

JAMES HOG OF CARNOCK (1658-1734),  
LEADER IN  
THE EVANGELICAL PARTY IN EARLY EIGHTEENTH CENTURY SCOTLAND

by  
CHARLES L. MOFFATT, JR.

A THESIS  
SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF DIVINITY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH  
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF  
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Edinburgh, Scotland

1960



TO SARA, CHARLES, AND ANNE

## PREFACE

It was Principal Emeritus Hugh Watt who, in 1953, suggested to me that James Hog would be a very rewarding study, while at the same time warning that two others who had begun research on Hog had abandoned their studies. Now, seven years after this initial conversation with Principal Watt, I can understand not only why he was so certain that a thesis on Hog would be a profitable study, but also why the two students fell by the wayside. Without the encouragement, kindness, and assistance of a host of people, I, too, would never have completed the research which I began--a task which, nevertheless, has been made more pleasant by these who have so often placed me in their debt. When thinking of all those to whom acknowledgment should be made for their assistance, I feel as the writer to the Jewish Christians did in his cataloguing, for "time would fail me" to include all their names! However, there are some whose names must be mentioned.

Principal Emeritus Watt has been my principal adviser from the first day to the last of the research, and for his unfailing patience, incisive queries and wise suggestions, artful criticisms, and friendly counsel in connection with the actual work of the thesis; as also for his intriguing reflections on Scottish life, his lecture on "The Scottish Reformation in its Inter-Actions", for baptizing our "bairn" who was born here when we were living with the Watts, and for being a kindly grandfather to our children on this second visit to Scotland, our profound thanks is hereby recorded.

To the staffs of the University Library, the New College Library, and the National Library of Scotland, for their expert, efficient, obliging, and cheerful assistance, grateful appreciation is hereby expressed. In this connection, particular mention must be made of and gratitude expressed to Miss J. A. Barrie, Library Assistant at New College, and to Mr. J. S. Ritchie, curator of the Manuscript Department of the National Library of Scotland, for their special courtesies and helpful co-operation. I would also record my thanks to Dr. J. A. Lamb, Librarian of New College, for his advice relative to certain mechanical aspects of the thesis and for his suggestions about source material. My genuine appreciation is hereby expressed to Mr. Andrew Broom and other staff members of the Register House for valuable assistance in making available for my perusal the records of various Church courts, records which were in process of being examined and catalogued at the very time it was necessary for me to consult them.

While there are many others to whom I am indebted, these acknowledgments would be incomplete without an expression of my warmest thanks to my own family, whose sacrifices, encouragement, interest, and support have made this demanding and sometimes discouraging task a rich and pleasant experience, and a joy to be shared.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
PREFACE . . . . .	iii
CHAPTER	
INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
I. JAMES HOG (1658-1734): His Life . . . . .	5
A. Childhood and youth prior to 1679 . . . . .	6
B. Student at Utrecht University and private tutor . . . . .	11
C. Return to Scotland and Ministry at Dalserf . . . . .	18
D. Ministry at Carnock . . . . .	33
E. Leader in Dunfermline Presbytery and Synod of Fife . . . . .	41
F. Participation in various Church controversies . . . . .	43
G. Experiences and contribution subsequent to the Marrow controversy . . . . .	53
III. RESISTANCE TO ERASTIAN ENCROACHMENT ON THE CHURCH . . . . .	70
A. The 1690 and 1692 Assemblies of the reconstituted Church . . . . .	76
B. Opposition to the compliant policies of the Church . . . . .	84
C. Protests against and resistance to the imposition of oaths on ministers . . . . .	88
1. In the 1695 General Assembly . . . . .	96
2. Against the Abjuration oath . . . . .	102
3. Principles enunciated by Hog against imposition of oaths . . . . .	107
D. Contendings against the exercise of lay patronage . . . . .	110
III. OPPOSITION TO THE 'SEPARATISTS' . . . . .	126
A. Dissident groups at the Revolution and later . . . . .	127
B. Hog, Hepburn, and the Hebronites . . . . .	132
C. Breach with the 'Separatists' . . . . .	142
D. Hog's philosophy of Church Communion . . . . .	144
IV. PRELUDE TO THE MARROW CONTROVERSY: I. BOURIGNONISM . . . . .	153
A. The teachings of Antoinette Bourignon . . . . .	154
B. The reaction of the Church . . . . .	159
C. Hog's anti-Bourignian teachings . . . . .	163
V. PRELUDE TO THE MARROW CONTROVERSY:	
II. THE CASE OF JOHN SIMSON, 1714-1717 . . . . .	172
A. Factors contributing to the Simson case . . . . .	173
1. The scientific movement . . . . .	174
2. Deism . . . . .	178
3. Arminianism . . . . .	180
B. James Webster versus John Simson . . . . .	184

C.	Hog's opposition to Simson's propositions . . . . .	193
1.	Scripture and reason . . . . .	199
2.	Man's depraved condition . . . . .	202
3.	Of an obscure objective revelation to the heathen . . . . .	203
4.	The morally serious use of means . . . . .	206
5.	The covenant with Adam . . . . .	211
6.	Of infant salvation and the number of the elect . . . . .	217
7.	Man's chief end . . . . .	221
8.	Sinning in Hell . . . . .	223
D.	Later developments in the Simson case . . . . .	224
VI.	JAMES HOG AND THE CONTROVERSY CONCERNING "THE MARROW OF MODERN DIVINITY" . . . . .	227
A.	Causes of the Marrow controversy . . . . .	228
1.	The legalistic-free grace controversy in England in the seventeenth century . . . . .	229
2.	Legalistic infiltration of Scotland . . . . .	235
B.	Controversy concerning the "Auchterarder Creed" . . . . .	243
C.	Publication of the Scottish Edition of <u>The Marrow of Modern Divinity</u> . . . . .	248
D.	Why <u>Evangelicals</u> welcomed the <u>Marrow</u> . . . . .	253
1.	The hyper-Calvinistic and Evangelical schools . . . . .	254
2.	The <u>Marrow</u> an echo of Evangelical teachings . . . . .	258
E.	The gathering storm . . . . .	261
1.	The <u>Marrow</u> charged with antinomianism . . . . .	261
2.	The <u>Marrow</u> defended by Hog . . . . .	263
3.	Principal Hadow's Synod sermon: Beginning of the public controversy . . . . .	270
F.	Condemnation of the <u>Marrow</u> by the 1720 General Assembly . . . . .	273
G.	The Marrowmen and their Representation . . . . .	280
H.	Side-lights on the controversy . . . . .	288
I.	Confirmation of the condemnatory act by the 1722 Assembly . . . . .	294
J.	The controversy in subordinate courts of the Church . . . . .	298
1.	Examples of oppressive measures . . . . .	299
2.	The process against Hog in the Synod of Fife . . . . .	301
K.	The theological position of James Hog . . . . .	310
1.	The nature of the Gospel covenant . . . . .	311
2.	The offer of Christ in the Gospel . . . . .	317
3.	The nature of saving faith . . . . .	328
4.	Repentance . . . . .	338
5.	Concerning Justification . . . . .	341
6.	The Relation of the Believer to the Law . . . . .	342
L.	Postscript to the Marrow controversy . . . . .	355
	SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS . . . . .	361
	APPENDICES . . . . .	382
	BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	401

INTRODUCTION.

The title—"James Hog of Carnock (1658-1734), Leader in the Evangelical Party in Early Eighteenth Century Scotland"—has been the limiting factor in the development and scope of this thesis. It is not without significance that Hog is described as "Leader in the Evangelical Party": the claim is not that he was the leader of that school; but he is presented herein as one of the leaders in the Evangelical party. This means that the share of Thomas Boston, the Erskines, and others of that group in Evangelical leadership is by no means denied, but it is not the scope of this thesis to give an exhaustive study of these particular men, of their party, or even of the various controversies herein discussed. Their contributions are for the most part not included in the thesis, or are included only insofar as is necessary to establish Hog's function in the various scenes, to balance the discussion, or to throw light upon the overall picture. In other words, the various subjects presented in the thesis are developed as James Hog impinged upon them, or as they impinged upon James Hog.

The words "Evangelical Party" are intended to apply in a broad way, for it is an accepted fact that there was, during the period under consideration, no hard and fast Evangelical--as opposed to Moderate--party. It was more properly an Evangelical school and as such the words are understood and developed.

It is the early eighteenth century with which the thesis is concerned primarily, but as it is impossible to plunge into the current of events and thought in ecclesiastical and theological studies without a retrospective presentation of the contextual situation preceding the immediate problem, an introductory section, rooted in the seventeenth century background, is placed at the



beginning of each chapter. The decision to take this approach was taken after consultation with my principal adviser, Principal Emeritus Hugh Watt, whose wise counsel has led the writer clear of many Charybdean hazards. In thus presenting the introductory sections, each chapter serves as a setting for that which follows, climaxing in the crucial chapter on the controversy concerning The Marrow of Modern Divinity.

In chapter one, some matters which were not to be treated more fully in the subsequent parts of the thesis have been enlarged upon, whereas those which were to be dealt with more completely have been passed over lightly.

All the works of Hog have been consulted during the course of my research. In addition, all records of the Church courts, from Session records to General Assembly minutes, have been consulted for the period under consideration.

In form and style of the thesis two guides have been followed: Bruce M. Metzger's A Guide to the Preparation of a Thesis (Princeton:1950) and "A Form for Thesis Writing"(unpublished) by Harold B. Prince, Librarian at Columbia Theological Seminary, Decatur, Georgia. American spelling has been used. Marks of ellipsis to indicate omissions of words in citations are not used at the beginning of quotations unless clarity requires them, but in all other cases where there are omissions they have been used. Direct quotations are reproduced exactly as they appear in the originals except that italics (which would often mean underscoring several lines) are not reproduced.

The research has not brought to light any dramatic revelations concerning Hog personally, the controversies of the period, or even of Hog's thought. However, those things which have been known in

a general way and vaguely expressed in many works (though often in connection with other Evangelical leaders rather than with Hog) have been produced in relief in one place, so that a comprehensive study of James Hog—his character, his thought, his activities, and his contributions—is embodied in this thesis. Aside from the thrill of resurrecting this colorful character of bygone days, one of the greatest rewards—and surprises—of the research has been the unusual variety of subjects into which Hog adventured, and thus into which I have been led. For this reason, the study of the man James Hog in his role as an Evangelical leader has afforded an interesting and a kaleidoscopic view of post-Revolution life and thought in the Church of Scotland. It has been a rewarding and an enlightening study.

CHAPTER I

JAMES HOG (1658-1734): HIS LIFE.

James Hog was born in the manse at Larbert in Stirlingshire in the year 1658.<sup>1</sup> His mother was Marjory Murray, of the Philiphaugh family, and his father, Thomas Hog, was the parish minister at Larbert.<sup>2</sup> Hog's father, grandfather, great-grandfather, and great-great-grandfather before him all were ministers, so that he was himself the fifth generation of ministers in the Hog family in direct succession from the Reformation.<sup>3</sup> His brother, Thomas, was minister successively at Delft, Campvere, and Rotterdam in Holland.<sup>4</sup>

There could hardly have been a more unpropitious time for a child to have been born into a Presbyterian manse in Scotland. It was the year of Oliver Cromwell's death and it was not long before the Prebyterians in Scotland could well have yearned for the return of the "Protector" and his Puritan legions. James Hog grew up in a period when Presbyterianism was proscribed and Episcopacy was forced on an unwilling nation by an irresponsible monarch. In those days it was not unknown for soldiers to pull a minister from his pulpit and to expel him and his family from the manse, leaving them at the mercy of the winter cold. Some ministers were cast into prison or banished from the kingdom.

---

1. Hew Scott, Fasti Ecclesiae Scoticae, V (Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1925), 9.

2. Ibid., IV. 310.

3. D. C. A. Agnew, The Theology of Consolation, (Edinburgh: Ogle and Murray, 1881), p. 295.

4. Scott, op. cit., IV. 310.

Their people had to attend their ministry secretly, in homes, in barns, in fields, and Presbyterian ministers performed ministerial duties under pain of punishment as seditious persons. The "Bishop's Drag-net" required the people to attend their parish church: those who failed to do so were liable to be reported by the incumbent, betrayed by a collaborator, or discovered by the troops who converged on forbidden gatherings. Children were baptised secretly or not at all and young people were married by their minister under cover of darkness. All were liable to heavy fines or confiscation of property, neither rich nor poor escaping. Men and women partook of the Lord's Supper on country hillsides under protection of armed guards, posted to warn them of approaching danger. The boot was applied to ministers as well as others in attempts to drag from their lips information they either never knew or refused to divulge. The Bass Rock became a government prison where helpless wretches were imprisoned until death gave them release. Civil liberties were cast aside and there was no redress for grievances.

Nor did the Hog family escape their share of the troubles. Thomas Hog was admitted to the ministry in the year 1650 and joined the Protesters. It is supposed that he was deprived by the Act of Parliament, June 11, 1662 and the Decreet of Privy Council, October 1, 1662, if not previously<sup>1</sup>. Another decret was passed against him and others on July 16<sup>th</sup>, 1671, and letters<sup>2</sup> of intercommuning on August 6, 1675. By the Act of Parliament

---

1. Loc. cit.

2. Loc. cit.

referred to, every man in public office or place of trust was required to abjure the Covenant and declare its unlawfulness. Another act, the "Act of Glasgow", declared that all ministers who, since 1639 had accepted parishes without presentation from the patron, must now accept presentation and collation from the bishop, or quit their charges. Those who refused were "forbidden thereafter to reside within twenty miles of their old parishes, six miles of Edinburgh, or any cathedral town, or three miles of any royal burgh."<sup>1</sup> There is no detailed account of the sufferings of Thomas Hog's family, but in his Memoirs, written in the third person under the name Philomathes, James Hog alludes to the experiences of the period: "It was much with him at this time, as with Isreal in the wilderness; they wanted the more ordinary and visible means of subsistence, and were cast upon the Lord's immediate care, who preserved them, provided for them, and protected them by a tract of wonders."<sup>2</sup> Hog also relates that his father had a triumphant death, leaving his mother a desolate widow with her family to care for, and few showing any concern for them. Professed friends became very cold and others showed no sympathy for him in his perplexed and distressed condition.<sup>3</sup>

---

1. Robert Story, William Carstares: A Character and Career of the Revolutionary Epoch, (London:Macmillan and Company, 1874), p.17.

2. James Hog, Memoirs of the Public Life of Mr. James Hogg, ed. by Archibald Bruce, (1798), p.11. Hereinafter cited, Memoirs. Manuscript copies of the full "Memoirs" are in the National Library of Scotland, and in the New College Library, Edinburgh. The part published by Bruce is that relating to Hog's public appearances. The rest relates to his own religious experiences.

3. John Brown of Haddington, The Christian, The Student, The Pastor, (Edinburgh: Gavin Alston, 1781), p.80. This work abridges a portion of the manuscript "Memoirs" above referred to.

Referring to his experience in childhood and youth, Hog relates that "he enjoyed a powerful dispensation of gospel ordinances" during these years of persecution. As to the matter of these sermons, he says, "Besides a powerful opening and applying the incontestable truths of law and gospel, our covenants and the work of reformation were kept in a savoury remembrance, and many steps of defection from thence came under a particular and close notice."<sup>1</sup> He goes on to recall that

it was his happiness to enjoy access unto some persons eminently godly, to have acquaintance with them, and to be frequently in their company, and particularly when they conversed together about the great salvation, and poured out their hearts unto the Lord in prayer with one accord. His part he acknowledgeth to have been very mean, and almost a nothing in these sweet exercises, being then young, and destitute both of knowledge and experience. Notwithstanding, as he hereby had the occasion to hear excellent things, so they were of use to give some displays of the reality and beauties of religion in its life and power.<sup>2</sup>

Notwithstanding the difficult times in which they lived, Hog's parents, with the assistance of friends, gave their son a good education in preparation for the day when he would enter the service of the Church. About the year 1673 he was entered upon his studies at the University of Edinburgh. He records, in characteristic humility, that he had "small proficiency" and "did not finish his philosophic course";<sup>3</sup> but his name occurs in the list of graduates of the University, anno<sup>4</sup> 1677.

---

1. Hog, op. cit., p. 10.

2. Ibid., pp. 10-11.

3. Ibid., p. 17.

4. Catalogue of the Graduates of the University of Edinburgh, (Edinburgh: Neill and Company, 1858), p. 111.

It was in these years at the University that he discovered a fascination for Cartesian philosophy, and while he did not positively espouse the hypotheses of Descartes, he remembered later how

these new, strange and dangerous notions did put a lamentable stop to the progress of the convincing influences he had aforesaid felt upon his soul. . . . It was not a little prejudicial to him, to have his mind rendered vain and frothy, while amused, and, in a manner drunk with these notions, which (whatever they otherwise were) did prove in his case like too much sail to a small vessel that hath little ballast.<sup>1</sup>

These early experiences and wrestlings with Cartesianism were to figure prominently in Hog's later life when he became a militant opposer of Professor John Simson of Glasgow University, and a frequent writer on Deism.

