition of his book "Christ's Commission to His Apostles", he added to the section on faith two additional notes, in which he made mention that "Some profess to admit, that 'faith is credence and nothing else,' yet at the same time affirm, that 'there are some truths which cannot be known or believed without a corresponding temper of heart.' (b) The name of Mr. Fuller was not mentioned in these notes, but Mr. M'Lean there gave the answers he considered necessary to counteract what appeared to him the dangerous effect of such a view of faith. Mr. Fuller was very much put out to find that his victory had not been conceded, and in 1801 published a second edition of his own, "Gospel worthy of all acceptation, with additions and corrections; to which is added, an APPENDIX, on the question, whether the existence of any holy disposition of heart be necessary in order to believing in Christ."

(b) M'Lean, "Christ's Commission to His Apostles", p. 74, note
Mr. M'Lean wrote a lengthy "Reply" to this appendix, which he published in the following year, 1802. In this reply, Mr. M'Lean discusses the three questions: 1. "Whether the existence of a holy disposition of heart be necessary to believing? 2. Whether justifying faith includes in its nature any thing more than a Belief of the Gospel? 3. Whether justifying faith respects God as the justifier of the Ungodly?" He answers the first two in the negative, and the third in the positive. However, the arguments continued in religious circles for some time. (a)

Thus we can gather from the foregoing account, one of the fruits of the attempt of Mr. M'Lean to become better acquainted with Andrew Fuller, was a controversy between them on the nature of faith. Another, and more profitable result, to my way of thinking, was the interest aroused in Mr. M'Lean, and the support given by him, to the Baptist Mission to India. In spite of difference, detailed in the correspondence with Mr. Fuller, between the Baptists of England and those of Scotland on several matters, especially in the order and government of their churches, Mr. M'Lean was convinced that the missionaries were preaching the faith of the gospel, so he considered it his duty to aid the Society for the support of the Mission, to the utmost of his ability. We have already mentioned his "Short Account of the Scots Baptists" in Rippon's Baptist Annual Register.

This Magazine also contains a paper, with which Mr. M'Lean introduced the "Periodical Accounts of the Mission to India" to the people of Scotland. It is called an "Address on the Duty of Using Means for the Universal Spread of the Glorious Gospel of Christ." Mr. M'Lean declares:
ADDRESS ON THE DUTY OF USING MEANS FOR THE UNIVERSAL SPREAD OF THE GLORIOUS GOSPEL OF CHRIST. (BY A.M. LEAN)

To the People of God in Scotland.

"My design in drawing up and publishing the foregoing accounts, is to acquaint such of you as have not seen the different publications, with what is going on; and to excite all who sincerely wish the extension of the Redeemer's kingdom, to join issue with the benevolent and spiritual exertions which are now making to send the gospel among the dark and benighted heathen. Permit me then to offer a few things to your consideration on this important subject.

"The deplorable state of the heathen world demands our most serious attention. According to the lowest computation, there are at this day above four hundred millions of our brethren of mankind involved in gross pagan darkness, and stupidly worshipping demons, or the work of their own hands. Nor is this all; many of them practice the most shocking barbarities and unnatural customs, such as offering human sacrifices, and feasting upon the flesh of their slain enemies, as in New Zealand and the islands of the Pacific Ocean. Others, as in the East Indies, burn women to death along with the bodies of their deceased husbands, and many voluntarily inflict the most cruel tortures upon themselves. These things cannot fail to move the compassion of every person who is possessed of the least spark of humanity. But how deeply must it affect the heart of a Christian when he reflects upon their condition in relation to their eternal concerns! It is truly overwhelming to think, that such a vast number of human beings, possessed of immortal souls, equally precious with our own, and capable not only of civilization, but of regeneration and everlasting happiness, should yet, at this advanced period of the Christian aera, be still sitting in darkness and in the shadow of death, totally ignorant of the only way of salvation, without Christ, without hope, and without God in the world. In comparing our situation with theirs, we cannot but adore the sovereign dispensations of God, and his distinguishing grace towards us, who were originally in the same state, and deserved no better than they: But have we not at the same time much cause for deep regret that we have hitherto done so little, if anything at all, towards communicating to them the invaluable blessings which we have so freely received?

"Some laudable exertions have been made, and are still making, by particular societies, to propagate the gospel among the heathen, and which, through the divine blessing, have produced good effects: but it is too obvious that Christians in general have not been much impressed with the obligations
they are under to co-operate in such undertakings. Let it therefore be duly considered, that it is the COVENANT of the everlasting God that the gospel should be made known to ALL NATIONS for the obedience of faith. (a) It is the express COMMISSION of our Lord and Saviour to his apostles, 'Go ye into ALL THE WORLD, and preach the gospel to EVERY CREATURE — Go ye therefore, teach ALL NATIONS, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world." (b) This commission was not restricted to the apostles, for many others were engaged in executing it; nor did it expire with their lives. It is a standing law of the kingdom of heaven, and continues in force through all ages of the church, even unto the end of the world, as the promise which accompanies it plainly imports, true indeed, it is addressed immediately to teachers, and all are not such; nor is it the duty of all teachers to leave their respective charges: But it is the duty of all Christians to be fellow-workers to the truth, by assisting those who for his name's sake go forth, taking nothing of the Gentiles: (c) They can co-operate according to their respective spheres, abilities, and opportunities, with the societies who are engaged in such undertakings, and assist them by their contributions, their influence, their advice, and their prayers; so that all have it in their power to concur in one way or other in promoting the great design of this commission, consequently it must be their bounden duty. If it be our duty to love Christ's cause, to be zealous for his honour and interest in the world, and concerned about the salvation of our fellowmen; then certainly it is our duty to promote these according to our sphere and ability: If it be our duty to pray that his kingdom may come; that his saving health may be known among all nations, and that for this end he would send forth labourers into his harvest, it must undoubtedly be our duty to act suitably to such prayers, insofar as we have it in our power.

"Consider what encouragements we have to concur in such a glorious undertaking. The mighty King of Zion has promised to those who are engaged in it according to his will, 'Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world.' The work is indeed extensive and arduous, and there are many obstacles in the way, which to human power are altogether insurmountable; but what then? Is there any thing too hard for him who has all power in heaven and in earth; who makes his strength perfect in weakness, and who has pledged his faithfulness to give success to the means he has appointed? Consider also, that the word of God abounds with promises, that Christ's kingdom shall

(a) Rom.xvi. 26.
(b) Mark xvi.15. Matt.xxviii.19,20.
(c) 3 John, ver. 6,7,8.
at last universally prevail on the earth. The Father hath
given him the heathen for his inheritance, and the uttermost
parts of the earth for his possession. (a) It is promised,
that all nations shall be blessed in him; (b) - that all the
ends of the world shall remember and turn unto the Lord, and
all the kindreds of the nations shall worship before him; (c)
that the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord, as
the waters cover the sea: (d) And it is the united voice of
the oracles of truth, that all the successive shakings and
overturnings of the monarchies and kingdoms of this world,
shall at last issue in their becoming our Lord's and his
Christ's. (e) What an encouraging prospect does this open
to our view! We are certain that this happy period will come;
and though it is not for us to know the times and seasons, yet
we cannot but observe, that the Lord at present seems remark­
ably at work in various ways, and particularly in stirring up
instruments to diffuse the light of the gracious gospel over
the dark parts of the earth. Is not this a hopeful sign that
he is about to accomplish the great things which he hath prom­
ised respecting the glory of the latter days? Much indeed is
to be done, and it is likely that it will be a work of time;
but this ought not to discourage the children of God from per­
severing in the use of the appointed means, which are mighty
through God to the pulling down of strong holds. The truth
shall at last prevail, and those who are instrumental in turn­
ing many to righteousness shall shine as the stars for ever and
ever.

"In forming associations of this kind, it is proper that
Christians should be satisfied as to the leading views and
principles of those with whom they propose to co-operate; and
though it cannot be expected that all who unite in this design
should be precisely of the same sentiments in every thing, yet
it is absolutely necessary that they should be agreed in the
great and essential doctrines of the gospel; for without this
they can have no proper union; And there is the more need to
be cautious in this, because no other scheme of doctrine than
that which the apostles preached will be blessed of God for the
salvation of men; and there is an anathema denounced upon all
who preach any other gospel, or corrupt the gospel of Christ.
It gives me sincere pleasure, however, to observe, that the
missionary societies which have lately been formed profess
evangelical principles, and in so far as they propagate the
faith once delivered to the saints, I most heartily wish them
God speed.

"Though we of the Baptist denomination in Scotland differ

(a) Psal. ii. 8.
(b) Gen.xxii. 18.
(c) Psal.xxii.27.
(d) Isa.xi.9.
(e) See Dan.ii.35,44; vii.14,27; Rev.xi.15
in some things from those of the same denomination in England, and have no intention to depart from those principles by which the order and government of our churches have hitherto been regulated; yet being satisfied upon the whole that they preach the faith of the gospel, and, as they declare, 'maintain the important doctrines of Three equal Persons in the Godhead; eternal and personal election; original sin; particular redemption free justification by the righteousness of Christ imputed; efficacious grace in regeneration; the final perseverance of the saints; the resurrection of the dead; the general judgement at the last day; and the life everlasting,' we have considered it as our duty to assist their missionary society, and have made a general contribution among ourselves for this purpose. But being a few in number, and most of us in moderate circumstances, it is not in our power to give any considerable aid; and as we understand the Baptist Society's Funds are but small, though they have four missionaries already employed in heathen countries; we therefore wish to give an opportunity to such of the disciples of Christ in this part of the country as may approve of the measures hitherto pursued by that society, to contribute for the purpose of enabling them to be more extensively useful.

"Donations to the Baptist Society in England, for propagating the Gospel among the Heathen, will be received by Mr. William Braidwood, merchant in Edinburgh; Messrs. James and Andrew Duncan, booksellers in Glasgow; and Mr. Alexander Millar, merchant in Dundee." (a)

---

(a) From: Dr. Rippon's **BAPTIST ANNUAL REGISTER**, Vol.II. 1795-6, London, pp. 376-380.
Mr. M'Lean has been credited by Dr. Stuart in his short biography of Mr. A. Fuller as being, "among the first, if not the very first," in Scotland to draw attention to the Mission. (a) On December 27th, 1795, he preached a sermon to the Baptist Church at Richmond Court, Edinburgh, on "The Promise, that all Nations shall be brought into Subjection to Christ, with the Reasons of it, briefly considered; together with a short View of the Duty of Christians to use means for its Accomplishment, and of their Encouragements in doing so." This sermon was published at Edinburgh in 1796 in the form of a 29 page pamphlet. He also published in 1796 two smaller pieces, - the "Address to the People of Scotland" already mentioned, and a 16 page paper published anonymously under the title, "A Very Brief Account of the Present Attempts to Carry the Knowledge of the Gospel to the Heathen; with a Few Remarks on the Different Proposals for Assisting Them." (b)

Mr. M'Lean's great zeal for this cause led to his addressing a great congregation at the Circus in Edinburgh, on the text, 2 Tim. iii. 16, on the importance of the Holy Scriptures, and the duty of aiding the translation of them, and also of disseminating the word of life throughout every nation, tongue, and people. At this time, another collection was made, which amounted to £188.

(a) A SHORT MEMOIR of the late MR. ANDREW FULLER, signed by DR. STUART. George Square, August 17, 1815. Part II. p. 15

(b) Ascribed by Alex. Pringle of Perth to Mr. M'Lean. See his "Prayer for the Revival of Religion...and for the spread of the Gospel among the Heathen Nations..." p. 12.
This amount he remitted to Mr. Fuller for the use of the Society.

Mr. Fuller made several visits to Scotland, during which he spread the information of the work of the Mission, and discovered that the contributions of the Scots Baptists were more than generous. It was scarcely surprising that they should give wholeheartedly to the Lord's work, for one of their principles was that the means with which they were blessed were theirs as stewards of His to use for God's purposes. This principle might work to keep their numbers small, but God's work had first call upon their pocketbooks, and even the very small societies gave as they could.

This principle was one of the first centres around which opposition to the spread of Scots Baptist doctrines in Wales was encountered by John Richard Jones of Ramoth, as is vividly told by the biographer of Christmas Evans. (a)

John Richard Jones of Ramoth, in the year 1795, gained possession of some books by Mr. M'Lean, which, at first, he read with much prejudice, as they were opposed to the ideas of religion he entertained at that time. In these books he was always being referred to the Scriptures as the test of the doctrines maintained. He therefore decided to investigate these allegations of scriptural verity for himself. The

---

(a) Rev. D.M. Evans, *CHRIST IN WALES - A Memoir*, p. 102.
The result was that he became thoroughly convinced of the truth of M'Lean's position, and began to advocate Scotch Baptist principles among his own congregation, and at the Association Meetings in North Wales. Jones found that most of the members of his flock were soon in agreement with his newly adopted doctrines, and he fostered their interest by procuring several volumes of writings by M'Lean and his fellow-elders, as well as books by Sandeman and Glas, which he distributed to the persons of his group who could read English. J.R. Jones entered into a correspondence with Mr. M'Lean, in which he sought advice upon various matters of faith and practice. Mr. M'Lean returned answers, pointing out certain measures of Scotch Baptist faith and practice, which they believed to be in accord with the injunction of the Lord Jesus.

It would be no exaggeration to say that J.R. Jones threw himself into the movement wholeheartedly. He was not a type of man who could quietly and gently seek to influence others to see his views of truth. He was a born leader of men, self-assured, sometimes inclined to be dogmatic, proud of his education by comparison with his unlearned Baptist brothers in the churches of Wales, skilful in debate, and inclined, I am afraid, to seek victory in the lists, whatever the cost.
Christmas Evans was a personality upon whom the power of suggestion was very strong. So, influenced by the dominant Jones, Evans joined the new movement, wrote to Mr. M'Lean, and was a zealous advocate of its measures for about five years.

The exact position of John R. Jones as regards Scotch Baptist principles is something of an enigma. At first, under the influence of M'Lean's writings, he swept almost everything before him, so that with one exception, all of the ministers of the Association followed in his train. As long as he dwelt on the fundamental matters of the faith, his movement was a counter-acting influence to the highly emotional "camp meeting" style of evangelism then prevalent in Wales. At these meetings, several poetical orators, with little knowledge of Scripture, but with unbounded enthusiasm, swayed the people with their frenzied words. Jones, however, began to impose the smaller matters of the "primitive church order" upon all and sundry, and made much of minor observances, such as the washing of feet, the kiss of charity, and so on, by raising these to the status of religious institutions. He labelled those Baptist churches of Wales which would not conform to him in these things, the "Babylonian Baptist" churches.

Then, too, the disciple was not averse to admonishing the master, if that be the relationship which then existed between Jones and Mr. M'Lean. Soon, Jones was hectoring Mr. M'Lean on
all sort of matters in the correspondence between them, and
debating so fiercely upon minutiae, that Mr. M'Lean, wearied
of incessant bickering, ceased the correspondence.

In Wales, under a quiet, well-versed Biblical scholar,
Thomas Jones of Glynceiriog, the opposition to J.R. Jones and
his "Sandemanianism" was becoming more and more apparent.
Finally, except for a dozen churches of North Wales which
remained "Sandemanian" most of the Baptist churches affected
returned to the evangelical and emotionally warming type of
religion which to them was more congenial than this frigid
"blast from the North".

It is interesting to note the appellation, "Sandemanian"
being applied to Jones. He himself declared that it was so
used:

"...because that epithet in Wales has much the same
import that the term 'Samaritan' had among the Jews
in our Lord's time; and is always used to frighten
devout people, especially such as appear to be under
any concern of mind about the doctrine, church order,
and discipline established by the apostles, among
the primitive societies of the saints." (a)

However, another writer informs us:

"Mr. Jones describes the change which took place in
his religious sentiments through the instrumentality
of the writings of Mr. M'Lean; and it would have
been well had he stopped where this pious minister
led him, which he certainly did not, but adopted the
peculiarities of Messrs. Sandeman and Glas in almost
every thing except baptism. His controversies with
Messrs. M'Lean and Braidwood in the Theological Re­
pository, on the Millenium; on singing and praying

in the presence of unbelievers; and on the success of the Gospel in the latter days, prove him to have been much more a Sandemanian than a Scotch Baptist. So bigoted was Mr. Jones in his Sandemanian views, that Mr. R. Morgan, and others of his brethren, had great difficulty to persuade him not to withdraw from the fellowship of the Scotch Baptists." (a)

The actual result, so far as we are concerned, of the enthusiasm of J.R. Jones, was that about a dozen churches in Wales adopted practices akin to those of the Scotch Baptists. They were nominally in connexion with this latter group, but there was not much intercourse between them, outside of correspondence. The connection was broken by Mr. Braidwood, when J.R. Jones separated from his colleague, R. Morgan. Some churches, termed "Scotch Baptist", persisted in Wales till 1917, when they united with the "Church of Christ" organization. (b)

In 1796 Mr. William Braidwood delivered three sermons to the Baptist Church at Edinburgh, which he published in a 92 page pamphlet, "The Purity of Christian Communion recommended as an antidote against the Perils of the Latter Days," to which he added an Appendix containing some thoughts "On the Weekly Celebration of the Lord's Supper, and on the Nature and Tendency of Human Standards of Religion." The Preface is dated 5th July.

In 1796, Mr. James Watt, (later Doctor Watt,) who had

(b) J.C.SY Rel. 7 2th. Vol.XI. 328,329 - CBOTS:Scotch Baptists
been licensed to preach the gospel by the Associate Synod of Antiburgher Seceders, published at Glasgow a pamphlet, "Plain Proof that the public Creeds involve Doctrines Erroneous and Intolerant...with a Vindication of Seceders." In 1797, having adopted scriptural views of Baptism and the nature of the church of Christ, he set forth his sentiments in a paper printed at Dublin, entitled, "Infant Baptism Unchristian". As a result, he was not only deprived of his license, but was excommunicated from the Associate Synod. Soon after, he was baptized, and added to the Baptist Church at Edinburgh.

The publications by Mr. Watt aroused discussion among members of the Associate Synod of Antiburghers. Some persons in Aberdeenshire, who adopted and advocated the truths which he had published, were in their turn also excommunicated. In the month of September, 1797, he was invited by them to preach in their neighbourhood. He was inclined to accept this invitation, and was encouraged to go to Aberdeenshire by the Edinburgh Church. The members at Edinburgh, who had formed a high opinion of his character and behaviour, as well as of his gifts, recommended him by solemn prayer and supplication to God for this service. Mr. Watt used Balmaud as his Headquarters during his stay in the north, and from there he visited New Pitsligo, Macduff, Huntly, Tureff, Newbyth, Banff, Cummingsstown, Strichen, Mill of Foderty, Gardenstown, Rosarty, Fraserburgh, Peterhead, Keith and Eden, as well as other places. In each town he preached several times to small
groups of hearers, which never exceeded five or six hundred persons, and were generally fewer. His reception at these places was varied, for some mocked, some heard with decorum, if not with attention, and a few treated him very cruelly. However, before he left Balmaud, where he preached every Sunday, as well as at other times, twelve persons made confession of their faith, and were baptized. (a)

In 1797 Mr. McLean published as a separate pamphlet his essay on the "Thoughts on the Calls and Invitations of the Gospel", which had appeared about 1796 in the Missionary Magazine. This 43 page booklet, printed at Edinburgh, also contained a "Reply to Some Animadversions" made by a friend on the anonymous paper in the Magazine. The Preface is dated February 2nd. In the same year, the second edition of his "Commission of Jesus Christ to His Apostles" was placed before the public. This edition differed from the first in the introduction of an epitome of the evidences of Christianity into the Preface; in an addition to the concluding part of the volume of an article on the fulfilment of the prophecies and promises which relate to Christ's kingdom, from the time of the apostles to the final consummation of all things. In the first edition of his book he did not enter much into the subject of Christ's reign on the earth, but it was obvious

(a) See Edinburgh Quarterly Magazine, Vol.1,1798-pp.68-73
from what he did say that he inclined at that time to the idea of the personal reign of Christ during the Millenium. During the intervening years, circumstances in the Baptist connexion led him to a more detailed study of the subject, by which he became convinced that this notion of Christ's personal reign is untenable, and therefore in the second edition he advocated Christ's spiritual reign, or the universal nature of his kingdom, and the prevalence of his religion during that period. He also added two long notes on the subject of faith, in order to defend himself against the strictures of Mr. A. Fuller upon his view of it.

After the death of Mr. Robert Meek at the London Church in 1793, Mr. Sam Jones, who had been baptized by Mr. M'Lean at the time Mr. Meek was ordained, was encouraged by the church, first to exhort on the Lord's day morning, then to give an occasional discourse, in order to assist the remaining elder, Mr. Blaikie. These exhortations and discourses were so acceptable to the brethren that Mr. Jones was requested to become an elder. He was therefore ordained to that office by Mr. M'Lean when the latter was in London in 1797. Mr. Jones was not an outstanding preacher, but in spite of a weak, unimpressive manner, frequent offence against the rules of grammar, an indulgence in colloquial barbarisms, and especially in spite of the handicap of a thick Cheshire dialect, he held his hearers by an animated style, by his good sense and
correct doctrinal sentiment, combined with an affectionate appeal to the judgement and conscience of his congregation. Mr. Jones served as an Elder to this Church till 1823, - a period of twenty-six years. He was not only a devoted pastor, but an extremely busy executive in private life, for during the last twenty years of his life the chief direction of the Limehouse Porter Brewery rested upon his shoulders. (a)

On the 15th of November, 1798, the church in Kirkcaldy was set in order, at which time Mr. William Peddie and Mr. H. Cameron were appointed elders.

While the church in Edinburgh, through the instrumentality of its pastors and other preachers whom it duly sent forth, was spreading the knowledge of the truth among fellow-countrymen, it felt that still some greater effort might be made. Hence, with a view to stimulating the other churches in the connexion to greater exertions, it circulated among them the first Home Missionary epistle sent out among the Baptists of Scotland. An original copy is preserved at the Baptist House, Glasgow. It is written in the handwriting of Archibald M'Lean, is dated 18th November, 1798, and is signed by all three of the elders at Edinburgh. The letter reads as follows:


The article "Angel" in Mr. Jones's Biblical Cyclopaedia is by Samuel Jones.


New Evangel. Magazine Vol. IV. - letters signed "- Scotch Baptist" are by Samuel Jones.
DEARLY BELOVED BRETHREN,

The exertions which Christians of different denominations are now making for the spread of the gospel in foreign countries, and the zeal with which they have united and embarked in the prosecution of that important object, must give pleasure to every sincere and well-informed disciple of Christ, as there is reason to hope, that, through the blessing of God, such endeavours will be productive of the most salutary consequences with regard to the eternal interests of an innumerable multitude of the human race, who are sitting in darkness and in the shadow of death, without life, and without God in the world.

But when we take a survey of the state of religion among the inhabitants of our own country, who are called Christians, and have long enjoyed the means of salvation in having the word of God among their hands, the greatest stretch of candour will not permit us to deny that a vast majority of them are as destitute of real Christianity as those who have never heard the gospel, whatever may be said of their inferior degree of civilization. Men styled ministers of the gospel are, indeed, everywhere to be found; such of them as really declare the truth as it is in Jesus must no doubt be useful to their hearers, though many of them are greatly deficient in zeal, faithfulness, and diligence in propagating the truth; and it is but too well known that there are others who neither believe nor preach the ancient faith once delivered to the saints.

Impressed with these melancholy facts, some have of late attempted to supply the defect, and, without the consent or concurrence of any church, have gone forth of their own accord, as Itinerants, to preach the gospel to their countrymen.

But while we rejoice to hear that Christ is preached by them, whilst we give them all credit for their honest zeal and disinterested motives, and sincerely wish that they may be successful in awakening sinners, and directing them to the Saviour, we cannot help regretting that they themselves are not instructed in the way of God more perfectly. They profess to act under the authority of Christ's commission in preaching the GOSPEL; yet it seems they have it not in their plan to follow out the different parts of that commission.
They neither baptize converts to the faith, nor teach them to observe all things whatsoever Christ hath commanded, as the first preachers did. They have no idea of separating the disciples from religious fellowship with visible unbelievers, or of bringing them into that state of union and order among themselves which is enjoined and exemplified in the New Testament, and in which they can properly edify one another, perform the mutual offices of their connexion, maintain that purity of communion which is essential to brotherly love, and observe the peculiar institutions of the gospel agreeably to the primitive pattern. These things, though founded on the authority of him who hath all power in heaven and in earth, and intimately connected with vital Christianity, and with the steadfastness of their faith in Christ, they sometimes represent as of little or no importance, and at other times as things which are only calculated, as matters now stand, to divide the people of God among themselves, and to promote a narrow, bigoted and party spirit, - a reproach which above all other things they wish to avoid, though it has hitherto been ever inseparable from primitive Christianity. Thus, by acting on what they esteem a comprehensive and liberal plan, they have, in reality, shut themselves up into a very partial and contracted system of doctrine, which does not permit them to follow out the commission given by Jesus Christ, in all its parts, nor to declare all the counsel of God; so that, instead of leading the disciples forward to the observance of all things whatsoever Christ hath commanded, they leave them, as to these things, just where they found them, and their care of the ends where that of the apostles began. We hope the Lord will bless their labours, so far as they declare the truth; but from such partial and defective teaching we have little cause to expect a revival of primitive Christianity, or that anything like the first churches of the saints will be the result of their exertions. There is, therefore, much need for those who, in connexion with preaching the gospel, have this also for their object, to exert themselves to the utmost of their power in so glorious a cause.

You know, brethren, that we have not been altogether deficient in this respect. We have contributed for the propagation of the gospel abroad, and occasionally sent out some of our number to preach it in different places at home, whose labours, through the blessing of God, have not been in vain. But much yet remains to be done, multitudes around us are perishing for lack of knowledge, - many are contenting themselves with a perverted gospel, and a form of godliness without the power of it, - while the greater part of even serious professors are entangled in the systems and traditions of men, mixed with the world in their religious fellowship contrary to the word of God, and placed in a connexion wherein they cannot possibly
observe many of the commandments of Christ, nor enjoy the rights and privileges which belong to them as his subjects. Here there is a wide field, and a loud call to exert ourselves more than we have hitherto done; for in this work, though the harvest is plenteous, the labourers are but few.

But it may be asked, what can we do more than we are doing at present? We have already set apart some besides the elders for preaching the gospel; these publicly exercise their gifts in the places where they are stationed, for the benefit of the brethren and of all who choose to hear them; the elders also make excursions to other places, and some of them take a pretty extensive circuit.

All this is granted; but yet we may still do more. It should be observed, that the few already set apart for preaching the gospel, are obliged to labour for their daily bread, and are completely occupied through the week, that they have no time for anything else, and if they should leave their brethren and make pretty wide excursions on the Lord's day, they could not well bear the expense which even this would occasion. There are others among us who possess gifts for this work, but are in the same predicament with respect to circumstances; and such of them as might be able to bear the expense, are much confined by the attendance which the nature of their business requires. Now, if it is in our power, in some measure at least, to remove these obstructions, and to render the gifts we already possess more extensively useful, it certainly is our duty to do so. In order to do this, we would suggest the following things:

I. That all the churches in the connexion should take this important subject into their most serious consideration, and be fervently engaged in prayer to God, for wisdom to direct them to the use of proper means, and for his blessing to render these successful.

II. That they should make the spread of the Gospel a common concern, and co-operate with one heart and soul in the most effectual means for accomplishing that important end.

III. That it be recommended to Elders and preachers regularly appointed, to extend their labours as far around the places of their abode as possible.