Though Hog had his religious beliefs put to the test to the extent that he nearly fell as a prey to philosophy, as he said; he never ceased to attend the meetings of the devout who met in their homes for prayer, reading of the Scriptures, and exhortation. Thus, about 1677 or 1678 he "had his little Share in Societies of more aged, judicious, and established Christians. . . . There I have heard weighty and difficult Questions and cases proposed. . . ." <sup>2</sup> Concerning these "societies", it has been suggested that the subjects discussed

---

1. Hog, op. cit., p. 12.

2. James Hog, Editor, Some Choice Sentences and Practices of Emelia Geddie, (Edinburgh: T. Lumisden and J. Robertson, 1741), v-vi. Hereinafter cited Emelia Geddie.



were not always those of a practical nature, but often included discussion of doctrinal points, forms of church government, and modes of ecclesiastical discipline.<sup>1</sup> While studying at the University Hog would also appear to have frequented the tolbooth of Edinburgh, where he met Thomas Hog, of Kiltearn,<sup>2</sup> with whom he communed concerning his religious condition. . . . Later, in great spiritual distress, Hog made an attempt to converse with his older and kind adviser who had by that time been cast into the Bass Rock. In this attempt James Hog was unsuccessful; however, he was permitted to send a letter<sup>3</sup> to the prisoner and received from him a helpful response.

It would have been in the Spring or Summer of 1679 that a favorable juncture of circumstances made it possible for James Hog, and probably his elder brother, Thomas,<sup>4</sup> to go to Holland to pursue their studies.<sup>5</sup> Some twenty years later, he reflected as follows on this experience of leaving his native land:

---

1. William Mackelvie, Annals and Statistics of the United Presbyterian Church, (Edinburgh: Oliphant and Company, and Andrew Elliot, 1873), p.1.

2. Brown of Haddington, op.cit., p.84.

3. Ibid., pp.84-5.

4. Ibid., pp.86,93-94.

5. Hog wrote the "Memoirs" after his settlement at Carnock, the last entry being dated April 9,1703.

He reckons not himself among the exiles, though a sharer of that persecution, of which his parents, and by consequence the family had their deep share. His youth at that time exempted him from particular notice, though yet he escaped not altogether, but was marked so far, that it would not have been long safe for him to continue in his native land, and hence his foreign education was the more wisely and mercifully ordered, that he might be in a capacity to serve his country in due time, might it please the Lord so to honour and bless him. . . . 1

What was it which made Thomas and James Hog have to study in Holland? The answer is that Parliament had passed, in 1672, an act against "unlawful ordination", the purpose of which was to secure the complete extinction of the Presbyterian Church by preventing the ordination of young men to the ministry. This act caused great hardship and if it could have been completely enforced, might have attained its end. As so often happens in such cases, the act resulted in a very different experience than what had been anticipated by either the king or his Presbyterian enemies. Writes Hetherington,

As it was, it rendered it necessary for young men to be sent to Holland, where a Presbytery was constituted of banished Scottish ministers, by whom these young men were ordained. It had another effect, which of course the prelates did not contemplate. The Scottish ministers in Holland were some of the most eminent men, in learning and abilities, of their age. Not only had they studied the subjects deeply for the maintenance of which they had been banished, before they suffered that punishment; but their exile furnished them with leisure to prosecute these studies, with the advantage of being aloof from the scene of conflict, their personal interests not involved in it, and themselves thereby enabled to take calmly both more comprehensive and profounder views of the whole matters in dispute, than would have been possible had they been in Scotland.<sup>2</sup>

1. Hog, Memoirs, pp.17-18.

2. W.M. Hetherington, History of the Church of Scotland, (Edinburgh: John Johnstone, 1841), p.435.

Life for the exiles was not without its pleasantries, as is seen from the description of life at Utrecht given by Principal Robert Story:

There was a large British colony at Utrecht, with the usual appanages of an English coffee-house, serving the purpose of a club, and an English church, in which an exiled minister, English or Scottish, officiated. The town, with its varied society, its noble cathedral, its shady mall, and open walks beyond the gates, must have been, in those days . . . a cheerful and pleasant residence.<sup>1</sup>

Among the exiles who found asylum there was William Carstares. The Duke of Argyll, Stair, Lord Loudon, Lord Melville, Sir Patrick Hume, and others of the Scottish nobility also found refuge there. Pringle of Torwoodlee, Denham of West Shields, James Steuart, author of the "Acompt", and many others "spent<sup>2</sup> their exile, and waited for the dawn of better days at Utrecht." John Erskine, later to be laird of Carnock and well-known to James Hog, studied there in 1685. Into this British colony came James Hog in 1679. The official record of the University of Utrecht reveals that Hog also matriculated at the University in the same year.<sup>4</sup>

Also in 1679 there came to Utrecht as Professor of Theology, Dr. Melchior Leydekker, a Calvinist of the Heidelberg type who entered into the exposition of the Heidelberg Catechism with relish. Leydekker was indefatigable in opposing Cocceius' views of the

---

1. Story, op. cit., p.25.

2. Ibid., p. 60.

3. John Erskine, Journal of The Hon. John Erskine of Carnock 1683-1687, ed. by Walter Macleod, (Edinburgh: The University Press, 1893), p.168.

4. Album Studiosorum Academiae Rheno-Traiectinae, 1636-1886, (Ultraiecti: J.L.Beijers et J. van Boekhoven, 1886), p.74.

dispensations of the covenant of grace.<sup>1</sup> The name "Jacobus Hoog, Scoto-Brit" occurs in the list of students in Professor Leydekker's class on the catechism referred to above, under the date September 9, 1683.<sup>2</sup>

During his years at Utrecht Hog had his intellectual and spiritual struggles of an unusually vivid nature and some four hundred pages of his manuscript "Memoirs" are devoted to an account of these conflicts and of his deliverance from atheism, deism, legalism, and kindred scourges of the soul. Though his professors delved into these subjects with that profoundness and accuracy typical of the Dutch theologians of that era, Hog found his own spiritual needs and desire for knowledge of the truth as it is in Christ unsatisfied. He and his fellow-students "heard and spoke of the Lord, but without any humble awe and reverence of his majesty upon their spirits, and did adventure to dispute and decide in these matters, as if they had been the meanest and most trivial things."<sup>3</sup>

Several things occurred in Hog's life at this times which reveal the respect with which he was held by his professors and by prominent Dutchmen. Some while after he and his brother had been attending the University of Utrecht, some of his professors took special notice of them and, their means of livelihood from their Scottish benefactors having been brought to an end by persecution, referred students to them for tutoring.

---

1. Agnew, op. cit., p.305.

2. Ibid., pp.285-86.

3. Hog, Memoirs, pp.15-16.

In this way they were enabled to pursue their own studies while at the same time earning money to meet their expenses.<sup>1</sup>

Hog could not bring himself to decide to enter the ministry, though he wrestled with this idea constantly, finally concluding that the ministerial work was too high for him. Whereupon, he threw himself into his studies with more delight, so that his professors pushed him forward in the public disputes at the University, which the young Scotsman pursued with gusto, he having now acquired "an Itch" for public applause.<sup>2</sup> There is an interesting confirmation of these things from a letter written by Professor Leydekker to his former pupil, by way of encouraging him in his efforts to defend the Reformed faith against John Simson:

I cannot but keep a Remembrance of you, since you left Utrecht, seeing you was one of my Scholars, who did assiduously attend my Lessons, and ofner than once did defend the Publick Theses, and particularly under my Patrociny, did defend our received opinion anent the Sacred Trinity, conform to the Faith of the Reformed Churches.<sup>3</sup>

Some time after he left Utrecht, having completed his studies, Hog was recommended by one of the professors to a noble family where he accepted employment as a tutor.<sup>4</sup>

---

1. Ibid., p.17: Brown of Haddington, op.cit., pp.93-94.

2. Brown of Haddington, op. cit., pp.87-88.

3. Melchior Leydekker, Copy of a Letter from the Learned Mr. Melch Leideker to the R.Mr. Ja. Hog, (Printed May 18, 1717).

4. Hog, Memoirs, p.18: Brown of Haddington, op.cit., p.100.

While in the home he had ample time to pursue his own interests and also to commune with persons of note who chanced to be in that home. In addition he took occasion to meet with the devout-<sup>1</sup> "persons of good note both for grace and parts"- in their societies, though not without his reservations, since he felt some of the members encroached on the ministerial office in their discourses.<sup>2</sup>

The more James Hog attempted to lead a retiring life, the more he seems to have been thrust forward by circumstances. Some of the Dutch rulers heard of the quiet, serious-minded, able young Scot and proffered their help in securing him employment in the Dutch Church. This Hog was unable to do from conscientious scruples, for he had noticed the Erastianism in the Church there which made certain compliances necessary in order to enter into the work of that Church.<sup>3</sup> As a matter of fact, Hog was several times on the verge of undertaking work of an entirely different nature, but "Providence directed differently" and he continued his pursuit of theological studies.<sup>4</sup>

Being thus more or less constrained to continue his studies, Hog's religious conflicts were renewed, in the course of which he read books and manuscripts "of the very worst note, he either could purchase, or were in providence brought to his hand, being intensely desirous to know the uttermost of the exceptions,

---

1. Hog, Memoirs p.22.

2. Brown of Haddington, op. cit., p.101.

3. Ibid., pp.88,101,144; Hog, Memoirs, p.19.

4. Hog, Memoirs, p.19.

objections and cavils of adversaries, atheists, libertines and heretics, of whatever denominations.<sup>1</sup> This failed to resolve his conflicts as he had hoped it would; but he later saw that his time spent in this way had not been without profit inasmuch as he was enabled to discover what he might well have been left in ignorance about,<sup>2</sup> and therefore unable to refute.

He next turned avidly to the reading of theology and at length he was led to know that he had the call of God to enter the ministry, that this was the purpose of God for him: ". . . Now . . . that he found peace, sweetness, and enlargement in his little essays towards theology, it gave him no small solace, that he knew his way in that respect, and that it was duty for him to go on whatever might be the result."<sup>3</sup>

This did not mean the end of his spiritual struggles, however; indeed, he was, as he puts it, "often entangled amongst the thickets of various temptations"<sup>4</sup>. Most especially does he bemoan his efforts to establish his righteousness by the Law and "legal efforts", in which experience he found he was not alone.<sup>5</sup> Hog took great delight in reading the works of various divines, eminent in both learning and in the experience of religion, who shed light on his difficulties. He mentions in particular that he took

---

1. Ibid., pp.19-20.

2. Loc. cit.

3. Ibid., p.21.

4. Loc. cit.

5. Brown of Haddington, op. cit., pp. 98,100, 115.

pleasure in reading and pondering the works of Hooker, Shepherd,<sup>1</sup> Jeremiah Burrows, Owen, and Goodwyn, among others.

While he was occupied as a tutor and engaged in the study of theology Hog was often in a frail estate of health. Most of the time he was able to continue with his labors, but on one occasion he became critically ill and at his own request was removed from the home of the noble family with whom he lived and for whom he worked. He was fortunate in being cared for by another Scottish exile, the now aging Thomas Hog of Kiltearn, of whose saintly and wise counsel Hog had availed himself not only as an inquiring Edinburgh University student, but also in the course of his struggles in Holland.<sup>2</sup> In later years James Hog took occasion more than once to refer to the debt of gratitude he felt to Thomas Hog, who, incidentally, seems to have been no relative of Hog's, for his spiritual guidance and counsel.<sup>3</sup> Hog recuperated from his illness and returned to the home of the noble family, where he remained until he left that country.

At the Revolution, after the accession of William and Mary, Hog, at the entreaty of his mother, determined to return to his native land, and "some while afterward" did return.<sup>4</sup> That his decision was a most difficult one may be seen from the remarks he makes concerning his return:

---

1. Hog, Memoirs, p.21.

2. Hog, Memoirs, pp.18,21; Brown of Haddington, op. cit., pp.97-99,104.

3. Vide Preface to Notes about Saving Illumination.

4. Hog, Memoirs, p.23.



Nevertheless the obligations he owed to some worthy persons in that strange land (which was a little native country to him), together with the intimate fellowships wherein he lived . . . and some attachments, which prudence forbids to mention in this manner . . .; those he saith, and other things he names not, concurring, made his leaving that foreign country one, if not the greatest, adventure of self-denial he ever had occasion for. . . . 1

Almost immediately upon his return Hog sought out some of the straiter sect for advice and guidance. These good people helped him to see the "innumerable evils" of his heart and life, and particularly to discern "his great ignorance of the gospel covenant,<sup>2</sup> and manifold entanglements with the law. . . ." Moreover, he had not been back in Scotland long before he discovered a two-fold extreme in the land: On the one hand there were those who "looked upon themselves as the alone entire, and standing part of the church"; and on the other those who had availed themselves of a "sort of indulgence" from the persecuting rulers, and who were recommending new policies under the "specious names of Prudence and Just Moderation."<sup>3</sup> He was in a dilemma as regards what his own conduct should be toward these two extremes, for he was sympathetic toward those who testified against the evils of the Revolutionary settlement (as they saw them), and yet he loved his mother Church and was desirous of loyalty to her. It was this tension between loyalty to his Church and obedience to

---

1. Loc. cit.

2. Ibid., p.24.

3. Ibid., pp.25-28.

conscience which involved Hog in a series of events which, as will be seen, constituted some of his most significant activities<sup>1</sup> as an Evangelical leader,

With the great scarcity of ministers, Hog could not remain inactive very long. He was encouraged by his friends, and invited by the Presbytery of Edinburgh, to submit to trial in order to his being licensed, and this he accordingly consented to do. The only record of Hog's trials is that he himself set down, the records of the Presbytery of Edinburgh for this period having been destroyed in one of the great fires which swept the town in 1701 and 1703. Fortunately, he gives rather a full account of these events in his Memoirs.

He was warned that some of the presbytery had determined to give him a close trial since he had studied abroad. Though his library was still in Holland, he resolved to go through with the trials, notwithstanding that he had "for a considerable time desisted from polemical studies." In preparing the assigned parts, Hog discloses that he consulted no author "save the Bible" only. Briefly, his assignment was as follows: First, to consider saving illumination from John 17: 3, "This is eternal life to know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent." Second, to consider Christ's dwelling in the human heart from Colossians 1: 27, "Christ in you the hope of glory." Third, a discourse on prayer was ordered, from Jude 20, "Praying in the Holy Ghost." The fourth part was a Latin discourse concerning the mystical union of Christ and believers, in which Hog took, or more accurately, made opportunity to strike directly at some

---

1. Infra, Chapter II.

of the Cartesian principles.<sup>1</sup> One of the examining ministers questioned the candidate closely on the latter point, with which the minister disagreed at that time; but in later years the minister told Hog "more than once, that the reasoning was made useful to him, and that he came to be of his opinion, from which he was averse before."<sup>2</sup> It appears that even as a young man, on trial before such an<sup>2</sup> august body as the Presbytery of Edinburgh, James Hog showed the mettle which fitted him so well as an Evangelical leader in the Church! The date of his licensing is not known, but it would probably have been early in the year 1690. He was<sup>A</sup> probationer at the meeting of the General Assembly in<sup>3</sup> October of that year, and had already received two calls.

In the months preceding the first General Assembly of the re-established Church of Scotland, Hog was distressed at the obvious policy of accommodation which, in his judgment, was directing those who were the leaders of church affairs. He felt that a more strenuous assertion of the principles for which Presbyterians had suffered ought to have been made to the king, "and in particular as they are opposite to prelacy and Erastianism. But our chief managers, sundry of whom were but temporary Presbyterians, did carry us into quite other measures."<sup>4</sup> There was a project on foot to settle Hog at Edinburgh, but having been invited to take a diet at the fast appointed shortly before the Assembly, he was led to dip into these matters of public concern,

---

1. Hog, Memoirs, pp. 29-31.

2. Ibid., pp. 31-32.

3. Ibid., pp. 35, 40.

4. Ibid., p. 34.

using as his text Lamentations 5: 16: "The crown is fallen from our heads; woe unto us that we have sinned." The result was, that notwithstanding his cautious and prudent handling of these matters (which even his opposers could not criticise), an end was put to the "motions which had been made by the chief doers towards his settlement there. . . ." <sup>1</sup>

Hog's conscience was a factor always to be reckoned with, and averse though he was to personal participation in disputations, he would not evade the issues, or keep silence when conscience commanded him to take a stand. He might be misunderstood—and he often was—or suffer rebuke, ridicule, or persecution, but James Hog could be relied upon to adhere to the voice of conscience, disregarding the cost to himself.

On July 8, 1690 the Presbytery of Hamilton, "considering how many parishes are desolate in their bounds," authorized one of their number to "deall with such ministers or probationers as he can prevail with to come and preach in these bounds", with a view to settling any such in the presbytery. <sup>2</sup> It appears that one of the probationers who was secured to preach in the presbytery was James Hog. We find the congregation at Dalserf applying to the Presbytery for a minister to preside at the subscribing of a call designed by them for Hog, and they having enquired about his testimonials, and being assured that they were "in readiness at Edinburgh, the presbytere appoint him to have them to produce

---

1. Ibid., p. 38.

2. Hamilton Presbytery Records, July 8, 1690.

before them with the first convenience, and in the mean time being certainly informed concerning the truth thereof resolve that they will not put a stop to a call which in the interim may be given him.<sup>1</sup> Two weeks later the presbytery received the report that there was complete unanimity in the call.<sup>2</sup>

At this stage, there came about an interesting occurrence. The Presbytery of Hamilton met at Edinburgh, October 27, 1690, and the following is in the minutes of that date: "At the desire of the Commissioner his Grace for Mr. James Hog to preach at Carmichael on the Lords Day come fortnight the presbytrie appoint him accordingly."<sup>3</sup> But a month later, when Lord Carmichael, in the name of the parish of Carmichael, requested that Hog preach there again, the presbytery refused the request, seeing there was a design to call him, and Hog had on that same day indicated his acceptance of the call of the parish of Dalserf.<sup>4</sup> This affords a good example of Hog's objectivity in reporting the events of his life. He tells that he had no fondness or inclination to either of the calls, and would have waved both, but he was brought

---

1. Ibid., September 23, 1690.

2. Ibid., October 7, 1690.

3. Ibid., October 27, 1690.

4. Ibid., November 25, 1690.

into an uneasy pinch, in regard church judicatories were like to interpose in favours of a nobleman [i.e., Lord Carmichael], who had the chief sway at that time, and was like to obtain a settling him at the place of his residence: and because he could in no wise agree to that proposal he went into another too suddenly; chusing of the two inconveniences that which he thought the least. So far did the softness of his temper render him averse even from necessary contendings; and his fears of displeasing some of our chief managers were at that time in an excess.<sup>1</sup>

The presbytery speedily approved his trials and ordained Hog "Minister of the gospell at Dalserfe in face of the congregation<sup>2</sup> thereof with prayer and imposition of hands" on January 20, 1691.

Some conception of the difficulties Hog faced in this charge may be gathered from the fact that only five months before his settlement there, the presbytery found that "that parish in their present circumstances cannot give a legal call to a minister for want of an Eldership" and took action for the election of elders, which was accomplished on September 1, 1690.<sup>3</sup> Moreover, the new minister observed that the people had "a large profession, but many of them were grossly ignorant, lamentably worldly, not square in their dealings, and guilty of sundry immoralities. . . ." After consideration of these facts, Hog was convinced that it was his ministerial and "indispensable duty publicly, and from house to house, to detect with plainness and pointedness the several delusions which had possessed their minds."<sup>4</sup>

---

1. Hog, Memoirs, pp.40-41.

2. Hamilton Presbytery Records, January 20, 1691.

3. Ibid., August 26 and September 1, 1690.

4. Hog, Memoirs, p.41.

The people were not accustomed to this mode of instruction and they did not receive it with much grace, but Hog reflects that there was "no open breach".<sup>1</sup>

Hog had entered upon his work thinking that it would be his chief purpose "to raise some fabric on the received and known foundations." He presumed that the people would be universally acquainted with the first principles of religion as laid down in the catechisms, particularly since there were some who were so strict "that there were not many amongst Presbyterian ministers they had freedom to hear, besides a few who had separated to the highest pitches. . . ."<sup>2</sup> In this, however, Hog was disappointed and he had to change his design and teach "the plain grounds of revealed truth." In his pastoral pursuits, in dealing with the more spiritually advanced, he used "a kind of secret catechism, wherein the substance of a special and efficacious work of grace and power upon the soul was summed up", which was afterwards, for the most part, published in his "Sacramental Notes".<sup>3</sup>

It is revealing of the man to note his stated aims in his first parish: First, it was his aim to be "free of rancour throughout the whole of his way; and in particular in religious and ministerial duties." Second, when he discovered that he had offended anyone, "he could enjoy no peace, nor find access to the Lord, until he did instantly set about what was incumbent upon him for the removal thereof: both in this, and all other respects, it was his business to have a conscience clear, as to the regarding

---

1. Loc. cit.

2. Ibid., p.42.

3. Loc. cit.

in his heart any iniquity whatsoever." Finally, it was his purpose to detect

a natural estate in its various covers and disguises, pointing out the distinguishing marks of the real Christian, which difference him from the most subtle and painted hypocrite, unvailing the various arts of hell in a covered mingling of the two Covenants, of works and grace, setting the deceits of Antinomianism in some clearness of light.<sup>1</sup>

Sometime prior<sup>2</sup> to March 26, 1691, Hog had married Janet Pyper for on that date the parish of Dalserfe applied for a visitation from the presbytery anent making provision for the minister and his wife.<sup>3</sup> Of his family almost nothing is known, for Hog scrupulously avoided references of a personal nature, as well as the giving of dates, names of places and friends, or even names of opponents. However it is known that a son was born to the union on March 23, 1695, and four days later the godly father is found contemplating the meaning of the baptism which is to take place the next day.<sup>4</sup> The son apparently died in childhood, but there were two daughters, Alison, who married William Hunter, minister at Lilliesleaf, and Janet, who married Daniel Hunter, successor to Hog at Carnock.<sup>5</sup> It is said that Hog's wife died in 1704.<sup>6</sup>

---

1. Ibid., pp.43-4.

2. Scott, op. cit., VIII. 407.

3. Hamilton Presbytery Records, March 26, 1691.

4. James Hog, Manuscript Journal, New College Library, under date March 23 and 27, 1695.

5. Scott, op. cit., V.9.

6. J.M. Webster, History of Carnock, (Edinburgh: William Blackwood and Sons, 1938), p.72.



Hog was one of the commissioners of Hamilton Presbytery to the 1692 General Assembly which met at Edinburgh, January 15, 1692.<sup>1</sup> At this Assembly, Hog served on the committee to visit the records of the "Commission for Visitations" appointed by the 1690 Assembly, and he was appointed to preach at the Old Kirk on the first Sabbath during the sitting of the Assembly.<sup>2</sup> In response to a petition from authorities in Aberdeen, the Assembly delegated Hog to supply there for a quarter.<sup>3</sup> He was present in the Assembly when, on February 13, 1692, the Royal Commissioner (the Earl of Lothian) rose and abruptly dissolved that Court—an action which both grieved and vexed James Hog.<sup>4</sup> Shortly before Hog made his journey to the North, he received calls from the Parish of Carmichael and of Douglas.<sup>5</sup> Each of these calls was prosecuted for several months. Lord Carmichael eventually made an appeal to the Synod of Glasgow and Ayr, so determined was he to have James Hog<sup>6</sup> as his minister. It is apparent that James Hog was highly regarded by the Church at large, notwithstanding his personal views on certain ecclesiastical matters—views which he had by no means concealed.

---

1. James Hog, Memoirs, p.64; cf. The Register of the Actings and Proceedings of the General Assembly 1692, ed. by Principal Robert Lee, (Edinburgh:Neill and Co., 1852,) p.3. Hereinafter cited Register of Proceedings.

2. Register of Proceedings, pp.3,8.

3. Ibid., p.19.

4. Ibid., pp.35-6; Hog, Memoirs, pp.64-5.

5. Hamilton Presbytery Records, April 26, 1692; May 31, 1692.

6. Ibid., June 12 to December 6, 1692.

A series of events now followed in rapid succession, events which thrust Hog onto the stage as a public person in the Church. He had been in his parish two years now, and as he says, had "both much delight and wanted not some little success in his aims."<sup>1</sup> Then, the Scots Parliament passed an act requiring the subscribing of the Oath of Assurance by all in public office, including the clergy, both Episcopal and Presbyterian. The purpose of the oath was to bring the Jacobite party to a direct recognition of William as king, it being suspected that in the Oath of Allegiance they intended merely to acknowledge the fact that he reigned, without recognizing his right to do so. In taking the Oath of Assurance, they declared William and Mary to be "the only lawful undoubted sovereigns of this realm, as well de jure, that is, of right, king and queen, as de facto, that is, in the possession and exercise of the government."<sup>2</sup> Hog was at first undetermined whether to take the oath, but a passage of Scripture (Acts 15:10) being "borne in upon him with serene sweetness and yet also with the awfulness of a check", he resolved not to subscribe the oath.<sup>3</sup> He was even more determined in his course when the "Act for Settling the Peace and Quiet of the Church" became known to him.<sup>4</sup>

---

1. Hog, Memoirs, p.45.

2. Ibid., opposite p. 142. Vid. John Cunningham, The Church History of Scotland, II(Edinburgh: James Thin, 1882), 189.

3. Ibid., pp.46-7.

4. Ibid., pp.48-9.

Perhaps nothing would have come from this decision had it not been for an incident which occurred at this time. Hog being indisposed on a Sabbath, the bulk of his people heard a probationer in the neighborhood who declared his satisfaction with the oaths, and his approval of ministers who took them. This made it necessary for the Dalserf minister to explain his position, and to vindicate his ministry from the aspersions which had been cast upon it by some who subscribed the oath. Hog took the first opportunity to speak to the point.<sup>1</sup> Then, lest the presbytery misinterpret his action, he wrote a lengthy letter to one of his brethren, requesting that it be read to the presbytery at the next meeting, he himself being unable to attend due to bodily infirmity. In the letter he gave a plain account of what had happened, and of his motives, and declared his intention not to meddle with the matter further.<sup>2</sup> But, much to Hog's surprise, the presbytery took quite a different view of his letter, as may be seen from the following:

The presbytry being informed that Mr. James Hog his way of preaching for some tyme particularly with regard to the oath of alledgiance is offensive and tends to separation. The Presbyterie appoynt Mr. Robert Wylie and William Ker to goe to Dalserfe on Fryday next and discourse Mr. Hog thereanent and report.<sup>3</sup>

---

1. Ibid., pp. 51-2.

2. Ibid., p. 53.

3. Hamilton Presbytery Records, July 25, 1693.

Two weeks later the presbytery appointed a visitation at Dalserf,<sup>1</sup> which was held on August 10. It will suffice to note that something of a stalemate resulted, the presbytery insisting that Hog was at fault in mentioning the oaths, and requiring him to bind himself not to mention them in the future, while Hog maintained that it was incumbent upon him to exonerate his conscience and refused to give the assurance demanded.<sup>2</sup>

Before the process could be brought to an issue Hog had been visited by John Hepburn, minister at Urr in Galloway, and had invited Hepburn—who had arrived at the week-end—to preach. This was on October 29. Two days later, the presbytery appointed two of their number to commune with Hog anent his inviting Hepburn to preach while he (Hepburn) was "under process and discharged by the Synod to preach within their bounds, and his own matter still in dependence."<sup>3</sup> Hog appeared on November 21, but did not satisfy the presbytery, and was, therefore, cited "apud acta"<sup>4</sup> to the next General Assembly. The libel against Hog included the charge that he had separated from his presbytery and joined another society.<sup>5</sup>

When his case came before the Assembly in March, 1694, it was discussed in a private committee, secretly, and Hog stood his

---

1. Ibid., August 7, 1693.

2. Ibid., July 25, 1693 and Hog, Memoirs, pp.55-63.

3. Ibid., October 31, 1693.

4. Ibid., November 21, 1693. Cf. Hog Memoirs, pp.75-87.

5. Hog, Memoirs, pp 91 ff.

ground firmly. Having been referred to an Assembly committee, no action was taken, except that it was left to the presbytery to handle the matter when and if necessary. Evidently popular feeling was with Hog, for the presbytery left the case in abeyance.<sup>1</sup> Hog himself offered to demit his charge for the sake of peace, but his proposal was not entertained.<sup>2</sup> What followed after this Assembly is not clear, but Hog declares he was averse from attending the judicatories of the Church when his own case was in suspense and he did not know how his brethren looked upon him. Moreover, "no further motion was made for a considerable while, in regard of his languishing state of body, which his wife and kindly physician . . . feared was irrecoverable. . . !" But he was "marvelously restored to health and vigour" in answer to a prayer, whereupon he met with representatives of the presbytery who reasoned with him about his affair. In due time, he found matters more to his taste and resumed communion with his fellow-ministers.<sup>4</sup>

During June and July, 1695, Hog made a journey to Moray, intending to remove from Dalserf if a suitable opportunity presented itself. He noted in his Journal that "if any where there is here a harvest."<sup>5</sup> This journey and his pleasant impressions probably

---

1. Ibid., pp.117-128.

2. Ibid., p.126.

3. Ibid., pp.127-8.

4. Ibid., pp.128-9.

5. Hog, Manuscript Journal, June 20, 1695 and August 5, 1695.

account for his being sent on the mission to Moray by the General Assembly following.

As the date for the 1695-96 Assembly approached, some of the members of Hamilton Presbytery apparently thought they could show their regard for Hog by sending him as one of their representatives<sup>1</sup> to the Assembly, and they accordingly elected him. Hog had been absent from the meeting and wishing to avoid issues which he knew would face him if he was a commissioner, he asked the presbytery to replace him. But the presbytery persisted in its course, and Hog was obliged to attend the Assembly which met<sup>2</sup> from December 17, 1695 to January 4, 1696. The trouble over the oaths did, indeed, confront Hog, just as he had warned his brethren, and so once again he was forced to take a stand for what he believed to be right.<sup>3</sup> The Assembly declared Hog transportable and sent him on the mission to Moray.<sup>4</sup>

Hog left almost at once for the North<sup>5</sup> and remained there for a considerable time, though just how long cannot be determined. He tells that he received a unanimous call there, and that he would have accepted it, but his health failed him. So, wearied with the struggle, and weakened from recurrent attacks of ague, with which he had been afflicted since his student days in Holland,<sup>6</sup> he demitted the charge of Dalserf.

- 
1. Hamilton Presbytery Records, November 26, 1695.
  2. Hog, Memoirs, pp. 130-32.
  3. Ibid., pp. 132-141.
  4. Acts of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, 1638-1842, (Edinburgh: Edinburgh Printing and Publishing Company, 1843), General Assembly 1695-96, Act XV. Hereinafter cited, Acts of Assembly.
  5. Hamilton Presbytery Records, January 25, 1696.
  6. Hog, Memoirs, p. 141.

He first communicated his desire to the presbytery in a letter received July 30, 1696, in which he gave as his reason for giving up the charge "his present indisposition". Another letter to the same purpose was read to the presbytery in December. But the presbytery indicated its willingness to await his return to health and did not actually declare the charge vacant until Mrs. Hog had removed the family possessions, and the representatives of the parish appeared requesting that the church be declared vacant. This action was taken on March 30, 1697<sup>1</sup>.

For over two years Hog accepted no other charge. He has left no indication of his personal affairs at this time, though it would appear that he was frequently incapacitated for preaching. He probably preached from time to time as his health permitted. Then, quite unexpectedly, a way was opened<sup>2</sup> for him to accept the call of the parish of Carnock in Fife.

Thomas Boston relates how he had been approached by the elders of Carnock on behalf of the Countess of Kincardine, indicating the desire of the Countess to have him preach there, with a view to a call. This was in the early part of the year 1699. Boston, however, was not in the least interested in that parish, for

---

1. Hamilton Presbytery Records, July 30 and December 15, 1696; March 30, 1697.

2. Hog, Memoirs, pp.141-2.

by means I think of a sister of my friend's living in their neighbourhood, I had been strongly imprest with a very hard notion of that parish, as a self-conceited people, among whom I would have no success . . . . I found my heart was not with them. . . . Thus I stood in my own way with respect to that parish: but Providence had designed a far better for them, the worthy Mr James Hog being thereafter settled there, where he continues to this day [1730] faithfully declaring the Gospel of God. And there fell to my lot, several years after, a people fully as conceited of themselves as those of Carnock could be.<sup>1</sup>

It must be said here that Hog thought differently of the good people of Carnock: Not too long after he had settled there he wrote of them that they were "an easy and manageable congregation."<sup>2</sup>

As early as July 13, 1699, the Presbytery of Dunfermline had "dealt seriously" with Hog about the call to Carnock, and reported that he was waiting for a reply from some friends in the north about the call. The presbytery replied by requesting him to preach at Carnock "as oft as he would betwixt this and next Presbytery meeting."<sup>3</sup> About a month later Hog indicated his willingness to accept the call, and the presbytery made arrangements for his installation,<sup>4</sup> which was duly performed on August 23, 1699.

---

1. Thomas Boston, A General Account of My Life, ed. by G.D. Low, (Edinburgh: Hodder and Stoughton, 1908) p.54.

2. Hog, Memoirs, p.141.

3. Dunfermline Presbytery Records, July 13, 1699.

4. Ibid., August 9th, 1699.



The parish of Carnock is located in the western extremity of the county of Fife, being about three miles square in extent, and its population in 1755 was five hundred eighty-three souls.<sup>1</sup> But though small in size, Carnock has had an influence in the affairs of Scotland out of all proportion to its size. Here John Row, the son of the Reformer of the same name, and himself the author of The Historie of the Kirk of Scotland, was minister for fifty-two years. Here Thomas Gillespie, father of the Relief body, was minister until deposed in 1752. Colonel John Erskine, known as "The Black Colonel", Lieutenant-Governor of Stirling Castle and perennial member of the General Assembly for nearly forty years, was the laird of Carnock. His son, John Erskine, "Erskine of Carnock", was Professor of Scots Law in Edinburgh University, and author of the standard work, Institute of the Law of Scotland. And his son was Dr. John Erskine of Edinburgh, who was one of the greatest divines of the Church of Scotland in the latter part of the eighteenth century.<sup>2</sup>

Half a century earlier the people of Carnock had been staunch covenanters. In 1643 the Solemn League and Covenant was "solemnlie sworne to, and subscribit be the parishioners of Carnock", and in 1648 it was "renewit and sworne, and the public confession of sins was read over againe."<sup>3</sup>

---

1. Sinclair, John. The Statistical Account of Scotland. XI (Edinburgh: William Creech, 1794), pp.480,485.

2. Vide Webster's History of Carnock.

3. Carnock Session Records, November 5, 1643 and December 17, 1648. Cited by Webster, op. cit., pp. 122-3.

The name of James Hog may be associated in most minds with the affairs of wider note in the Assembly in which he was so often involved, but the new minister had hardly arrived when he turned his attention to the affairs of practical importance in the parish. Despite his involvements in the disputations of the times, he seems to have been a faithful pastor throughout the nearly thirty-five years he served as minister of Carnock.