IV. That to assist them in this, a small sum of money be collected in the most eligible mode (suppose a monthly collection) to be applied in procuring places for preaching, if needful, and also to assist in defraying the extraordinary expenses of journeys, &c.

By adopting this plan, the gifts already employed, as well as those persons who afterwards may be found qualified for that work, will have a more extensive sphere of usefulness.

Now, brethren, if our zeal bear any proportion to the importance of the cause, if our prayers are sincere that the Lord of the harvest may send forth labourers into his harvest, -
if we have faith in Christ's promise, that he will be with those who faithfully execute his commission, even unto the end of the world; - let us give solid evidence of this, by concurring heartily in every scriptural measure for advancing the kingdom of Christ, and for promoting through the divine blessing, as far as in us lies, the salvation of immortal souls.

Subscribed in the name, and by the appointment of the Church,

(Signed; ARCH'D M'ILLEY, )
WILLIAM BRAINTWOOD ( Elders
HENRY DAVID INGLIS

Edinburgh, 18th November, 1798." (a)

----

It is noteworthy that this letter was sent out just at the time when the Haldanes were drawing the attention of Scottish people to the Home missionary opportunities at their doors. So this appeal of the Edinburgh Church reveals their awareness of that opportunity, and of their desire to support the Lord's work in the home field as well as in foreign parts. As we can see, too, by this frank letter, part of the Baptist zeal was aroused by their feelings that the Haldanes, in not following in detail all the steps which Scots Baptists regarded as necessary for the true separation of Christ's own from the world, could not possibly be doing a work of permanent importance. The Baptist churches, stimulated by this appeal, and being favoured by having many among them qualified and willing to preach the gospel to sinners, increased in numbers. Believers in other places were formed into churches. Mr. M'Lean and Mr. Henry David Inglis were indefatigable in their labours. They preached the gospel, not only at home, but in the case of the former, throughout England as well. Mr. Inglis used the leisure given him from professional duties by vacations of the Court of Session in travelling throughout Scotland to visit the brethren and to preach the gospel to sinners.

"From 1804 onwards we find the Edinburgh Church administering an Itinerant Fund contributed by itself, Glasgow, Paisley, Dunfermline and one or two other churches, and rendering aid to missionaries in the north as well as meeting the expenses
of elders who visited throughout the connexion or made Highland tours. Edward Mackay in Thurso, David Macrae in Fortrose, and A. Fraser, first in Huntly and then in Dundee, were employed in itineration for some years from 1805; and at a later date, when division had crippled the churches and the fund had become a purely Edinburgh one, those at Whitehaven and Beverley became special objects of care." (a)

The pens of Mr. M'Lean and his co-elders were not idle in this time, for in 1798 Thomas M'Crie produced a pamphlet entitled, "A Conversation between JOHN, a Baptist, and EBENEZER, a Seceder, on the Faith of the Gospel. Occasioned by Mr. M'Lean's Treatise on Christ's Commission to his Apostles." This produced a reply by Mr. M'Lean, which was published in 1799 at Edinburgh by the same printer who had produced Mr. M'Crie's pamphlet. M'Lean's paper is called, "A Second Conversation between EBENEZER, a Seceder, and JOHN, a Baptist, on the Faith of the Gospel. Occasioned by Mr. M'Lean's Treatise on Christ's Commission to his Apostles. BY THE AUTHOR OF THAT TREATISE." This, in turn, produced a reply from Mr. M'Crie in 1799, - "A Third Conversation between JOHN, a Baptist, and EBENEZER, a Seceder, on the Faith of the Gospel; in which The Point of difference between them is clearly stated, and the Mistakes of the SECOND CONVERSATION corrected. BY THE AUTHOR OF THE FIRST CONVERSATION."

The format of these tracts is very deceiving to the casual reader, as no names of authors are printed on the title pages,

(a) History of the Baptists in Scotland, p. 68.
and they are each printed by Thomas Turnbull, Canongate, Edinburgh, in 1798, 1799 and 1799 respectively. The authorship of the first is acknowledged in the biography of Dr. M'Crie, (a) and the second is to be found also in the WORKS of M'Lean - in which WORKS he contents himself with a few additional remarks upon the third conversation, to which he did not publish a lengthy reply. When these pamphlets are all bound together, it takes a close scrutiny to discern the fact that they are not all from a single author.

Mr. M'Lean had before this time sent in a stray article or paper to a periodical or magazine, and had it published there. Now, he began to cultivate that method of approach as an author, and from 1798 till the time of his death he contributed a steady flow of essays and letters to a series of monthly magazines.

The first of these magazines was the Edinburgh Quarterly Magazine of 1798. M'Lean found in this periodical a vehicle for a paper defending his "Commission" against a review which had appeared in the Missionary Magazine. (Vol.XIII.pp.180-186) His paper was entitled, an "Examination of a review of Mr. M'Lean's 'Treatise on Christ's Commission to his Apostles' by the author of that treatise." (b) The same magazine also published his, "Animadversions on excommunication", which he signed "A.M."

Footnotes:
(c) Ibid, pp.411, ff., 578 ff.
Mr. William Braidwood, in 1799 published the substance of a sermon which he preached to the Baptist Church, Edinburgh, on 4th August, - "Loyalty Enforced by Arguments which are Founded upon Just Views of Civil Government, as an Ordinance of God, and Essential to the Happiness of Mankind. To which is added, A Vindication of Some Dissenting Congregations, who have been charged with Disloyalty by the late General Assembly of the Church of Scotland." This was a 47 page pamphlet, printed by the aforementioned Turnbull, Canongate, Edinburgh. It will be held in mind that 1799 was the year in which the General Assembly was fulminating against "vagrant preachers" and intruders.
Chapter V. — 1800-1812 — CLOSING YEARS.

In the year 1800, Mr. William Jones and David Stewart Wylie were ordained as elders of the church at Liverpool. This year saw the printing of a volume of "Sermons and lectures on Important practical subjects" by Andrew Swanston. This was a posthumous publication by Swanston's friend, David Greig, who contributed a Memoir of Swanston in the Preface.

Mr. Archibald M'Lean, in 1800, published at Edinburgh his 107 page pamphlet, "A Dissertation on the Influences of the Holy Spirit. To which is added, A Defence of the Doctrine of Original Sin, and a Paraphrase, with Notes, on Rom.v.12 to the end." Mr. M'Lean, in the Preface, gives the following information regarding the writing of this paper:

"Though the importance of the subject may well apologise for this publication, yet the particular occasion of writing it was a letter which the author received from Mr. W. Skinn of Beverly, containing the following paragraph, "With respect to men's conversion, I nowhere find in the New Testament men's first believing said to be the immediate effect of the Holy Spirit's agency, or that it is his work to make men see and believe. Yet I am far from disbelieving it; but as it is not matter of revelation that unbelievers, but such as believe, have the promise of the Spirit, I think it is best to abide by the analogy of Scripture." Though this paragraph is inaccurate and inconsistent, yet it plainly denies, that the agency of the Holy Spirit in men's conversion, is a matter of revelation. In answer to this the substance of the following pages was written, without any intention
of printing it; but several friends at Hull and Beverly, having seen the manuscript, earnestly requested its publication. This the author has at last complied with, after having enlarged it a little, hoping it may, through the divine blessing, be useful to others. He has only to add, that several thoughts on this subject have been suggested to him by Mr. M'Laurin's (John) excellent essay on the Scripture doctrine of divine grace." (a)

He also contributed this year an article to the Edinburgh Quarterly Magazine, entitled "A Short Sketch of the doctrine of the New Testament concerning Reconciliation with God." (b)

Churches in connexion with the Scotch Baptists were now planted in various parts of Scotland and England. At Wooler in Northumberland, there had been a few brethren for several years; and in 1801 they were set in order by Mr. Archibald M'Lean, when Mr. William Pattison and Mr. Robert Law were ordained elders.

Dr. James Watt, who had settled at Glasgow to practice as a surgeon, was ordained elder of the Baptist Church there, simultaneously with Mr. David Smith, on the 17th June, 1802. These men were colleagues of Mr. James Duncan, who, having been ordained in 1778, was now entering his twenty-fifth year as elder of the Glasgow church.


In the year 1802, the church at Edinburgh purchased St. Cecilia's Hall, Middry Street, and removed to that place for worship. During that year, Mr. M'Lean was much occupied with the subject of faith, for he was in the midst of his controversy with Mr. Andrew Fuller on that subject. Among his publications that year was, "A Reply to Mr. Fuller's Appendix to his book on The Gospel Worthy of ALL Acceptation, particularly to his Doctrine of Antecedent Holiness, and the Nature and Object of Justifying Faith." He was well represented in the New THEOLOGICAL REPOSITORY for 1802, which was printed at Liverpool by his friend William Jones. In this periodical, the controversy between Fuller and M'Lean was very thoroughly discussed by the editor, Mr. Jones. (a) Another article by Mr. M'Lean was presented in Vol. IV. (which covered the months of Jan-June, 1802). This was called, "The Nature of Saving Faith." (b) Three other articles by Mr. M'Lean are found in Volume V (July-Dec that year. These are:

"The Economy of Redemption," - pp.61-75.
"An Answer to an Inquiry Respecting the Millenium," pp.348-381.
"Concerning Eating the Lord's Supper Without Elders," pp.335-341.

In the year 1803, Mr. William Peddie, of whom mention has already been made, removed to Edinburgh, leaving the church in

(b) Ibid, - pp.209-216.
Kirkydew under the pastoral care of Mr. Charles Arthur. Mr. Arthur was the intimate friend of Mr. Peddie, - they had been associated together in preparing for the ministry in the Secession church. Mr. Arthur left that body, and was baptized about the same time as Mr. Peddie. In the year 1798 he went to Dunfermline, remained there two years, then he removed to Kirkcaldy, and was shortly after appointed colleague to Mr. Peddie in the Elder's office. That office he held for nearly forty years with great advantage to the church at Kirkcaldy. He died in 1841, highly respected and esteemed by all who knew him.

Volume VI of Jones's magazine, 1803, differs in two respects from the first five volumes of the series. The word NEW is dropped from the title, which is simply, "THE THEOLOGICAL REPOSITORY". Also, the magazine is issued at intervals of two months, instead of monthly, as before, and thus the one volume covers the whole year of 1803, in place of six months covered by the first five volumes. Jones commenced his last volume of this series with a paper, (a) "Remarks on an Observer's View of the Controversy between Mr. Fuller and Mr. M'Lean," in which he caustically comments upon the work signed by that name which appeared in the Biblical Magazine for Nov.1802. (The Biblical Magazine was published at Clipstone by friends of Mr. Andrew Fuller).

(a) THE THEOLOGICAL REPOSITORY, Vol.VI, 1803, Liverpool, pp.1-14
Articles by Mr. M'Lean in this sixth volume of the Repository, are:

"Remarks on Christian Perfection," pp. 43-46
"On a Party Spirit" pp. 87-89 (Reprinted from the Edinburgh Evangelical Magazine, No. 3)
"Essay on Justification," pp. 121-135

This year, 1803, witnessed the beginning of a new publication. This was the magazine, THE EDINBURGH EVANGELICAL MAGAZINE, of which three volumes in all appeared, - these for 1803, 1804, and 1805. These are, however, of interest to us, as in them Mr. M'Lean found opportunity to publish several of his papers. These were:

Volume I of THE EDINBURGH EVANGELICAL MAGAZINE, 1803.

"Christ's Kingdom lot of This World," - pp. 278-282.
"On the Universal reign of the Messiah," - pp. 529-532

Volume II of the EDINBURGH EVANGELICAL MAGAZINE, 1804.

"A Chronological Sketch of the principal Monarchies of antiquity...Prophecies Fulfilled," pp. 180-193
"On Forbearance," pp. 294-301.
(Restrictions on this essay published, pp. 337-349.)
"Substance of Sermon preached on Revelation xvi. 4," pp. 435-441 and 483-486
"Answer to the Query on Faith and Repentance," pp. 497-499

Volume III. - THE EDINBURGH EVANGELICAL MAGAZINE, 1805.
Mr. M'Lean used the name "SEirJX" as his signature to the articles in the Edinburgh Evangelical Magazine. This fact is attested by several of the pieces, signed in this way, which were published in later editions of his Works, under his name as author.

In 1804 Mr. M'Lean issued the Third edition of his "Commission given by Jesus Christ to His Apostles Illustrated."

In addition to the occasional labours of pastors and private brethren in diffusing the knowledge of the truth in their various localities, the church in Edinburgh resolved, with assistance from some of the other churches, to set apart three individuals as missionaries, who were wholly or partially supported. Accordingly, in 1805, Edward Mackay, David Macrae and A. Fraser were appointed, and sent to labour at Thurso, Fortrose and Huntly respectively, from which centres they itinerated in Caithness, Ross-shire, and Aberdeenshire.

On the 5th January, 1805, the church at Dunfermline was set in order by the ordination of Messrs. William Scott and T. Morrison to the elder's office. On this occasion Mr. Henry David Inglis of Edinburgh, and Mr. Charles Arthur of Kirkaldy officiated.

On the 12th January, 1805, Messrs. Shearer and Ritchie were ordained over the church at Stirling, by Mr. William Braidwood of Edinburgh, and Mr. James Duncan of Glasgow.
The friends of Mr. M'Lean several times suggested that he ought to publish his writings in a series of volumes, instead of leaving them scattered in pamphlets and magazine articles. It was therefore decided that a series of six volumes of WORKS should be attempted. Accordingly, in 1805, the first volume of this series appeared. The title page sets forth the scope of the projected works as: "THE WORKS of Mr. Archibald M'Lean, one of the Pastors of the Baptist Church, Edinburgh, containing TRACTS, ESSAYS, SERMONS, &c. on the Most Important Subjects. Together with A PARAPHRASE, AND COMMENTARY, on the EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS.

Volume I. is: An Illustration of PRIMITIVE CHRISTIANITY in a Treatise on CHRIST'S COMMISSION to his APOSTLES."

Volumes Two and Three of the WORKS also appeared in 1805. Volume II. contained Seven "Essays and Tracts on Various Subjects" as follows:

2. A reply to some Animadversions on the foregoing Essay.
5. The Imputation of Sin and Righteousness; being a Paraphrase, with Notes, on Rom.v.12 to the end.
6. A Dialogue between a Seceder and a Baptist, concerning the extent of the Gospel promise.
7. The Distinction and Consistency of Justification by Faith and Works; shewing the agreement of the Apostles Paul and James on that subject.

--- 329 pages.

Volume III. was of 348 pages, which included six papers on:

1. Letters addressed to Mr. John Glas, in answer to his Dissertation on Infant-baptism.
2. A Defence of Believer-baptism, as opposed to Infant-sprinkling, &c.

3. A Letter to a Correspondent, shewing, that all the arguments for Infant-Baptism are rendered null by Pedobaptists themselves; and that there can be no positive Divine Institution without express scripture precept or example.

4. That Baptism must precede visible Church Fellowship.

5. On the Divinity and Sonship of Christ.


In the year 1806, the church at Largo, Fife shire, which had lost one of its elders, appointed Mr. David Shiells and Mr. Andrew Drummond to that office. They were ordained as fellow-elders with Dr. John Goodsir. This year, also, Hugh Cameron published his "Address to the Scots Baptists, respecting their church government, discipline, &c.," Alexander Pirie of Newburgh put out, "A Dissertation of Baptizing, and letters on the Sinai covenant; together with an inquiry into the lawfulness of eating blood," printed at Edinburgh.

The church at Edinburgh suffered a severe loss in this year through the death of Mr. Henry David Inglis, who was cut off in the prime of life, in the midst of his usefulness. Mr. Inglis was well regarded and esteemed in all the churches of the connexion, for he was widely known, both by reason of his writings and by his personal labours in the work of the Gospel. His death was most keenly felt at Edinburgh, for it was the first breach in the eldership of three gifted devoted pastors, which eldership had served the church so well for a period of more than twenty-one years.

Mr. Inglis was especially interested in preaching the Gospel to men in the shadow of death, and in this work had
been of great blessing to a goodly number of such factors.
The case of William Mills became widely known through the pamphlet which Mr. Inglis presented to the world in order to relate the tale of that noteworthy conversion in the death-cell. This narrative shows clearly the nature of Mr. Inglis's teaching of the Gospel, and the uplifting effect of the good news of salvation upon the mind and spirit of the condemned man. Four of the members of the church at Edinburgh visited William Mills during the last night of his life. From the time when the jailer freed him from his chain; these brethren observe,

"It is impossible to describe the ecstasy of joy he was in from this time till we left him. Being at liberty, he took the chain up in his hand and kissed it, saying - 'Oh, blessed be God for this chain! and kneeling down and praying by himself, he again kissed the chain, and returned it to the jailer." (a)

"Perceiving us much affected, he took hold of our hands, beseeching us to remember that he was going to the Saviour. 'I have been (said he) caught like a sheep straying on the dark side of the mountains; plucked like a brand out of the burning, half-burned.' He then turned to the soldiers, saying to them, 'Soldiers, look at my brothers, did you ever see a company like this? they are all in tears, like children weeping for their father - what is the cause of all this, think you? You see they have lost their night's rest, left their families and good houses to sit in the dungeon of a prison, and all for the sake of a poor thief. They knew nothing about me before I came here; what is it that influences them to this? I will tell you, it is because I believe the truth in which they are united, and they love me because they love Jesus Christ." (b)

The following short summary of the character of Mr. Inglis as Pastor and preacher is found prefaced to his works:

(a) Letter First, Case of Mr. Mills, p. 24.
Ibid, -- p. 25
"As a preacher, he possessed a happy talent for stating the gospel in a very clear and simple manner, pointing out the atonement of the Lord Jesus Christ as the alone and exclusive ground of hope for the guilty, and detecting those false views of the nature of faith which have so frequently perplexed the minds of persons under convictions of sin, and earnestly inquiring what they must do to be saved. His manner of speaking was very forcible, and his addresses to thoughtless sinners were of the most arousing nature. And, although he frequently illustrated the various doctrines of the Scriptures, and the duties and privileges of believers, yet the preaching of the cross of Christ was his principal theme. As a Pastor, his memory will long be held in affectionate remembrance by his brethren." (a)

He died on the 12th May, 1806, in the 49th year of his age.

William Jones of Liverpool now began another publication of the THEOLOGICAL REPOSITORY, this time the NEW SERIES, the first volume of which was for June-December, 1806. In this volume there were included some articles concerning Mr. Henry David Inglis:

2. Anecdotes of Mr. Inglis. pp. 82-83.

Mr. Archibald M'Lean, under the pen name SCM also had some queries on the subject of Believer's Baptism in this issue. On page 348 is found an original letter from Mr. Robert Moncrieff.

Volume IV of Mr. M'Lean's WORKS, printed by John Turnbull, Edinburgh, appeared in the year 1807. This volume was one of SERMONS on Various Important Subjects. Nine sermons were included:

1. The Belief of the Gospel Saving Faith.
2. On the Parable of the Sower.
4. On the Economy of Redemption.
5. The preferable Happiness of being with Christ.
6. The Doctrine of Reconciliation.
8. The great Object and End of the prophetic Dispensation.
9. The Subjection of all Nations to Christ.

In 1807, Mr. M'Lean published at Edinburgh his 120 page pamphlet, "A Review of Mr. Wardlaw's Lectures on 'The Abrahamic Covenant and Its (supposed) Connection with Infant Baptism'."

THE THEOLOGICAL REPOSITORY, NEW SERIES, Vol. II. Liverpool, for January-June, 1807 contained:

1. A Letter from the Glasgow Church to the Edinburgh Church on the death of Mr. H.D. Inglis. pp. 328-330.
2. Two letters from Mr. W. Braidwood:
   (a) "Reply to Andreas," pp. 16-23
   (b) "Answer to Philologos." pp. 89-100.
3. An "Answer to Queries on Baptism" by A. M'Lean. pp. 110-112.
4. An 18 page Review of the WORKS by M'Lean which had been published so far. pp. 171-180, 231-239.

THE THEOLOGICAL REPOSITORY, NEW SERIES, Vol. III. Liverpool, for July-December, 1807, contained:

2. Three Letters and an article by W. Braidwood:
   (a) Letter to Palaemon, pp. 211.
   (b) Letter to Palaemon, pp. 252.
   (c) Letter to Palaemon, pp. 301.
   (d) On Praying with Unbelievers, pp. 341.
3. Two articles by A. M'Lean:
   (a) On Universal Restoration, pp. 189-
   (b) Doctrine of Reconciliation defended against the Objections of Socinians, pp. 52-60, 103-114, 162-168.

In 1807 a church at Fordforge, Northumberland, was set in order by Mr. Archibald M'Lean, when Mr. John Black, Sr. and his eldest son John were ordained elders. The latter only survived his appointment one year, when he was succeeded by his brother.
Robert; he also soon after died; and on the 15th January, 1827, Mr. John Black, Sr. died, — the pastoral care of the church devolving on his fifth son, Mr. Thomas Black.

Two other churches, at Lawers and Killin, in the district of Breadalbane, Scotland, were set in order in connexion with the Scotch Baptists; but were dissolved some years afterwards by the whole of the members emigrating to Canada. (a)

In the year 1808 several churches were set in order. On the 8th April, Messrs. James Murray and John Macfarlane were ordained elders over the church in Perth, which then consisted of only twelve members, but by additions from the Old Independents and the Tabernacle connexion, they rapidly increased. In 1809 two other pastors were appointed—Messrs. Greig and Stalker. In 1810 the church there consisted of eighty members, having four elders, four deacons, and two preachers.

(a) "We hear of a church at Fordforge, near Wooler, and two churches in Breadalbanshire, which have been set in order during the same month. (June).—THE THEOLOGICAL REPOSITORY, NEW SERIES, Liverpool, Vol. V, July-Dec. 1808, p. 59."
In June 1808, Messrs. George Jamieson and John Cockburn were ordained elders over the church at Whitehaven (a).

A society of disciples had existed at Kingston-upon-Hull, for several years prior to 1808, at which time it was set in order, Messrs. Gilchrist and Clarkson being appointed to the elder's office. (b)

In November 1808, the brethren at Newburgh, Fifeshire, were set in church order by Mr. Archibald M'Lean, when only one elder was ordained, - Mr. James Wilkie. (c)

(a) "A Small Society of Baptists has existed in Whitehaven for many years, in unison with the Baptists in Scotland. They had remained long without those gifts which are useful for edifying the body of Christ. It must be gratifying to many of our readers to learn, that this want has now been supplied by Him, who walketh in the midst of the seven golden candlesticks. In the last month (June) George Jameson, and John Cockburn, persons eminently gifted as Christian teachers, were set apart, as elders, among them, by the unanimous choice of the brethren; and at the same time Deacons were appointed to oversee their temporal concerns. The whole church seem much animated by that spirit of unity and affection, which distinguished the primitive Christians, and by a zealous attention to preserve the purity of communion."


(b) "KINGSTON-UPON-HULL. A Society of disciples in connection with the Scotch Baptists, has existed in this town for several years past. But 'the things which were wanting' have lately been set in order among them, by the ordination of Mr. Gilchrist and Mr. Clarkson, as elders over them in the Lord. Mr. G. was formerly the colleague of Mr. Innes of Dundee, in the Tabernacle connection, from which he separated himself on the grounds of Baptism."


(c) "NEWBURGH IN FIFESHIR". A Society of a similar description was set in order at this place by Mr. Archibald M'Lean of Whitehaven about the beginning of last month (November). At present, however, they have only one elder over them, viz. Mr. James Wilkie. THEOLOGICAL REPOSITORY, NEW SERIES, Liverpool, Vol. V, July-Dec. 1808, p. 343.
The labours of the brothers Haldane and their fellow-workers during the end of the eighteenth and the beginning of the nineteenth century, resulted in congregations of Christians being gathered together throughout different parts of Scotland. About 1800 several amongst them, including James Alexander Haldane, and later, his brother Robert, embraced the principle of believers' baptism. As a consequence, a number of members left these churches, called the "Tabernacle connexion", and joined those of the Scotch Baptists. In some cases where Baptist adherents were in the majority, the churches continued with a mixed membership, and observed the principle of free communion. One Tabernacle connexion church in Glasgow, which was however, of strict communion principle, and which consisted of forty members under the pastoral care of Messrs. Buchan and M'Laren was united to the Scotch Baptist Church there. Since the latter had a membership of 200, with 3 elders, the combined church numbered 240 members, with five elders. (a)

(a) "Glasgow. In this city there had existed for some years past two societies of Baptists, holding the same faith and order, yet having no fellowship with each other. The oldest church under the pastoral care of Mr. James Duncan, Mr. James Watt, and Mr. David Smith, consisted of about 200 members. The other church consisted of about 40, and their elders were Mr. -- Buchan, and Mr. David M'Laren. These two societies have united as one body, and have consequently now five elders over them."

Liverpool for January-June, 1808, contained several items of interest to Scotch Baptists. These included:

1. Farther Account of the Late Mr. H. D. Inglis. pp. 1-11.
2. Journal of Mr. Inglis' last days. pp. 11-19.
4. Sermon by Late Mr. Inglis on a thanksgiving day. pp. 148-154.
5. Hymn by Mr. Inglis on 2 Cor. v. 9, 10. pp. 19.
6. Stanzas on the death of Mr. Inglis. pp. 64.
7. An Illustration of the Prophecies of the Old Testament (By Archibald M'Lean. in a letter to a friend, written about the year 1770, but never before printed.) pp. 225-238, 268-279, 347-352.
   Letter 1, pp. 26-43 Letter 5 on this subject.
   Letter 2, pp. 74-91 Letter 6 on this subject.
   Letter 3, pp. 305-309, Letter 7 on this subject.

In 1808 William Braidwood published at Edinburgh a 175 page pamphlet, entitled, "Letters on a Variety of Subjects relating chiefly to Christian Fellowship and Church Order, c."

Hugh Cameron published at Cupar, "An Address to professors in General, and to the Scots Baptists in Particular."

The THEOLOGICAL REPOSITORY, NEW SERIES, Volume V.
Liverpool, July-December, 1808, contained:

2. Wm. Braidwood:
   (b) Letter (18th Nov. 1808) A Caution Against Exceeding in Use of Strong Liquors. pp.301-314.


On January 29th and February 5th, 1809, Mr. M'Lean preached two sermons at the Baptist Meeting-house in Niddry Street, Edinburgh. These sermons he had printed and published as a 48 page pamphlet, "Prayer and Occasional Fasting for the Peace of Our Nation and Government, a Duty Incumbent us as Christians," with a view to the proper observance of the day appointed by the King for a National fast. (a)

Mr. William Jones, of Liverpool, commenced in this year, 1809, the publication of THE CHRISTIAN ADVOCATE magazine, designed to plead the cause of Primitive Christianity.

On the 7th August, 1809, Mr. Ninian Lockhart was appointed to the elders office over the church in Kirkcaldy. (Mr. Lockhart is known as the author of a treatise on "The Duty of Christian Churches to Edify themselves, or the Means of Christian Edification as taught and exemplified in the New Testament." - a second edition of which was published in 1841).  

(a) The New College copy is autographed as J.A. Haldane's copy.
Mr. William Peddie, who, since his return from Kirkcaldy had been actively engaged with others of his brethren of the church in Edinburgh, in preaching the gospel in the vicinity of that town, was, on the 26th March, 1810, unanimously appointed an elder of the church there in place of the late Mr. Henry David Inglis.