The care of the poor figures prominently in the records of his ministry. Indeed, the very first entry in the Session Records following his arrival is a list of the poor of the parish—ten in number at that time— who were approved for assistance, and a "distribution" made to each one.<sup>1</sup> From that time forward the less fortunate of the parish were provided for systematically. Special distribution was made at Communion occasions. Their children were provided with shoes and clothing, their education was paid for, and their dead buried at the expense of the church. While Hog was attentive to the needs of his own parish, he certainly was not oblivious to needs beyond the confines of Carnock. Thus, the record tells of collections for "the relief of Seamen taken by an<sup>2</sup>Algeir pyrat"; for "rebuilding some burnt houses in Leith";<sup>3</sup> for the "redemption of a Slave in Turkey";<sup>4</sup>

---

1. Ibid., October 23, 1699.

2. Ibid., January 20, 1701.

3. Ibid., October 31, 1702.

4. Ibid., August 4, 1704.

and for the relief of Protestants in Lithuania, for which  
 cause the Elders made a house to house visitation.<sup>1</sup> Knowing  
 Hog's attitude toward Episcopacy, it is interesting, if not  
 actually, astonishing, to find distributions made to ousted  
 curates!<sup>2</sup> Though Hog is known to have had a sterner side,  
 still, he must have been a man of broad sympathies, judging  
 by some of the entries in the Session Records.

As in all parishes of the day, the education of the young  
 came under the watchful eye of the minister. The Session  
 Records show that no other undertaking during Hog's ministry  
 was fraught with more difficulties, frustrations, and  
 disappointments. Practically from the beginning, there was  
 friction between the heritors and the Session, and matters did  
 not improve with the passing of time. Colonel Erskine  
 continually frustrated Hog and the Session, and even the  
 presbytery, by his adamant position,<sup>3</sup> and the Session eventually  
 petitioned the presbytery to "take some effectual course in  
 regard the youth of the parish suffers very much by Reason of  
 the want of [a schoolhouse]."<sup>4</sup> J. M. Webster, of Carnock,  
 observes that while Colonel Erskine was "a man of blameless  
 personal life and keenly interested in Church affairs," there was  
 "another side to the man—a certain combativeness of disposition

---

1. Ibid., October 26, 1718.

2. Ibid., July 5, 1717, November 4, 1724.

3. Ibid., May 29, June 3, 1713; April 20, 1720.

4. Ibid., September 10, 1727.

and partiality for litigation that made him more or less a nuisance to everybody who had dealings with him." <sup>1</sup> That James Hog knew this to be true much more than Webster cannot be doubted.

In matters of discipline Hog had more definite success, though there were moments of frustration as well. Shortly after his arrival the Session "resolved with one voice that the elders in their severale quarters, shall take notice of such as dyshaunt the publick ordinances, and warn them privatlie. But if they continue dilate them to the Session." <sup>2</sup> By and large the offences dealt with were of a minor nature, such as profanity; <sup>3</sup> and Sabbath breaking; <sup>4</sup> but the stool of repentance was in constant use by those guilty of sins of the flesh. Hog was certainly firm in enforcing discipline, but he was only observing the directions of the various Church courts, as when he acquainted the Session with the Act of Assembly 1705 anent dealing with scandalous persons. <sup>5</sup> Moreover, Hog was strictly impartial, even to the point of rebuking one of the lairds of the congregation, whose son was an elder! <sup>6</sup>

- 
1. Webster, op.cit., pp.216-218.
  2. Carnock Session Records, November 4, 1699.
  3. Ibid., July 22, 1709.
  4. Ibid., October 30, 1703.
  5. Ibid., November 24, 1705.
  6. Ibid., October 17, 1710 to January 7, 1711.

Once, too, he had to deal with an elder who contradicted him in the time of public worship, an incident reported by Robert Wodrow.<sup>1</sup>

In this connection the records reveal that Hog always expected his officers to function efficiently and faithfully. Something of the standard he sought to maintain in his congregation is seen in his writing about the responsibility of church officers in making enquiry before admitting people to the Lord's Supper. He believed that the "Overseers" of the Church have the souls of those under their care "in pledge", and

that as the Communicant ought to make Conscience (as he shall answer to God) of searching himself, so Ministers and Elders are called of GOD, by vertue of their Office, to lay out themselves, through his Grace, in the effectual use of the most apposit Means for understanding the state of Matters with these whom they admit, in so far as the Nature and Concerns of that distinguishing Ordinance do call for.

.....

And I shall not Stand to aver, that they are cloathed with the Authority, which not only impowereth, but obligeth them to faithfulness in this manner, that they may escape the guilt of Soul-blood. . . .<sup>2</sup>

Hog made it clear that he was "very far from stretching this beyond the Nature, and Design of the Trust, and abhorre the least thought or inclination to pry into the Secrets of any."<sup>3</sup>

---

1. Ibid., June 1, 1723 cf. Robert Wodrow, Analecta, II (Edinburgh: Edinburgh Printing Company, 1843), 377.

2. James Hog, Remarks Concerning the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, (Edinburgh: James Watson, 1706), pp.36-37,41; et passim. Hereinafter cited Lord's Supper.

3. Ibid., p.44.

Hog thought that before a person was received into church membership he should manifest a "knowledge of the Principles of Religion, together with some diligence in the use of the instituted Means of Grace, and an attendance upon the Lord in Publick, Family and secret Worship; as also a Conversation . . . both in these, and otherways, serious and sober."<sup>1</sup>

During his pastorate at Carnock Hog kept the Session at full strength; worked for the election of Deacons; and maintained the property of school, church, and community as well as could have been done under the circumstances of the parish. Carnock Communion was held in alternate years throughout his ministry, though the General Assembly and Synod both enjoined more frequent celebration of the Sacrament.<sup>2</sup> That Communion seasons were observed with great solemnity is clear from the Session Records.<sup>3</sup>

When one considers the recurring attacks of illness to which he was subjected; the responsibility of rearing two young daughters following the death of his wife in 1704; and the obvious attention he gave to the various duties of his parish ministry, it is surprising to find that James Hog was able to engage in other activities to any large degree. But there was a kind of restlessness about him which made him averse to

---

1. James Hog, Otia Christiana, (Edinburgh: 1708), p.86.

2. Acts of Assembly, 1701. XIX; 1711.VI; 1712.XI.

3. Carnock Session Records, June 19, 1703, July 15, 1717  
October 26, 1719.

inactivity, so that he found ample time for his endeavors of a literary nature, as well as for applying himself to concerns of the Presbytery, Synod, and General Assembly.

Two months after his admission to Dunfermline Presbytery, Hog was elected its moderator.<sup>1</sup> The following May he was appointed "to repair to Edinburgh with all convenient speed and concurr with the meeting of ministers there, in representing grievances to the parliament. . . ." A little later he and Allan Logan, then of Torryburn, were appointed to confer with the Presbytery of Kirkcaldy about "an important affair."<sup>2</sup> He was elected by the presbytery as one of its representatives to the General Assembly of 1701.<sup>3</sup> The Synod of Fife elected him its moderator in 1701<sup>4</sup> and for several years thereafter Hog was regularly named to the Synod's Committee on Bills and Overtures, often being the first named.<sup>5</sup> Judging from his numerous activities in the various judicatories in these early years it appears that his brethren saw in the Carnock minister a great capacity for leadership and frequently availed themselves of his talents in pursuing various ends.<sup>6</sup>

- 
1. Dunfermline Presbytery Records, October 25, 1699.
  2. Ibid., May 29, 1700.
  3. Ibid., August 4, 1700.
  4. Ibid., December 12, 1700
  5. Synod of Fife Records, September 30, 1701.
  6. Ibid., April 1, 1707 et passim.

It was in the year 1701 that Hog's first printed work, entitled Remarks Concerning the Spirit's Operation, was published. In the Preface the occasion for the writing of the little volume is thus described: "The Author, being by Indisposition laid aside from any other Exercise of his Ministry, did employ his Talent in Family Exercises: They come to thy hand in their native dress, because of the Spiritual Good, that was thereby conveyed to the Souls of some that heard them."<sup>1</sup> It may be that these "Remarks" were written during the period when Hog was without a charge, following his demission of the parish of Dalsenf. However that may be, it was more than a desire to bring spiritual enrichment to the readers that prompted the publication of the book. The work made its appearance in the same year that the Assembly passed the sentence of deposition against Dr. George Garden, minister at Aberdeen, who had espoused the cause of the French quietist, Antoinette Bourignon. It also coincided with the beginning of the debates concerning the tenets of the neonomians, or Baxterians. It was revised and enlarged and republished in 1709, at which time its anti-Bourignonian design was specifically declared.

During 1700 and 1701 James Hog and Allan Logan took the Leadership in a bitterly contested case in Dunfermline Presbytery against James Graham of Dunfermline, a minister of known Episcopal sympathies who had retained his charge at the Revolution. Several charges were lodged against Graham, but the things which weighed most heavily against him were that he was an Episcopalian,

---

1. James Hog, Remarks Concerning the Spirit's Operation, (Edinburgh: Andrew Anderson, 1701), Preface.



he taught that Christ died for all who believe, and that salvation had been made available to men upon the condition that they believe and repent. The Synod of Fife had the case by appeal and deposed Graham for Arminianism and neglect of his ministerial duties. The General Assembly sustained the Synod's findings when it came before them by appeal, and in 1704 passed an act concerning "Preaching or Disseminating Erroneous Doctrine" in which the Synod of Fife was enjoined to "take heed to Mr. James Grahame at Dunfermline, that he contravene not this act."<sup>1</sup> Graham had many of the gentry on his side and he contested the pursuit vigorously, though unsuccessfully. He wrote a complete report of the case and after his death it was printed by one of his Episcopalian friends.<sup>2</sup> Throughout this account Graham charges Hog and Allan Logan with being his prosecutors and judges.<sup>3</sup> It must be confessed that the Presbyterian ministers, Hog and Logan not the least, were blameworthy in their conduct, though their opponent showed a considerable gift for evading and clouding the issues and for a generally pugnacious behavior.<sup>4</sup>

Another case which involved James Hog was that of John Hepburn, the firebrand leader of some malcontents in the southwest of Scotland, to whom reference has already been made. The General Assembly labored for over twenty years, from 1695 onwards,

---

1. Acts of Assembly, 1704. XII.

2. James Graham, The Famous Tryal of the late Reverend and Learned Mr. James Grame, (London: J. Bettenham, 1719).

3. Ibid., pp. 3, 39, 41, 66 passim.

4. Vide Dunfermline Presbytery Records, June 26, 1700ff.; Synod of Fife Records, September 24, 1700 ff.

to bring about a reconciliation with the minister of Urr, in the course of which Hepburn was suspended, reinstated, deposed, and restored, and conferred with on numerous occasions. James Hog was a member of most of the Commissions of Assembly and of the special committees appointed to reclaim the recalcitrant minister with whom he had at one time felt a kindred spirit. Hog's efforts to avoid schism in the Church he loved gave rise to the impression and report that he was on the verge of joining Hepburn and his adherents, though in reality he never had any such intention and came to have a real aversion to his former friend. Hog's conduct and philosophy in this affair and others relating to schism show an interesting side of the man as an Evangelical leader and is to be developed in one of the chapters of this thesis.<sup>1</sup>

Between 1704 and 1711 Hog was engaged in a discussion with Sir Hugh Campbell of Calder relative to the use of the Lord's Prayer, and of the imposition of forms of prayer, in worship. The Laird of Calder had appointed himself a committee of one to lobby for the restoration of the Lord's Prayer in the worship of the Church, and he published, in 1704, his essay on the Lord's Prayer in which he strongly advocated its use as a form of prayer in worship. He also wrote letters to several moderators of the General Assembly in the course of the reasonings, though his efforts were crowned with little success. Hog contributed two pieces to the debates in reply to his opponent, (for Hog was opposed to the imposition of any prayer as a required form

---

1. Infra, Chapter III.

of worship), A Casuistical Essay on the Lord's Prayer containing an appendix (1705) and a letter on "The Unlawfulness of Imposing Forms of Prayer" (1710). Hog's position was based on the principle that the use of forms alone, prescribed by the Church, tends to "obstruct the attainment and just improvement of Gifts and Graces" and cannot be "reckoned lawful and right in that respect."<sup>1</sup> Towards the end of the controversy Robert Calder, the reputed author of Presbyterian Eloquence Displayed, took issue with Hog in his Answer to Mr. James Hog (1710). This peculiar issue is in some ways insignificant; yet it does serve to reveal the scruples of James Hog, while also offering an interesting sidelight in the clash between Presbyterian and Episcopalian in the early eighteenth century, and for this reason it is sketched in an appendix of the thesis.<sup>2</sup>

The Presbyterians in Scotland were at once astonished and bewildered by the succession of events in the year 1712: the passage by Parliament of the Toleration Act (and with it the Oath of Abjuration); the restoration of Patronage; the Christmas Recess Act; and the endowing of the Episcopal clergy out of the bishops' teinds. Any one of these acts would have sufficed to arouse most Presbyterian ministers, but taken together, and in the context of the Jacobite boasts and predictions that the days of the Presbyterians were numbered, they were sufficient to set

---

1. James Hog, The Unlawfulness of Imposing Forms of Prayer, (Edinburgh: John Moncur, 1710), p.63. Hereinafter cited, Forms of Prayer.

2. Infra, Appendix A.

the whole country at fever pitch. It was whispered that yet more ominous measures were to come. It was said that the General Assembly would be interdicted from meeting, or allowed to meet only to be dissolved, and that presbyteries were to be compelled to induct licentiates who received presentations without any further form or<sup>1</sup>trial.

James Hog naturally shared the alarm of his brethren and joined in the protests, overtures, and addresses which were sent up to the Commission, Assembly, Parliament, and Queen. The Session at Carnock ordered a fast to be held on August 2, 1712, to confess "the sins of the Church, and Land," and to implore the Lord, that he would

restore the protestant Churches, which one way and another are brought very low; and in a peculiar manner, that he would preserve his Church, in these Covenanted Lands, in a Day, wherein, our Doctrine, Worship, Discipline, and Government, are incroached upon, and much Indangered. . . .<sup>2</sup>

There was a voluminous correspondence between ministers regarding the taking of the Abjuration Oath and concerning patronage, and Hog corresponded with Robert Wodrow, and others,<sup>3</sup> giving and asking advice.

---

1. Cunningham, op. cit., II. 238-39.

2. Carnock Session Record, August 2, 1712.

3. Robert Wodrow, The Correspondence of the Rev. Robert Wodrow, ed. by Thomas M'Crie, I (Edinburgh: Printed for Wodrow Society, 1842), pp. 188 et passim. Hereinafter cited Correspondence.

There were also conferences within the presbyteries and synods and among groups of ministers who scrupled at the oath, and there can be no doubt that Hog played his part in not a few of these conferences.<sup>1</sup> It is certainly no surprise to find that Hog was a non-jurant. Nevertheless, while he had very deep feelings and convictions and did not hesitate to declare himself openly, it would appear that he did not join in malicious recrimination against those who had light to take the oath. He wrote against those who claimed that the evils of the times gave ground to withdraw from the Church of Scotland, and he also wrote a small tract for the promoting of concord between the brethren who differed about these points.<sup>2</sup> Though the great majority of ministers eventually took the oath, there were some, Robert Wodrow,<sup>3</sup> Thomas Boston, and Hog among them, who continued to reject it. If Hog had his trouble with Colonel Erskine at some points, yet in this point they were of one mind, and both<sup>4</sup> went to their graves as non-jurants.

As to patronage, Hog was for many years a bulwark in his presbytery in opposing the inducting of any minister on a presentation without the free concurrence of the congregation. It was probably the case of Chrystie's presentation to Dunfermline

---

1. Ibid., II. 411-12, footnote.

2. James Hog, Some Proposals for Peace and Harmony, (Edinburgh: John Reid, 1718).

3. Robert Wodrow, Correspondence, II. 449; Boston, op.cit., 238-240 (footnote).

4. Webster, op. cit., pp.65-66.

which moved him to write a pamphlet asserting the right of church members to choose their own overseers. He and others prepared a paper for the presbytery, in 1718, giving reasons for not concurring with the directive of the Commission of Assembly to transport Chrystie to Dunfermline.<sup>1</sup> He continued his activities in this sphere until the very end of his life.<sup>2</sup> Hog's endeavours in these disputations are discussed fully in the second chapter of this thesis.

While Hog was an active leader of the Evangelical school in these areas of the Church's life, he is better known to most students of Scottish ecclesiastical history for his appearances in certain theological disputations of the period. He had already revealed a theological interest in his opposition to the Bourignian heresy and in publishing several tracts aimed at opposing certain theological aberrations. It has been suggested that the thought that "the yearly college vacation might preserve his life, induced him to be a candidate for the Divinity Chair in Marischal College, Aberdeen, in 1711;"<sup>3</sup> but it is more likely that he was motivated to seek the post by his fondness for theological study and a desire to guide the young theologues into an evangelical orientation. Whatever the case, however, Hog was defeated in his quest for the post.