The peace and prosperity which had for a number of years attended the Baptist profession, was in 1810 interrupted by the revival amongst them of the sentiment of observing the Lord's Supper without elders. This idea was chiefly revived by individuals who had joined them from Mr. Hallane's connexion. In that connection, as at first the demand for labourers was so great, every encouragement was given to persons who were at all qualified, to preach the gospel and edify their brethren. As this group became more organized into a regular system, the leaders considered it necessary that its agents should be better educated, by a longer period of study than at first had been required. In some places, mutual exhortation among the brethren was frowned upon, rather than encouraged. Several of those who had advocated this practice, alarmed at the idea that a system of clerical teachers was to be forced upon them, swung to the opposite extreme. They therefore began to minimize the elder's office, and to assert that every thing could be done by a body of believers without
elders that could be done with them. Mr. Greville Swing, who was an advocate of an educated ministry, published a treatise in which he refuted this principle, but he recommended the other extreme, - that a certain number of years' study at a Theological Academy was indispensable for a pastor of a Christian Church. For refutation of this extreme, Mr. Braidwood wrote and published his series of Letters on Christian Fellowship and Church Order. Though he gave Mr. Swing credit for opposing those who would do away with the elder's office, he exposed the weaknesses of Swing's position, and attempted to place the office of elder in its proper place between the two extremes, advocating that the principle of a plurality of elders (where it can be obtained by the discovery of a sufficient number of spiritually gifted, though not academically trained men) is consistent with the uniform practice exhibited in the New Testament.

The controversy of eating the Lord's Supper without elders was not a new one in Baptist circles, but reached a height between the years 1808 and 1810, when, in the latter year it produced a rupture amongst some of them. At Glasgow, about 160 members left the church, along with Dr. James Watt, one of the elders, and formed themselves into a separate society in North Portland Street. Mr. Archibald M'Lean, though an old man, wielded his pen in support of the doctrine
of the middle way, which was maintained by the elders at Edinburgh, and published that year his pamphlet of "Strictures on the Sentiments of Dr. James Watt and others respecting a Christian Church, the Pastoral Office, and the Right of Private Brethren to Dispense the Lord's Supper."

The result of this rupture was the division of the churches at Glasgow and Dundee into two separate societies at each place; while at Paisley, Dunfermline and Liverpool, the churches embraced the new views, and broke off all connection with the original Scots Baptist churches. The other churches were saved at this time, by the strength of the leadership from Edinburgh, from any division or disruption from the original connexion.

Mr. James Duncan, who had for many years filled the elder's office over the church in Glasgow, died on 3rd June, 1811, aged 73 years. Mr. Duncan was one generally respected, by all who knew him, as a benevolent and kind-hearted man. During the long period of thirty-three years in which he held the pastoral office in the church in Glasgow, much occurred to try the stability of his principles. Though he was not possessed of great gifts as a public speaker, he was well qualified by his wisdom, patience, and firmness, to exercise the duties of a pastor. To the steadiness of his principles
and the meekness with which he maintained them, the church was in a great measure indebted for its preservation on some trying occasions.

In June, 1811, the Baptist Church at Edinburgh removed from St. Cecilia's Hall in Niddry Street, to a large new meeting-house built for them in the Pleasance. In this year, another old man, and much respected Scotch Baptist, passed to his rest. This was Mr. William Dickie, who died at Edinburgh. He had been for some years an elder of the church at Dundee, but spent the last years of his life at Edinburgh. He was a very heavenly-minded Christian, and seldom did he address the church without the blessedness of the redeemed being the theme. (a)

In the month of September 1811, Mr. Andrew Duncan, son of the late James Duncan, was ordained to the elder's office in the church at Glasgow, along with Mr. Swanston. Mr. Andrew Duncan continued in this office till the time of his death, which took place in 1840.

Mr. M'Lean had been working for several years upon a Commentary of the Epistle to the Hebrews. This book finally appeared in two volumes. The first volume, which also comprises the fifth volume of his Works, was published at

(a) A touching incident in the life of Mr. Dickie, - the death of his son, Edgar, is related in THEOLOGICAL REVIEW, NEW SERIES, Vol. IV. Jan-June 1863, Liverpool, pp. 65-74 and 139-148.
Edinburgh, by A. & J. Aikman, in 1811. This firm, which had taken over his publishing from Turnbull, also issued in this same year a set of five volumes of M'Lean's WORKS. There was no difference in this set from the four volumes which had before been presented to the public, but it was now possible for a purchaser to obtain all five volumes of the WORKS in a uniform edition. The second volume of the Commentary was not published during Mr. M'Lean's lifetime, but came out in 1817, printed by A. & J. Aikman, to complete the six volumes of M'Lean's WORKS.

The works of the other pastor of the Baptist Church at Edinburgh, Mr. Henry David Inglis, were collected into one volume, and published at Edinburgh in 1812, under the title, "Letters, Sermons and Tracts on Various Important Subjects."

About the middle of November, 1812, after a distressing case of discipline in the church, Mr. M'Lean was seized with a dimness in one of his eyes. Electricity was applied, but without any apparent effect. He continued to labour at the church, and preached as usual on Sunday, December 6th. On Monday, the 7th, he visited a friend, from which visit he went home, apparently no worse. But on the Tuesday, his left hand went numb, and because this want of feeling interrupted his studies and writing, he went for a walk. During
the course of this, still he continued to grow worse, and came home, feeling that the time of his departure was near. In the evening, he was too sick to attend the meeting of the church. On Wednesday morning he did not rise at his usual time for breakfast, so his daughter, Mrs. Kerr, tried several times to rouse him. He appeared, however, to be in a semi-comatose condition. At 12 o'clock, Mrs. Kerr roused him and asked how he was. He replied with difficulty, "Very ill", and as she attempted to question him, they discovered that during the night he had suffered a partial paralytic stroke, which had paralysed the whole of his left side. Various remedies then used by medical science were tried to reduce the disorder, and to arouse him to consciousness. For several days, however, he continued to drowse and wake, till on the morning of the Sunday December, 20th, it was seen that he had taken a turn for the worse. Throughout that day the spark of life lingered on, but at one o'clock in the morning on Monday, December, 21st, Mr. M'Lean slipped away.

He was buried on Thursday, December 24th, in the West Church burying ground, Edinburgh, (Now St. Cuthbert's) and though Jones in the Memoir remarks, "No sculptur'd marble marks the place" (a) a stone was later erected by members of the church which he served. It stands on the right of the path as one enters St. Cuthbert's from Lothian Road, immediately beyond a small flight of steps) and is inscribed:

(a) "Memoir" by Jones, p. lxxxiii
"Died 21st Decr. A.D. 1812 Aged 79 years

Mr. ARCHD. M'LEAN,

who was one of the original pastors
of the First Baptist Church
in Edinburgh.

and who devoted the great mental endowments
of which he was possessed
to the work of the ministry,
with unwearied assiduity and zeal
for the period of forty five years
when he fell asleep in Jesus

But although dead he yet speaketh,
in the many valuable writings
he has bequeathed to posterity.

To His Memory
This stone is erected
with sentiments of the highest respect
and affection,
by the members of the church over which
he so long and so faithfully presided.

His remains are interred
100 feet to the South East of this stone"
SECTION III.

THE THOUGHT OF ARCHIBALD M'LEAN.
THE TREND OF ARCHIBALD M'LEAN'S THOUGHT.

Mr. M'Lean's religious thought was an attempt to base religious doctrine and practice upon that outlined in Scripture, especially as interpreted and exemplified by Christ and the Apostles. He was assiduous in searching for Scripture precept and example, and where inference had to be used, sought interpretation by use of context, rather than by use of words or texts isolated from their Scripture connection. As could be expected from one who had been nurtured in the Church of Scotland, he was a Calvinist in his approach to Christian doctrine, though he was much influenced in his "Independent" sentiments by the writings of John Owen, the Puritan divine. His viewpoint was somewhat coloured, too, by his introduction to Scripture doctrine by the writings of John Glas and Robert Sandeman. In their works, he first saw clearly pointed out the divergence of the doctrine and practice of the National Establishment from the apostolic norm, and assimilated their ideas of the spiritual nature of the kingdom of Christ. However, whenever he conceived that the Glasites or other Independent groups were inconsistent with their avowed principles of conformity to Scripture precept and example, he was not slow to indicate their defection in this respect, and call upon them to give up the remnants of regard for the teachings of man.

The reader finds, therefore, in all of M'Lean's writings and controversies, the continual attempt to set the doctrine
in hand in a purely Scriptural light, had M'Lean been able to find in Scripture a satisfactory express precept or example for infant-baptism, he would have been a paedobaptist, but since he does not, he argues against all who infer from certain incidents of the New Testament that they are justified in baptizing infants, that this is not so, for their position is rendered untenable by the fact that all the actual precepts and examples of Scripture are of the baptism of believers.

He thinks that Old Testament doctrines, prophecies, covenants, and types are to be understood by the interpretations given by our Lord and his apostles, and therefore opposes innovations conceived by the mind of man, however learned, which do not harmonize with these inspired expositions.

The most important of M'Lean's writings contain an exposition of primitive Christianity, as illustrated by parts of "Christ's Commission to his Apostles;" considerations of various aspects of the subject of Infant-Baptism, in which he contovers at different places, the positions of John Glasgow, of the Glasgow "Daleites", of Mr. John Huddleston of Whitehaven, of Mr. Wardlaw of Glasgow, and of Mr. Carter; considerations of the subject of Faith in many aspects, which called forth papers in which Mr. M'Lean tried to refute sentiments held by Mr. S. Barnard of Hull, ("Belief of the Gospel Saving Faith"), by Mr. Andrew Fuller of Kettering, and his supporters, ("Reply to Mr. Fuller's Appendix"), and by Dr.
Thomas M'Crie; as well as aspects of Christian doctrine, which illustrate what were to M'Lean the important subjects of Original Sin, Old Testament prophecies on the "spiritual seed," the influences of the Holy Spirit, the Meritorious ground of Justification in Christ, and the principle of fear in assuring the perseverance of the elect.

In his smaller pieces, Mr. M'Lean is found often indicating what he conceives to be errors on the part of members of the Independent group, and of others in the Baptist connection, -- these errors usually being a departure from what he believes to be the Scripture rule on the subject.

M'Lean's thought may generally be classified as Scripture exposition, in which he sets forth an interpretation of Scripture as opposed to another interpretation of it; or, as more often is the case, opposes the reasonings of the other side by the words and import of Scripture. He is generally very fair in his attempts to follow every argument or inference of the subject, (and sometimes, by showing opponents the implications of their position, is accused of a misrepresentation of their sentiments). His effort to answer squarely every problem presented, makes it possible for us to cover in this thesis many aspects of his thought under a few headings, for he investigates every approach to a subject of which he can think. Thus, while nominally discussing the subject of Baptism, for instance, we find him led to include in his arguments illustrations of his positions on an almost infinite variety
of other aspects of Christian doctrine. Then, too, there is a certain amount of overlapping or duplication in his writings as many of them were produced to meet specific situations. Since the greater number of his papers could be classified in one way or another under Faith, Baptism, or subsidiary aspects of these subjects, we shall use these as the main source of illustration of his thought, and will complete the picture by adding illustrations, in brief form, of topics not revealed already. Before embarking upon the waters of Baptism, or delving into the depths of Faith, however, let us quickly have,

A SUMMARY VIEW OF THE PRINCIPLES OF ARCHIBALD M'LEAN.

Mr. M'Lean held it to be the indispensable duty of all Christians to contend for the faith once delivered to the saints, and to stand fast in one spirit, with one mind, striving together for the faith of the Gospel. This faith he held to be no other than "the Truth" by which the knowledge of salvation was brought to sinners. It was therefore termed "the Gospel", or good news, and glad tidings of peace. It was that truth which Christ came into the world to bear witness to; which was well known to, and experienced by, the first Christians, and which distinguished their profession from every other religion that then was, or ever would be in the world.

This truth revealed the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit,
into whose name all disciples of Christ were to be baptized, and it held them forth severally and distinctly acting their different parts, while jointly co-operating in the work of redemption. This revelation of the one only, and undivided God-head, which was made in the Gospel revelation of salvation and redemption through Christ Jesus, contained a testimony concerning the dignity of his person as the Son of God, the perfection of the work which he finished on the cross, and the divine good pleasure therein; ALL of which were not only implied in, but clearly demonstrated by his resurrection from the dead. To this testimony of the Gospel was annexed the declaration or promise of the God of truth, "that whosoever believeth it shall be saved, and that he who believeth not shall be damned;" so that it was by faith alone in the glad tidings of salvation that men were justified and saved. He therefore maintained that the salvation of lost sinners was entirely of sovereign free grace, and that the faith of any believer was as little of themselves or of works as the divine gift of the Son was. He believed that those only who were taught of God, by His word and Spirit, were able to confess and abide in the faith which was in Christ.

He also held it an indispensable duty to follow entirely the PATTERN of the primitive apostolic churches, as recorded in the New Testament, and to attend to all the directions given them. These directions he considered to be inseparably connected with genuine love to the truth, and steadfastness
and liveliness in the faith and hope of the Gospel, as well as with due reverence for Christ's divine authority, love to his person, and the honour of his name in the world.

With regard to CHURCH ORDER AND PRACTICE, Mr. M'Lean held from the New Testament, that each church planted by the apostles was a single congregation, and met together in one place, that it was composed of visible believers, that it had a plurality of elders to rule and labour in the word and doctrine, and also a plurality of deacons to minister in the proper application of the church's bounty; that both elders and deacons were chosen by the characters laid down in 1 Tim. iii.1-14, Titus i.5-10, and set apart by the laying on of hands. (a)

He aimed at the faithful and impartial exercise of church discipline upon all proper occasions, according to the rules laid down in the New Testament. Such discipline, he said was calculated only for a church so constituted, was of the highest utility, and absolutely necessary for the preservation of love and unity among its members; consequently essential to the very being of a Christian church, but altogether impracticable in any other sort of society. (b)

Mr. M'Lean believed that none should be RECEIVED into church fellowship, but such as made an explicit and Scriptural profession of faith in Christ as their all-sufficient and only Saviour, and showed their regard for, and readiness

(b) Ibid. pp. 259-272.
to observe, all his sayings, and whatever Christ had enjoined. He believed that none should be retained in the communion who had visibly departed in any instance from the faith, hope, and obedience of the Gospel, and were proof against all the means instituted for their recovery. (a)

He held that the rule of forbearance was divine revelation, and not the fancies of men. It was a duty of Christians to forbear one another in love, by making all due allowance for differences in natural tempers, capacities, growth in grace, etc., and by exercising all long-suffering, lowliness, and meekness in their endeavours to instruct and to reclaim an erring brother. In this, however, he distinguished between infirmity and perverseness; and as he held that no precept given by Christ could be a matter of indifference, he acted upon the principle that Christ's authority could never clash with itself by giving laws, and at the same time a dispensation to neglect them. (b)

Mr. M'Lean considered it a duty among Christians that they should be all of one mind in everything that regarded their faith and practice as a body, in agreement with that unanimity which was exemplified in the Church in Jerusalem, and was solemnly inculcated upon other churches. Upon this principle, he considered that nothing should be decided in the church by human influence, or policy, or by majority of votes, and that all due pains should be used with any who (a) M'Lean, WORIS, Vol.I, p.270, London, 1822.
(b) Ibid, p.248.
dissented.

He concluded that Scripture held forth reasons for the church to meet every first day of the week, in order to observe the following institutions of divine worship.

The public reading of the Old and New Testaments.

The mutual exhortation of the brethren, which was to be attended to on the Lord's day immediately after the reading of the Scriptures.

The preaching and expounding of the word, which was a work proper to the Elders or Pastors, who were to feed the flock, and to labour both publicly and from house to house.

The public prayers, not only of the Elders, but also of the brethren, according to the directions given them in general as a body, and as was exemplified in the first churches. To these prayers and thanksgivings the whole church said, Amen. (1 Cor. xiv.16).

The singing of praise, in which they made use of Psalms and hymns and spiritual songs.

The fellowship, contribution, communication, distribution, or well-doing, -- the collection for the support of poor saints, in which the church at Jerusalem continued steadfastly, and for which the first day of the week was assigned.

The breaking of bread, or the Lord's Supper. The church in Jerusalem continued as steadfastly in the observation of this, as of any of the other ordinances, and the church at
Troas came together chiefly for that end on the first day of the week.

The feast of charity, in the interval of public worship, as these feasts were anciently kept by the apostolic churches.

Mr. M'Lean held it a duty to join fasting with prayer on particular occasions.

He thought that Christians should use the kiss of charity on various occasions.

He believed in washing the saints' feet even literally, but that not as a ceremony, but whenever it could be of real service to a disciple of Christ. (In his church, the men performed that service to men, and women to women only).

M'Lean abstained from eating blood, and things strangled, or "flesh with the blood thereof," because these were not only forbidden to Noah and his posterity when the grant of animal food was first made to man; but also under the Gospel they were solemnly prohibited to the believing Gentiles along with fornication and things offered to idols, by that very decree of the apostles which ascertained their freedom from the law of Moses. This decree was afterwards referred to in Rev. ii. 20, 24 and commanded to be held fast till Christ came again.

He did not find himself at liberty to eat a common meal with persons who had been excommunicated from the fellowship of the church, because this was prohibited for an important
and obvious end. But he did not think that the prohibition was meant to set aside any natural or relative duty.

"'Lean considered himself bound to be subject to the powers that be in all lawful civil matters, to honour them, to pray for them, to pay them tribute, and rather to suffer patiently for a good conscience than in any case to resist them by force. Therefore, he could have no fellowship with any who were known to be disaffected to Government, or who defrauded the public revenue by smuggling, or in any other manner, by evading taxes or tribute. (a)

It is worthwhile to note further under this consideration of Church Order and Practice, what Mr. "'Lean understood by Christ's LAW OF DISCIPLINE. In this regard, he maintained that Christ's rule of discipline, as revealed especially in Matt.xviii.15-17, did not respect mankind in general, but only the saints and faithful brethren of Christ, as distinguished from the world; that the context showed this rule was given only to these disciples in a state of separation from the world; it did not merely respect brethren as they were

(a) For a complete documentation of this summary of "'Lean's principles, see

also, Dr. Rippon's Baptist Annual Register, Vol.II,275-381.
and - The Theological Repository, New Series, Vol.IV,1813,
pp.194-199,194-203, Article:"A Compendious Account of the Principles and Practices of the Scottish Baptists."
really such in the sight of God, but as they appeared to be such to one another in the profession of the faith; and was delivered to Christian brethren as members of a visible body, connected together in church fellowship. (a)

With regard to the trespass itself, he thought that though it was supposed to be committed against a brother, yet the rule was not restricted merely to such trespasses as respected such private or personal concerns, but also comprehended every breach of the plain law of Christ; for a trespass was either the omission of something which Christ had commanded to be done, or the commission of what he forbade, either by words or actions. These had to be visible to the brother who was offended, as there was no warrant to make any distinction as to the degree of guilt, or quality of the trespass which called for discipline. (b)

He maintained that the first step of procedure with respect to private offences, was for the offended brother immediately to tell the offender his fault, in private, in a spirit of meekness, but with plainness and faithfulness. If the brother repented, then the command was to forgive him. If he would not hear, then the second step was to be taken. That was for the offended person to take with him one or two more, in order to give weight to the admonition, and more effectively convince the offender, as well as to provide witnesses in case the matter had to come before the church. The third and last step of discipline was to tell the matter to the church.

(b) Ibid. pp. 422, 423.
which, to L'Lean, meant to the whole assembly of the brethren, with their elders and deacons. There, two or three witnesses could attest the truth of the charge, and he felt the church was obliged to receive their testimony as decisive upon all facts relating to the matter, which they had access to know. When the charge was established by the witnesses, it then belonged to the church to consider the nature and quality of the trespass, with its different circumstances, and to point out the law of Christ against which it was committed. They then were required to lay the matter home to the conscience of the offender, with all that solemnity, faithfulness, and concern which the nature of the case called for, and which became those who were acting in the name, and by the authority of the Lord Jesus. When the church had thus discharged its duty, had laid before the offender his guilt, had urged him to repentance by all the motives afforded by the word of God, the members were then called to form their judgment, and to come to a unanimous determination respecting him, according as he appeared to receive or reject the admonition. (a)

If the offender would not hear the church, he was no longer esteemed as a brother, but counted as an alien who had lost the visible character of a child of God, and had forfeited all title to charitable regard as such. He was excluded from the communion of the church, which held no religious fellowship while he continued impenitent, and that either

private or public. The church did not keep company with, nor eat with, an excommunicated person. (a)

Mr. M'Lean believed that the discipline of Christ's house had for its object the best of ends, as it was intended to maintain the separation of Christ's church from the world, and so to keep up the purity of communion; to recover or reclaim an erring or transgressing brother; for an example to deter others from similar practices; and designed to preserve the fervent exercise of brotherly love among all the members, so that it might circulate freely through the whole body. (b)

He considered that this discipline was neither calculated for, nor indeed was it practicable by, any National Church; nor yet in a parish, which was a part of the former, of the same kind with the whole; nor could even a disciple of the Lord Jesus, while connected with such worldly churches put that rule into practice. (c)

Another aspect of Church Order and Practice, to which Mr. M'Lean was very much opposed, was that practice espoused especially by Dr. James Watt of Glasgow, and by the Helcandes, of observing the LORD'S SUPPER WITHOUT A PASTOR. In general, Mr. M'Lean inferred from the New Testament that a society of Christians could not regularly eat the Lord's Supper while they had none among them who by office was authorized to administer it to them, because of the example of Christ at

(b) Ibid. pp. 450-454.
(c) Ibid. p. 455.
its first institution, when the Lord acted not only as insti-
tutor, but also as administrator of this ordinance; hence it
seemed to M'Lean that the administering of this ordinance
belonged only to such as were appointed officially to feed the
church of God, and not to the members in common, or to any
one of them who might assume that office for a time. (a)

He also inferred this from what was said in the New Test­
ament of the peculiar work assigned to elders, for the exhorta­
tion for elders to "feed the flock", appeared to him to carry
in it both the idea of rule, and of officially administering
to them the word and ordinances, among which the Lord's Supper
must certainly have been included. (b)

Another reason for such an inference was the account
given of the churches to which the Lord's Supper was at first
derivered by the apostles, for it was not delivered to single
individuals separately, but was a social ordinance, exhibit­
ing the visible communion of saints, which the first Christ­
ians came together to observe. There was no example in Scrip­
ture of this ordinance being observed by parts of a church
meeting separately, or in different places. Nor did it appear
that any company of Christians ate the Lord's Supper, till
they were set in order, and had gifted persons appointed over
them for government, and the work of the ministry. Also, all
the metaphors under which a particular visible church of
Christ was represented, were descriptive of its order and
organization. (c)

(c) Ibid. 505.
ARCHIBALD M'LEAN ON BAPTISM.

Of the various writings of Archibald M'Lean which expressed his thought on the subject of Baptism, his first publication was, "Letters to Mr. Glas," in 1766.

In the first of these Letters, Mr. M'Lean, after commenting upon the inconsistency, and the contradictory principles which he had found in several of Glas's WORKS, and noting that the other's Dissertation on the Subject of Infant Baptism had been boasted of as unanswerable, prepared to follow step by step the arguments used by Mr. Glas in that pamphlet. Mr. M'Lean concluded this first Letter by stating what appeared to him to be the Scripture view of Baptism:

"Baptism is an ordinance, instituted by the Lord Jesus Christ, under the new and better covenant, which belongs only to the apparent subjects of that covenant, upon the profession of their faith in Christ, and obedience to him; being a sign and representation to them of the cleansing efficacy of his blood, and regenerating operations of his Spirit, and so of their having communion with, and conformity to him in his death, burial, and resurrection, by dying unto sin and living unto righteousness.

The name into which believers are to be baptized, is that of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.

The action termed baptism is immersion, or dipping of the body in water, as appears from the proper acceptance of the Greek word, and from the circumstances of our Lord's baptism, and those of the eunuch's, as also from the allusions made to it as a burial and resurrection." (a)

In Letter II, he first took up the statement of Mr. Glas that,

"The denying of infant baptism comes of making the salvation by baptism to lie in something else than the thing signified; even that, whatever it be, which distinguishes the adult Christian from his infant ... The denial of infant baptism must have always proceeded from a disbelief of this." (That salvation lies only and wholly in the thing signified in baptism.) (a)

Mr. M'Lean pointed out that the deduction of Mr. Glas was not sound in this instance, for his own denial of infant baptism did not rest upon the reason given. He believed that the salvation of both infants and adults was grounded solely on the sovereign free grace of God through the sufferings, death and resurrection of Christ. Since this was to M'Lean the "thing signified" in baptism to the adult, salvation was not the point in question, but rather the distinction between what was signified and the sign which demonstrated that relationship to God. He denied baptism to infants because it was not commanded nor exemplified in Scripture, because infants were not capable of showing themselves to be the proper subjects of that ordinance, and because the symbolism of baptism could not be perceived nor comprehended by babes. In short, though infants were the objects of God's everlasting love, to M'Lean they were not proper subjects of the Gospel ordinances. He further pointed out that since Glas

(A) John Glas, A Dissertation on Infant Baptism, p.5
required a confession of faith, an understanding of the thing signified, and a renunciation of sin, before candidates could be baptized, then he (Glas) must either consider these as qualifications which turned the salvation of adults upon a different footing to that of infants, or he was guilty himself of "making the salvation by baptism to lie in something else than the thing signified." M'Lean considered this whole charge as more relevant to Paedobaptists than to Baptists, for Baptists required a personal profession of faith from a candidate for baptism, while the Paedobaptists sustained a vicarious profession of faith from the parent in order to baptize his infant. Then, too, those Paedobaptists who believed that baptism was necessary for the salvation of infants were guilty of making the thing signified in baptism unavailable without the sign.

In Letter III, Mr. M'Lean took notice of Mr. Glas's statement that,

"The whole plea against infant baptism comes to this, that there is neither particular express precept nor indisputable example for it in the New Testament, where baptism is inseparably connected with a profession of the faith, which infants are not capable to make." (a)

To M'Lean, this "whole" plea was of major importance,

(a) Glas, Dissertation, pp.5,6.
for he could not imagine that God, who had expressly enjoined every circumstance of the old covenant ritual, would leave such an important ordinance of the new covenant to be gathered from dark hints or inferences. Therefore, when Glas tried to deny the inference of this plea by the argument that on the same grounds women might be debarred from the Lord's Supper, Mr. Lean quickly denied this on the grounds that Christian women could be shown to be subjects of the Gospel ordinances, since they are capable of answering the Scripture requirements by a personal profession and by their Christian character; that Scripture expressly tells us that there is no distinction of male and female among those who are one in Christ Jesus; and that in the precept concerning the Lord's Supper, "Let a man examine himself, and so let him eat," the word "man" is used in the common gender.

Mr. Glas fairly laid himself open to a thrust by Mr. Lean when he declared that "We must depart from the principle that every opposer of infant-baptism sets out upon, viz. That such an express precept, and such a plain example, is necessary to show the warrant for it." (a) Mr. Lean pointedly retorts that this means Glas is departing from the very principle upon which he left the National Church.

Mr. Glas's argument then called upon him to show in what manner a confession of faith could be called for, without having to require the infants themselves to do so. (a) Glas, Dissertation, p.7.
In doing so, he attempted to avoid the weight of any objection by identifying the children of believing parents as disciples with their parents.