---

1. Dunfermline Presbytery Records, December 11, 1717, January 22, 1718.

2. Vide Dunfermline Presbytery Records, February 20, 1734.

3. Agnew, op.cit., p.288.

An indication of Hog's reputation for theological competence is seen in his being asked to write the preface to Thomas Halyburton's Natural Religion Insufficient in 1714. Halyburton, the Professor of Divinity at St. Andrews, was a theologian of considerable ability and of evangelical earnestness. It is not the words of Hog's preface that are significant or indicative of his theological proficiency, but the fact that the commendatory epistle is signed by such men as William Carstares, William Wishart, and William Hamilton.<sup>1</sup> It is not likely that Hog would have been selected to write the preface to this work unless he was respected in circles of higher learning.

If it was theological exercise for which Hog was yearning, he soon found ample opportunity to lay himself out in that regard, in opposition to one of the sons of the Church who was accused of heresy. In 1711 the Church had imposed upon her clergy a form of subscription which was more rigid than that prescribed by Parliament.<sup>2</sup> Since its formation the Church of Scotland had had few occasions to try any of her clergy for deviation from the faith once for all delivered to the Church. As John Cunningham has said,

---

1. Thomas Halyburton, Natural Religion Insufficient (Edinburgh: Andrew Anderson, 1714), Preface and Epistle of Recommendation.

2. Cunningham, op. cit., II. 245.

The mind of each minister reproduced with wonderful distinctness all the theological conclusions of the Westminster Divines. Notwithstanding the independence of the Scotch intellect, it was seldom exercised upon forms of faith. Notwithstanding the free scope of its metaphysics, the region of theology was carefully avoided. Notwithstanding the schisms which had taken place, heresy was never able to lift up her head. Every Scotsman you met with, in whatever corner of globe it might be, was sure to be rigidly orthodox. Amid all the winds of doctrine which had blown since the Reformation, the Church had been kept steadily at her moorings by the weight of her anchorage. With the terrors of deposition before their eyes <sup>1</sup> few Scotch ministers have dared to think for themselves.

The wind of change was blowing, however, and the Church found itself under the necessity of assessing the orthodoxy of one of its theological professors, John Simson of Glasgow, whose propositions smacked strongly of the Arminian and rationalistic flavor. James Webster, the vehement Evangelical minister of the Tolbooth Church at Edinburgh, accosted Simson while on holiday in the peaceful village of Moffat and the two began discussions which continued for some three years or more, but which were doomed to failure. The two men were of an inveterate irascible disposition and Webster at length made a formal accusation of Simson before the Presbytery of Edinburgh. The Synod of Lothian referred the matter to the Assembly of 1714 which appointed Webster to table his charges (of Arminianism and Pelagianism) before the Presbytery of Glasgow, and permitting any who desired <sup>2</sup> to do so to assist Webster in the process.

---

1. Ibid., p.246.

2. Acts of Assembly 1714, (Edinburgh: Andrew Anderson, 1714), Unprinted Act, May 14, 1714.



Webster and Hog were fast friends, the former having prefaced two of Hog's works.<sup>1</sup> Hog was one of those present at the Simson-Webster conferences.<sup>2</sup> During the 1716 Assembly Hog is reported by Wodrow to have alleged that the "very soul of Pelagianism" was in some of Simson's propositions and offered to prove it.<sup>3</sup> Professor William Hamilton of Edinburgh immediately moved that Hog "be obliged to prove what he had undertaken, and joined with Mr. Webster in the pursuit."<sup>4</sup> The motion was not gone into but the exchange in the Assembly is no doubt largely responsible for the three prints published by Hog against Simson's principles in that same year. These were his Letter Detecting the Gangrene of Errors, Essay to Vindicate Scripture Truths, and Letter Concerning the Interest of Reason in Religion. Webster, John M'Claren, and John Flint, with Hog, were among the leading opponents of Simson. Hog's share as one of the leading Evangelical voices in the Simson case is set forth in Chapter V of this thesis.

The Simson case showed very clearly the inroads made in Scotland by rationalistic and Arminian influences and was the forerunner of the case which has placed Hog's name in the books of Church History published since that time.

---

1. The Covenants of Redemption and Grace Displayed and Abstract of Discourses on Job XXXVI: 8-10.

2. John M'Claren, The New Scheme of Doctrine, (Edinburgh: John Reid, 1717), pp.346-47.

3. Robert Wodrow, Correspondence, II. 191.

4. Loc. cit.



The 1717 Assembly disposed of Simson's process by administering a mild rebuke to the professor while almost in the same breath it lashed the Auchterarder Presbytery for its effort— it was a clumsy and highly irregular one it must be granted— to guard purity of doctrine. That presbytery had sought to arrest the progress of legalistic doctrines by securing the assent of its candidates to a series of propositions which indicated that man is bankrupt insofar as his performances are able to influence God in the salvation of the sinner: for salvation is by grace alone, taught the presbytery. The unfavorable action of the Assembly evoked Evangelical reaction and a resolution to contend against the legalistic strain of teaching and preaching. It was this which led in the end of that year to Hog's recommendatory preface to The Marrow of Modern Divinity in a Scottish Edition. Principal Hadow of St. Andrews fired a salvo against Hog and the Marrow which resulted in the appointment by the Assembly of another "Committee for the Purity of Doctrine". This committee, led by Hadow, engineered the condemnation of the Marrow in 1720, an act which Ebenezer Erskine—and he probably spoke the mind of many who were not of his school—alleged to have been aimed against the doughty recommender of the book.<sup>1</sup> This is not the place, however, to go into the Marrow controversy. Hog's leadership in that affair is the matter of Chapter VI and is the climax of the

---

1. John Brown of Whitburn, Gospel Truth, (Glasgow: Blackie, Fullarton, and Co., 1831), pp.125-126; cf. James Hog, The Controversie Concerning the Marrow of Modern Divinity, Dialogue I, (1721), p.52. Hereinafter cited Dialogue I.

events of his life and of his contribution to the Church's life and teachings. There the controversy concerning The Marrow of Modern Divinity is related in full, both as to the events themselves and the doctrines which were the subject of debate. For his role in this controversy he has been properly denominated the "leader of the Marrow Men".

It has been supposed that following his harassing experiences in the affair of the Marrow Hog lived a life of semi-retirement in his quiet retreat at Carnock. Agnew supposes that Hog "was frequently disabled even from preaching."<sup>1</sup> There is abundant evidence to demolish this impression.

Hog's own case relative to his prints which propagated and defended the Marrow teachings was still depending before the Synod of Fife when he found it necessary to observe a day of thanksgiving appointed by the king on a date different from that which had been approved by the Synod of Fife. That Argus-eyed body took offense at such contemptuous conduct and directed the Presbytery of Dunfermline to bring the two ministers to account. They in turn gave in to the presbytery a paper of reasons for their not observing the day of thanksgiving as appointed. They assert that the day set aside was the only Saint's Day in that month; that the last three fasts had been on Fridays, a known day of fasting in the English and Romish churches, and that they feared the design was gradually to lead the Church of Scotland into the same practice; that many of their people would have been aggrieved had they kept the day; and that

---

1. Agnew, op. cit., p.289.

they had not taken their action out of any disrespect they had to Church or State, since they had complied with the presbytery in making the act before they knew that it was one of the Church of England's fixed feast days.<sup>1</sup> There was another reason given which reveals the heart of the matter: They state that an observance of such days as regarded by the Church of England

might be found some Breach of our Solemn National Engagements, whatever Sentiments others might have in that Matter, to whom we owe a just Regard; seeing we are solemnly sworn and engaged, 'in our Places and Callings, to endeavour the Reformation of England and Ireland, in Doctrine, Discipline, Worship and Government, according to the Word of God.' Now, to observe, with the Church of England, such days of Fasting and Thanksgiving from Time to Time, we humbly conceive, is not the Way to reform that Church; but, we fear, would confirm and harden her in her superstitious Esteem of Days.<sup>2</sup>

Furthermore, they contend that the Church of Scotland's freedom was disquieting to their English neighbors and that therefore their liberties were being encroached upon. It was time to oppose any motions that way lest the Church of Scotland "be quickly brought to the Erastian Set of other Churches, where there is not the least Vestige of this Power [of proclaiming fasts] left to the Overseers."<sup>3</sup>

The paper was referred to the Synod of Fife which declared Hog censurable (Mr. Bathgate having died in the interim).<sup>4</sup>

---

1. James Hog and James Bathgate, Reasons for not Observing the Day of Thanksgiving, (n.d.), pp.1-10. Hereinafter cited Reasons.

2. Ibid., p.2.

3. Ibid., p.14.

4. Synod of Fife Record, April 8, 1724.

Hog then gave<sup>in</sup> a "representation" in which he repeated his reasons and said that his action was "for a Testimony in my Capacity to the Right of the Church above-mentioned, and for keeping myself from the Guilt of Countenancing the Church of England, in her Symbolizing with the idolatrous Church of Rome in the Observation of Holy-days; and thereby contributing to the Hardning of the said Church of England in her Superstitions, instead of endeavouring her Reformation."<sup>1</sup> The publication of these papers by one into whose hands the papers came may have played a part in the rise of a controversy about obligation of the Covenants.

Since the Revolution Settlement the MacMillanites had maintained Covenanting fervor and this fervor reached its apex<sup>2</sup> when they renewed the Covenants at Auchensaugh in 1712. While many ministers and members of the Church of Scotland were in accord with their actions, they did not follow their example. But from about the year 1725 to 1730 there were some heated discussions within the Church of Scotland concerning the Covenants. Apparently it was John Glas who by his preaching that the Covenants were incompatible with the spirit of the gospel dispensation and the liberty of the individual conscience, touched off the debates. He was moved to his attack on the Covenants because Willison of Dundee had encouraged his people in their dissatisfaction with the Church by insisting much on the National Covenants and the defections of the Church while

---

1. Hog, Reasons, p.16

2. Hugh Watt, Recalling the Scottish Covenants. (London: Thomas Nelson and Sons, [1946]), pp.69-77.

"magnifying the former covenanting Days, and prophesying of great Days to come, by the reviving of these Covenants; but, as for this Day, expecting no Benefit by the Gospel, nor lying open to its Influence."<sup>1</sup> It had also been discovered that the new edition of the Confession of Faith did not include the Covenants as had been customary in the past. The Presbytery of Angus and Mearns instructed their members to the Assembly to seek the renewal of the Covenants and several presbyteries protested the omission of the Covenants in the new edition of the Confession. Glas felt that he had to give his people guidance when there was rumor of separation from the Church, and he did so in his sermons. The obligation of the Covenants was preached about, wrangled over at meetings of Church courts, discussed in correspondence, agitated by various papers distributed by the pro-Covenant party in the north, and even used in some cases as a means of fencing the table<sup>2</sup> at Communion,

Hog's sentiments were no secret, for many of his pamphlets had harked back to the glorious days when there was a "covenanted work of reformation". He had corresponded with a noble lady who had requested his sentiments, who in turn referred Hog's letter to Glas for comment.<sup>3</sup> Glas relates how, after the meeting

---

1. John Glas, Narrative of the Rise and Progress of the Controversy about the National Covenants, (Edinburgh, 1728) p.2.

2. Ibid., pp. 7-17, 62-27, 169-70.

3. Ibid., p. 114.

of the Synod of Dundee, April 18, 1727,

the Business of printing upon the Subject of the Covenants commenc'd, and the first Paper of that Kind that came to my Hand was a Letter concerning, as the Title Page has it, 'Our solemn and sacred National Covenants, against which some have of late too boldly, and yet without Censure, vented their heterodox Notions.' 1

When Glas compared the anonymous print and the letter from Hog to the lady, he recognized at once that both were from the same hand. Hog admitted the pamphlet was his, but disapproved of the title page and ascribed it to the publisher.<sup>2</sup> Hog's earlier letter, dated November 2, 1726, was incorporated by Glas into his Narrative and, along with the published letter (dated April 27, 1727), replied to in some detail.<sup>3</sup> The primary basis for Glas' opposition to the Covenants was his conception of the Gospel dispensation. He said the notion that was abroad about the obligation of the Covenants was the same as that of the disciples of Christ who believed in a temporal kingdom, while Christ taught that his Kingdom was not an earthly, temporal one. He held that "The Covenants, in the Way wherein they were entered into, were a Mean of mixing the profane World with the visible Church in Scotland, Britain and Ireland" and had "a Tendency to lead off Men from the Foundation. . . ." <sup>4</sup>

---

1. Loc. cit.

2. Loc. cit.

3. Ibid., pp. 117-45.

4. Ibid., pp. 39-42.

In his published letter Hog maintains that covenanting is warranted in the Gospel dispensation inasmuch as the Old Testament warrants are simply "prophetical of what shall be done under the New Testament;" that the very nature of a well-constituted Church implies an engagement to faithfulness and mutual assistance; that while there is no direct example of covenanting in the New Testament, that is a poor reason to reject covenanting, since the same argument was adduced by Anabaptists against infant baptism, which no Presbyterian would allow.<sup>1</sup> Moreover, rebutted Hog, the Old Testament and the New are both rules for the Church, which in essentials is one and the same in both dispensations.<sup>2</sup> He gives ample Scripture to show that oaths oblige posterity, just as the ordinance of baptism infers an obligation on the part of parents for their children, and he claims that in matters of oaths and covenants "the Society is to be considered as a Person."<sup>3</sup> He concludes his missive by instructing that Covenant-breaking is a heinous sin and that "The Lord is righteous in whatsoever Strokes he hath inflicted or may further lay upon us, considering how deeply these Lands are involved in the dreadful complex Sin of Covenant-breaking. . . ."<sup>4</sup>

---

1. James Hog, Scriptural Grounds and Warrants for the Reformation of Churches by Way of Covenant, (Edinburgh, 1727), pp. 9-10. Hereinafter cited, Reformation by Covenant.

2. Ibid., p. 10.

3. Ibid., pp. 10-11.

4. Ibid., p. 15.



The dispute offers several illustrations of incongruous alignments and actions on the part of the participants from the various schools in the Church, quite aside from the numerous publications which were issued by the two sides, Glas was at length accused of teaching antinomianism and promoting schism, in addition to other charges, and the Commission of Assembly deposed him in 1730. But the same Assembly which prepared the way for the deposition of the Erskines opened up the way for the restoration of Glas, who was restored to the character of a minister, though not of the Established Church.<sup>1</sup> Professor Hamilton voted in favor of Glas in 1730 while James Smith who, in 1723 when one of the members of Assembly referred to "the covenanted work of reformation", challenged the statement from the moderator's chair by declaring the church was no longer "upon that footing",<sup>2</sup> voted on the opposite side. The Marrowmen of Fife made amends with their opponents there and voted for deposition, but Boston and those Marrowmen to the south were against deposition.<sup>3</sup> As far as Hog is concerned, the debate only serves to underscore the fact that he maintained the old covenanting zeal to the end—in which he was not alone in the Church of Scotland.

---

1. Cunningham, op. cit., II.310.

2. Michael Shields, Faithful Contendings Displayed, (Glasgow: John Bryce, 1780), Preface, x (footnote).

3. Robert Wodrow, Analecta, IV. 135-6; J.T.Hornsby, "The Case of Mr. John Glas", The Scottish Church History Society Records, VI (1938), p.132.

Hog had refused to subscribe the Confession of Faith and Formula anew as required by the Synod in 1722; but on March 22, 1727, the following entry was made in the presbytery record: "Mr. Hog subscribed the Confession of Faith with the Formula one thousand seven hundred eleven."<sup>1</sup> Ralph Erskine stated that he, James Wardlaw, and Hog all signed the Confession "allenary", importing their subscribing was not in conformity to the act of Synod referred to;<sup>2</sup> yet no such statement is in the record. It is probable that Hog signed the Confession so that he would be qualified to sit in the Assembly. He had attended previous Assemblies as Commissioner from his presbytery in 1692, 1695-96, 1701,<sup>1705</sup> 1706, 1709, 1711, 1714, and 1717; but the way had been barred since he came into disfavor with the Synod of Fife over the Marrow. Now, however, he was immediately elected to the Assembly as Commissioner in 1727 and again in 1728 and 1730.

There is scant information concerning his activities in the Assemblies during these latter years, but it is known that he was wholeheartedly in favor of the highest censure of the Church against John Simson. From Wodrow it is known that he was active in the 1730 Assembly, Hog attacking the sermon preached during the Assembly of that year by a Mr Telfair of Hawick,<sup>3</sup> a sermon which Wodrow pronounces "one of the wildest out-of-the-way sermons that ever I heard."<sup>4</sup> He was also one of those who

- 
1. Dunfermline Presbytery Records, March 22, 1727.
  2. John Brown, Gospel Truth, p.146.
  3. Wodrow, Analecta, IV. 129-134.
  4. Ibid., p. 129.

dissented in the settlement of Robert Waugh at Hutton against the will of the congregation.<sup>1</sup>

Hog's last published work was directed against Professor Archibald Campbell of St. Andrews who in his Enquiry into the Original of Moral Virtue and Discourse Proving That the Apostles Were No Enthusiasts had asserted that man was unable by his natural powers to find out the being of a God; that the law of nature was sufficient to guide rational minds to happiness; that self-love was the sole principle and motive of all virtuous and religious actions; and that the Apostles, after Christ's death and before Pentecost, concluded Jesus to be an imposter.<sup>2</sup> These propositions caused considerable discussion and many were offended at them despite the fact that they were laid down, according to Campbell's explanation, in defense of divine revelation against natural religion.<sup>3</sup> Hog thought that self-love had to be regulated above all else by the love man owes to God and that "the Consideration . . . of Self, and Advantages whatsoever which attend the Service [of God], ought not to be the primary Spring or principal Motive of our Actions; all these must be subordinated unto the Glory of God as the great and ultimate End."<sup>4</sup> He objected that Campbell had

---

1. Ibid., pp. 127-28.

2. Acts of Assembly, 1736. X.

3. Cunningham, op. cit., II. 302-303.

4. James Hog, Two Letters Concerning Professor Campbell's Divinity, (Edinburgh: 1731), p.13.

not mentioned the necessity of a new nature and of faith which works by love, without which no man can please God;<sup>1</sup> and he summed up his thoughts on the questions by this observation: "According to our Author's Scheme; I see not of what Use the Person of Christ is in Religion, unless it were for an Example of Moral Virtue: Welcome News to Socinians, and Deists, from a Professor of Theology in Scotland."<sup>2</sup> Hog's remarks are very largely a re-iteration of arguments used against Professor Simson fifteen years earlier. They only serve to illustrate that Hog was far from incapacitated and that he still was possessed of a keenness for expressing Evangelical views in any and all theological questions which arose.

The 1736 Assembly received a report from its Committee for Purity of Doctrine which hinted that Campbell should be prohibited from expressing such views, but passed a milder warning to Campbell and all ministers to "hold fast the form of sound words."<sup>3</sup> This leniency was deplored by the Secession leaders in their "Judicial Testimony", in which they declare the conduct of the Assembly to be another "lamentable Step of Defection."<sup>4</sup>

During the ascendancy of Episcopacy in Scotland many individuals had recourse for spiritual guidance to praying societies, in which there was discussion of the Scripture, exhortation, prayer,

---

1. Ibid., pp.26-30.

2. Ibid., p.61.

3. Acts of Assembly, 1736. X.

4. Act, Declaration and Testimony, (Edinburgh: Printed for James Jaffray, 1737), p.99. Campbell's tenets are animadverted upon in pages 75-100 et passim. Hereinafter cited Judicial Testimony.

and sometimes reasoning on such subjects as forms of church government and modes of discipline. These societies were continued after the Revolution by those who continued to attend their parish churches but who met in small groups in private houses on week-day evenings for social worship in private.<sup>1</sup> There is reason to believe that Hog corresponded with these societies for many years, particularly with one in Edinburgh, for there is a manuscript record of some of his letters to the Edinburgh society from as early as 1725. In these letters Hog's favorite subjects are those which he had always expatiated upon—the corruption of man in his fallen state, and the means of his recovery; the signs that one is in a state of grace; on doubt, faith, and assurance. There is also an interesting section on worship—its nature, its object, its Rule, and its acts;<sup>2</sup> and one letter on the right of people to choose their minister.<sup>3</sup> By and large, these letters are a repetition of the opinions he had voiced in his prints previously published and they do not shed any new light on Hog's thought. Always there is a plea for the believer to trust in the God of glory who will never let faith "fall", since he is its Author and Finisher.

It is clear that Hog was engaged in some degree in the publication of works other than his own prints. The Marrow of Modern Divinity furnishes the obvious example. His preface to

---

1. Mackelvie, op. cit., pp. 1-2.

2. Vide Manuscript Correspondence with the Edinburgh Society, pages 57-123.

3. Manuscript letter dated Culross, March 5, 1733.

Halyburton's Natural Religion Insufficient has been mentioned. He was in possession of manuscripts written by James Fraser of Brea and published at least one selection from these manuscripts.<sup>1</sup> His letter to the publisher of Memoirs or Spiritual Exercises of Mistress Ross shows his interest in the publishing of works in the field of personal religion. There is one other work which he is known to have published and which has had an interesting history. The print is called Some Choice Sentences and Practices of Emelia Geddie and was edited and published by Hog. It is the record of the religious character and experience of a devout young Christian girl, Emelia Geddie, who died in 1681. Aside from what it reveals of Hog's editorial care<sup>2</sup> the little work is interesting because a second edition, issued in 1741, contains a letter from George Whitefield<sup>3</sup> recommending it to young people. Finally, there was another edition of it in 1795, a copy of which is in the National Library of Scotland, again recommended to the younger generation.

Hog's activities in the publishing field are another illustration of the versatility of this Evangelical leader, quite apart from whatever polemical connections some of the prints had.

On May 19, 1729, Hog's desire for an assistant in his work was communicated to the Session, who "heartily declared their willingness to comply" with this request and assured their aging

- 
1. Some Choice Select Meditations.
  2. Vide Emelia Geddie, pp. iv-vii.
  3. Ibid., iii.

minister that they expected "the like compliance" from the congregation.<sup>1</sup> As it turned out there was some opposition from a few churlish members, some of whom claimed Hog was acting as a "presumptive" patron, while others indicated they were not pleased with the voice of the candidate.<sup>2</sup> The Presbytery of Dunfermline heard the reports and unanimously approved the call to Daniel Hunter.<sup>3</sup> An appeal was carried by two persevering objectors to the Synod, which sustained the call, "being desirous to promote what is for the Support and encouragement of their Reverend Brother Mr. Hog, in his infirmity and old age. . . ."<sup>4</sup> Accordingly, on January 21, 1730, Hunter was ordained "assistant to the Reverend Mr. James Hog present Minister of Carnock during his Lifetime and to be the sole pastor of Carnock after the death of the said Mr. Hog."<sup>5</sup>

Hog continued to perform some of his pastoral responsibilities (though hereafter his name occurs much less frequently in the Session record) and lived in the manse at Carnock until his death. Donald Fraser has erroneously fixed the date of Hog's death as May 14, 1736;<sup>6</sup> but his name is not listed by the clerks of

---

1. Carnock Session Records, May 19, 1729.

2. Ibid., June 26, 1729.

3. Dunfermline Presbytery Records, August 20, 1729.

4. Synod of Fife Records, October 2, 1729.

5. Carnock Session Records, February 5, 1730; cf. Dunfermline Presbytery Records, January 21, 1730.

6. Donald Fraser, The Life and Diary of the Reverend Ralph Erskine, (Edinburgh: William Oliphant and Son, 1834), p.124; cf. Wodrow, Correspondence, I. 25.

Dunfermline Presbytery and the Synod of Fife as being a constituent member of their respective bodies after April 1734—a clear indication that shortly after that date Hog had died. The official record of the Church indicates that Hog died at Edinburgh on May 14, 1734, in the seventy-sixth year of his age.<sup>1</sup>

As a parish minister, Hog seems to have enjoyed no small measure of success at Carnock. He had the usual tribulations that any pastor experiences, but he had the confidence and support of his people, as may be observed in the records relative to the settlement of his assistant and successor. When the synod sustained the call to Hunter over the protest of two hot-heads of the congregation, they specified as one of their reasons for doing so "the affectionate respect they [the people] testified, for their Reverend Minister Mr. Hog."<sup>2</sup>

Few of his sermons are in print, and those which are were abstracts of discourses initially delivered, not for the public eye but to minister to the spiritual needs of his congregation. It is not without significance that at least three of the sermons were printed "at the desire of some of the hearers."<sup>3</sup> Each of these sermons, as well as several of his earlier works in the field of practical religion, reflect the theological and religious state of the times and demonstrate how one minister sought to bring to his flock an assurance of God's love and

---

1. Scott, op. cit., V.9. cf. Brown of Haddington, op.cit., p.150; Agnew, op. cit., p.289.

2. Synod of Fife Records, October 2, 1729.

3. James Hog, Abstract of Discourses on Mark 9: 23 (Title page); On Psalm 41:4 (Title page); and On Job 36: 8-10 (p.1).



and Fatherly Providence amidst their many shortcomings and backslidings, trials, sorrows, and failures. For in these sermons Hog strives to instil in his people a sure and steady confidence in the love and mercy of God revealed in Christ the Lord our Righteousness. The following excerpt is illustrative of his strain of preaching:

Howsoever heavy the Troubles of our Lord's Patients may be, and to whatever Height their Fears may be raised, yet their Souls detest the intertaining harsh Thoughts concerning 'the God of Glory. His Dispensations of Providence in the Case may be very dark, and have a most dismal Aspect, as to what appears to the Eye; yet the believing Patient ascribeth Righteousness to his Lord, the sovereign and just Judge of all the Earth. The Lord's Ways . . . he honours as just and equal, . . . being firmly assured that he is punished far less than his Iniquities deserve.

. . . . .

[We ought] to put a Blank in the Hands of our infinitely compassionate Lord and Physician, as to Means, Methods, Time, etc., yea, and every Thing, while we earnestly desire, and thro' his Grace, do patiently wait for promised Cures. 'Do unto us, as seemeth good unto thee: Only save us this Day',<sup>1</sup>

One cannot help feeling that Hog was, notwithstanding his numerous appearances in the Church judicatories, a pastor at heart, and most at home in performing the duties of parish minister to his people.

Nevertheless, Hog undoubtedly will continue to be remembered by posterity for his vigorous leadership in the Evangelical councils of the Church in the early eighteenth century. He was eminently qualified by natural gifts for the task, being of keen intellect, unwavering in principles, and of

---

1. James Hog, Abstract of Discourses on Psalm XLI, 4, (Edinburgh, 1716), pp.28,31.

extraordinary fortitude. Thomas Boston—who was not inclined to flattery—calls Hog "a man of great learning and singular piety and tenderness."<sup>1</sup> That Hog was a widely-read scholar and not a mere passionate protester is evident in his Essay to Vindicate Scripture Truths, written to oppose the teachings of Simson. In the thirty-two pages of this pamphlet he cites more than forty-five authors and Reformed Confessions, some of them orthodox and some heterodox. Among the authors cited are Amyrald, Amesius, Arminius, Flavel, Dent, Durham, Diodati, Grevinchove, Bucan, Pool, Turretin, Flacius Illyricus, Chamier, Utenbogard, Zanchius, and, of course, Calvin. There was not one major issue before the Church in the early eighteenth century which escaped the attention of James Hog, and he participated in the various debates in the Church courts concerning them in addition to the prints which issued from his pen.

Like most of the children of the seventeenth century Hog inherited a conscience which was both tender and over-scrupulous; yet it must be said that while he judged himself severely he went out of his way to avoid harsh and personal reflections where others were concerned. This was nowhere more obvious than during the heat of the Marrow controversy. A glance at many of the more recent ecclesiastical histories gives one the impression that Hog was an austere, haughty, and uncharitable disputant; but he felt "upon a due reflection the greatest Cause of any living to be deeply humbled before the Lord"

---

1. Boston, op. cit., p.245.

and often hesitated to write for the public eye "as if I entertain'd any design of imposing my poor Mints and Methods.

. . ."<sup>1</sup> His good friend Ralph Erskine, bestowed this tribute on him:

With [Boston], blest Hogg, the venerable sage,  
The humble witness 'gainst the haughty age,  
Was swept, with other worthies, off th'  
unworthy stage. 2

It will now be the purpose of this study to show the occasions which thrust James Hog forth into the national scene as an "Evangelical Leader in Early Eighteenth Century Scotland". In pursuit of this aim the thesis will be developed, as far as the material permits, along chronological lines corresponding roughly with the sketch of his life in this chapter. And thus, Hog will be presented, first of all, as he led in the "Resistance to Erastian Encroachment on the Church".

---

1. Hog, Lord's Supper, pp.34-5.

2. Ralph Erskine, The Poetical Works of the Reverend and Learned Ralph Erskine, (Aberdeen: George and Robert King, 1858), p. 644.

CHAPTER II

RESISTANCE TO ERASTIAN ENCROACHMENT ON THE CHURCH

When William of Orange landed at Torbay on November 5, 1688, he was not left long in doubt about the warmth of his welcome. One after another of the nobles hastened to his support; James's own armies defected to the enemy; even the fleet declared for a free parliament; the princess Anne deserted her father; and James, utterly bewildered and terrified by the misfortunes, with a single attendant, embarked at midnight on December 23, in a small vessel for France, thereby leaving<sup>1</sup> to William a bloodless victory and a vacant throne.

In Scotland the Revolution was accomplished with the same ease and success. However, the prevailing spirit and the anticipation of regained liberties, together with wild rumors and the dissolution of authority, prevented the coup d'etat from being wholly bloodless there. At Edinburgh, rumors of a papist invasion, caused the people to attack the palace, where, after a skirmish in which some citizens and soldiers were killed and wounded, they pillaged the Jesuit schools and abbey church which had been fitted for Roman Catholic worship. They continued for several days to search houses of Roman Catholics, destroying any "superstitious" religious paraphernalia they came across. Students at Glasgow University burned the effigy of the Pope. In the southwest, the populace began to gather amidst the wildest of rumours and vented their long pent-up feelings on the detected curates. The "rabblings" began on Christmas Day, and continued for two or three months, during which time some two hundred of the Episcopal clergy were ejected from their

---

1. Malcolm Laing, The History of Scotland, IV, Second Edition; (London: Printed for J. Mawman, 1804), 188-191.

parishes, their manses, and their livings.<sup>1</sup> But though these events were not always peaceful scenes, it has been observed that in view of the bloody stains of the persecuting days, one is "rather surprised and pleased that those fierce Cameronians, stigmatized, and pursued by the late government as assassins, abstained from a massacre of the established clergy."<sup>2</sup>

It was not long, however, before steps were being taken to bring a semblance of order to the land. After conference with William, a convention of estates was held at Edinburgh on March 14, 1689, in which, after an initial test of strength, the Whig majority asserted itself, and then addressed itself to the pressing concerns of the nation.<sup>3</sup> It declared that James, "having endeavoured to subvert the constitution, by breaking the original contract between the king and people, and having violated the fundamental laws, and withdrawn from the kingdom, had abdicated the government, and that the throne was thereby vacant."<sup>4</sup> William and Mary were invited to accept the Scottish crown and were duly proclaimed King and Queen on April 11, 1689, at Edinburgh, and the coronation oath was administered at Whitehall exactly one month later.<sup>5</sup>

Steps were taken for the meeting of the Scots Parliament in June, which, when it met, at once ratified the political actions

---

1. *Ibid.*, pp.191-194; Cunningham, *op. cit.*, II.153.

2. Laing, *op. cit.*, IV.194. cf. Cunningham, *op.cit.*, II.153.

3. Cunningham, *op. cit.*, II. 159.

4. Laing, *op. cit.*, IV. 203-4.

5. *Ibid.*, p.208.

of the Convention.. However, when the ecclesiastical measures were brought up, the Parliament was confronted with one difficulty after another—many of which were neither fostered by the religious factions, nor essentially ecclesiastical in nature. Principal Robert Story has thus depicted the state of affairs in Scotland at this time:

Its factions were embittered. . . . Its political life was demoralised. . . . Its religion was deformed on one side by an irrational fanaticism, on another by a hard and insolent intolerance. Its public men meedy, selfish, and unprincipled. It possessed a national independence, in virtue of which it might legally refuse to grant the Scottish crown to the sovereign of England. . . . Its Highlands were inhabited by a half-savage people, alien in race, language, manners, and religion from the Lowlanders; and the two races, were full of mutual hatred and distrust. Every political difficulty, which arose in a country disorganised through misgovernment, and seething with the elements of revolution, was intensified by the infusion of religious discord and sectarian enmities,<sup>1</sup>

It is sufficient to say that Episcopalians, taking a weapon from the Presbyterian armory, argued that any regulation of Church affairs by Parliament would be outright Erastianism; while the Presbyterians protested that the Episcopal incumbents so far outnumbered their own clergy that it was necessary for Parliament to determine the establishment and who should govern in the affairs of the Church.<sup>2</sup> It was certainly true that "if the re-establishment of that [Presbyterian] system had depended on the efforts of its adherents, it could never

---

1. Story, op. cit., pp.159-60.

2. Cunningham, op.cit., II 170-71.

have taken place."<sup>1</sup> Finally, after heated debates, an act was passed on the twenty-second of July, 1689, declaring prelacy, or any office in the Church superior to presbyters to be "'a great and insupportable grievance to this nation, and contrary to the inclination of the generality of the people ever since the Reformation',"<sup>2</sup> and abolishing the same. So Episcopacy was quashed insofar as establishment was concerned.

King William had all along shunned an outright declaration of his own approval of one form of church government over another. However, he was

no sooner seated on the throne than he showed the cherished purpose on which his heart was set—the union of the Presbyterian and Prelatic clergy in one Church. As a statesman it was to him a matter of pressing importance to have them brought together. He seems to have had no particular belief in any form of church government; at all events, a united Church and a united people were far more to him than any difference between Presbytery and Episcopacy.<sup>3</sup>

Burnet tells how, when the Episcopal clergy sent up the dean of Glasgow to ascertain what the intentions of the then prince were with relation to them, William replied that he would do all

---

1. William Law Mathieson, Scotland and the Union, (Glasgow: James Maclehose and Sons 1905), pp.12-13.

2. John M'Kerrow, History of the Secession Church, I (Edinburgh: William Oliphant and Sons, 1839), 2.

3. Thomas Brown, Church and State in Scotland, (Edinburgh: Macniven and Wallace, 1891), pp.166-67. Hereinafter cited, Church and State.



he could to preserve them, while granting a full toleration<sup>1</sup> to the presbyterians. But this was with the proviso that they "concurred in the new settlement of that kingdom: for if they opposed that, and if, by a great majority in parliament, resolutions should be taken against them, the king could not make a war for them."<sup>2</sup> The disaffection of the Episcopalians, the firm adherence of the people to Presbyterian government, the influence of William Carstares, and the loyal support of the Presbyterians, at length prevailed upon the king to establish the Presbyterian government of the Church.<sup>3</sup> Nevertheless, it was not until April and June 1690, that the measures were adopted by Parliament which reconstituted the Presbyterian Church as the Established Church of Scotland. By these acts the grievous Act of Supremacy (1669) was abolished. Those ministers who had been ejected from their parishes since January 1, 1661, were restored to their parishes, and the government of the Church was left to them, and to those ministers and elders who were received and admitted by them. The Confession of Faith was read and approved as the avowed Confession of the Church. Presbyterian church government and discipline, as defined and secured by the Act of 1592,<sup>4</sup> was ratified— excepting that part which related to patronage. Eventually, patronage was

---

1. Bishop Gilbert Burnet, History of His Own Time, 2nd. edition, IV (Oxford: The University Press, 1833), 40-41.

2. Ibid., p.41.

3. Brown, Church and State, p.167.

4. Hetherington, op. cit., 549-550 pp.; Story, op. cit., p.187; Cunningham, op. cit., II. 174-5.

abolished.<sup>1</sup> Finally, the day was appointed for the meeting of the General Assembly. Thus was the Church of Scotland reconstructed by the Parliament.