To Mr. M'Lean it seemed rather strange that, since a confession of faith was admitted by Glas as being required, the other should not deny baptism to those who could not make such a confession. This part of Glas's argument seemed to him very much like begging the question, and also dangerously near to that which Glas had accused the Baptists of doing—"making the salvation of infants to lie in something else than the thing signified"—by giving the children of believers a right to baptism, because of something performed for them by adults, a right which Glas did not give to the children of infidels. He saw that the Glas's argument was based on the idea that the word "disciples" included infants, when the apostle Peter asked, "Why tempt ye God, to put a yoke upon the neck of the disciples?" They reasoned that the Judaizers were seeking to have the yoke of circumcision laid upon the infants of believing parents, and that Peter, who had received the command to baptize disciples took that designation to comprehend infants, and called them disciples with their parents. But Mr. M'Lean could not see that this inference was justified, for the context of the passage led him to a different conclusion. He read that the "disciples" here were brethren capable of being taught; that they had received the Holy Ghost; and that they had their
hearts purified by faith. None of these things could apply to infants. In further refutation of Glas on this point, he maintained that Peter here was opposing the necessity of circumcision to salvation, as opposed to salvation by the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ; and added that since our Lord's description of his disciples did not apply to infants, and since they could not be called "disciples" in the plain meaning of the word, which meant "capable of being taught," he could see no reason why infants should be designated disciples with their parents, and thus entitled to baptism.

Glas then launched out into the deep waters of sentiment, and attempted to impale the Baptists on the horns of a dilemma. He said,

"According to the commission in Mark's gospel, to preach and baptize, infants must either be reckoned with the believing or the damned. For, as to the believing there connected with baptism, it is expressly said, 'He that believeth not shall be damned.' And, therefore, if we cannot look on the infants of the faithful, dying in infancy, as damned, we must look on them, according to this scripture, as believing, and so entitled to baptism, here connected with the believing that includes them, in distinction from the damned." (a)

"'Lean, undaunted by the weight of the implied criticism of an unmerciful spirit which would be laid upon one who denied this reasoning, neatly hoisted Glas on his own petard by showing that here Glas himself was under the harsh necessity of admitting that infants of unbelievers would be damned; that he was setting at naught the sovereign grace of God;

(a) Glas, Dissertation, p.8.
that he was arguing against Scripture, which gave examples of children of infidels who grew up to be saved, and of children of believers who grew up to be unbelievers, -- all in support of a nebulous salvation which seemingly was dependent upon the death of the children of believers in their infancy. M'Lean sidestepped this attempt by Glas to have him judge of the state of infants by asserting that salvation was of sovereign free grace, not according to age, situation, or connection in life, and that the state of salvation of infants was better left in the hands of God, than in the judgement of the state of their parents.

In Letter IV the argument of Mr. Glas for infant-baptism from the apostles' baptizing believers and their houses seemed very weak to Mr. M'Lean. He thought that Glas was guilty of more than simple appropriation in his idea that a believer was not only warranted to appropriate salvation to himself, but also to his whole house! M'Lean considered that the members of the house must be believers themselves in order to be saved. Furthermore, he found that in the house of Cornelius all heard Peter's sermon, and that the Holy Ghost fell on all who heard the word there. In the Jailer's house, the apostles spoke the word of the Lord to all in that house. To M'Lean, it was evident that in these houses "believers" were baptized. That they were not infants was clear to him, for in the house of Stephanus they were addicted...
themselves to the ministry of the saints," and the apostle writes "that ye submit yourselves unto such, and to everyone that helpeth with us and laboureth." In the household of Lydia were "brethren, comforted by Paul and Silas," therefore they were adults. In the Jailer's house, "all heard the word, believed in God, and rejoiced." M'Lean turned the argument upon Glas by pointing out that unless the unscriptural assertion was made that only infants were in these houses, then all the occupants, -- servants, infants, adults, believers, unbelievers, wives, -- were baptized, according to the argument of Glas, upon the single profession of parent or master, for all of these persons were included in scripture examples of "households." Glas had sought to cull a grain of comfort out of the idea that if these houses contained infants, then he had here a Scripture example of infant-baptism. To this M'Lean retorted that till Glas could prove the presence of infants in these houses, and that they believed, he would still affirm with boldness that there was no Scripture example for baptizing infants.

Glas considered that infants had part in the promise of the Holy Ghost, and so must be entitled to baptism on that ground. Hence in Letter V, Mr. M'Lean turned to a study of this argument. He found Glas had based this reasoning on part of the speech made by Peter to the Jews at Jerusalem, as found in Acts ii.38,39. The promise of the Holy Ghost in
this passage, M'Lean found to be the prophecy from Joel ii. 28-32, quoted by the apostle. Considered in a limited sense, it was the Old Testament promise of the Spirit, which was fulfilled in the apostolic age. The apostle applied it to the outpouring of the Spirit which began on the day of Pentecost, when extraordinary gifts were conferred, which were to cease when they reached their end or purpose. However, since miraculous powers did not extend to infants, M'Lean believed that the word "children" here meant the "sons and daughters" who should prophecy. Therefore the promise applied to the Jews and such of their children.

Considered in a more general sense, the promise was of the gift of the Spirit, for the regeneration and sanctification of all that were Christ's in all ages of the world. It did not hold for all the natural children of believers, any more than it held for all the descendants of Abraham. Scripture and experience, the faithfulness of God in the fulfillment of his promises, and the fact that infants could not have part in a conditional promise, all concurred to convince M'Lean that this promise did not belong to all the natural children of believers as such. In fact, the apostle distinguished between Abraham's children as "the children of the flesh, and the children of God, or, of the promise," and restricted the promise to "as many as the Lord shall call."

Gles attempted to turn off an objection to the fact that infants would be totally unaware of regeneration by the Holy
Spirit, by asserting that they were as capable of such renewing as their parents. M'Lean foiled that effort by succinctly pointing out that the "unawareness" was the point in question, not the capability of regeneration, for the apostle Peter held that the answer or stipulation of a good conscience towards God was necessary to baptism, and thus infants were not capable of fulfilling that requirement. On the whole, Mr. M'Lean could see no reason to suppose that a spiritual promise belonged to infants on account of their parents' faith, so as to infer their baptism, and he certainly saw no basis for such a supposition in the promise quoted.

In Letter VI, Mr. M'Lean attended to the Third Section of Glas's Dissertation in which the latter infers from 1 Cor. vii.14, "For the unbelieving husband is sanctified by the wife, and the unbelieving wife is sanctified by the husband: else were your children unclean; but now are they holy," that the children of believers, begotten by such aliens, were now to be considered holy, and thus were to be acknowledged to be those little children whom the Lord declared to belong to his kingdom in distinction to the world, and thus eligible for baptism. M'Lean, however, from the gospel doctrine, the scope of the apostle's argument, and the sense of like expressions in several other places of the New Testament, found that this passage meant that the unbeliever was a chaste and lawful yoke-fellow, and the children "holy" in that they were begotten in lawful wedlock and therefore not illegitimate.
I lean felt that in his interpretation of this text, Glas had obscured other points of greater concern than infant-baptism; for if the New Testament required only one parent to constitute the children members of Christ's true church, while the Old Testament required both parents to constitute them members of the earthly typical church, then it followed that carnal generation was now more effectual to produce a true holy seed, than it was formerly to produce a typical holy seed. Likewise, if all the infants of believing parents were "those little children whom the Lord declared to belong to his kingdom in distinction to the world," then carnal or fleshly birth availed as much, or more, for the enjoyment of the privileges of the heavenly kingdom, as it did formerly for the enjoyment of the privileges of the earthly kingdom. This idea was inconsistent with that set forth in Glas's "Testimony of the King of Martyrs." Then, too, if all the infants of believers were members of Christ's true church, then they should all certainly be saved, for this church was the same with the general assembly and church of the first born, written in heaven, for which Christ gave himself, so that none of its members could ever perish or be plucked out of Christ's hands. But if this were so, and some of these little children fell away in their adult state, as Glas supposed some of them might, this meant that a person might be a member of Christ's real church for a while, and afterwards a child of the devil. But if any perished for whom Christ gave himself, what ground was left for Christians to believe their salvation sure?
Such a scheme of things militated against the doctrine of election, effectual calling, the stability of the covenant, and the faithfulness of God. Though M'Lean was far from thinking that Glas intended to do any such thing as to argue against these doctrines, he felt that a little reflection on Glas's part would soon show him that the shifts to which he was put to support his idea of infant-baptism were unsettling the foundations of many important Scripture doctrines.

In Letter VII, Mr. M'Lean turned to a consideration of the fourth section of Glas's Dissertation, which attempted to show how baptism came in place of circumcision. Glas felt that he had a foundation for his argument in the words of the apostle, Col. ii. 11-13, where he thought the apostle gave baptism with the thing signified in it, in place of the circumcision of the flesh and called it the circumcision of Christ, so that baptism must be to the true Israel who were born of the Spirit, as circumcision was to the typical Israel who were born of the flesh.

M'Lean noticed that this conclusion bore a double meaning. If Glas meant that baptism was the same thing to the true Israel that circumcision was to the typical Israel, M'Lean would not agree, for circumcision was to the Jews a distinguishing mark from other nations, typical of an internal "cutting off" from these foreigners, but baptism signified the saints' likeness to Christ and participation in his sufferings, death, and resurrection; circumcision was hereditary to the Jews, but baptism was not so to the true Israel; and since baptism took place among
the believing Jews a considerable time before circumcision was given up, M'Lean could not accept the idea that baptism came in place of circumcision. However, if Glas meant that baptism belonged to the true Israel, even as circumcision belonged to the typical Israel, M'Lean was willing to agree, provided Glas would keep clear the distinction between the typical and true Israel, in that the first were born of the flesh, and the latter of the Spirit. However, this distinction Glas confounded in his next words; and when he used the word "infants" in place of "children" as used in the text, M'Lean referred him to the distinction made between the use of these words in Acts ii.

To clear up the question of whether the infants of believing parents were the true Israel, born of the Spirit, M'Lean found it necessary to state more particularly the difference between the natural and spiritual seed of Abraham. He found this distinction clearly made by a comparison of the Old and New Covenants made with Abraham, which contrasted in this manner:

"ABRAHAMIC COVENANT."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Old Covenant.</th>
<th>New Covenant.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The old covenant was only a TEMPORAL relation betwixt God and a particular nation, which is now DONE AWAY and come to an end, Heb. viii.13.</td>
<td>1. The new covenant is an ETERNAL relation betwixt God and his people from among all nations, and is therefore called an everlasting covenant, Heb. xiii.20.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The old covenant was CARNAL and EARTHLY: (1) In its WORSHIP, which stood only in meats and drinks, and divers washings, and carnal ordinances, Heb. ix.10.</td>
<td>2. The new covenant is SPIRITUAL and HEAVENLY: (1) In its WORSHIP, which requires a true heart, faith, and a good conscience, and to be performed in spirit and in truth, Heb. x.19-23, John iv.23.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(2) In its SACRIFICES of bulls and of goats, which could never take away sin, or purge the conscience, Heb. ix.3 and x.1.

(3) In its PRIEST, viz. Moses, Gal. iii.19.

(4) In its PRIESTS, viz. Aaron and his sons, who were sinful men, and not suffered to continue by reason of death, Heb. vii. 23, 25.

(5) In its SANCTUARY, which was worldly and made with hands, Heb. ix.1, 24.

(6) In its PROMISES; they being worldly blessings in earthly places, and respecting only a prosperous life in the earthly Canaan, Deut. xxviii. 1-15. Isai. i.19. Josh. xxii.43, 45. Chap. xxiii. 14, 15.

(7) In its SUBJECTS, or people covenanted; they being the fleshly seed of Abraham, children of the temporal promise, related to God as his typical people, and to Christ as his kinsmen according to the flesh; which typical and fleshly relation availed them much for the enjoyment of the typical and earthly privileges of this covenant: but as Sarah, the bond-woman, was cast out with her son born after the flesh; so the covenant itself being antiquated, its temporal, typical privileges

(2) In its SACRIFICES, which is Christ, and which perfects for ever them that are sanctified, Heb. x.14.

(3) In its PRIEST, viz. Christ Jesus, Heb. xii.24.

(4) In its PRIEST, viz. Christ, who is holy, harmless, &c. and abideth priest continually, ever living to make intercession for us, Heb. vii.24, 25, 26.

(5) In its SANCTUARY, which is heaven itself, whereinto our great high-priest hath entered, having obtained eternal redemption for us, Heb. ix.12.

(6) In its PROMISES; they being spiritual blessings in heavenly places, and chiefly respecting the life to come, and the enjoyment of the heavenly inheritance, Eph. i.3. Tit. 1.2. Heb. viii.6 and xi.13.

(7) In its SUBJECTS; they being the spiritual seed of Abraham, typified by the fleshly seed; being chosen in Christ before the foundation of the world, predestinated unto the adoption of children, and redeemed by the blood of Christ. These are the children of the promise, who, in God's appointed time, are born not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God; being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, even by the word of God, which liveth and abideth.
vanished, its subjects were cast out and disinherited; the fleshly relation upon which they received circumcision, availed nothing for their partaking of spiritual privileges, nor were they, as children of this covenant, admitted heirs with the children of the free woman, or new covenant, Rom. ix. 4-9. Gal. vi. 15 and iv. 22-31.

For ever: who have the law of God written in their hearts, and all know him from the least to the greatest. Through this work of the Spirit, they believe in the name of the Son of God, and by the profession of this their faith, they appear to be the seed of Abraham, children of the free-Woman, and heirs according to the promise, to whom belong all spiritual privileges, and baptism among the rest, Eph. i. 4, 5. 1 Pet. i. 18, 19. John i. 13. 1 Pet. i. 23. Heb. viii. 10, 11. Gal. iii. 28, 29. and iv. 28, 31. Acts ii. 41, 42."

Glas's mistake lay in the fact that he had confused the fleshly seed of believers with the spiritual seed of Abraham. K'Lean discovered from his comparison of the covenants that the natural descendants of Abraham typified the spiritual seed which was born of the Spirit of God. He then went on to consider what distinguished the spiritual seed of Abraham from the world, and gave them a visible right to the ordinance of baptism. He dismissed the carnal birth as being no index, for the fleshly birth was common to both natural and spiritual seeds, hence could not distinguish them; being born of blood did not indicate their character as sons of God; from the fleshly birth the spiritual could not be inferred as the latter had no necessary, natural, or foederal connection with the former; as

the apostle had declared that the fleshly children of Abraham were not as such the children of God, M'Lean could see no more reason to account the children of believers as spiritual seed; nor did he consider any man as able to distinguish in infancy between the seeds, for nothing was visible on which to make such a distinction, and it was unscriptural to judge of the state of infants by the faith of their parents. Since, therefore M'Lean was unable to distinguish spiritual from natural seed in infancy, and the scripture commanded the baptism of those who appeared, by their faith, to be spiritual seed, he could not see any support here for the baptism of infants.

Glas had tried to make his point by declaring that infants appeared to be spiritual seed in the same way that a parent appeared to be such on the first profession of his faith, but M'Lean could see not the least comparison there. To him, this first profession of the parent afforded a credible ground to believe that it agreed with the belief of his heart, but there was no connection between his profession and the spiritual state of his child. It was by their walking in the steps of his faith that the spiritual seed of Abraham appeared to be such, not by their being natural children of believers, and so he felt there was no basis for Glas's claim that "the word of God calls us to acknowledge them the spiritual seed by the parent's profession." (a)

(a) Glas, Dissertation, p.18.
In his next paragraph Glas endeavoured to show that the baptism of infants would not infer their being admitted to the Lord's Supper, because this did not mean that they were acknowledged as members of any visible church, but only of Christ's true church, which was invisible; because the examples of baptism in scripture always preceded adding to a church; and because they must be capable personally to declare their purpose of heart to be united to the Lord in a church, before they could be admitted as members. To this Mr. M'Lean retorted upon Glas his own arguments in support of infant-baptism, and showed that these were just as strong in support of admitting infants to the Lord's Supper. Then after a repetition of arguments used before, on personal profession, believers' houses, and the holiness of children of believers, Mr. M'Lean closed this Letter by concluding that if Glas had dropped entirely the apostolic distinction of the two covenants, and had adopted the popular idea of their identity, he might have been able to handle the argument from circumcision more consistently than he had done.

In Letter VIII, Mr. M'Lean took note of what seemed to him a very grave charge against Baptists, in the accusation of their evincing a self-righteous and unmerciful spirit in not allowing infants to be brought to Christ. Glas maintained that the same spirit which had shown itself in the disciples who rebuked those who brought children to Christ, and the same reasons, animated the Baptists who also forbade infant-baptism.
Mr. I'M'Lean could not see the validity of this charge against himself in particular, for his reason was not the same as that of the disciples, as Glas thought they had a commission to baptize infants, but he denied that such a commission was ever given. Nor could he be identified with the disciples as considering children incapable of Christ's blessing, for he believed it was a duty to bring children to Christ for his blessing. He felt that there could be no self-righteousness nor unmercifulness in denying what was never commanded to be given, nor that which could be of no more advantage to infants than the Lord's Supper. The whole charge looked to him like a playing upon the emotions of parents by groundless assertions that Baptists denied salvation to infants, and that they opposed their being brought to Christ. In spite of Glas's notion that it was in foresight of the denial of infant-baptism that the Lord said, "Suffer the little children to come unto me, etc," I'M'Lean found that in that place Jesus neither enjoined nor exemplified their baptism. In addition to the actual incident, when the infants were blessed, not baptized, I'M'Lean saw that Christ here was conveying instruction by similitudes and metaphors, as he often did, and that the "little ones" were those who were converted, and resembled such in humility, though they were adult in age.

I'M'Lean then turned to what was to him a vital discrepancy between the ideas of Glas on the subject of infant-baptism, and the practice in Glasite churches. He felt that these practices were such that he could be led to think Glas held infant-baptism
independent of any arguments he had yet advanced, for Glas sustained any baptism, performed according to scripture rule or not, and never enquired as to whether or not parents were real believers. He did not regard the persons themselves as having been disciples, believers, holy, and of the kingdom of God when they were baptized, but only when they made a personal confession of faith, and applied for admission to his communion. "Lean therefore felt that in thus departing himself from all the arguments and inferences for infant-baptism in his own practice, Glas showed that he had no shadow of pretence to any scripture warrant whatever.

Letter IX was taken up with the arguments for infant-baptism from ancient history. Only M'Lean's conclusion is of much interest to his thought.

"...as you have no foundation in scripture for infant-baptism; so, though you should search the whole records of antiquity, you will find little to support the modern arguments for it, which rest chiefly upon conceits that have been hatched amongst Protestant Pseudobaptists within these three hundred years." (a)

Letter X was concerned with the manner of baptism, and the scripture sense of the word "Baptism", in which, though M'Lean was very witty at times at the expense of Glas, as he went through all the manners of washings, and the similitudes used of baptism, he came out at the same point stated in Letter one, that Baptism was immersion, for the reasons given there.

Mr. M'Lean had often thought that the subject of baptism could be approached in a more convincing and instructive manner as doctrine rather than controversy. Therefore with this in mind, he published in 1733 a pamphlet on "The Nature and Import of Baptism", in which his purpose was to give a brief account of the outward form and proper subjects of Baptism, with an answer to to common pleas for infant-sprinkling; and especially to dwell upon the nature, import, and ends of this institution. He found that the correspondent to whom he was writing this paper in the form of a letter, thought that infant-sprinkling was supported by many plausible arguments, though he did admit the scripture support of believer's baptism; and also that the opposition of the Baptists was a stressing too much of their own particular views, and a making an external rite of as great importance as the faith itself, when they refused communion to other than baptized believers. M'Lean deduced that this objection arose because his correspondent did not fully understand that believer's baptism was the only baptism appointed by Christ, and that the other did not feel that the institutions of Christ were indispensably binding. He therefore pointed out that baptism was to be found in the New Testament only, and that those who looked for it in the Old Testament were seeking more than a simple institution of Christ. He maintained that the commission of Christ to his disciples was the main warrant for baptism.
as an established and standing ordinance of his kingdom, for
there the first command was to make disciples by teaching, with
the end in view that the hearers would believe, and then the
second command was to baptize those who believed.

With regard to what baptizing is, M'Lean found that the
action enjoined meant to dip, plunge, or immerse, as distinguish-
ed from all other modes of washing, for it was always used as
baptizing "in" or "into" a thing. The words connected with this
action were significant, for "dip" was not "unto" or "towards";
nor was "en", either "with" or "by." He pointed out that persons
could not be poured or sprinkled "into" water, but they could
be immersed; that Jesus "went up out of the water"; that Philip
and the Eunuch "went both down into the water," and later, "came
up out of the water;" that John baptized in Elon, "because there
was much water there;" and that baptism as a sign of burial,
and resurrection, must signify the believer's death, burial
and resurrection in the action. M'Lean believed, therefore, that

"Upon the whole, it is clear, that the action enjoined
is immersion; and that any other action is not merely
a different mode of Baptism, but a different thing alto-
together. It is not Baptizing, and so not Christ's
institution." (a)

He also considered that the element into which the believer was
to be immersed was water, without dispute, for this ordinance
was not the baptism of the Spirit.

r. M'Lean found by his study of the Scripture that the

(a) M. M'Lean, "The Nature and Import of Baptism," p. 3, Edin. 1715
expression "In the name," sometimes signified "for the sake of," "in the strength of," "by the authority of," and "invoking the name of." With respect to baptism, he concluded that it signified, "into the faith of the gospel."

"To baptize, therefore, 'into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost,' is to baptize into the faith or doctrine of the gospel, which is testified by the Divine Three who are one; which reveals them in their distinct and relative character, and manifests their glory as acting their respective parts in the economy of redemption; the gospel being a revelation of the 'mystery of God, and of the Father, and of Christ.'" (a)

He thought that Christians were to be baptized into the name of the Father and of the Son in distinction from idolatrous heathens who had many false Gods; in distinction from unbelieving Jews and Deists, who acknowledged one God, yet denied the Son; for he held that the faith of the Father and Son must be professed in baptism, for it was a baptism into that faith. He also considered it necessary for Christians to be baptized into the faith of the Holy Ghost, for to him baptism signified the baptism of believers by one Spirit into one body, and of their being all made to drink into the one Spirit of truth, holiness and consolation.

M'Lean went on from the name into which believers were to be baptized, to a consideration of the subjects of baptism, but as this has already been covered in the same terms in the discussion with Glas, all we need to notice is his summary:

(a) "M'Lean, Nature and Import of Baptism, p.10, Edin. 1786."
"Whether, therefore, we consider the plain words of the commission, or the uniform practice of the inspired apostles in executing it, it is evident to a demonstration, that baptism does not belong to professed infidels, ignorant persons, or mere infants, but only to professed believers of the gospel." (a)

Next came a presentation of his arguments against the pleas of Paedobaptists, which has already been covered in the Letters to Mr. Glas.

Mr. M'Lean discovered among men many mistaken views of the signification of baptism, such as giving a name to the child; a christening, or making infants Christians; the initiation of infants into the visible church; the seal of some covenant; the parent's dedication of the child to God, with a vow to bring it up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord; as well as a sign that Christ was able to save the child, and that the parent must enter the kingdom of God as destitute of any good qualification as his infant.

To him, however, the import or signification of baptism was the sign of spiritual regeneration, or the new birth, without which it was impossible to enter into the kingdom of God; the sign of the washing away of sin, both as to its guilt and pollution, and thus the sign of justification and sanctification; it especially represented the death, burial, and resurrection of Christ as the ground of the believer's hope, of the believer's union and communion with Christ therein, with his

(a) "Lean, Natures and Import of Baptism, p.18, Edin.1787."
spiritual conformity to him in dying to sin and rising to a new life of holiness; and the sign of the believer's complete conformity to Christ in the death of his mortal body, and in his resurrection to a heavenly and immortal life from the dead. To M'Lean, all of these aspects and meanings of the ordinance of baptism, made it of immeasurable benefit to the faith, hope, love, holiness and consolation of believers, for whom alone he considered it as intended, as they alone could reap any benefit from it.

Mr. M'Lean held that Baptism was an indispensable prerequisite to Church-fellowship, and communion in the Lord's Supper, because Christ, who had sufficient authority to do so, commanded it; because of the order in which baptism stood in the commission to the apostles; because the apostles adhered strictly to that order, and did not admit any to church-fellowship till once they were baptized; because the order was not accidental, for baptism was a sign of spiritual birth, and of entrance into the kingdom of God; and because he could not admit of any distinction between the institutions of Christ and the terms of communion, or between his obligation to observe them himself, and his right to urge them upon others who desired fellowship in the Baptist church. He felt that the very nature of church communion required that he should not only observe Christ's institutions, but insist that his brethren should likewise observe them, for by disregarding the authority of Christ in one ordinance, he thought he would be showing his disregard to it in all, for it is the same authority which has enjoined all.
In his paper on "The Belief of the Gospel Saving Faith," Mr. M'Lean gave a clear insight into his understanding of the Scripture doctrines concerning faith. He first considered the nature of faith or belief in general, and took notice of some mistakes on this subject. Though he admitted that the word "faith" was sometimes used in Scripture in a metonymical sense, he found that in the common and ordinary acceptation of the word, it was that credit which was given to the truth of any thing which was reported, testified, promised, or threatened, and was grounded either on the veracity of the speaker, or on the proofs and evidence by which his words were confirmed.

He found that some had asserted that "faith" and "belief" were two very different principles; yet all who could read the English New Testament might easily see that these words were used indifferently as convertible terms, which signified one and the same thing.

He also noted that many affirmed that the apostles used the word faith or belief, in connection with salvation, in a sense different from that of common use. He, on the contrary, was certain that the apostles used great plainness of speech, for they never explained any unusual meaning of the word "faith," which convinced him there was no such unusual meaning attached to the word as used by them.
To M'Lean, the general nature of faith or belief had always to be the same, whatever difference there might be in its degrees, objects, or effects. It might be weak or strong, according to the degrees of perceived evidence; it might have God or men, things heavenly or earthly, for its objects; it could produce different effects upon the heart and life, according to the different natures or qualities of these objects; but the nature of faith or belief itself had to be the same in all cases.

The only formal definition of faith M'Lean discovered in the word of God was in these words: "Now faith is the confidence of things hoped for, the conviction of things not seen." (Heb. xi.1). He thought that the confidence of faith was a confidence of persuasion, founded on God's power and faithfulness, that the good things he promised should be accomplished or conferred. Things known by nature, reason, or experience, without revelation, were not the proper objects of faith, for faith was the conviction of things "not seen." Divine faith respected divine revelation, and was a conviction of the truth of whatever God was pleased to reveal. The conviction that was in faith was not a blind enthusiastic fancy, or the effect of weak credulity, but a conviction founded upon the most rational evidence, as grounded in the nature and perfections of God, who could not lie.

M'Lean saw that many confounded faith with its effects, and these strenuously maintained that it was something more
than belief; some motions or actings of the will and affections; and they included in its very nature every good disposition and affection of the heart. He granted that when a man really believed, his mind would be affected with the objects of his belief, according to the perception he had of their nature and qualities, or the concern he had in them; as evil, disagreeable or hurtful objects would excite his hatred, aversion, or fear; while excellent, amiable or beneficial objects would draw forth his esteem, love, desire, hope or joy. But these dispositions, passions, and affections, evidently supposed the previous perception and belief of what excited them, and so were not faith itself, but its effects.

He considered that absurd distinctions had been made in order to show that faith was more than belief. These included the distinguishing the belief of the head from the belief of the heart; true faith from a historical faith; between believing the doctrine of the gospel, and receiving the person of Christ; believing the Son, and believing in, or on him.