It was on October 16, 1690, that the General Assembly convened at Edinburgh, thirty-seven years having elapsed since Cromwell had dispersed the last meeting.<sup>2</sup> One hundred sixty-three commissioners were present, of whom one hundred twenty were ministers, and forty-three were elders.<sup>3</sup> It was surely one of the most moving and thrilling days of the Church's one hundred and thirty year existence. It was at the same time a rather uneasy Assembly, facing as it did a host of difficulties from within and without. The king desired the admission of the Episcopalian clergy and there was the danger of offending him. The Jacobites hoped to embroil the Church in internal strife until their scheme for a counter-revolution could be put into action. The Assembly was composed of ministers who, on the one hand, had accepted the Indulgences and conformed to prelacy, and on the other, represented the fiery Covenanters who had witnessed unto death.<sup>4</sup>

Notwithstanding the long debate and the enacting of a thoroughly

---

1. Hetherington, op. cit., pp.550-51.

2. Alexander Smellie, Men of the Covenant, II (London: Andrew Melrose, 1908), 297.

3. Authority for these figures is Principal Emeritus Hugh Watt, whose source is the manuscript minutes of the 1690 Assembly, deposited in the Glasgow University Library.

4. Hetherington, op. cit., pp.553-54.

Presbyterian Church, there were many who refused to accept the Revolution Settlement. Some of these, like the Cameronians, remained outside the Church; others, the stricter sect of the Presbyterians, went into the Church and sought to remedy what they deemed to be its defects. They resented the interference of William in Church affairs, fearing "above all things a lukewarm Erastianism" which might gradually corrupt the pure faith of their fathers.<sup>1</sup> They were smarting because "no renunciation of Episcopacy was demanded from those Episcopal ministers, who should wish to abide in the national establishment."<sup>2</sup> The Settlement was based on the Act of 1592 rather than on the accomplishments of the years 1638 and following, and they looked upon this as a retrograde movement. All mention of the Covenants had been carefully avoided in these acts, for it was well known that William would never consent to a legal recognition of them.<sup>3</sup>

It cannot be doubted that some of these charges were true, but at the same time it has been acknowledged by so firm an Evangelical as W.M. Hetherington that the Revolution Settlement "approaches very near to what it ought to have been,—much more so than many will allow."<sup>4</sup>

The truth of the matter is that from the very beginning the

---

1. Sir Henry Craik, A Century of Scottish History, I (Edinburgh: William Blackwood and Sons, 1901), 9.

2. Story, op. cit., p.199.

3. Ibid., p. 191.

4. Hetherington, op. cit., p.555.

hostile forces and discordant elements threatened the Church with a rupture. So the letter of the king to the Assembly was not a mere form, and was surely welcomed by the more enlightened members of the Assembly. In it William stated that

Our concern for the good of our ancient kingdom hath been such, that we have left nothing undone that might contribute to the making it happy: And therefore, having been informed, that differences as to the government of the church have caused greatest confusions in that nation, we did willingly concur with our Parliament in enacting such a frame of it as was judged to be most agreeable to the inclinations of our good subjects. . . . So we expect that your management shall be such as we shall have no reason to repent of what we have done. A calm and peaceable procedure will be no less pleasing to us than it becometh you.<sup>1</sup>

The Assembly showed its gratitude by observing the "calm and peaceable procedure" and "moderation" enjoined by their sovereign. The three Cameronian ministers were received; a solemn National Fast was appointed; and two "Committees of Visitation", one for the region north of the Tay and the other for that south of the Tay, were appointed, and instructions given relative to the admission of the curates. Several acts were passed which dealt with the worship and life of the Church. Then the Assembly reported its work in a letter to the king and adjourned, leaving the matters of less universal interest to the next Assembly.<sup>2</sup>

While the Assembly itself had proceeded with admirable moderation, the Commissions did not see fit to adhere closely to

---

1. Acts of Assembly, 1690. II.

2. Vide Acts of Assembly, 1690. V, XII, XIV, passim.

their instructions. The result was that large numbers of incumbents were removed from their parishes, in direct opposition to the assurances given the king by the Assembly's letter. The Episcopal clergy, conscious of William's sympathy and aware of their own strength, were not willing to take the subordinate place assigned to them under the Settlement, much less inclined meekly to accept the verdicts of the Commissions.<sup>1</sup> They sent a deputation to William, who was then in Flanders, which returned bearing letters from the king calling for the cessation of harsh measures and the redress of those who had been wronged. He insisted that those who were willing to submit to the government in Church and State should be left in their places.<sup>2</sup> Though he had acquiesced in a Presbyterian form of government, his pet ecclesiastical project continued to be the inclusion of the Episcopalian clergy in the established Church—"he would have a door left open for them, and would make it as wide as he could."<sup>3</sup> These letters were something less than welcome to the Presbyterians who regarded them as outright Erastian interference, and they continued their business in the same fashion as before the king's pleas had been heard.

The 1690 Assembly had appointed the next meeting to be held on the first of November 1691, but there was a lapse of over three years between the close of the 1690 Assembly and the sitting down

---

1. Mathieson, op. cit., p.14.

2. Cunningham, op. cit., II 184.

3. Brown, Church and State, p. 167.

of the next Assembly of which the Acts have been printed  
 in the standard collections.<sup>1</sup> What happened to the supreme  
 judicatory of the Church in the meantime?

The fact is, that this General Assembly which should have begun on the 1st of November 1691, was adjourned by Royal Proclamation on the 26th of October, only five days before it should have met, to the inexpressible disappointment and vexation of Members who were on their way, or who, in many instances, had come to Edinburgh, and it was postponed till the [1]5th of January 1692, a most inconvenient season, which, at a period when there were few roads and no public conveyances, rendered it almost impracticable for distant members, particularly in the north, to travel so far in the depth of winter. . . .<sup>2</sup>

Perhaps the king expected that this rap on the Presbyterian knuckles would incline them to a speedy, if unwilling, compliance. If so, it only shows how poorly he understood Presbyterian principles.

The General Assembly 1692, when it did meet, was certainly under a cloud. All the events since 1690 had confirmed the Presbyterians in the belief that William was too benevolently inclined toward the Episcopalian clergy, and the king was just as firmly convinced that the Prebyterians were unduly rigorous in their treatment of the Episcopalians. William's letter to the Assembly certainly did nothing to allay the suspicions of the Presbyterians. He referred to his letters in February and June, 1691, in which he had "signified [his] care for the settlement of the Church . . . and desire to bring these

---

1. Register of Proceedings, p.iii.

2. Ibid. (The Proclamation itself is printed on p.ii).

Ministers who formerly conformed to Episcopie to an union with you in the Church Government by Presbytery." <sup>1</sup> He reminded the Assembly of the "fair Assurances" he had received from them, but of their failure to make any progress. He further urged the reception of the conformers under the terms of the formula sent down by his Commissioner, and proposed that if time did not permit the accomplishment of this reception, two Commissions should be appointed, each of at least twenty-four ministers, to consist of twelve Presbyterians and twelve of those who had formerly conformed to Episcopacy. <sup>2</sup> Then, having reassured them of his firm purpose to maintain and protect the Presbyterian government of the Church, he continued, "We do expect that you will rest and depend upon this, and not allow yourselves to be imposed upon by some hot, violent spirits, who would carry you from moderation and charity. . . ." <sup>3</sup>

If this was not sufficiently clear, the Royal Commissioner, the Earl of Lothian, continued in the same vein in his address to the Assembly. He first exhorted them to charity. Then he lectured them on Church government, stating that he did not deny its importance, "it being the Hedge about the Vineyard, without which the tender Plants cannot be raised, neither the mature Fruit well preserved." <sup>4</sup> But he underscored the point that while "that 'Fence' be of very good use, it cannot be supposed,

---

1. Ibid., p. 9.

2. Ibid., pp. 9-10.

3. Ibid., p. 10

4. Ibid., p.12.

it is raised to keep out Fellow-laborers, who are willing to work in the Vineyard. . . ." <sup>1</sup> Further, he warned them against standing upon "Nyceties and Punctilio's", and "Bigotry, which I hope you need not be guarded against, though incident to Church-men." <sup>2</sup>

What was the Church to do? It had received too much from William to defy his wishes openly and deliberately, yet it was decidedly averse to compliance with his desires. The alternative—and this was the procedure set upon—was to "offer to his policy, if it did not chime with theirs, an inert and stolid opposition of inaction and non-compliance, which should defeat it as effectually as overt hostility." <sup>3</sup>

Accordingly, the Formula of William, and the petition of the Episcopal clergy, was referred to a committee, <sup>4</sup> while the Assembly busied itself with sundry matters of lesser urgency. When the real issue was raised in the Assembly, the reply was that the committee was not yet ready to report. At length, on February 2, 1692, the Episcopalians demanded an immediate and final answer to their petition. <sup>5</sup> On this occasion, the king's Commissioner "acknowledged that he had occasioned the delay of the said Answer". <sup>6</sup> Meanwhile, there was evidently no progress whatsoever in the committee.

---

1. Ibid.

2. Ibid., pp.12-13.

3. Story, op. cit., p. 222.

4. Register of Proceedings, p. 14.

5. Ibid., p. 24.

6. Ibid.



So, immediately after the opening prayer on February 13, the Earl of Lothian rose, sharply rebuked the Assembly for failure to accomplish "what was the principal Design in calling this Assembly (of uniting with your Brethren)," and declared that since they showed no inclination to comply with His Majesty's demands, he was commanded to dissolve the Assembly.<sup>1</sup>

This, wrote James Hog, who was present as a commissioner from the Presbytery of Hamilton, "came upon them suddenly, like a thunder-bolt, with the greatest surprize."<sup>2</sup> He recounts how the Moderator, William Crichton,<sup>3</sup> asserted "the immediate dependence of church judicatories upon the Lord Jesus, the exalted Head of his church, and that he had entrusted his servants who bear office in his name with full power over their meetings and matters."<sup>4</sup> At the desire of the Assembly, the Moderator named the third Wednesday of August, 1693, as the date for the next meeting, which was unanimously approved by the whole Assembly.<sup>5</sup>

It is obvious that a crisis had been reached in the relations of Church and State. Originally, the question was the granting the curates a share in the government of the Church in the terms sent down by the king.<sup>6</sup> Now there was ~~the~~ added and more delicate

---

1. Ibid., pp.35-6.

2. Hog. Memoirs, p.65.

3. Register of Proceedings, p. 5.

4. Hog, Memoirs, p. 64; cf. Register of Proceedings, p.36 and John Pollock, Answer to the First Part of Humble Pleadings, (Dumfries: Robert Rae, 1717), p.25.

5. Ibid., p. 65. cf. Register of Proceedings, p.36.

6. Register of Proceedings, p.14.

question of the inherent right of the Church to meet in its highest court.

It has already been noted that James Hog lamented the way in which the leading men had meekly complied with the secular authority and compromised the Presbyterian principles.<sup>1</sup> In the months that followed the dissolution of the 1692 Assembly, the country was in a state of violent agitation over the issues, and the majority of the Church, weary of bickering and desirous of getting on with the actual work of the Church, hoped that a collision could be avoided. In their desire to have peace at almost any cost, certain of the leading ministers arranged a meeting at Edinburgh to make an address to the king. But the meeting was held secretly by a few of the conspirators, so that by the time the members of the various judicatories arrived, the meeting itself was already adjourned.<sup>2</sup> Assuming the title of the "Synod of Glasgow and Air [sic], the Presbytery of Edinburgh, with delegates from several other Presbyteries",<sup>3</sup> the schemers sent up an address to the king, to the following effect:

---

1. Supra, pp. 28ff.

2. Hog, Memoirs, p. 70.

3. Ibid., p. 70 Cf. Protesters Vindicated, (1716), p.262.

They regret the disorder at the dissolution of the last Assembly, which, say they, was occasioned by the suddenness thereof, and would have been prevented, had they known but a moment before, in which event they represented that some overture would have been fallen upon, agreeable to his Majesty, and suiting the exigence of matters, as then stated. Hereupon they humbly desire that his Majesty would overlook what is past, and be graciously pleased to call a General Assembly, wherein they promise such a management as they doubt not will be acceptable.<sup>1</sup>

Hog objected first of all to the method used to draw up the address. No authority of any judicatory was ever given for this action, and some of the courts involved instructed their commissioners to propose its being laid before the General Assembly. It was even moved that the Assembly call for this paper, but pretexts of various kinds procured delays and in the end the pursuers wearied of ever securing their motion, and gave up.<sup>2</sup> Hog himself saw the paper, but he was never permitted to have it in his custody for even a minute, or to make a copy of it.<sup>3</sup> Hog declares that what really took place was that those who were involved knew that no such repentance would be forth-coming from the judicatories mentioned, and "therefore they thought meet to do it for them. . . . No address from private hands could have borne weight, it wanted to have the name of the church, or at least of a considerable part thereof, and therefore they gave it that name, though without their knowledge and consent."<sup>4</sup>

---

1. Ibid., p. 72.

2. Ibid., p. 71.

3. Ibid., p. 70.

4. Ibid., p. 71. Cf. Pollock op. cit., p.43.

If Hog is objective in his reporting of these proceedings—and there is no evidence to contradict it, but contrariwise a strong indication of his carefulness and candidness—then new light is shed on the whole trend of the Church, and the carriage of affairs in the post-Revolution days. There is weighty evidence that the Church was being "managed" by a kind of oligarchical system, and Hog and his compatriots were not fighting shadows, but a very real enemy of the liberties of the Church.

Of course, when they were confronted with the evidence, the abettors of the scheme gave it the fairest possible explanation.<sup>1</sup> But the king himself understood its meaning and exclaimed with surprise when he saw the address that "the Church of Scotland had acknowledged their offence, and craved pardon."<sup>2</sup> Perhaps the naming of a date for the Assembly to meet in 1693 was not entirely due to the skilfull management of Johnston, as has been claimed,<sup>3</sup> but in some measure due to this unexpected concession on the part of the proud Presbyterians of Scotland! Hog, however, maintained that there was no need for any apology for the Moderator's affirmation at the close of the 1692 Assembly, since, after all, he had said only what the Confession of Faith asserted "in terms fully as strong and stronger."<sup>4</sup>

---

1. Ibid., pp. 72-3.

2. Ibid., p. 74.

3. Brown, Church and State, p. 169.

4. Ibid., p. 73.

Such a performance was, said Hog, contrary to the spirit of the inspired writer who declared, "I will speak of thy testimonies before kings, and will not be ashamed." (Psalm 119: 46) The Church at this juncture "had a notable opportunity . . . of owning the royalties of Christ, and the liberties of his house, before the best and mildest of kings, to whom we owed the highest obligations, and hereunto a fair and open concurrence might have been obtained, but other contrary and clanculary [sic] courses were taken."<sup>1</sup> If Hog had had his way, there can be no doubt that the Church would have seized this opportunity to demonstrate its inherent power.

As matters turned out, the Church was forced into taking a stand, and Hog was given ample opportunity to testify to those principles which were so precious to his philosophy of Presbyterianism. As the date announced by the Moderator of the 1692 Assembly for the 1693 meeting (August, 1693) approached, Hog took note that his own presbytery was taking no action in preparation for keeping the date. So he wrote one of the older ministers urging that the presbytery choose commissioners and give them instructions "as a juncture so very critical should be found to require."<sup>2</sup> He received, in return, a rebuff from the older brother, who suggested that Hog's health was being impaired by his "thoughtfulness about things of this sort."<sup>3</sup> On the appointed day, only a few appeared at the New Church of Edinburgh,

---

1. Ibid.

2. Ibid., pp. 66-7.

3. Ibid., p. 67.

and the Moderator and Clerk were not among these. Hog recalled that this caused the enemies of Presbytery to boast that "we would get no more assemblies. . . ." <sup>1</sup>

The king was finally prevailed upon to call an Assembly to meet on December 6, 1693, but just a week before that date, he adjourned the Assembly to the 29th of March, 1694, when it did in fact meet. <sup>2</sup> By that time there was another burning issue before the country and James Hog was deeply involved in it.