Some described faith to be "an inward principle of grace implanted in the heart by the operation of the Spirit, separate from, and previous to, the knowledge of the word of God." (Fuller later adopted this view). I"Lean could not conceive what was meant by such a principle of grace as this. It could not be a sentiment respecting Christ or his salvation; nor could it be any disposition or affection of the mind towards
Christ. It was supposed to be implanted in the heart by the operation of the Spirit; but to suppose that the Spirit implanted a principle of grace, as it was called, in the heart without the word of God, or previous to any knowledge of it, was altogether unintelligible, for it made the word of God of little consequence, opened a flood-gate for wild enthusiasm, and set aside the Scripture rule for distinguishing the Spirit of truth from the spirit of error.

Many zealously contended that faith was an appropriation of Christ, or "a persuasion that Christ and his salvation is mine; that he loved me, and gave himself for me, etc."

(Associated Synod Catechism, Part II, On Faith in Jesus Christ.)

"'Lean pointed out that true faith was required of all men, and yet all the hearers of the gospel had no ground to believe that Christ was theirs. The general declaration, "that Christ came to save sinners," would not warrant such a belief, either upon the scheme of universal or particular redemption. This same Catechism alleged, "that God hath made an universal grant of Christ in the word to mankind, sinners as such, and that this warrants every one to believe he is theirs." But, 'Lean reasoned, if this was allowed to be true, yet, as it was owned that this supposed grant made to ALL, did not actually convey Christ but to SOME, it could never warrant all the hearers of the gospel to believe he was theirs. The Seceders further affirmed, "that God commands all who hear the gospel to believe that Christ is theirs, and assures them of success
in their appropriating Christ." !Lean saw no such command, to believe that Christ was theirs, in the entire word of God. This would have been to command many to believe a lie; for it was not true of ALL who heard the gospel that Christ was theirs; nor could their believing it convert it into a truth. God did not command men to believe any thing without evidence, or which was not true in itself whether they believed it or not.

!Lean considered these "absurdities" concerning faith to have each a pernicious tendency, for in the first group, when men conceived faith to be a principle wrought in the heart by the Spirit, abstract from the word, it would lead them to look within themselves for the operation of some spirit, very different from the Spirit of truth who spoke in the Scriptures. They would seek for this inward principle, in the first case, as the basis of their hope, so that this would prevent them from finding comfort in God's word till they either found or fancied they found, this mysterious principle -- probably a blind enthusiasm or a self-conceit -- wrought in them.

He had a somewhat similar criticism for those who confounded faith with its effects, and made it to consist of a number of good dispositions and vigorous exertions of the mind. This group limited the extent, and impaired the freed of divine grace to the worst sinners, for they confined this grace to those who were supposed to be better qualified to receive it. Such an error led men to seek relief to their
guilty consciences, and peace with God, not from the gospel ground of hoping solely in the character and work of Christ, thus set at a distance from them, but upon the strivings and workings of their own minds, in order to be justified.

The doctrine of appropriation had the bad tendency of leading its supporters to expect no benefit from the belief of the truth, without a good opinion of their own state; which opinion, that Christ was theirs, was really self-deceit, as it was founded upon a lie. This doctrine superseded the necessity for its devotees to work out their own salvation in fear or trembling, or of their having to be diligent to make their calling and election sure, as the Scripture directed believers to do. Such a view of faith was very discouraging to many of the real children of God, who were not so easily satisfied as to their own particular interest, which required the testimony of conscience both to their faith and its fruits.

WHAT THAT FAITH IS IN PARTICULAR TO WHICH THE PROMISE OF SALVATION IS MADE.

In introducing this section of the subject, Mr. 'Lean drew attention to the fact that it was now the object of faith with which he had particularly to do. He held that faith saved in no other way than as it respected a saving object, for all its influence upon the heart and life was the influence of the truth believed. The question was, therefore, "What is the object of saving faith?"
Mr. M'Lean found that the whole New Testament clearly demonstrated that it was THE GOSPEL which men were called to believe. The next step was to discover what was meant by "the Gospel?" To M'Lean, the gospel was the glad news of the fulfilment of the Old Testament prophecies in the coming, life, death, resurrection, and exaltation of the Son of God, and of the salvation, which he had thereby obtained for sinners of all nations. It was the revelation of the sovereign free grace and love of God towards a guilty, perishing world, in giving his only begotten Son to die for the offences of men, and in raising him again from the dead for their justification, that whosoever "believeth in him might not perish, but have everlasting life."

M'Lean held that the belief of the gospel was saving faith, for the gospel was frequently set forth under the aspect of a testimony, witness, or record, concerning Christ; as the testimony of God, of Jesus, of the Spirit, and of the apostles; the receiving of which testimony was declared in Scripture to be connected with salvation. Likewise, no faith but what was true and saving was the effect of being born of God; no other faith could possibly overcome the world; but it was declared in the Scripture that he was born of God, and overcame the world, who believed that Jesus was the Christ the Son of God. This truth not only imported the dignity of his person, but also his mediatory character and work, as the Saviour of lost sinners. The resurrection of Christ
included the substance of the gospel testimony; hence the belief of this important fact in its proper sense was true justifying faith. That which the gospel testified of Christ was most frequently termed "the truth", the believer of which was the fruit of election to salvation; it was inseparably connected with the sanctification of the Spirit; it was to this belief that God effectually called the elect by the gospel, and the end of this faith was their obtaining the glory of our Lord Jesus Christ; so certainly the belief of "the truth" must be true and saving faith.

Mr. M'Lean believed on the other hand that it was counterfeit, and not true faith, if men were either ignorant of, or had a false view of, the Gospel, or of the sense in which Jesus was the Christ, even though they had a general belief that something called the gospel was true, and that Jesus was the Christ, the Son of God. Likewise faith was counterfeit, if men were ignorant of, or denied the import of all the gospel facts relating to Christ, or connected some error with the truth which was subversive of it, even though they believed all these facts. He thought that though there could be no true faith without knowledge, yet there could be a kind of speculative knowledge without faith or belief. Then too, it was not true faith if men did not in some measure perceive the excellence, importance, and suitableness of the gospel to their lost condition as sinners, regardless of what they might think of their knowledge and belief of it.
Next, he stated his grounds for maintaining that it was the indispensable duty of all who heard the Gospel to believe it to the saving of the soul. He saw that the word of God expressly commanded all men without exception to believe on Christ for salvation. So he reasoned: if these commands and calls were of divine authority; if men were under obligation to obey God; if it was right to do so, and wrong to do otherwise, then it undeniably followed that it was the indispensable duty of all who heard the gospel to believe it to obtain salvation. He further observed unbelief, which was the opposite of faith, was always represented as a very great and heinous sin against God, by the Scriptures, especially as it made God a liar, and rejected his love and grace as revealed in the gospel. "Lean inferred from this, that since the opposite of sin was duty, and the opposite of unbelief was belief, then belief must be a duty. Further, on this point, he read that God had promised salvation to him that believed, and had threatened damnation to him who did not believe. This was to Lean an irrefutable demonstration that God approved of believing, and was highly displeased at unbelief, and that consequently belief was a duty, and its opposite a sin. He sums up his position in these words,

"Therefore, though it is God's gift to believe, it is nevertheless men's duty; and though eternal life is likewise the free gift of God through Jesus Christ, and entirely of grace; yet it is graciously promised to believers as a reward of their faith and obedience. Neither is unbelief a mere descriptive character of those who shall be damned, but a
Mr. M'Lean, in his "Commission of Jesus Christ to his Apostles Illustrated," included several long notes, the substance of which is interesting in revealing the position he held on faith in opposition to certain specified opponents. The first was written at the outset without names, but was accepted by Mr. Fuller as being aimed directly at him.

In this note, Mr. M'Lean noticed that "Some profess to admit, that faith is credence and nothing else, yet at the same time affirm that there are some truths which cannot be known or believed without a corresponding temper of heart." (b)

The meaning of this, to M'Lean, must be that faith in its very nature was a temper or disposition of heart corresponding to the truth believed; which was to maintain that it was something else than credence, and so to retract what was before granted. It was argued in support of it, that if faith was a mere exercise of the understanding, it would contain no virtue, and if faith contained no virtue, unbelief could contain no sin. But Mr. M'Lean deduced that to be to the point this mere exercise of the understanding had to mean a believing exercise of it. He held that the affirmation that this contained no virtue when it had God or his word for its object, was rather too bold, considering how highly the Scrip-

ture spoke of it, and represented it as the root principle of all Christian virtues. It was that which gave glory to God, without which it was impossible to please him. Surely it was right to believe all that God said, so it would not follow that in this case there would be no sin in unbelief, for that was to make God a liar. M'Lean's denial that faith was the exercise of a virtuous temper of heart, he recognized as refusing some praise to the creature; but his opponent's denial that unbelief was a sin, was an impeaching of the moral character of God. M'Lean wondered why his adversary was so solicitous to find virtue or moral excellence in faith? The answer given to this was that a faith which included the acquiescence of the heart was a moral excellence, and thus there was a fitness in God's justifying those persons who thus acquiesced. M'Lean saw immediately that such a fitness was that which was between virtue and its reward, which was only a round-about way of saying that men were justified by faith as a virtue, and therefore justified by their own righteousness. The same charge of justification by their own righteousness held good for the argument of his adversary that hope implied desire, and desire included love, so that believing the loveliness of an object and loving it were the same. In an attempt to dodge this inference, the other that though hope and love were moral excellencies as well as faith, none of them had the relation to Christ which faith had. M'Lean pointed out that
if faith, hope and love were all one, or included in each other, as his opponent averred, then they must all have the same relation to Christ, consequently the same place in justification. He pressed home the weak position of the other, by triumphantly revealing that it was simply impossible to point out any distinction in the relation which faith, hope and love had to Christ, without admitting that they were distinct in themselves, which was for his adversary to give up the argument.

Another note concerned the extent of the gospel promise, on which Mr. M'Lean held simply and clearly that the gospel promise of salvation was not universal, but was restricted to him who believed. This was his position in contradistinction to the Associate Synod (as before noticed under the "absurdities" of faith), and was in its brevity the sum and substance, the pith and marrow of his paper on "A Conversation between a Seceder and A Baptist," in which he replied to the animadversions of Dr. Thomas M'Crie. (a)

The other note concerned Mr. John Barclay (of the Bereans), and his "Assurance of Faith." On the title page of his "Assurance of Faith Vindicated," Mr. Barclay had asserted that "the assurance of faith (meaning the assurance of a man's own justification) is established, along with the resurrection of Jesus from the dead, upon the direct testimony

of God, believed in the heart." !'Lean considered this as
absolutely absurd, for a direct testimony was that which
absolutely affirmed, in so many express words, the truth of
the particular thing testified. Barclay therefore had said,
in substance, that God had absolutely, positively, and express
ly testified in the gospel that "John Barclay in particular
is justified;" for such was the nature of the testimony given
to the resurrection of Jesus from the dead. The resurrection
of Jesus was a foundation principle; a truth which stood in­
dependent of men's believing, and was the subject of direct
testimony which men were called to believe absolutely. But a
man's particular justification was not declared to be a truth
until he believed the former. No one could know that he in
particular was justified by any thing openly and directly
testified, till he knew that he believed, for only those who
believed were declared to be justified. Therefore he triumph­
antely noted that after all that John Barclay had advanced in
order to establish the assurance of his own particular justi­
fication upon the direct testimony of God, he was obliged at
last to depart entirely from that principle, and draw his
justification as an inference from his believing, by reason­
ing, "All who believe the record are justified. I believe the
record; therefore I believe I am justified." (Assurance of
Faith Vindicated, p.38.) (a)

In Mr. M'Lean's "Answer to Mr. Fuller's Appendix to his Gospel Worthy of All Acceptation," the first question taken up was,

**WHETHER THE EXISTENCE OF A HOLY DISPOSITION OF HEART BE NECESSARY TO BELIEVING?**

This holy disposition Mr. Fuller termed a divine principle -- the moral state or disposition of the soul -- a change of the bias of the heart towards God. (pp.127,129,170) (a) He maintained that this principle must exist prior to, or before believing, and in order to it. He frequently represented faith as arising out of it, as influenced by it, and as partaking of it. (pp.171-176)

Mr. M'Lean considered that they were interested in the nature of faith itself, and not what was prior to it, but as Mr. Fuller brought forward this previous holy disposition of heart, and made it the fundamental principle of his scheme, Mr. M'Lean examined it a little. Fuller had stated the question thus:

"That there is a divine influence upon the soul which is necessary to spiritual perception and belief, as being the cause of them, those with whom I am now reasoning will admit. The only question is, in what order these things are caused? Whether the Holy Spirit causes the mind, while carnal, to discern and believe spiritual things, and thereby render it spiritual; or whether he imparts a holy susceptibility and relish for the truth, in consequence of which we discern its glory and embrace it? The latter appears to me to be the truth." (204,205)

Mr. M'Lean considered this to be a very unfair stating of it.

(a) Numbers in brackets refer to pages in Fuller's "Gospel Worthy of All Acceptation."
the question, as regards the words "while carnal", and felt sure that Fuller would have complained if he had put such words into a statement of Fuller's position. The very next argument of Fuller's, that to cause the mind, while carnal, to discern and believe spiritual things, was a thing impossible even with God himself, because impossible in its own nature, and that the Holy Spirit declared it to be so, he saw as an arguing against a contradiction of Fuller's own framing. In any case, it was as easy for Lean to conceive that the Holy Spirit should in the first instance communicate the light of truth to a dark, carnal mind, and thereby render it spiritual, as, that he should prior to that, impart to it a holy susceptibility and relish for the truth. He could not presume to affirm that it was impossible with God; but he could not conceive how a human mind could have any relish for the truth before it had any perception of it.

Lean found that the principle upon which Mr. Fuller established this holy disposition, previous to faith, seemed to be that the understanding, or perceptive faculty in man was directed and governed by his will and inclinations. The most of Fuller's arguments were evidently founded on this hypothesis. One was to suppose that in regeneration, the Holy Spirit first performed some physical operation upon the blind will, to give it a new bias or inclination, and thus made way for the introduction of light into the understanding.
Mr. Fuller said, "God does not cause the natural man to receive spiritual things; but he removes the obstructing film by imparting a spiritual relish for those things." This obstructing film he explained to be "the obstinacy and aversion of the heart," and thought that the first operation of the Spirit was his "imparting a spiritual relish for those things, for thus it was that spiritual things were spiritually discerned." (205, 206) Mr. M'Lean could make no sense of these words but that spiritual things were discerned by a spiritual relish "for we know not what," since there had been no communication of light to the understanding.

Fuller then observed,

"though holiness is frequently ascribed in the Scriptures to a spiritual perception of the truth, yet that spiritual perception itself, in the first instance, is ascribed to the influence of the Holy Spirit upon the HEART. Acts xvi.4 2 Cor. iv.6 1 John ii.20.27." (p.203)

M'Lean found in this, that Mr. Fuller used the word "heart" to signify the will and affections, as distinguished from the understanding or perceiving faculty. So, according to Fuller, the Holy Spirit made persons relish or love the truth, and then perceive or understand it. But, M'Lean pointed out, the word "Heart" included the understanding as well as the will and affections, for in Scripture, the heart knew, understood, studied, discerned, devised, meditated, pondered, considered, reasoned, edited, doubted, believed, and was wise. In fact, every exercise moderns considered as belonging to the intellectual faculty, was in Scripture ascribed to the "heart." He
then went on to show that the Scripture passages used by Mr. Fuller to prove his point were against him.

To show that the will acted prior to the understanding, and independently of it, Fuller asserted, "Whatever may be said of particular volitions being caused by ideas received into the mind, original biases are not so." (p.207) He used President Edwards as an example of one who, "speaks with great caution on the will being determined by the understanding." (207) Yet M'Lean found that President Edwards merely explained what he meant by "understanding", as not only reason and judgement, but also perception and apprehension. President Edwards denied that the will acted without any previous inducement, motive, cause, or ground of its choice. (a) M'Lean dismissed the question of whether original biases were caused by ideas received into the mind, as having no concern with the point under consideration, unless it could be shown that regeneration was an original bias, existing before any spiritual light was communicated to the mind. But Fuller considered that "every thing which proves spiritual perception and faith to be holy exercises, proves that a change of heart must of necessity precede them, as no holy exercise can have place while the heart is under the dominance of carnality." (207) To which Mr. M'Lean replied that as it would be allowed that God could change the heart, the question was, whether did this change

begin with a removal of the darkness and unbelief of the mind, or whether was the heart actually changed previous to this, and while it was yet in a state of spiritual darkness and unbelief? The former was Mr. Lean's sentiment, the latter Mr. Fuller's, for he asserted that "It is thus I apprehend that God reveals the truth to us by his Spirit, in order to our discerning and believing it", (208) -- by changing their hearts before they perceived and believed. In this manner Fuller thought it was revealed to Peter, to babes, to the apostles. Mr. Lean held that the Scriptures expressly declared that the word of truth, or the incorruptible seed of the word, was the means or instrument of regeneration, and that this birth must be effected by the Spirit's causing men to understand and believe the word in the first instance, for it was certain to him that the word could have no saving influence upon the heart previous to this.

The discussion then turned to a consideration of the term "regeneration," for Fuller declared,

"The term regeneration in the sacred writings is not always used in that strict sense in which we use it in theological discussion. Sometimes it is used in a more strict, and sometimes in a more general sense. Regeneration is sometimes expressive of that operation in which the soul is passive; and in this sense stands distinguished from conversion, or actual turning to God by Jesus Christ." (210)

Mr. Lean thought that regeneration was not the operation of the Holy Spirit, but the effect of it. To regenerate men, was to beget them to the faith; and this faith, which was the gift of God, came by hearing, and hearing by the word of God. Mr. Lean —
found that Mr. Fuller's strict sense of the term regeneration had no foundation in the word of God, nor indeed in the nature of things; for even the two texts adduced by Mr. Fuller held forth no distinction such as he made, far less the whole sentiment that regeneration was without the word, and previous to the perception or belief of it. M'Lean saw that Scripture frequently spoke of mental powers under the metaphor of bodily members, hence many, instead of explaining these metaphors in a way suitable to the spirit of man, affixed such gross notions to them, as were applicable only to the material part of him. Thus Mr. Fuller spoke of God's first removing the obstructing film from the mental eye, by imparting a spiritual relish for divine things; but if this spiritual relish preceded the exercise of intellect, or the mind's perception of an object, then it was certain it could have no object, consequently could not be a spiritual relish, for spiritual objects could not be felt and relished by the soul, while the judgement had no spiritual perception or knowledge of them.

Fuller pleaded,

"All I contend for is, that it is not by means of a spiritual perception, or belief of the gospel, that the heart is, for the first time, effectually influenced towards God; for spiritual perception and belief are represented as the effects and not the causes of such influence." (211,212)

To M'Lean, the sentiment that the heart was effectually influenced towards God previous to any true knowledge of him, or to any spiritual perception and belief of the truth, or to
any influencing motive whatever having been presented to the view of the mind, was not only unscriptural, but altogether irrational and absurd. Fuller explained that "a spiritual perception of the glory of divine things, is not the first operation of God upon the mind." (212) But M'Lean felt that he could safely affirm that there was not any holy susceptibility or relish for the truth subsisting in the human heart previous to the influence of the word. In support of this he quoted several Scripture passages. He pressed home his point by insisting that if a holy disposition of heart was previous to faith, it had to be without it, and so could not be pleasing to God, for without faith it was impossible to please him. This also made the doctrine of reconciliation needless, in order to reconcile the heart to God. This would make men, "godly unbelievers," so that they must be saved without faith, and to affirm that men would be saved short of believing was contrary to Scripture. Fuller then tried to enlist the scripture in favour of his view by claiming that the "honest and good heart" in the parable of the sower, represented persons as regenerated previous to their hearing the word. (174) Here M'Lean was on very familiar ground, so he immediately declared that this use of the passage was an abuse of Scripture metaphor, for the design of this parable was to set forth the different reception and effects of the word among those who actually heard it. He showed that the order of things, as seen by a comparison of
the three Evangelists, was that the sower went forth to sow, which meant to publish the word of the kingdom; those to whom it was published heard the word; they understood and received it; they, in an honest and good heart, kept it; they brought forth fruit with patience, in various degrees. Fuller then admitted that "a spiritual perception of the glory of divine things appears to be the first sensation of which the mind is conscious; but it is not the first operation of God upon it." (212) To this, M'Lean succinctly retorted that if not, then this first operation of God made no impression upon the rational mind of man.

They then came to the effect of M'Lean's principles with respect to addressing the unconverted. Fuller charged,

"First, If the necessity of repentance in order to forgiveness be given up, we shall not be in the practice of urging it on the unconverted." (214)

M'Lean found this to be an amazing statement, for he could not conceive what ground Mr. Fuller had to suppose that those whom he opposed had given up the necessity of repentance in order to forgiveness. It had always been his own firm belief that not only the unconverted, but even the converter themselves, needed often to be called to repentance in order to obtain forgiveness. He felt strongly that here Fuller was misrepresenting his own sentiments. But Fuller went smoothly on,

"We shall imagine it will be leading souls astray to press it before, and in order to believing; and afterwards it will be thought unnecessary, as all that is wanted will come of itself." (214,215.)
I. 'Lean, though he knew that none would truly repent but those who believed, still felt that the declaration of the gospel doctrine of salvation, with men's need of it, laid a reasonable foundation for calling all who heard it to repentance, and for urging it by every argument and motive which the word of God afforded. He considered that it was not upon his own, but upon Mr. Fuller's plan that he would have been very much embarrassed in pressing true repentance upon the unconverted, for that scheme rendered the principles and motives of the gospel altogether useless as to their influence on repentance, and therefore could not with propriety be used for that purpose. Fuller then admitted,

"that a conviction of the being and attributes of God must, in the order of nature, precede repentance; because we cannot repent for offending a being of whose existence we doubt, or of whose character we have no just conception: but the faith of the Gospel ... is represented in the New Testament as implying repentance." (173)

'Lean saw as the point which Fuller wished to establish, that true repentance was previous to the belief of the gospel, and was produced by a conviction of the being of God, and a just conception of his character, which last Fuller supposed might be obtained without the gospel. 'Lean admitted that legal repentance was produced by fear of sin and its punishments, and he had no objection to Fuller's placing it before the belief of the gospel. But it was not true repentance, or what the Scripture called "repentance unto life," which, together with
a humbling conviction of sin and its deserts, necessarily implied an apprehension and belief of the mercy of God, through Christ, as revealed in the Gospel. Mr. Lean felt that he might justly question, if ministers of the gospel were warranted to urge repentance on their hearers, as a pre-requisite to faith, for there was no example of any such thing in the New Testament. Then too, though repentance ought to be urged upon all who heard the gospel, and though none believed it, who did not repent, yet Mr. Mr. Lean strongly suspected that it would be leading souls astray, to press repentance upon them before, and "in order to their believing" the gospel, for this laid an insuperable barrier in the way of faith, and consequently prevented genuine repentance. He also felt that a conviction of guilt and danger by the law, though it ought to be urged, would not by itself produce true repentance.

Fuller returned to the attack from a new angle,

"Secondly, For the same reason that we give up the necessity of repentance, in order to forgiveness, we may give up all exhortations to things spiritually good, as means of salvation." (215)

Here Mr. Mr. Lean became a bit annoyed with Fuller for his way of conducting an argument. In affirming that Mr. Mr. Lean disapproved of unconverted sinners being exhorted to do anything spiritually good, Mr. Fuller had used as proof of this charge, a reference to a pamphlet, "Simple Truth Vindicated," which was not written by Mr. Mr. Lean at all, but by a Mr. John Barnard of London! What aggravated Mr. Fuller's offence was that this
natter had been brought to his attention before he published the second edition of his "Gospel Worthy" pamphlet, but he had made no attempt at correction. "Mr. Lean also showed that Fuller knew of several writings in which Mr. Lean had combatted the very sentiment here ascribed to him, so that Mr. Lean could not but feel that Fuller was deliberately misrepresenting his sentiments. All he could do in this case was to reiterate his belief that calls and exhortations to believe were both proper and necessary when men were told what to believe, and upon what grounds. Without that, all the preacher's vociferations were but empty and unmeaning noise. But he considered that the gospel was much perverted when faith was represented under the idea of acting or working, and in this view urged upon sinners for their justification. This was the reverse of calling them to believe in the sufficiency of Christ's work to justify them. It necessarily drew their attention from Christ's finished work to seek after justification by some exertions or activities of their own, of a very different nature from believing the gospel.

**QUESTION II. WHETHER JUSTIFYING FAITH INCLUDES IN ITS NATURE ANY THING MORE THAN A BELIEF OF THE GOSPEL?**

Mr. Mr. Lean felt that he had already shown in the "Commission of Christ to His Apostles", and in the "Belief of the Gospel Saving Faith," that justifying faith was neither more nor less than a belief of the gospel, or of God's testimony concerning his Son. He therefore referred readers to these
papers as introduction to this question. Fuller's account of faith in the first edition of "The Gospel Worthy of All Acceptation," was highly acceptable to Mr. M'Lean, who considered that he could hardly give a better view of his own sentiments than by transcribing Fuller's. He discovered, however, that Fuller explained "belief" as a cordial reception of the truth, and thus by this definition seemed to mean more than M'Lean considered belief, for to him this cordiality was an immediate effect of belief. Fuller admitted "the truth" to be the gospel, but obscured it to such a degree that M'Lean could scarcely recognize the apostolic gospel in it; for Mr. Fuller first specified some gospel truths, and stated them as so many abstract disconnected particulars, and kept out of view their coherence, import or design, such as,

"that there was such a person as Jesus Christ -- that he was born at Bethlehem -- lived, and wrought miracles in Judea -- was crucified, buried, and raised again from the dead -- that he ascended to glory, and will judge the world at the last day -- that he is God and man, and bears the titles of king, priest, and prophet of his church -- that there is an eternal election, a particular redemption, an effectual vocation, a final perseverance, &c. &c. &c. -- these, no doubt, are truths, and great truths ... but they are general and external truths ... which may be believed where no saving faith is." (p.13)

M'Lean felt that Fuller's stating them in such a light tended to deprecate the great truth with which they stood connected, which was the subject and scope of the gospel testimony. The grand foundation truth which the gospel testified was "That Jesus Christ, is the Son of God." This truth included in it his character and also his work, as the Saviour of lost
sinners, in that he died for our sins according to the Scriptures; that he was buried, and rose again the third day for our justification. Whatever Mr. Fuller might say about "general" and "external" truths which could be believed where no saving faith was, the word of God expressly told us that the belief of this truth was saving faith. But Mr. Fuller had not left him in the dark as to his idea of truth, for he had said,

"By truth I mean (and I think the apostle means the same) to include with the fore-mentioned doctrines their qualities or properties, which make a great, and even an essential part of their truth." (p.13)

McLean was of the opinion, that the gospel doctrines were termed "the truth", not on account of their qualities as good or bad, nor only as exhibiting the substance of the legal shadows; but chiefly because they were true as opposed to all falsehood or deceit. Though a belief of this testimony included a belief of the qualities or properties of what was testified, yet it was as truths or realities that they were objects of faith; and till they thus existed as truths in the mind, they could have no influence on the will and affections. The truths or qualities which Fuller thought were more especially the objects of saving faith were,

"The infinite excellency of God, the reasonableness, and goodness of his law, the exceeding sinfulness of sin in itself considered, men's vile, dangerous and lost condition, the equity of God in sending them to hell, the infinite loveliness of Christ, and excellency of his way of salvation, the beauty of holiness, &c. &c. ... these are truths concerning which every wicked man is an infidel." (p.14,15.)
In general, Mr. Lean found that this idea of the truth was not Scriptural, for in none of the apostles' expositions of "the truth" was there any direct or explicit mention of what Mr. Fuller considered chiefly as the truth. What the apostles expounded seemed to consist wholly of what Fuller termed "general and external truths", which he said could be believed where there was no saving faith. The apostles declared the testimony of God concerning his Son, and constantly connected salvation with the belief of it; but Mr. Fuller, though he did not exclude the main subject of their testimony, gave it such epithets as tended to depreciate it, while he transferred salvation from it to the belief of some other truths or qualities which he considered as more particularly the objects of saving faith.

Mr. Lean was willing to admit that he and his opponent were agreed on certain points, such as Fuller's account of faith as given in his pamphlet, "The Gospel Worthy of All Acceptation;" the meaning of the word "belief;" on what was meant by the gospel, in general; about the excellent qualities of that truth, and the hearty reception it must meet with from all who really believed it. But Mr. Fuller would not abide consistently with what they had agreed to, and struck out a difference in these words: "Our disagreement on this subject is confined to the question, what the belief of the gospel includes?" (180)

This made it very evident to Mr. Mr. Lean that Fuller did not abide by their common definition of belief, but on the contrary laboured in his Appendix to prove that belief was something
else than credence. Thus M'Lean found that any difference between them on this point had to be between the real meaning and the plain sense of Fuller's words. He suggested that Mr. Scott's definition of faith as "a cordial consent to the testimony of God in his holy word," (a) would have suited Fuller better than the one he had professed to use.

M'Lean then turned to consider the animadversions which Fuller had made on the sentiments he had advanced on this subject in the "Commission," and the "Belief of the Gospel Saving Faith." He related that all he had said, or had meant to say, in these publications on the nature of faith, centred in this single point, that justifying faith was simply a belief of the gospel. Therefore, if Fuller's animadversions were to the point, they had to deny that position. M'Lean's complaint was that Fuller, instead of attacking his sentiments directly, proceeded first to misrepresent M'Lean's ideas, and then combatted his own misrepresentations.

Fuller first charged M'Lean with denying that there was any thing holy in the nature of faith, or that it was a virtue or moral excellence. (164,165) M'Lean took notice of this error by reviewing some of the early stages of the controversy, and showed that Fuller first asserted that,

"If faith were a mere exercise of the understanding, it would contain no virtue; and if faith contained no virtue, unbelief could contain no sin." (165.)

(a) Scott, "The Warrant and Nature of Faith in Christ," p.8
In answer to which statement, Mr. 'Lean had maintained that a believing exercise of the understanding (which alone could be properly termed faith) when it had God or his word for its object, did contain virtue. Then too, even supposing Mr. Fuller's assertion were true, his conclusion would not follow, that unbelief could contain no sin, because there were many things which had no real positive virtue or holiness in them, and yet their opposites would be very sinful. It appeared to 'Lean that the quality of belief depended much on the nature of its productive cause, grounds, objects and effects. When these were not holy and spiritual, neither was belief; but when they were, belief was also holy and spiritual. So, in spite of all Mr. Fuller's misunderstanding of this, he and 'Lean were agreed on this point in every particular: Fuller was catching at a supposition made in argument and turning it into a sentiment espoused by 'Lean. Whatever holiness might be ascribed to faith, however, 'Lean still held that it was credence or belief, and nothing else. With respect to the efficacy ascribed to it in justification, that must be laid to the account of its object.

Fuller inconsistently both admitted, and then denied, that faith was credence and nothing else, in a train of reasoning on both sides of the question, but the scope of his Appendix went to deny that faith (be its cause, grounds, objects, or effects what they may) could be a holy principle, unless it arose from a previous moral state of the heart, and was produced
by an act of the will. His main arguments seemed to be grounded on the principle, "I can scarcely conceive of a truth more self-evident than this, That God's commands extend only to that which comes under the influence of the will." (163)

Lean held in opposition to this that every command of God extended not only to the will, but what fell under its influence, and also to the belief of the motives God had set before us to influence the will itself. Nor could he, in turn, conceive of a truth more self-evident than that every holy motion of the will and affections towards God, always presupposed the mind's perception and belief of some manifestation which God had made of himself. Every thing that was holy in the state of the heart, or exercise of the will and affections, was the effect of the truth believed; for faith purified the heart, and worked by love, but was itself the gift of God.

Fuller, in support of his above-mentioned principle, said,

"Knowledge can be no further a duty, nor ignorance a sin, than as each is influenced by the moral state of the heart; and the same is true of faith and unbelief." (163)

Lean replied warmly, that if this were so, then it could be no man's duty to believe the testimony of God concerning his Son, until he was previously possessed of that moral state. This made the obligation or duty of the belief of God, to be founded entirely on some previous good disposition wrought within us, not in any objective revelation or command of God in his word. Then too, no man who adopted this opinion would find himself
warranted to believe, till he knew that the state of his
heart was changed. This position took for granted the very
point at issue, though the regular exercise of men's facult­
ies; the Scripture instances of conversion; the nature of the
means to which that change was ascribed; all militated against
that assertion. Fuller thought,

"We might as well make a passive admission of light
into the eye, or of sound into the ear, duties, as
a passive admission of truth into the mind." (163)

M'Lean retorted that the truths of revelation were not like
material objects which obtruded upon our bodily senses. They
were brought to the view of our minds by a testimony, and our
belief of that testimony required the mind's attention to, and
consideration of, its import and evidence. Men were not passive
in believing, though a glance at Fuller's previous moral state
of the heart, which to him made faith a duty, showed that it
was a condition in which the mind was perfectly passive. Fuller
supposed the duty and activity of faith to arise from a pass­
ive and unconscious moral state of the heart, and faith was a
receiving of the truth into the heart, or a voluntary acquies­
cence in it. It was obvious to M'Lean that no truth could be
acquiesced in by the will, or received into the affections till
it was first perceived and believed. This self-evident truth
interfered with all Mr. Fuller's arguments on this head.

In the foregoing part of his book, Mr. Fuller asserted,

"If faith were wholly an intellectual and not a moral
exercise, nothing more than rationality, or a capacity
of understanding the nature of evidence, would be
necessary to it. In this case it would not be a duty,
nor would unbelief be a sin, but a mere mistake of the judgement. Nor could there be any need of divine influence; for the special influences of the Holy Spirit are not required for the production of that which has no holiness in it." (128)

Li'Lean saw this as a denial that men were under any obligation to believe God. In fact, it was a denial that it was men's duty to acquiesce in, or love the truth. That depended entirely on a previous perception and belief of it, and could have no existence without this. Fuller's supposition that in this case unbelief would not be a sin but a mere mistake of the judgement, could rest only on the ideas, either, -- that God had not given a clear revelation of the truth, or supported it with sufficient evidence; -- or that there was no moral turpitude in mental error. These suppositions were false. Though faith was not the exercise of the will, but of a spiritually enlightened judgement, whereby the will was moved, yet unbelief arose not merely from ignorance, but also from the aversion of the will, whereby the judgement was blinded, and most unreasonably prejudiced against the truth. In this respect, Fuller declared,

"aversion of heart is the only obstruction to faith; the removal of that aversion is the kind of influence necessary to produce it ... the mere force of evidence, however clear, will not change the disposition of the heart, ... in this case therefore, and this only it requires the exceeding greatness of divine power to enable a sinner to believe." (128)

Since Fuller restricted the influences of the Holy Spirit entirely to the will, and spoke so diminutively of the understanding; denied that its exercise in believing the gospel was a duty, or of a holy nature, Li'Lean thought that it was
plain Fuller did not consider the understanding as the subject of any part of regeneration, or capable of it. If he did, he must consider it as changed into something else than the understanding, and its exercise into something else than a perception and belief of the truth. In all of this, Fuller was arguing in direct contradiction to Holy Writ.

Fuller next turned to Scripture in an attempt to prove that faith was more than belief, as arising from, and partaking of a moral state of the heart. He opined,

"First, That faith is a grace of the Holy Spirit... and must be of a spiritual and holy nature resembling its divine origin." (p.171)

Mr. Lean deduced that by a grace, Fuller probably meant a fruit of the Spirit, and to this he was willing to agree; but he was by now convinced that they both differed as to what faith itself was. Mr. Lean viewed it as the belief of a spiritually enlightened understanding; whereas Fuller considered it as consisting chiefly of the consent or acquiescence of the will, and denied it to be holy in any other view. Continuing, Fuller maintained that,

"Secondly, Faith is that in the exercise of which we give glory to God, Rom. iv.20. -- If faith be what Mr. Mr. Lean acknowledges it to be, a duty, and an exercise of obedience, its possessing such a tendency is easily conceived, but if it be a passive reception of the truth, on which the moral state of the heart has no influence, how can such a property be ascribed to it?" (p.172)

Mr. Lean explained that the apostle in this passage intended it not only as a description, but commendation of Abraham's faith,
as an example to ours. He said nothing of the previous moral state of Abraham's heart, whatever that was, nor of the actings of his will and affections, which some made the capital figure in definitions of faith. Nothing was mentioned but simply Abraham's believing God according to that which was spoken, and the strength of his belief. Indeed, nothing could have been more foreign, or even opposite to the apostle's purpose, than dwelling upon Abraham's virtuous and holy dispositions, when setting him forth as an example of God's justifying the ungodly by faith without works.

Fuller's third point was that, "Faith is represented as depending upon choice, or the state of the heart towards God;" for which he cited John xi.40. ch.v.44. Mark ix.23. (172)

To M'Lean, the fact was, that believers might have occasional doubts which did not arise from aversion of heart to the truth, but from remaining ignorance, or absence of evidence from the mind. These doubts were not removed by an act of their will, but by a renewed perception of light and evidence in the judgement. With respect to John v.44. -- Christ did not there insinuate that believing depended upon choice, or that any would really seek the honour which came from God only, before they believed the way of acceptance with him. With respect to Mark ix.23. -- belief was a natural impossibility in all cases where there was no information or evidence given; for "how shall they believe in him of whom they have not heard?" This man's doubt was removed by Christ's reply, which assured him of
the sufficiency of Jesus' power, if he only gave credit to it.

Fuller said, "Fourthly, Faith is frequently represented as implying repentance for sin, which is acknowledged on all hands to be a holy exercise." (173)

M'Lean believed that faith implied many things which it did not include in its nature, for as faith and works were not the same, neither was faith and repentance, though he felt they were more immediately connected. Fuller plodded on,

"Fifthly, Faith is often expressed by terms which indicate the exercise of affection. It is called receiving Christ, John i.12, -- receiving the love of the truth, that we may be saved, 2 Thess.ii.10. -- In true believers Christ's words have place, which is more than a mere assent of the understanding, John viii.37 -- they, in an honest and good heart, having heard the word, keep it, Luke viii.15." (174)

He was quickly dismissed by M'Lean, who asserted that none of these passages proved that faith was the exercise of affection, or that belief and love were the same, though in this case they were inseparable. Undiscouraged, Fuller produced a new approach to his favourite idea, "

"Sixthly, Belief is expressly said to be with the heart, Rom.x.9,10. -- with all the heart, Acts viii.37. ... Doing any thing with the heart, or with all the heart, are modes of speaking never used in Scripture, I believe, for the mere purpose of expressing what is internal or mental, and which may pertain only to the understanding: they rather denote the quality of unfeignedness, a quality repeatedly ascribed to faith, and which marks an honesty of heart which is essential to it." (175)

M'Lean granted this, so far as to have no objection to the positive part of this explanation, but was at a loss to conceive what more there was in an unfeigned belief, than a real internal or mental belief with the understanding. He
suspected it would require something beyond metaphysics it self to explain this, though he owned that he was no adept at that science. Fuller then affirmed,

"Seventhly, The want of faith is ascribed to moral causes, or the want of a right disposition of heart." (176)

"Lea[, agreed with this also, but reasoned that it did not follow, that any thing more than that same light and evidence of the gospel, properly perceived and understood, through the enlightening influence of the Spirit, was necessary to produce faith, and so remove that aversion. Fuller then produced his final support from Scripture,

"Lastly, Unbelief is not a mere error of the understanding, but a positive and practical rejection of the gospel." (176)

To this M'Lean rejoined that though unbelief was not a "mere" error of the understanding, yet there was some very essential error of the understanding included in it, as the Scriptures abundantly testified. To affirm, as Mr. Fuller had done, "that unbelief is owing only to the aversion of men's hearts, and nothing else," (p.177) was to contradict a great number of the most plain passages in the word of God. Indeed, if Mr. Fuller's sentiments and reasoning on this subject were just, there must be many improprieties in Scripture language, which could not fail to mislead us.

"Lea[, then took up the distinction between faith and its effects, for he felt very strongly that the effects of faith, or of the truth believed, ought not to be confounded with faith
itself, as was commonly done. Though faith was the confidence of things hoped for, and also worked by love; yet it was neither hope nor love, for the apostle distinguished it from both. To this Fuller retorted that he had never "thought of affirming that they are three considered only in respect of their objects." (199). M'Lean quickly pointed out, that since the apostle did not affirm they were three-in different senses, and as Fuller knew that his argument required him to deny that they were distinct in themselves, (for to admit this would be to give up his argument), Fuller had no alternative but to place the distinction of faith, hope, and love in their objects -- and make the object of faith, revealed truth; of hope, future good; and of love, the holy amiableness of God, and of whatever bore his image. In this view, M'Lean pressed the fact that the apostle was not speaking of the objects of faith, hope and love, but of themselves. If they were not three as distinguished from each other, their objects could never make them three. Love was not greater than faith and hope in respect of its object, but in its own nature; which showed that faith, hope and love were different from each other, and properly termed three.

The whole drift of Fuller's reasoning on the nature of faith, charged M'Lean, was to confound it with love, hope, and other fruits of the Spirit. Though faith, hope and love were all holy fruits of the Spirit, and inseparably connected in the hearts of true Christians; yet love was the greatest of
them, both in respect of its nature and duration. M'Lean stoutly maintained that any attempt to confound faith and love, particularly on the point of a sinner's acceptance with God, was to pervert the Scripture doctrine of justification by faith alone.

**QUESTION III. WHETHER JUSTIFYING FAITH RESPECTS GOD AS THE JUSTIFIER OF THE Ungodly.**

Instead of following all the intricacies of an unfruitful argument, in which charges of misrepresentation and absurdity were frequent, the purpose of this thesis, to set forth the thought of Mr. M'Lean, can best be served on this point by taking up the exposition given by Mr. M'Lean of his position, (in the Commission) -- a position which Fuller evaded, rather than met.

In answer to a question as to what harm could arise from including in the nature of faith such holy dispositions, affections and exercises of heart as were confessedly inseparable from it, Mr. M'Lean requested that it should be considered: That unless we carefully distinguished faith from its effects, particularly on the point of a sinner's acceptance with God, the important doctrine of free justification by faith alone would be materially affected. The Scriptures pointedly declared that God justified sinners freely by his grace, through the redemption that was in Jesus Christ, and that this justification was received through faith in Christ's blood. Faith in this case was always distinguished from, and opposed to the works
of the law; not merely of the ceremonial law which was peculiar to the Jews; but of that law by which was the knowledge of sin, which said, "Thou shalt not covet," and which required not only outward good actions, but love and every good disposition of heart both towards God and our neighbour; so that the works of this law respected the heart as well as life. The distinction therefore between faith and works, on this subject, was not that which was between inward and outward conformity to the law; for if faith was not in this case distinguished from, and opposed to our conformity to the law both outwardly and inwardly, it could not be said that we were "justified by faith without the deeds of the law," or that God "Justifieth the ungodly." Faith indeed, as a principle of action, "worketh by love;" but it was not as thus working that it was imputed for righteousness; for it was expressly declared that righteousness was imputed "to him that worketh not, but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly." — "It is of faith that it might be by grace," and grace and works were represented as incompatible with each other; for "to him that worketh is the reward not reckoned of grace but of debt." Now, when men included in the very nature of justifying faith such good dispositions, holy affections and pious exercises of heart as the moral law required, and so made them necessary (no matter under what consideration) to a sinner's acceptance with God, it perverted the Apostle's doctrine upon this important subject, and made justification
to be at least as it were by the works of the law.

The effect of such doctrine upon the mind of an awakened sinner was obvious. He who conceived that, in order to his pardon and acceptance with God, he must first be possessed of such good dispositions and holy affections as were commonly included in the nature of faith, would find no immediate relief from the gospel, nor any thing in it which fully reached his case, while he viewed himself merely as a guilty sinner. Instead of believing on him who justified the ungodly, he believed, on the contrary, that he would not be justified till he sustained an opposite character. — Though Christ died for sinners — for the ungodly; yet he did not believe that Christ's death would be of any benefit to him as a mere sinner, but as possessed of holy dispositions; nor did he expect relief to his conscience purely and directly from the atonement, but through the medium of a better opinion of his own heart and character. This sentiment, if he was really concerned about the salvation of his soul, must cause him to attempt to reform his heart, and to do something, under the notion of acting faith, that he might be justified; and all his endeavours, prayers and religious exercises would be directed to that end.

Mr. M'Lean considered that the religion of thousands consisted in a train of successive attempts of this kind throughout the whole course of their lives, while they were agitated by alternate hopes and fears, according as they
felt they had been successful or not in such self-justifying labours. As, upon this plan, they could receive no relief from the atonement till they perceived some favourable symptoms about themselves, those whose consciences were the most tender, and who had the keenest sense of their guilt and depravity, would be the most uneasy and distressed. In their case, it had been thought necessary to extract comfort to them from their very convictions, doubts and perplexities, to keep them from absolute despair. But should others, less conscious of their guilt, work themselves up to some degree of hope and peace by exertions of this kind, such hope did not arise from the work finished by the Son of God, as alone sufficient to justify the ungodly, but from some supposed change wrought on their own hearts, which entitled them to trust in him. The effect of this principle was either tormenting fear, or self-righteous confidence, and therefore it was equally inimical to true peace and real gospel holiness.

Mr. M'Lean wound up his whole controversy with Fuller on faith, in these words,

"To conclude:— As the clear and decisive reasoning of the apostle Paul has not put an end to this controversy, which has been agitated ever since, I am of opinion that it is of such a nature, that it can only be satisfactorily decided in the conscience and experience of such individuals as are taught of God, and that it is part of that knowledge which no man can effectually teach his neighbour." (a)

Mr. M'Lean applied the term, "original sin" to that corruption of nature which was derived from fallen Adam, or to the innate moral depravity of the human heart.

He found in Scripture that "... as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned." (Rom.v.12) As this depravity came from fallen Adam as the natural root of mankind, it was inherent in man's nature, and derived from him in a person's very birth. Mankind, in Scripture, were represented as wicked from their childhood, or from their youth. The Scripture spoke of sin and depravity as what belonged to man in his natural state, as if it were a natural property of the species. They represented mankind in their natural state as universally sinful and depraved, without a single exception. The word of God portrayed the corruption of human nature as total, or extending to the whole man.

He further discovered, from facts, events, and experience that all mankind, in all ages and nations of the world, and under every circumstance and dispensation, had been sinners against God, and transgressors of his holy law. He reasoned that such an universal, constant and steady effect must have had an adequate and answerable cause. He felt that such a cause must have been inherent in human nature, in that there must have been a fixed, prevailing bias, propensity, or tendency in man's nature to sin. It seemed to M'Lean that this
evil tendency must have been very strong, as it had resisted
(unless subdued by divine grace,) the most powerful motives
and inducements to holiness, and had maintained a most
violent conflict, even in real believers.

He found among men an infinite variety of ideas opposed
to the doctrine of original sin. To every one of these he was
opposed, as he could not agree with a single one of them on
the ground of Scripture. Some held that this doctrine which
taught that men came into the world with a depraved nature,
made the author of their being also the author of their dep­
ravity. Others reasoned that the making of Adam to represent
his unborn race, the imputation of his sin to them, and the
punishment of his sin in them, was altogether unjust, and
highly injurious to the human race. It was argued, that man­
kind dervied no corruption of nature from Adam, for as God
was the immediate Father of their spirits, he must have creat­
ed them pure, and they must have continued so till they
arrived at a certain degree of maturity in knowledge, judge­
ment and experience, and consented to the irregular propen­sities and passions of animal nature. From this erroneous
principle it was further argued that those who died in infancy
had no need for the salvation of Christ, because they were
never spiritually lost; nor did they need to be regenerated,
because they were possessed of original purity and perfect
innocency by their creation. Another denial of original sin
came from those who held that there was no sin but what was
actual; and to suppose that men were born in sin, without their choice, or any previous act of their own, was to suppose what was inconsistent with the nature of sin, which was the voluntary transgression of a known rule of duty. A sixth group held the opinion that neither Adam nor the angels that fell were possessed of a sinful nature, yet they sinned, and all mankind might, without a sinful nature, sin as well as they. Still others declared that there was no tendency to sin inherent in man's nature; but it was the result of the constitution and frame of the world into which he was born, in which he was placed, where he was surrounded with so many and strong temptations, as had an infallible tendency to lead him into sin. Still the objections mounted, as some tried to explain that, without supposing any corruption in man's nature, the general prevalence of sin in the world might be accounted for from his senses, animal appetites and passions being first in exercise, and forming into habits before judgment and reason were capable of assuming the reins. Others said there was a self-determining power in the human will which was essential to its freedom, and that this was a cause which would sufficiently account for the general wickedness of mankind without supposing any depravity of nature. A final objection was raised by those who thought that bad example would sufficiently account for the corruption of mankind without supposing original sin.
Though Mr. M'Lean gave brief answers to each position in turn, his entire conclusion on the matter is summarized in his words,

"In short, there is no accounting for these things without admitting the scripture doctrine of original sin; and every attempt to account for the universal depravity of mankind upon any other principle is vain, and must land in absurdity." (a)

THE DISTINCTION BETWEEN COMMON AND SAVING GRACE.

M'Lean held that saving grace might be distinguished from common, by its being permanent and abiding, because of the continued influences of the Holy Spirit, by which the elect were kept through faith unto salvation. He found from Scripture, that the saving work of the Spirit was characterized as universal, in that it extended to the whole man; predominant, over the corrupt principle; habitual, therefore not contained in transient impressions and emotions; and permanent, as opposed to its continuing for a time.

He considered that common grace was different in kind from that which was saving, because it was not habitually prevalent in degree, or that such as had only common grace, had no true or sincere love to God in kind; because no love to God was of a true or sincere kind, but that which had a habitual ascendency in degree.

The criterion by which the Scriptures always distinguished common and saving grace was by their comparative fruits

and habitual effects. (a)

THE EVIDENCE OF CHRIST'S RESURRECTION.

The evidence of Christ's resurrection is established upon the facts that it was the subject of Old Testament prophecies; that Jesus himself foretold, not only to his disciples, but also to his enemies, that he was to rise again from the dead on the third day after his crucifixion, and rested the proof of his divine mission on that event. The conduct of Christ's enemies affords many strong corroborating proofs of its truth. As no one could not be deceived themselves, for they were numerous, well acquainted with Jesus, saw him and heard his instructions, felt, handled, ate and drank with him after his resurrection, nor could they deceive others, had no motive or incitement to give false testimony, since they had nothing to hope for if Christ was not risen, and everything to fear in giving the testimony they did, and since a wonderful and sudden change took place upon them in a short time after his crucifixion, -- the qualifications, character, and condition of the chosen witnesses, together with this change, are strong evidence of the truth of their testimony. Finally, the truth of Christ's resurrection is fully established by the supernatural witness of the Holy Spirit, which is the witness of God himself.

Mr. M'Lean explains that the different accounts of what

happened on the day of Christ's resurrection are agreed, when one remembers that no single Evangelist gives a full account of all that happened from Christ's resurrection to his ascension; that the Evangelists do not always observe an exact chronological order in their narrations, as they sometimes omit the circumstances of time and place; nor do they always use the same expressions in their different accounts of the same things, nor state them with the same minuteness. They all mention the principal events which took place on the day of the Resurrection. With regard to a seeming difference in some circumstances, bear in mind that there were a number of women engaged in the design of embalming the body; there were two appearances of angels made to the women; that Mary Magdalene, and Peter also, both went twice to the sepulchre.

The import of Christ's resurrection is that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; it is a proof of the perfection and efficacy of the atonement which he made by his death; it imports the resurrection of the saints at the last day, and is the proof and example of it; and it imports that the judgment of the world is committed to Jesus.

The moral influence of Christ's resurrection is very great, for this truth, once established, has the most powerful influence in producing faith in the whole of the Gospel revelation. It is the foundation of hope. Believers in it must feel the sanctifying influence of this truth on their hearts.
and affections. It has a very strong influence on obedience. The resurrection of Christ, and the hope grounded on it, is a source of consolation amidst all the afflictions of this life. (a)

DISINTERESTED LOVE TO GOD AND THE PRINCIPLE OF FEAR.

Mr. M'Lean took up this subject in a letter to a person who had asserted that a true Christian was one who,

"by faith rests on the righteousness of Jesus Christ, as his justifying righteousness, and in this rest does every piece of commanded duty, without being influenced either by the fear of hell, or the hope of heaven."

This last phrase, Mr. M'Lean was certain, did not come from the word of God, for that set before Christians, both the hope of heaven to encourage them in duty, and the terrors of hell to deter them from sin, or to alarm them when they fell into it. He noted that Christ saw the need of stimulating Christians to their duty, both by the rewards and punishments of a future state. Mr. M'Lean was willing to grant, that as hope prevailed, its opposite, fear, would subside, but yet held that there was a fear of hell which had no torment, and answered in the spiritual life to the principle of self-preservation in the natural. It made us cautious to avoid everything we considered to be hurtful. By it, God kept his people from totally falling away, by the application at the right time of the motive of fear as well as hope.

On the other hand, Mr. M'Lean reasoned that the principle of

pure disinterested love, uninfluenced by fear or hope, raised a Christian above the state of a dependent creature, who derived all his happiness from God. He thought that it was essential to man's dependent state to be under interested obligations to love Him, as the source of his being and happiness. In support of this, he pointed out that the noblest principle of obedience enjoined in Scripture was gratitude, which was not disinterested love, but arose from benefits received or expected. The Scripture was full of examples of this motive, which his correspondent might call "selfish" or "mercenary", but which the Spirit of God stated was an effect of faith.

With respect to fear, this correspondent had admitted of none but the fear of sin, and of temporal corrections, and even this, he had said, "if it influence to duty is mercenary and selfish. Mr. M'Lean admitted that, but declared that there was a more awful consequence of sin than that set before men in the Scripture, as an object of fear -- the fear of hell or misery in a future state, -- the fear which the other had held unsuitable to a Christian. But, Mr. M'Lean pointed out, there were many texts in Scripture which held forth the motive of fear to Christians. There were those which showed the fear of God overbalancing the fear of man. There were many others which showed the fear of God's severity on unbelievers who did not continue in His goodness. In fact, the texts were innumerable which might be quoted to show that
the fear of hell was one motive of the Christian obedience.
If it should be asked how such passages could be reconciled
with the doctrine of election, the unchangeableness of God's
love, his faithfulness to his promise, the assurance of our
interest in Christ, etc. Mr. M'Lean explained this also.

His position was that the general doctrine of election
was clearly revealed in Scripture; but no man could know his
own particular election, except in believing and obeying the
Gospel; for that was the evidence of it. If a man was lax in
his diligence to make his calling and election sure, there
was still room for cautious fear, as a spur to that diligence,
by which he obtained and preserved the knowledge of his
election.

He thought that God's love to his elect was unchangeably
the same in itself; but not so in its manifestation and manner
of being exercised towards the changeable objects of it. God's
love was exercised in making the motives of hope and fear,
the two great stimulants to duty in this imperfect state,
each produce their proper effect, as circumstances required;
while the end He invariably pursued in both was the salvation
of their souls.

M'Lean was certain that God was also faithful to his
promise of salvation to a believer; but felt that no person
could know his own salvation by that promise, any farther than
he was at that time holding fast the faith, and influenced by
it. The promise was not that he should be saved at any rate,
whether he believed and continued in the faith or not, for the alternative was that an unbeliever should be damned. If a man denied God, He would deny that man, in faithful accomplishment of His promise. The promise of salvation was to them who endured to the end. God's promise, therefore, still left open a door for cautious fear upon all proper occasions, without any impeachment of His faithfulness.

The final perseverance of the saints was also consistent with this fear, for fear was one of the methods by which God hedged their way, and also reclaimed them when they had gone astray.

To M'Lean, this cautious fear likewise was consistent with their assurance in Christ, for the Scripture gave no man such an absolute assurance of salvation, as to make him think he was quite secure from future misery, apart from his keeping the faith, and abiding in Christ. Nor had he ground to think that God would keep him by His power in any other way. An assurance which utterly excluded a cautious fear of sin, declared M'Lean, and especially of its awful consequences, would be very unsuitable to the believer's present state of imperfection and trial, for the Christian life was compared to a warfare, and to a race. As an example of the consistency of assurance and fear, M'Lean cited the case of Paul and the others with him, facing ship-wreck. (Acts 27) God gave them the assurance of safety in His own way, He gave them as certain grounds to fear death otherwise; thus they were saved by fear, which caused them to remain in the ship. (a)

APPENDIX.
APPENDIX, NOTE A.

LETTER from DR. GILL to EDINBURGH.

"My dear Friend,

I have received your letter with Mr. Carmichael's and Mr. Walker's, and have read them with great pleasure and satisfaction: and rejoice to hear that God is enlightening the minds of any of his dear children at Edinburgh into the rich and distinguishing doctrines of grace, and inclining their hearts to separate from all antichristian forms of worship, and to bear a public and open testimony to the truths and ordinances of Christ; in which I hope they will persevere. It gives me a pleasing view that there is any prospect of a church being settled in Edinburgh, according to the primitive order of churches, holding the truth as it is in Jesus, and walking in all the commandments and ordinances of the Lord. I perceive by Mr. Carmichael's long account of himself with which he has favoured me, and for which I am obliged to him, that he has gone through many changes in life: in which he appears to have acted with great ingenuity and uprightness; and I trust he will be the more qualified for the important work he is called unto, and be of greater usefulness, under a divine blessing, in the latter part of his life, yet to come. The Lord direct and guide him by his Spirit, and keep him faithful unto death! By Mr. Walker's obliging letter, it appears that God has blessed him with a rich experience of his grace, and favoured him with a large measure of spiritual and evangelical light and knowledge. I desire you will present my Christian respects to him, and to his spouse, who, I understand, also is highly favoured of God; and I return them thanks for the kind invitation given me to reside at their house during my stay in Edinburgh, should I come thither; but with respect to their request, with yours and Mr. Carmichael's, anent coming down, it is with much concern and great reluctance that I cannot comply with it. The work called to is very inviting and engaging; but my age and the infirmities of it, together with the charge and care of my people, and constant attendance on the press - my exposition of the Bible not being yet quite finished - will by no means admit of me taking such a journey; nor do I know of any minister here that I can recommend, and who would be willing to undertake such a service. I think it would be most advisable for Mr. Carmichael to come to London and be baptized; and then, upon his return, he might baptize the party who are desirous of
submitting to that ordinance. Also, he would have the
opportunity of conversing with ministers of our denomina-
tion relative to what is requisite in the settlement of a
gospel church. I shall be ready to do anything that
lies in my power, both by way of advice, and towards the
making the expense of a journey or voyage easy to him.

I am your affectionate friend and
brother in Christ,

JOHN GILL.

LONDON, July 15, 1765.

(Found in: "The Origin and Progress of the Scotch Baptist
Churches, 1765-1834," by Patrick Wilson,
Edinburgh, 1844. Appendix, Note B,
pp. 91, 92.)

APPENDIX, NOTE B.

SECOND LETTER from DR. GILL to EDINBURGH.

"July 16, 1765.

...There is one Mr. David Fernie, a Scotchman by
birth, in the northern part of England. He is a man of
great evangelical light, and good knowledge of the con-
stitution and order of churches. He frequently preaches
at Newcastle and Sunderland; but his ministry lies
chiefly in the bishoprick of Durham. I direct my
letters always to him - for I have had a correspondence
with him for many years - in this manner: To Mr. David
Fernie, at the Chair-head, Newgate, Bishop-Auckland, in
the County of Durham. If Mr. Carmichael could take a
journey into these parts, which is the nearest I think I
can direct to, he might be baptized by him, and then, as
I before observed, upon his return, he might baptize the
rest of the friends.

(Signed) JOHN GILL."

(Found in: "History of the Northern Baptist Churches,
1648-1845," by David Douglas, (Hamsterley),
London, 1846, p. 190.)
LETTER from MR. ROBERT CARMICHAEL to MR. ARCHIBALD M'LEAN.

"Dear Brother,

We wrote to London in June, desiring the favour that Dr. Gill would come down to Edinburgh, as we were made to hope he would if invited. It was long before we received an answer, which still made us hope for a favourable return. However Dr. Gill and Mr. Robinson wrote us that they were extremely glad to hear of us, and that there was a prospect of a Baptist church in Edinburgh; but at the same time signified that he could not come such a long journey for several reasons, which I cannot mention at present, and desiring me to come up to London, promising us all the encouragement in their power. Yet we wrote again, insisting on their coming down if possible, because of our present situation and circumstances. We got no letter in return till Monday night last: by this we were told that Dr. Gill could not possibly come, and desiring me to come up as soon as possible. So we resolved that I should go with Capt. Thomson's ship. You would have heard from me sooner, but I waited always for an answer to our letters, and now I am in great haste because the ship sails this afternoon. I shall be well accommodated in my voyage, as I am to have the best room in the cabin, and every thing convenient. I hope you will remember me in your prayers. Since I wrote you there is one Mr. John Home added to our number. I recommend you to the God of all grace, and I hope if it please the Lord to return me in safety, we shall have a visit from you at Edinburgh. I shall write you when I return. Give my kind respects to Mrs. M'Lean and Miss Alison. Pray be so good as send with the first opportunity my Declaration, and also a copy of John M'Lean's answer to your long letter to him, and direct to Mr. Robert Walker, Surgeon, in Edinburgh.

Grace, mercy, and peace be with you.

I am,
Yours in our Dear Lord Jesus,

ROBERT CARMICHAEL.

EDINBURGH, 19th Sep. 1765."

(From: "Sermons on the Doctrines and Duties of the Christian Life," by the late Mr. Archibald M'Lean. Jones, London, 1817, pp. cix, cx (Memoir).)
LETTER from MR. ROBERT CARMICHAEL to DR. ROBERT WALKER.

"LONDON, 12th Oct. 1765.

Very Dear Brother,

I received yours of the 1st instant, which gave me great satisfaction. I am very glad that the Lord has so much favoured you with his presence that your meetings together have been so comfortable; I hope they will still be so more and more; he that hath begun his work will certainly carry it on among us; the work is his, and he will see to it in spite of all adversaries. Last Lord's day I preached in Dr. Gill's church in the forenoon, and, as far as I have heard, to the satisfaction of all the hearers; I am to preach tomorrow, being the Lord's day, in the same place, forenoon, and in the afternoon to a Baptist church in Devonshire Square, who have no minister, and on Monday evening in Mr. Clark's church.

Last Wednesday was appointed for the administration of the ordinance of baptism; though there was no public intimation thereof, yet there was a great company, computed above 600, among which were a great many ministers, both Independent and Baptist. We met in a large meeting-house at Barbican, in the city, where there is a baptistery. Dr. Gill preached from 1 John v.3 - 'For this is the love of God, that we keep his commandments;' after opening up the words, and showing baptism to be a special command of our Lord Jesus: he went through the whole controversy of baptism in a very plain and clear manner. It was, indeed, a short but most comprehensive discourse, and delivered with a good deal of vivacity and life. I hope to have it printed, and to carry some copies of it with me to Edinburgh. After sermon he administered the ordinance to me in the presence of all the multitude, and the whole was conducted with great decency and solemnity. This ordinance is, indeed, a most lively sign and representation of the death, burial, and resurrection of our Lord Jesus, and of our communion with him therein, which I hope I experienced.

Next day I was present at the baptism of three women belonging to Mr. Walline's church, where Mr. Walline preached, and afterwards baptized them; which was both edifying and informing as to the manner of performance. At his desire, I prayed after the ordinance was admini-
stered. I have had occasion of being in company with a
great number of Baptist ministers, who all showed me
great kindness and respect.

I proposed what you wrote to me, about a large
wooden vessel for baptizing in, to Dr. Gill and several
other ministers; but they all gave their opinion that
it would not do, unless it could be made so as to admit
both the person baptized and the administrator to go
into it, according to the Scriptural mode. However,
you may defer doing anything until I come home.

I am longing to see you all. Grace, mercy, and
peace be with you.

I am, very dear Sir,
Your brother and servant in Christ Jesus,

ROBERT CARWICHAEL."

(Found in: "The Origin and Progress of the Scotch Baptist
Churches, 1765-1834," by Patrick Wilson,
Edinburgh, 1844. Appendix, Note B,
pp. 93, 94.)
APPENDIX, NOTE E.

BAPTISM a DIVINE COMMANDMENT to be OBSERVED.

Being a SERMON Preached at Barbican, Octob. 9, 1765, at the Baptism of the Reverend Mr. Robert Carmichael, Minister of the Gospel in Edinburgh.

Published at Request. By JOHN GILL, D.D. LONDON, 1765.

I shall attempt:

I. To shew that baptism, water-baptism, is a command of God and Christ, or a divine command.

II. That being a divine command, it ought to be kept and observed.

III. The encouragement to keep it; it is the love of God, and it is a commandment not grievous.

I. The ordinance of water-baptism is a divine command.

A. John the Baptist was commissioned by God to baptize.

1. John declared so.

2. Jesus' questions to the Parisees concerning John's baptism proves this.

3. Jesus speaks of his baptism as part of righteousness to be fulfilled.

B. Jesus' disciples were ordered and commissioned by him to baptize.

C. In matters of worship there ought to be a command for what is done, nor should any thing be introduced into it but what God has commanded.

1. Therefore, Infant baptism must be wrong since there is no command of God and Christ for it; no precept.

(a) Note the absurdity of looking for a New Testament ordinance in the Old Testament.

(b) It is absurd to affirm that baptism comes in room of circumcision.
(c) Any precept for infant-baptism must be in the New Testament, but,

(1) It is not in Matt. xix.14 - "Suffer the little children."

(2) It is not in Christ's commission to his disciples.

2. There is no precedent for infant-baptism in the Word of God.

(a) There were no infants in Lydia's household.

(b) There were no infants in the Jailor's household.

(c) There were no infants in Stephana's household.

II. To shew that the ordinance of water-baptism, being a divine command, it ought to be kept, and observed, as we are directed to in the word of God.

A. By whom it is to be kept and observed.

1. By sensible, repenting sinners.

2. By believers in Christ.

   (a) Faith is a prerequisite to baptism.

3. By such who are the disciples of Christ.

4. By such as have received the spirit of God.

B. The manner in which the ordinance of baptism is to be kept and observed.

1. It should be kept in faith.

2. In love, and from a principle of love to Christ.

3. It should be kept as it was at first delivered and observed.

   (a) Manner - immersion - covering the whole body in water, for "baptizo" means dip or plunge. This appears:

   (1) By the places where it was administered.
(2) By the instances of persons baptized, and the circumstances attending their baptism.

(3) By the end of baptism, which is to represent the burial and resurrection of Christ.

(4) By the figurative baptisms, or the allusions made to baptism in scripture.

III. The encouragement, motives, and reasons given to keep this ordinance as well as others.

A. A man shows love to God when he keeps his commandments.

B. The commandments of God and Christ are not grievous, hard and difficult to be performed.

CONCLUSION.

1. Let none despise this command of God, the ordinance of baptism.

2. Let such who see it their duty to be baptized, not tarry, but immediately submit to it.

3. Let those that yield obedience to it, do it in the name and strength of Christ; in the faith of him, from love to him, and with a view to his glory.
APPENDIX, NOTE F.

LETTER from MR. ROBERT CARMICHAEL to MR. ARCHIBALD L'LEAN.

"My Dear Brother,

I saw your letter to our brother, Mr. Walker, yesterday. I see you are a little straitened with one of Dr. Gill's corrections upon your performance; where he denies that Baptism is to the true Israel who are born of the Spirit, what Circumcision was to the typical Israel who were born of the flesh; and that Circumcision and Baptism cannot be considered as type and antitype; and therefore he says that your parallel must be left out, or altered. Now in my opinion, if this were left out, one of the strongest and most convincing arguments against Infant Baptism would be laid aside. I know, indeed, that Dr. Gill and all the Baptists constantly deny that Circumcision is any sense a type of Baptism, or that Baptism in the New Testament comes in the room of Circumcision in the Old. I am ready to think that which hath led them to deny this so strenuously is the seeming advantage which the Paedobaptists have from this argument - That if Baptism comes in the room of Circumcision, then infants may now be baptised even as infants then were circumcised; and their common answer to this is, There was an express command for circumcising infants of old, but none for baptising infants now; which, indeed, is a sufficient answer, but yet not convincing; for let us deny that Baptism comes in the room of Circumcision never so much, they as constantly affirm it does, and so are never driven out of this their stronghold. I think, therefore, it is better to grant them their argument, (though it be not easily proved) That Baptism in some sense or other comes in place of Circumcision; and then we have a very strong and clear argument on our side, which at one blow cuts the sinews of all arguments for Infant Baptism - viz. That Baptism being a privilege of the New Covenant, it cannot belong to any but them who are the children of it, nor can it be administered to any but them who appear to be so, which are believers professing the faith, who were typified by Israel after the flesh - on the other hand, I am not willing to have any controversy with our brethren who are agreed with us in the same cause against Infant Baptism, about this. Wherefore my mind is, that your parallel should stand, and you may introduce it in some such manner as this, in Answer to Mr. Glas, when he says, that "The Apostle gives us Baptism instead of Circumcision, and that Baptism must be to the true Israel who are born of the Spirit, as Circumcision was to the typical Israel who were born of the flesh;" - This cannot be easily proved, and
though it could, yet the argument comes up with full force against the Baptism of Infants: which clearly appears from the following parallel.

Any thing further that I might write you about its being published, I leave to Mr. Walker.

With my kind respects to Mrs. M'Lean,

I remain,

Very Dear Brother,

Your affectionate Brother and Servant in our Dear Lord Jesus,

ROBERT CARMICHAEL.

EDINBURGH, 12th June, 1766."

(From: Jones, Memoir, cx - cxii.)
APPENDIX, NOTE G.

LETTER.

"The Church of Jesus Christ, which is in Edinburgh, professing and holding the doctrine of Free, Sovereign Grace, in the Salvation of Sinners, &c. To the Churches of Jesus Christ of the same faith and order at Harton, Hexham, and Newcastle, under the pastoral care of our dearly beloved brother Mr. David Fernie, Grace to you, and peace from God our Father, and from the Lord Jesus Christ.

Very Dear Brethren,

We cannot but return you our most sincere and hearty thanks, for your great love, sympathy, and care, you have shewed to us: first, in seeking after acquaintance with us, and in expressing your hearty affection towards us, in your letters to Mr. Harlaw, and afterwards to ourselves, in your epistles to us; and now, at this time, have shewed the greatest evidence of your real regard to us for the truth's sake, which you judged to be in us, in sending messengers to us, to comfort us in our infant state; and still more in that one of them is your pastor, whom we highly regard, and to whom we are highly obliged. And we cannot but express our joy, to find both in conversation with your messengers, and hearing your minister preach, that there is such a unity of spirit and sentiment in the doctrines and ordinances of the gospel; and we think ourselves very happy in having acquaintance and Christian correspondence with you, as a sister church, or churches. O how wonderfully hath the Lord manifested his goodness to us, in delivering us from Anti-christian darkness; and gathered us into a church state, publicly to confess him before men, and to follow him without the camp, bearing his reproach; and without being ashamed to bear testimony to the doctrines of the gospel, and ordinances thereof, that have been corrupted and trodden underfoot of men; and all in a way that we looked not for! We may truly say, that we have experienced the fulfilment of promise, 'I will bring the blind by a way that they know not,' &c. We are but a very small handful, poor and despised in the world, very unfit and unlikely for such a work, as to raise his truths and ordinances from so much rubbish as they have been buried under; but the Lord himself hath begun it and he needeth not great instruments for his work. 'Not by might, nor by power; but by my Spirit, saith the Lord.' To Him be all the glory.
We shall be always glad to hear from you, and to maintain Christian and kindly correspondence with you, and when it shall be in our power, we shall cheerfully return your visit; meantime, we acknowledge your great kindness in giving us this visit, which hath been very refreshing, strengthening, and comforting unto us. And we pray the Lord may make you a fruitful vine, by the sides of his house; and thy children like olive plants, round about his table; and that he may do better to you than at your beginnings.

Wishing you a joyful meeting with Mr. Fernie and Mr. Angus, your messengers, and kindly saluting you all, we are severally your very affectionate brethren in our dear Lord Jesus.

Signed in the name and in the presence of the Church, at Edinburgh, 28th July, 1766, by

ROBERT CARMICHAEL, ROBERT WALKER,
JOSEPH STRACHAN, JOSEPH WAINWRIGHT,
and J. HARLAW.

LETTER from DAVID FERNIE to EDINBURGH. (Probably to Dr. Walker.)

"NEWCASTLE, 5th August, 1766.

Very Dear Brother,

Through the good hand of our God upon us, we got safely home, and had a comfortable meeting with our brethren, at Hexham, on the First Day of the Week, when, after the Lord's Supper, your church letter was read, which, with our account of your primitive simplicity, gospel order, and steadfastness in the faith, brotherly kindness to us, and our great satisfaction and comfort among you, caused great pleasure and joy to them; and also, to the brethren here, whither I came yesterday, and delivered your salutations to them, at a meeting we had in the evening. All of them rejoiced at the consolation, and salute you heartily in the Lord, and wish your 'city may flourish like the grass of the earth'.

Then we reflect on that love to Jesus, and to his truth and kingdom, that purity and zeal, that humility, openness of heart, and brotherly love to us, that appeared in you and your worthy spouse, and also in our dear Mr. Carmichael and all the church, we cannot but love you, and thank and praise the Lord on your behalf. It is the Lord's doings, and wondrous and very pleasant in our eyes.

Mr. Alder's love, and mine, to Mr. Maclean. - Mr. Powler, that minister I spoke of, has been here. He rejoices at the good tidings from Edinburgh, and gives kind respects to you all, and joins in good wishes for you. Accept this short epistle, as I have little time. If there is any material thing among you, inform us of it soon. Direct either to Mr. West, as before, or to Mr. Caleb Alder, on the Side, Newcastle. God is able to make all grace to abound to you. His blessing be on you, your dear spouse, and your dear little children; and his beauty in the work of your hands. He is not unrighteous to forget your work and labour of love. The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you all.

I am, dear Sir, your sincere and affectionate brother in the dear Lord Jesus,

DAVID FERNIE."

LETTER from ARCHIBALD M'LEAN to MRS. M'LEAN.

"LONDON, 13th July, 1767.

My dear Wife,

After a tedious, dangerous, and expensive voyage, I have at length arrived at this place: the particulars are as follows.

On Thursday the 18th June I set off from Glasgow; and sailed from Leith on Monday June 29, at 4 o'clock in the afternoon, with a fair wind. On Tuesday, at 7 in the morning, we were off Berwick, with the wind fair - Wednesday off Shields below Newcastle at 9 in the morning, and at night came in sight of Flamborough head - wind still fair. On Thursday morning we were off Hull with a brisk fair gale and about noon, lost sight of land. In the afternoon the wind changed directly against us, so that we were obliged to tack without making much way. Friday morning at 9, we were off Yarmouth - dropt anchor in Leostoff roads, till the tide should favour us, the wind being directly a-head - weighed anchor at 10 at night and made some little progress by tacking with the assistance of the tide. On Saturday morning we were driven back to Leostoff roads and dropt anchor, the wind continuing strong and contrary. We weighed anchor again, by favour of the tide, but dropt it again opposite Aldbourne. On Sunday morning weighed anchor again and bore up against a very high wind, but again cast anchor two leagues above Orfordness. At 8 o'clock in the morning a violent hurricane came on, so that the ship would not obey the helm; and as the Captain imagined it would not continue long on account of its violence, he dropt anchor, being unwilling to lose any thing he had gained; but the wind and rain still increasing, the sea rose to a prodigious swell, and being far from land and fully exposed, we were apprehensive the cable would break and that we should be driven back upon the Ness in the night. The storm was so excessive, that the spray of the waves rose higher than the yard arm, and the rolling of the vessel was so great that every person and thing in it, were tossed about in the strangest manner imaginable. The fore part of the vessel which lay towards the weather was as often below as above the water, and the seas or waves which she shipped a-head frequently ran along the deck to the stern. I often looked out of the cabin hatchway, and in a moment was rendered as wet as if plunged in the sea. All the
rest of the passengers were sick, and some of them staring wildly expected every moment to go to the bottom. For my part, I was never touched with sickness, nor was I apprehensive of danger, till I observed the Captain much concerned and the tears starting from his eyes, and then I thought there must be real danger. As there were ships at anchor on every side of us, we were apprehensive that some of them might run foul of us, and therefore the carpenter was ordered to have his hatchet in readiness to cut the cable in case any of the vessels to the windward should fall back upon us.

At 10 at night a vessel broke her cable and appeared to be coming our way, and now we were on the point of cutting our cable; but providentially she came no nearer than a cable's length. At half past eleven at night, our cable broke, and the vessel instantly heeled about, on which the sea and storm beat upon one of the cabin windows. I immediately ran a sheet in it nailing it with my fist without any sense of pain at the time. The whole of the passengers now expected immediate death; some of them moaning, others praying. Some of them entreated me to perform worship; but I told them the thing was improper in the present state of confusion, and desired each of them to commend their souls to God, at the same time telling them that I was not yet without hope of deliverance, for that God who rules the raging of the sea and stilleth the waves thereof, could soon give the winds and sea an effectual rebuke, and say, 'Peace, be still'.

The other anchor was dropped with all expedition, and the storm still continued. The vessel danced so prodigiously high, and gave such twitches on the cable, that the Captain said, with a heavy sigh, 'She could not stand it long.' Besides, the vessel was exceedingly leaky, and required to be pumped every half hour. I have it, however, to remark to the goodness of God, that I preserved a calmness and serenity of mind even in the view of death; and the thoughts of leaving you and the children constituted my chief reluctance; for it certainly affected me much to think with what concern you would receive the intelligence of my death. However I commended you and them to the merciful protection, and bountiful providence of our gracious God and compassionate Father.

At break of day we were somewhat encouraged, as we could then see about us; but at 8 o'clock on Monday morning, the other cable broke; and now having lost all our cables we were reduced to the necessity of driving before the wind. The passengers entreated that the
vessel might be run on shore, which they thought gave them the only chance for life: but the Captain unwilling to lose the vessel, was for standing off to sea: but to do that, our stock of provisions was insufficient. As the vessel was now driving before the wind we were afraid of running foul of some vessels to leeward, before we could get the broken cables hauled in and sail struck; but God in his providence prevented it. Having struck sail we bore back to Yarmouth roads - and arrived off Leostoff, on Monday morning at six o'clock, where we hoisted a flag of distress. A boat immediately came off from the shore with eight men, who risked their lives for our relief. In about an hour we got an anchor on board, and myself and fellow passengers went ashore in the boat which brought the anchor. We remained at Leostoff that night, and on Tuesday set off for London by land, having 120 miles to travel - and we arrived here on Friday at 3 o'clock in the afternoon.

A. M."

LETTER from MR. ARCHIBALD M'LEAN to J.G. - MONTROSE.

"Dear Brother,

I received your acceptable letter of the 27th ult. and find you are very sparing in your remarks upon what I wrote you. You observe that it would need some caution to distinguish my view of faith from John Barclay's notion of it; but if you will read it carefully over again, you will find it distinguished from John Barclay's, John Glas's, and the popular doctrine of appropriation. From the appropriation, which consists in a believing what is not true till it is believed. From Mr. Glas's view, who denies any knowledge of our justification but by works or the labour of love. From John Barclay's scheme, who denies any additional evidence of interest arising to ourselves from the fruits of faith; which is a very great error, and of dangerous consequence in hardening people, and fostering presumption; for though upon our first believing the gospel we are conscious that we do so, and consequently must know that we are justified by the open declaration of scripture; yet we cannot at present tell whether we shall continue in the faith grounded and settled, and therefore need to attend to the scripture exhortations to that purpose, and not be high-minded but fear, from the examples of apostacy set before us; neither can we as yet tell what fruits our faith will bring forth, and so have need to give heed to the exhortation of showing our faith by our works, knowing that faith without works is dead. But in holding fast the faith, and bringing forth fruit with patience, we have an experimental proof of the genuineness of our faith, which we could not have on our first believing when it was not put to the trial; and this must afford an additional evidence to us of our justification. I had no design in leaving out baptism in quoting the text to which you refer; but as it is seldom mentioned in scripture upon this subject, I omitted it only for shortness. I would have you again to look over every line of my letter with great attention, and especially the texts referred to, and let you or Mr. X send me your thoughts on it with all brotherly freedom. I shall perhaps some time after this send you another letter upon a different point for your animadversion, if I can get time to transcribe it from my notes.

Your remarks upon Luke xvii.5 are very just, as is also your gloss on ver. 37 which Mr. Sandeman greatly mistakes the meaning of when he makes the carcase to be
Christ, and the eagles believers! On Latt. xvii.20, 21, your observation is also very pertinent. It would have been putting new wine into new bottles to make the disciples fast whilst the bridegroom was with them; but when the bridegroom was taken from them, they then fasted and prayed, and did greater works than even Jesus did on earth, because he went to the Father, and poured down the Spirit on them for that purpose, John xiv.12. But I am not so clear about your explication of Ezek. xxxiii.11 for though it be true that the Lord had no pleasure in the typical sacrifices, nor in visiting the iniquities of the fathers upon the children, on their own account, but as they prefigured the vicarious sufferings of the Son of God; yet this does not appear to me to be the meaning of that text. The wicked there spoken of, are those amongst his own covenanted people, who had broken his covenant, transgressed his law, and revolted from him. The death spoken of, is that temporal death which he threatened in that peculiar covenant against the breakers of it, and which he accordingly executed, either in judgments immediately from his own hand, or by the sword of his enemies; and the life they were to enjoy in turning to the Lord, and doing that which is lawful and right, was a happy and prosperous life in the earthly inheritance, for this is the life promised in the old typical covenant. Now the Lord had no pleasure in their death, or in punishing them for their sins; for he does not afflict willingly or grieve the children of men, Lam. iii.33. See how he laments over them, Psal. lxxxi.8-16, and our Lord foreseeing the dreadful calamity that was to fall upon the Jewish nation, his mother church and brethren according to the flesh, weeps over Jerusalem, with the tenderest emotions, Luke xix.41-45. But how can this make against predestination? Did not all the elect among them obtain, whilst the rest were blinded, being disobedient, whereunto also they were appointed? See Rom. ix.5-8. 1 Pet. ii.8. Though in distributive justice the Lord punishes the wicked, yet it can never be said that he has a pleasure and complacency in either the temporal or eternal destruction of his creatures; but the sovereignty and freedom of his grace on the vessels of mercy, is displayed by his just severity on others, who deserved no worse than they did. In their punishment we see what he might in justice have inflicted on all, had he been bound in justice to save all, mercy could never have appeared; for mercy must be optional, and can only be exercised where justice might have taken place in punishment. In the salvation of the elect he exercises the riches of his grace which he was in no way bound to do from any inherent goodness in them more than in the reprobate, but only the sovereign good pleasure of his will. In the damnation of the reprobate, he takes no pleasure, but manifests his just displeasure and wrath against sin.
I proceed now to answer some difficulties which you propose. As to Luke vi.1 'the second sabbath after the first'; the original is literally the second-first sabbath, for understanding which, you must notice, that the Jews ate the passover on the fourteenth day of the month, Exod. xii.18, from thence they held seven days of unleavened bread, until the twenty-first day, ver. 19, from the second day of unleavened bread, they were to reckon seven sabbaths complete, which, including the first day of the passover made the fiftieth day, or Pentecost, when they offered the first-fruits, Lev. xxiii.15. Now, because these seven sabbaths were reckoned from the morrow after the passover, or second day of unleavened bread, they called the first of them the second-first Sabbath, that is, the first Sabbath from the second day, (for so it should be translated) the next they called the second-second Sabbath, the third they called the second-third Sabbath, the next the second-fourth Sabbath, and so on to the seventh, which they termed the second-seventh Sabbath, which is Pentecost. The day then in which our Lord went through the field of corn was the eighth day of unleavened bread, or the first Sabbath, reckoning from the second day of it.

As to what you remark upon the expression, being justified by faith, I cannot see any reason you have to object to it. That expression is not unscriptural, for it runs through the whole New Testament, see Rom. i.17. Ch. iii.28. Ch. v.1. Gal. ii.16. Ch. iii.8,24. Eph. ii.8, &c. Those who believed Christ's power to heal them, he commends their faith or belief, Matt. xv.28, to some of them he says, Thy faith hath made thee whole, Matt. ix.22. Ch. x.52. Luke viii.48. Ch.xviii.19, and to others he says, Thy faith hath saved thee, Luke vii.50. Ch. xviii.19. If we understand these last expressions, we may easily understand the other. It was Christ's divine power that healed them; but then his power was exerted according to their faith in it. So he tells them, According to your faith be it unto you, Matt. ix.29. All things are possible to him that believeth, Mark ix. 23. In like manner we are justified freely by God's grace, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus, Rom. iii.24, justified by his blood, Ch. v.9, but then it is through faith in his blood, Ch. iii.26. This faith justifies us just as it saved the diseased. God justifies the ungodly, Ch. iv.5, not the unbeliever, but the ungodly believing in him that justifieth such as he is. God justifies the ungodly in revealing to him his righteousness in the remission of sins; this discovery is his faith and though it makes him happy, it does not lead him to view himself in any other light than as ungodly. A condemned criminal
does not view himself as a better man, or as doing anything to obtain an acquittal, when he credits his king proclaiming pardon to him, and yet he cannot be relieved in his mind unless he does believe the proclamation. You say, it is unscriptural to say we are justified by faith, as that we are justified by works; but this arises from your viewing faith as a work, whereas the scripture always opposes it to all kinds of work, see Rom. iii.28, Ch. lv.5, it is of faith that it may be by grace, ver. 16, faith and grace tally exactly with one another, and works and debt are opposed to both, Rom. xl.6. Is it any work to see the truth of God's testimony when he makes it known to us? You say, "We are justified before we believe, else we should be believing what is not true." This indeed would be the case, if the thing which all men are called to believe was, that they are justified; but the scripture proclaims no such thing. It proclaims that Jesus is the Christ; this is what we are called to believe, and when we believe this, it proclaims we are justified; for he that believeth shall be saved, and so when we are conscious that we believe that Jesus is the Christ, we know that we are justified, because God hath said it; but not before, for this is no where revealed; on the contrary it is said, he that believeth not shall be damned, and we are all considered as children of wrath, till we believe the gospel. Excuse, dear brother, my honest freedom. Write me soon, and believe me to be your affectionate brother in the truth.

A. M'LEAN.

EDINBURGH, February 7, 1776."
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AN APPRAISAL OF ARCHIBALD M'LEAN.

In his own day, a succinct appraisal of M'Lean would have been made in the statement that he was a Baptist. That title carried with it a connotation of independent, free thinking, of a rejection of church tradition, of an espousal of many aspects of church polity and policy which were distasteful to the great mass of churchgoing people. It called for moral bravery to distinguish oneself for criticism and even for ostracism on the basis of religious principle. Hence we must evaluate M'Lean as a man to whom the principle was the thing for which he would stand in the face of any or all opposition. Such men are not always what we in the present day would classify as "broadminded", for dogged perseverance is not a quality compatible with easy going tolerance of the views of others. Therefore, we could well expect that the Baptist principles espoused and held by M'Lean would be rigorously observed with a tenacious adherance somewhat different to that of our contemporaries, whose lot is cast in much easier circumstances.

Archibald M'Lean is at the same time an example and a warning. He is an example of the manner in which an intelligent man, by the consecrated use of the powers which God has given him, can become to his fellowmen a leader and guide through the various adjustments, trials and tribulations which attend the early days of any new movement. He demonstrates the power of sincerity of principle in action. The rise of a group of adherents to his views in his own time reveals the influence which a man who knows the things for which he stands, and is not afraid to live by his convictions, can have upon the thinking and behaviour of his associates. M'Lean was a real pioneer, — a Baptist in a land of persons
hostile to his view of the faith — who at first stood alone in the
city of Glasgow, and persevered in his course of witness, in spite of
loss of prestige, of scoffing, of ridicule, and in spite of the need for
pecuniary sacrifice. He was the first in Scotland who had printed a
pamphlet in opposition to the popular conceptions on the subject of
infant baptism. By that very paper alone, he cut himself a niche as a
leader, for, having taken up pen to express Baptist doctrines, he could
naturally expect that whatever controversy would be raised, and whatever
argument might be produced in opposition to these ideas, would henceforth
centre around his head as spokesman of this new sect. In this he was not
disappointed, and it is to his credit that though assailed on all sides,
he gave a good account of himself. He answered so well the papers of his
opponents that he was able to convince others of the validity of the
views he espoused. It is also worthy to note, in view of the fact that
the controversy on believer baptism has broken out once more in our day,
between Karl Barth and his critics, that the main gun spiked once and
for all by M'Lean — the argument for infant baptism from Scripture —
has not been used. Rev. J.M. Creed of Cambridge University, former Canon
of Ely, sums up the modern position in these words:

"...there is a widespread consciousness of the difficulties which
arise, when language of the New Testament which clearly has
adult Baptism in view is transferred to the entirely different
situation which the general practice of infant Baptism has
created. There does not however appear to have been any pro-
nounced tendency to break with the tradition of infant Baptism,
which indeed admits of an obvious justification when incorpor-
atation into the life of the Christian Society is the dominant
idea associated with the rite." (a)

(a) Encyclopaedia Britannica, 1948 ed. USA, Vol. 3, article "Baptism"
pages 85, 86.
M'Lean is an example of the fact that when once the hand has been put to the plough, it is too late to turn back. Once having exercised his pen as spokesman for the Scotch Baptists, it devolved upon him thenceforth to continue in that role. He became, not only outside the fold, but inside the new denomination, the arbiter and upholder of the faith in which they were united. When we recall the fact that he was the son of a poor farmer, self-educated, and with no formal theological training, we read with respect the volumes of Works which he produced upon all phases of Christian faith and practice. We thank God for this demonstration of the way in which a consecrated mind can be illumined by diligent study of His Word. The fact that even so far away from Scotland as the colony of Rhode Island, his Works were so well regarded as to earn for him the offer of a D.D. degree from the College of Rhode Island, shows the quality of the intellectual and spiritual fruits produced in his long hours of application to the study of the Bible. (Here again, his strict religious principles were demonstrated, for in his abhorrence of titles, and his denial of the "pride of life", he regarded as childish such needless foppery, and consequently ignored the offer.)

He is, moreover, a warning to us of the price which must be paid for literalism. He was rigidly consistent when he read his Bible and looked for rules of Christian conduct. His principle was that not a single commandment of Christ could be ignored, for if His authority was null on one single point, how could it be valid in any? Therefore, his type of New Testament religion came to be what approximated very closely to a Christian legalism. Criticisms which had once been levelled at the
Pharisees were directed at him. These he regarded as unjust. It must be acknowledged once and for all that a literal attempt to follow slavishly every commandment of the New Testament, will lead a religious group into an exalting of the letter of the teaching above the Spirit of the Teacher. M'Lean was wholeheartedly convinced that the Holy Spirit would lead men into all truth, but he also believed that all truth lay before him in the pages of the Scriptures. Revelation was final and complete therein. Nothing could be added or taken away. If he was right, a new legalism has been substituted for the old Judaism, the keyword of which will be, "How can a man attain eternal life, unless he keeps every commandment of Christ?" Naturally, what was not specifically authorized or exemplified in Scripture was not Christian to M'Lean. Tradition, contemporary usage, local custom, theology, philosophy, — all were swept aside, as he sought to "go apostolic" to the exclusion of all other considerations. Thus many persons who were keenly interested in Scriptural Christianity, and who could have been drawn into the fellowship by this interest, were alienated by the picayune and rigid regulations by which they were confronted and oppressed.

On the basis of M'Lean's exposition of Scripture, Scotch Baptists observed plurality of elders or pastors; insisted that these be chosen on the grounds of spiritual qualifications; denied the need for an educated ministry; would not permit the observation of communion in the absence of an elder; refrained from the eating of blood or things strangled; fasted on national days; held "love feasts"; used the kiss of charity; washed each other's feet; took the Lord's Supper each Sunday; were organized into autonomous congregations; baptized only believers, and that by immersion; and admitted only members of their own group to
the Lord's table. This mixture of ordinances, and observances which were purely temporary expedients of the first Christians, caused tensions in their own midst, as well as in their relations with other kindred organizations, which kept their numbers small.

From the beginning, M'Lean's type of church group, and his religious practice, was exposed to all the weaknesses of sectarianism. New sects are tempted to emphasize unduly certain aspects of truth, or minutiae of practice, and make them of supreme importance. Like the Glasites, from whom M'Lean had come, the Scotch Baptists felt that they had rediscovered truths of doctrine, and were observing essential practices which had been neglected up till then by generations of Christians. They knew that they were indeed a "peculiar people", in that they alone among the denominations were exemplifying and following in detail the model of apostolic Christianity. Such an attitude of being God's "chosen people" in the midst of an apostate society can be conducive of a spirit which is narrow, bigoted, censorious of others, intolerant, self-centred, "holier-than-thou", and which prides itself on its being "unspotted from the world." M'Lean would have felt that such criticisms of his group were dictated by anti-Christian impulses. Yet, in the tale unfolded in former pages of this thesis, we feel that at times M'Leanism was more or less guilty on all charges. Certainly, at times the Baptist cause in Scotland was endangered and hampered by outbreaks of the sectarian spirit.

The extreme severity of their discipline, founded upon some finely woven interpretations and inferences from a few texts of Scripture, was entirely out of keeping with the spirit of Christ, as understood by Baptists of today, and by contemporary Baptists in England. M'Lean, in
another carry-over from Glasite practice, conceived that only unanimity of decision could be Scriptural in church meetings. Here he sowed the seeds of discord which cost Scotch Baptist churches many members, who found that they could not agree with the majority vote. These had to be excommunicated for exercising what is now recognized as a Baptist privilege, (of "agreeing to disagree"). The resentments thus aroused were far removed from the aim of this discipline — to foster love and unity in the body of Christ.

Other detrimental aspects of M'Lean's doctrine and practice may be singled out. His definition of faith as belief, or a "crediting of the testimony of God in the Gospel," was a very narrow and imperfect view of an important and basic Christian truth. It led to an argument with Andrew Fuller which did not edify or build up either side of the Baptist cause. This argument, too, led to bitter words and recriminations between the adherents of both men, when, as a matter of fact, both M'Lean and Fuller had elements of the truth on their side. Their finely drawn and exclusive argumentation left out considerations which could have led both to see that they were each approaching the same area of truth from divergent angles. Criticism of M'Lean's obsession with the intellectual aspects of belief brings out the following points. Behind the Saxon structure of the word "belief" there is an old Teutonic root, akin to that in our word "love". This derivation indicates what is also true in fact, that belief is not purely an intellectual matter, but has roots in feeling as well. This very fact, that there is an emotional element in belief, gives it a power which some of the most certain intellectual convictions do not carry. Unbelief, too, gains its strength
because of its emotional tinge. Belief is related to will. Feeling and will work hand in hand, and what we feel strongly about soon creates beliefs that are in keeping with our feelings. Our desires may point us in the direction of reality. Psychologically, there is a "Will to believe" which justifies our adopting provisionally the alternative which seems to promise the truth. Another factor, which enters into and modifies all our beliefs, is our surroundings, especially our social surroundings.

There is the influence of suggestion on belief, as represented by atmosphere, "Zeitgeist" or time spirit, — which suggestions have had a tendency at times to "water down" Christianity. If it is a duty to believe, it is a duty to believe honestly; yet psychologically, the belief in possession has reason as its advocate, and experience often shows that reason pleads its cause instead of testing its claim to possession.

Faith, however, does work with reason, whereas superstition does not. Finally, those who reason about religion do not always practice its outward observances. Reason is undeniable in matters that are purely abstract, yet reason seldom converts where feeling and will are against it. We do not listen to reason invariably, for religion is a venture, which, like every other venture, demands a risk. Hence the heroic is often the unreasonable.

A negative element in M'Lean's teaching was his absorption with Calvinistic ideas on the great subject of man's salvation. His outstanding pamphlet on the "Calls and Invitations of the Gospel" was rendered weak and of little effect by his insistence that God had foreordained and elected a certain number of "saints" for redemption. Herein he completely denied man's freedom of will, or the universal nature of
the atonement of Christ, as having provided the offer of salvation to "whosoever will" receive it. His contention that the gift of God was conditional and limited was crippling to a marked degree to the assurance which his companions could feel that salvation was offered to them, and was really and truly theirs. Even the fact that he maintained that God justified the ungodly was little compensation for the uncertainty he always evinced as to which of the ungodly of his own generation really were in a state of justification. There were too many "ifs", "ands", "buts", and "whereases" in M'Lean's theories of atonement to appeal to warm-hearted, emotional people, who could be reached by the warmth of the love of God, but not by a contractual law of recompense and redemption. The initial momentum of his ideas in Wales was completely stopped because of the frigid nature of his exposition of the "Gospel." The Welsh described his theology as a "cold blast from the North."

One of the first of M'Lean's quests was to seek to find and apprehend the life and polity of the New Testament Church, in order to conform thereto. The story revealed in the earlier part of this thesis shows how he thought he had done so. But, since this is evaluation, we must note that his quest was beset with difficulties which he does not seem to acknowledge. He sought to find an actual, true picture of the apostolic church, upon which to pattern the new congregation, and produced and used from the Pauline writings a blue-print. But later scholars, Baptist among them, have had to admit that they could find in the New Testament only a sketchy outline upon which to pattern a church. There is richness of material, but it supports other polities equally well. M'Lean would not admit that every other denomination of Christian people could find the roots of its polity in this same New Testament.
Nor did he comprehend that no one of these has ever been able at the same time to vindicate its own position, and destroy the claims of others to Scriptural polity. The facts seem to be that church organization in the New Testament was living, and growing with emerging needs; it was adapted to the particular environment in which the churches were placed. Nor did the founders and leaders of New Testament churches seem to be conscious of any revealed pattern for their guidance. They freely pioneered in matters of constitution, administration, procedure and method. There is no uniformity to be found. As between the church at Jerusalem, and those churches founded by the labours of Paul, there is a difference of polity. There is a gulf between the Syrian churches, the offspring of Antioch, with their apostles, prophets and teachers, — and those presided over by the Elder, Bishop of Ephesus. Here are illustrations of both free democracy and also, side by side with it, the control of the monarchial bishopric. Tendencies which later made strides toward some sort of episcopacy appear in the New Testament writings. A casual reader may observe the conflict between spiritual guidance, as over against official control. Generally, New Testament polity remains in a fluid state, refusing to become definitely fixed and static. Hence there are varying polities in the New Testament, all in embryo. Congregational, Presbyterian, and Episcopal roots lie clearly exposed. Others may be, and have been, found by a bit of digging.

Yet the polity of 'Leanist churches was not a manufactured, handed down variety. It knew the pangs of birth, the vicissitudes of growing up, the strength of maturity, and even the rheumatic inflexibility that came with advancing years.
it was born and directed with what may be termed doctrinal principle, — the creative idea that the individual is competent in all matters of religion. In these affairs he had no need for priest to intercede on his behalf, for he was able to make his own approach to God. He did not need a Church to bring him salvation or mediate to him divine grace, for he possessed the capacity to attain these directly through Jesus Christ, who is the one and only High Priest, and thus is the one and only mediator of salvation. This doctrine of soul competency produced a doctrine of church in which there could be nurtured the growth and edification of the individual soul. In their exaltation of the status of the humble, average man, who was not to be judged by social rank or worldly possessions, but as seen by the eyes of God, as worthy of the gifts of God in salvation, the Scotch Baptists advocated the freedom of men in the sphere of religion.

Certain steps toward freedom of conscience were made by '"Lean and the first Scotch Baptists, in that they claimed their own right to worship God as they felt He had ordained. However, in their midst, the freedom of the individual to follow the dictates of his own conscience in matters wherein the majority of the group did not agree, was denied to such a degree by the imposition of the desire for unanimity, that some were alienated by this inconsistency. An imposition of authority is totally at variance with the principle of religious competency in the individual. Later generations of Baptists in Scotland have more correctly succeeded in attaining a working arrangement of free individuals cooperating in the organized group, by a greater use of Christian forbearance, — a virtue spoken of by '"Lean, but seemingly seldom used in matters of real importance.
The Scotch Baptists did, however, follow the doctrine of competency very closely in accepting the great weight of personal responsibility. They felt that it was up to the individual to "make his own peace with God", and maintained that each person must bear himself the condemnation which God had pronounced on those who rejected His salvation. Neither did they try in any manner to escape their responsibility to live as children of God. Narrow and bigoted they might seem to some in their community, but each one accepted his share of the commission to "let his light so shine before men" that these would see their good works, and glorify their Father in heaven.

The ideas of the Scotch Baptists on the emphasis of the individual in religion caused them to steer clear of the making of creeds to which all must conform; and made them wary and ready to protest against any inroads that the civil government might wish to make into religious territory. This last was by no means so clearly defined as today, when individual conscience may even be exalted above the law of the State. They were started upon this path, albeit in a peaceable and long-suffering frame of mind, in contrast to the violence of the Anabaptists of Münster.

L'Lean, though not the very first to do so in Scotland, pioneered in the free association of believers as a church. His group stood for the idea that each local church was a complete autonomy, which had need for no commission but the Commission of Jesus Christ as its Head or Lord. Thus the local church he envisaged was an organized band of disciples of Christ who, by the regeneration of the Holy Spirit, were at the same time members of the spiritual Kingdom of their Lord. Each, under Christ, was one of the company of the saints, and a priest in his own right. Though,
we must make note, there was not in M'Lean's system an exposition of the doctrine of the priesthood of all believers, in the sense that each was in his eyes capable of administering equally the rites and ordinances observed by the organized body. That idea was brought to full fruition in later years, and was especially advocated by the Plymouth Brethren. Each independent Baptist Church was to M'Lean an agent democratically co-operating with other Baptist churches in the work of the Kingdom of Christ, in order to advance His cause upon earth. Therefore, though each church might contain members of the Kingdom, as he believed each did, it was not synonymous with that Kingdom, as it was in the minds of members of other Independent groups. It was important that those of like mind and aims in various places should be united in the work of the Kingdom, so that they could make a single witness to the spirit that was in them. As there is no such thing as purely individual living in society, so there cannot be a purely independent church, living to itself alone. The association of Scotch Baptist churches was fostered by the "connexion" which existed between them, in which, though no single one of them acknowledged the authority of another church to dictate, they agreed upon matters of faith and practice concerning the Kingdom. In this respect, we remember times when M'Lean exercised all the weight of his pen and personality to preserve unity of mind within his own church, and with other churches; but we also note that when others could not agree, they were at liberty to sever the "connexion", which they did. Ideals and practical realities are seldom the same, hence we often witness in practice those realities which are the result of compromise with circumstances. We must admit that in the trying days of the new Scotch Baptist denomination, complete
autonomy of every unit was seemingly overwhelmed by the authority of Edinburgh; yet we must also acknowledge that in every way possible, consistent with their continued existence in the connexion, each church was called to "stand on its own feet". Primarily, M'Lean was not interested in building a Baptist Church (or denomination) as such. With him, such matters as organization, procedure, program, polity, and the institution in general were means to an end, not ends in themselves. His main object was to observe the great Commission of Christ.

Worship in M'Leanist churches was patterned after what he considered to be New Testament practices, as has already been outlined. However, since M'Lean was eminently a teacher, it can be seen, on reading his Memoir, that the emphasis in worship was didactic. Certainly he built up his people, and directed their attention to Gospel doctrines in which they could grow in abundant living, as well as to an infinite variety of phases of Christian truth and salvation themes. I say "salvation themes", for it is evident from his sermons, and from contemporary sources, that the modern emotional connotation attached to the word, "evangelism", was absent from the manner in which M'Lean approached the message of the Gospel on salvation. There was nothing of the "social gospel" either, in the preaching of M'Lean; but his great missionary zeal, both for the cause of foreign and home missions, gave his fellow-Baptists a vision of the outreach of the Kingdom to the ends of the earth.

The modern emphasis on "worship", in the corporate sense, was missing in his church also. In this lack, we may perhaps find a weakness in the service which he rendered as pastor to his flock. His influence among them was great. So great, that in our terms, there may have been a tendency for them to go to his services to hear M'Lean, rather than to hear
God; to wait upon M'Lean rather than upon God. Certainly, his preaching was not with honeyed words, to please men rather than God, but the way in which his ideas and principles were accepted and defended, and especially the manner in which his style and approach were imitated by his fellow-elders, gives one a suspicion that there was more than a grain of "M'Leanism" in these first Baptist churches of Scotland. That country was then a place famed for "sermon tasters". These must have been pleased with the substance, order and power of M'Lean's sermons. But in the exaltation of "talk" to the central place in worship, is not a certain section of Protestantism neglecting that "waiting upon God" which brings a sense of the Eternal? It can be summed up in the difference between the Temple and the Synagogue. The temple was the house of God -- a place of worship. The synagogue was the place of instruction. Present day Baptists emphasize a combining of these two forms in worship -- a uniting of the didactic and the worshipful. Baptists now are seeking to set the sermon in a worship atmosphere, as a jewel in the ring. It may well be that the devout prayers, the observance each Sunday of the Lord's Supper, and the devotional intensity of each spirit, enabled M'Lean's congregation so to unite worship and teaching. In the bare rooms, furnished only with pews and desk, where they met for worship, there was little to provide "atmosphere". Truly they had to worship the Lord in the "beauty of holiness", and in spite of their surroundings. It took a severe and mystic spirit, alien to many in the twentieth century, to find the glory of the Lord in such barren places of worship.

M'Lean recognized two ordinances which Christians ought to observe -- Baptism, and the Lord's Supper. By denominating these two practices "ordinances" he emphasized the conviction that they are empty of any and
all sacramental implications. He considered that they symbolized experience, but did not communicate sacramental grace. They had an edifying, but not saving value, and were mainly important in fostering the life of devotion in Christ. M'Lean had no place for any other source of salvation than Christ Himself. In his opposition to infant baptism, so clearly portrayed in other sections of this thesis, we notice that he could not subscribe to the opinion that without the sacramental implications of baptism an infant must be regarded as lost.

He enunciated a principle of powerful meaning, throughout the years of Baptist history, when he declared that these ordinances contained an outstanding richness of symbol. Symbols have power to teach and edify far beyond the capacity of words. Thus baptism is eloquent beyond speech concerning the experience of conversion or the hope of eternal life; and the Lord's Supper reveals to the "born again" Christian the rich symbolism and deep meaning of the nourishment of the new life by Christ, the living bread.

M'Lean was an early one of many Baptists of history who have held that the Lord's Supper is reserved for believers who have been baptized by immersion. From this position, he logically observed the practice of "close communion". He considered that the ordinances belonged, not to the individual Christian, but to the local church as an institution, and that the local church had control of the conditions of their celebration. Even believers could be excluded, if they were not immersed, or not members of the Baptist "church family". In the present day, though there are sections, notably in the Southern States of the USA, where close communion is still practiced, the Baptist stress on individual freedom is more and more being followed to its logical conclusion. It is now felt that the
ordinances exist for the individual, — that Christ died for each individual, and feeds each new-born soul in the new life, — so that churches are more reluctant to draw lines which exclude others from the table which is set in the name of the Lord, and not merely in the name of the local Church. Another present day ministry of the Lord's Supper -- to sick and aged or shut-ins — was completely denied by those who, like M'Lean, demanded it be observed only in a church.

His contemporaries gave him place as the pioneer who wrote and had printed the first pro-Baptist pamphlet in Scotland; as the first Baptist in Glasgow; as the first to baptize a person by immersion in that city; as the outstanding influence both in the first Baptist church formed at Edinburgh, and in the formation, setting in order, and guidance of the new Scotch Baptist churches formed during the eighteenth century; as the first to advocate and support in Scotland the Baptist Mission to India; and as the first to produce and circulate a letter to sister churches on the foundation of Home Mission work in Scotland.

His influence, and personal ministration to Scotch Baptist churches extended to England as well as Scotland. His writings went into Wales, and were known in the American colonies. It is a commentary on the progress (or change) of Christian thought, that today it is impossible to purchase a set of his Works in Britain. These Works had been eulorized by a contemporary who felt that they would be read as long as "Primitive Christianity" prevailed. It would seem by this test that "Primitive Christianity" no longer prevails in Britain. (Or it may be that those who have a set are unwilling to part with them.)

M'Lean cannot be rated as an outstanding leader such as the leaders
of the Reformation, but he can be grouped in the next "wave" (to use a 
military term) of those who went a step farther away from Romanism, and 
led their followers into the founding of Independent congregations. That 
such leadership had its place in the theological picture, and that the 
influence of such leaders still lives, is testified by the fact that in 
the American Baptist Convention in 1950 a new church is being founded at 
the rate of one each week. Individual patterns of worship in the Baptist 
Churches have changed the world over, but the basic principles of M'Lean 
-- separation of Church and State, baptism of believers only, congrega-
tional autonomy, voluntary financial church support, foreign and home 
missionary activity -- are still the basic principles of these churches. 
Since he was one of the first in Scotland to advocate such positions, and 
since it was to his group, so greatly influenced by him, that the begin-
ning of the Baptist cause in Scotland can clearly be traced, Archibald 
M'Lean is entitled, whatever may be his faults or failings in other 
respects, to take his place among world Baptist pioneers as Scotland's 
representative.