One of the grievances against the Revolution Settlement was that the Parliament had passed an act enjoining the oath of Allegiance to be sworn in place of any other oaths that had been imposed in the past. Though the act was framed with a view to the abolition of the offensive oaths of the Restoration, "it was so worded as to include amongst the number of the oaths that were abolished, the oath of the covenant . . ." <sup>3</sup> However, there were other matters more pressing and there was no major controversy over this oath. Then, in 1693, Parliament devised an Oath of Assurance which was to be imposed as a qualification for the holding of all public office, including that of the ministry. While designed to end the evasions of the Jacobites, who avoided the direct recognition of William as king, the Assurance was found to be just as distasteful to the Presbyterians as to the Episcopalians. The latter opposed it because they did not want to recognize William and Mary as King and Queen de jure as well as de facto.

---

1. Ibid., p. 68.

2. Register of Proceedings, p.iii.

3. M'Kerrow, op. cit., I. 2.

The former opposed it because they looked upon it as an encroachment on their liberties by the State, who had no right to prescribe civil oaths as a qualification for ecclesiastical office. The Oath of Assurance was followed up with "An Act for Settling the Quiet and Peace of the Church", which declared that all Episcopal ministers who took the oaths of Allegiance and Assurance, subscribed the Confession, and acknowledged the Presbyterian government of the Church should be entitled to admission to church courts and be protected in their parishes until admitted.<sup>1</sup> It has been noted that Hog determined not to take the oath, and how he became involved in a process against him by Hamilton Presbytery.<sup>2</sup> The background to the whole issue is clearly described by Agnew, who explains that at the Revolution epoch

all godly ministers observed, with deepest feeling, how the Stuart rule had demoralized the consciences of the people by a wanton imposition of oaths. The people had been compelled to swear this thing and that thing, and even an undescribed et cetera, not because they believed it, but because it was commanded. Falsehood and perjury were incurred with a light heart and elastic conscience, and a sacred solemnity was rendered contemptible and ensnaring.<sup>3</sup>

Hog's case came before the 1694 Assembly, at which he stated in large detail those principles which had made him scruple at the taking of the oaths, though it must be borne in mind that the libel also accused him of separating from the presbytery and

---

1. Story, op. cit., pp. 235-37.

2. Supra, pp. 28ff.

3. Agnew, op. cit., p. 287. Cf. Hog, Memoirs, p. 118.

and joining another society.<sup>1</sup> Thus, Hog's views at this time, hereinafter expressed, are based on his statements made before the presbytery at various stages of the process; a paper he prepared (but never had occasion to use) in reply to his libel;<sup>2</sup> and the arguments he advanced when he was before some committees of the General Assembly.<sup>3</sup> There were many ramifications of this whole question, however, which it is necessary to include in the examination and exhibition of Hog's views.

Though he had no great antipathy to the oaths at first, he was at length made to see

clearly the political design and tendency, which could not but prove ensnaring, by obliging gospel ministers to swear, as the several turns of government, and claims raised upon them, would move the prevailing party to demand. Thus a heavy foundation was laid for wreathing about our necks a heavy yoke of oaths. . . . That the ministry might be kept free of that yoke, he thought it most advisable to decline the same in the entry. . . .<sup>4</sup>

On the other hand, Hog declared his absolute and unyielding loyalty, gratitude, and subjection to William and Mary in all matters of civil government. This he did at the outset of the whole controversy in a letter to the Duchess of Hamilton, whose husband was at that time the Commissioner to the Parliament.<sup>5</sup>

Hog's criticism was aimed more at the Church than it was at

---

1. Hog, Memoirs, p. 91.

2. Ibid., pp. 91-97.

3. Ibid., pp. 103-105, 117-128.

4. Ibid., p. 48.

5. Ibid., p. 49.



the king personally. At the same time he objected to the foundation on which the Church had been reconstructed by Parliament. Episcopacy had been abolished only because it was contrary to the "inclinations of the people" and Presbytery had been established only for that reason, said Hog, and this meant that church government was "very uncertain and variable."<sup>1</sup> Of course, the king himself had taken occasion more than once to refer to Presbyterian church government as being founded on "the inclinations of the people."<sup>2</sup> Hog lamented the silence of the General Assembly in the face of this defection from the covenanting work of reformation and thought a strong assertion of the jus divinum should have been made. He reminded his presbytery that from the Reformation the Church had been zealous in "owning and asserting the liberties of our Lord's house, especially when encroachments were made thereupon; and that this was one of the glories of the Church of Scotland, wherein they excelled other churches."<sup>3</sup> He referred particularly to the Act of Assembly 1638, "whereby it is declared that, by divine, ecclesiastical and civil warrants, this national kirk hath power and liberty to assemble ordinarily, and pro re nata, as occasion and necessity shall require. . . ." <sup>4</sup> It was clear that the events at the 1692 Assembly, and subsequent thereto, had afforded the Church the very chance to demonstrate this principle, but

---

1. Ibid., p. 82.

2. Vide Acts of Assembly, 1690. II.

3. Hog, Memoirs, pp. 82-3.

4. Ibid., p. 83. Cf. Acts of Assembly, Session 26, December 20, 1638.

instead, pardon had been craved! Hog declared that the prudential reasons advanced by his brethren did not remove the "moral, and therefore, indispensable obligation, our Lord hath laid upon us all, to stand fast to the liberties wherewith Christ hath made us free, by refusing to submit to an Erastian yoke, and bearing testimony . . . against whatsoever is injurious to the honour of the glorious Head of the church, and encroacheth upon the liberties of his courts."<sup>1</sup>

There was another point made by Hog (in the paper of answers to the libel) which established his argument on a basis less open to objection. He called attention to the fact that no ecclesiastical statute obliged him to take the oaths and that, therefore, there was no basis for a church pursuit! Moreover, the State had overlooked his non-compliance, and since the only violation was that an act of Parliament, "it might have been reputed a strange flight of Heteroclite zeal, should his reverend brethren have taken upon them to execute acts of parliament."<sup>2</sup> In addition, Hog found weight added to his arguments by the "Act and Declaration against an Act of Parliament, and against all new Oaths and Bonds in the Common Cause, imposed without Consent of the Church", passed by the General Assembly in 1648, which act prohibited the swearing, subscribing to, or pressing new oaths not approved by the Assembly.<sup>3</sup>

---

1. Ibid., p. 84.

2. Ibid., p. 92.

3. Ibid., p. 93. Vide. Acts of Assembly, 1648, Session 18.

Yet another consideration which aggrieved Hog was the fact that all the affairs of the Church were in the care of a few men under the influence of the court, and that any overtures at obtaining redress of the Erastian encroachments were suppressed and never permitted to come before the Assembly. The point Hog made was that in the courts of the Church there was not liberty to disagree with, or even reason on, measures that the court would frown upon. The very purpose of the form of commission adopted by the 1695 Assembly was to thwart any designs of this nature, Hog claimed.<sup>1</sup>

These were strong words and that they were disseminated in Hamilton Presbytery—if not beyond its bounds—is indicated by the fact that the presbytery had demanded a "double of that paper of reasons for his refusing the oath qch. the presbytrie is informed is spread in the countrie."<sup>2</sup> When, therefore, he went up to the Assembly and made it clear that he had never had the least intention of separating from the Church; and when it was known that his presbytery had mismanaged the affair from the very beginning,"the conduct of the Presbytery was universally disrelished."<sup>3</sup> There was a meeting of a committee delegated to attend to an important matter (the comprehension of the curates), and in a private meeting they conversed with the Dalserf minister, showing him marked respect. They pointed out that "his difficult circumstances had fixed the eyes of many upon him,

---

1. Ibid., pp.100-101. Acts of Assembly, 1695, Act VIII.

2. Hamilton Presbytery Records, August 29, 1693.

3. Ibid., p. 103.

being brought, as it were, upon a public stage, where his deportment would not want its influence one way or another upon the general state of the church."<sup>1</sup> It seems that the real desire of these brethren was to pacify Hog and insure that he did not appear before the Assembly. And this they at length succeeded in accomplishing.

They did not gain this end, however, before Hog had said his piece about the whole state of affairs as he saw them! The real business before the Assembly was the comprehension of the curates. Apparently, everything that was discussed led, like the spokes of a wheel, to this question as the central issue, and Hog seized his chance and plunged into the stream of discussion, pleading for the Church to throw off the Erastian yoke. He again lamented the defective basis of the established government of the Church and the absence of protests in the face of encroachments on its liberties. In reply to those who held that "times had changed", Hog asserted that the path of duty is the right path always; that the path of duty should be determined by the written Word alone; that the King must think their principles did not matter since they could so easily "come and go" upon them; that it was easier to decline the Erastian yoke than to shake it off once it was hanging about their neck; that the honor of God was at stake and that this took precedence over all other loyalties and considerations, though an assertion of stated principles was not in the least inconsistent with a dutiful respect to the powers set over them.<sup>2</sup> Then, answering those

---

1. Ibid., p. 104.

2. Ibid., pp.120-124.

critics who claimed that the Confession of Faith itself acknowledged the power of the civil magistrate to call Assemblies, Hog responded that the Act of Assembly prefixed to the Westminster Confession stated the Presbyterian principle very clearly and deliberately.<sup>1</sup> He also pointed out that it was one thing to call an Assembly—which was for the advantage of the Church—and quite another to dissolve an Assembly, which was to the harm of the Church. And as for the doctrine of the 'custos', by which Erastians claimed that civil authority, as keeper of both tables of the Law, had jurisdiction in the sphere of the Church,<sup>2</sup> Hog argued that there was truth in the argument, but that the keys of doctrine and government were given only to the Church and its officers.<sup>3</sup>

While Hog's remarks did not prevent the adoption of measures for the receiving of the curates, the Act when passed did define the conditions for their reception in terms that removed the real objection. For example, it was necessary that each applicant accept the Confession as the confession of his faith. Moreover, there was to be no mass reception such as had been attempted in 1692: they were to apply "one by one." It is also to be noted that no express promise was made to receive the incumbents into the government of the Church, but only "into ministerial communion,"

---

1. Ibid., p. 125. Cf. Acts of Assembly 1647, Session 23, which states that in case the magistrate withholds or denies his consent to the meetings of the Church judicatories, the Church may meet "by the intrinsical power received from Christ".

2. James Walker, The Theology and Theologians of Scotland, (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1872), p.137.

3. Hog, Memoirs, pp.125-6.

though William would undoubtedly be led to understand that the admission would be into the government of the Church.<sup>1</sup>

One other point should be noted here: There is at least some reason to believe that James Hog's case, directly or indirectly, led the Assembly to pass an "Act anent Processes against Ministers" in which presbyteries were warned to proceed against ministers in case of processes with "all due circumspection and prudence" and "that no judicatory of this Church do take advantage to censure any minister whatsoever, for not having qualified himself in the terms of the act of Parliament, 1693, intituled, 'Act for settling the Quiet and Peace of the Church'. . . ."<sup>2</sup>

In due time Hog found indications of a healthier state of religion, one of the most encouraging signs for him being a fast ordered by the Synod of Glasgow in which one of the reasons for the fast was "'Encroachments upon the Liberties of the Church, and Restraints put upon our General Assemblies'.<sup>3</sup>" A reconciliation with his brethren of the presbytery followed and he was especially pleased with the instructions which the presbytery drew up for those who were to be named their commissioners to the 1695 Assembly. Hog reflected that he could not have desired more faithfulness and freedom on their part than was used at that time.<sup>4</sup> The atmosphere of Hamilton Presbytery had undergone a

---

1. Acts of Assembly, 1694. XI; cf. Register of Proceedings, iii.

2. Acts of Assembly, 1694. XII.

3. Hog, Memoirs, p.129.

4. Ibid., p. 130.

decided change since the spring of 1694! So pleased was Hog that he shortly took the occasion to visit his friends in Edinburgh and report the developments within his presbytery. /s

While he was in Edinburgh, however, his presbytery met and elected him a commissioner to the approaching Assembly. Despite Hog's pleas to be relieved of the duty, the presbytery, assuring him of their confidence in him and that his fears were groundless, continued the obligation upon him. The only consolation Hog could find in his predicament was that this would bring out clearly "whether the King and Parliament had enacted the Allegiance, and required the Assurance, as an ecclesiastical qualification."<sup>1</sup> Nevertheless, he was a most unwilling commissioner.<sup>2.</sup>

All went well at first, chiefly because the king's Commissioner<sup>3</sup> (Lord Carmichael) had not appeared. When he arrived and learned that James Hog was a commissioner, he expressed his displeasure at such "an imprudent choice."<sup>4</sup> He sent for Hog, who, appearing, was privately interviewed. The purpose was to persuade Hog to desert his commission. In response to this suggestion, Hog made the following argument: That he objected to the many encroachments upon the liberties of the Assemblies, by adjournments and dissolutions as if they had been civil courts; that the presbytery,

---

1. Ibid., p. 132.

2. Ibid., pp.130-32.

3. Acts of Assembly, 1695. VII; Hog, Memoirs, p.132

4. Hog, Memoirs, p. 132.

with whom he was reconciled, had sent him and that in spite of his own wish to avoid trouble, he could not desert the commission; that "the State had nothing to except against him, save that he was not qualified by law (though as loyal as any other subject, both in principle and practice), and for them to judge and determine in the necessary qualities of a member of Assembly, he feared not to say ,was an encroachment upon their liberties"; that he was doing only what was "necessarily consequential to our principles, as Presbyterians in opposition to Erastianism," and that since it was a civil oath which was required, a "declining it could not infer an ecclesiastical penalty, such as the being incapable to sit as a member in a General Assembly; a censure utterly incapable for the State to inflict." They might just as well forbid him to preach!<sup>1</sup> He refused to desert the commission unless the Assembly itself should direct him to do so.

Lord Carmichael replied that even if the Assembly should declare itself satisfied, he, as the representative of the king, could not permit him to sit and act in that court, and advised<sup>2</sup> Hog that his wisest policy was to retire quietly to his home. Hog records that in all this discussion he was treated with much kindness by the Commissioner.<sup>3</sup>

The Commissioner having failed, the Synod of Glasgow took its turn, but with even less success, for Hog spoke to them with candor

---

1. Ibid., pp. 133-34.

2. Ibid., p. 135.

3. Loc. cit.



and forthrightness. Church and State having failed in their individual efforts, they now collaborated in the strenuous pursuit of their policy: The Lord Advocate summoned Hog, and first used wily persuasion to gain his compliance. Next he questioned the validity of the commission itself, which Hog easily cleared. Now he urged him to take the oaths, and said if he did not, he would write the presbytery a letter exonerating him for not attending. When Hog politely refused this, the Advocate was furious, and peremptorily interdicted him from entering the Assembly, and said he personally would note whether he complied. When Hog replied that he expected to be there just as much as the Lord Advocate himself, the Advocate summoned him before the Privy Council and threatened to confine him until his appearance. In the end, however, Hog was released.<sup>1</sup>

Finally, a committee of the Assembly, dealing with controverted commissions, sought to disqualify Hog. But Hog was more than a match for their flimsy arguments and he himself offered to give up the whole affair if the Assembly<sup>2</sup> "would attest his diligence in pursuance of the commission." Though the Committee of Overtures drew up the paper and the Clerk of Assembly signed it, Hog insisted that the Assembly itself should authorize this action and attest the same, and when this requirement was not met, "therefore he went ordinarily to the Assembly, and sometimes spake in it, but not much. This was uneasy to them, yet no person challenged it, and he was satisfied not to push the matter

---

1. Ibid., pp.136-139.

2. Ibid., p. 141.

too far: Notwithstanding he could not refrain from giving his dissent from the manner of its dissolution in the King's name."<sup>1</sup>

Of Hog's courageous stand at this Assembly, Charles G. M'Crie has written this penetrating comment:

James Hog often reproached himself with being 'soft'; he certainly was a man of great diffidence and singular modesty, and yet his bearing in this crisis displayed a quiet heroism, a loyalty to convictions, and an unflinching resistance to efforts made to overbear him, which render the man worthy of a place alongside of Knox and of Melville, of Henderson and of Carstares—most dauntless of Scotsmen.<sup>2</sup>

Hog was soon incapacitated from the duties of the parish ministry and he did not appear on the public scene again for several years. Nevertheless, the controversy over the inherent rights of the Church continued to rage in the land. It has been pointed out that the civil authority, in ratifying the Westminster Confession at the Revolution, deliberately ignored the declaration made by the 1647 Assembly as an amendment to the thirty-first chapter. This amendment declared the intrinsic right of the church courts to meet with or without the magistrate's consent.<sup>3</sup> By virtue of this omission, the king might claim the power of calling, proroguing, or dissolving Assemblies.<sup>4</sup> The king did, in fact, frequently exercise this

---

1. Ibid., p. 141.

2. C.G. M'Crie, "Studies in Scottish Ecclesiastical Biography", British and Foreign Evangelical Review, XXXIII (1884), p.679. Hereinafter cited B. F. E. R.

3. Supra, p. 95.

4. Mathieson, op. cit., pp.13-14; Brown, Church and State, p. 165; Stewart Mechie, The Office of Lord High Commissioner, (Edinburgh: The Saint Andrew Press, 1957), p. 26.

right, to the inconvenience, embarrassment, and <sup>1</sup> the chagrin of the Church. David Blair wrote to Carstares on July 18, 1695, complaining that "The adjourning of the general assembly but the very day before it should have sat, was very grievous to our ministers, who were come in from all quarters; and it was no easy matter to get them quieted."<sup>2</sup> Again, in December 1697, he addressed letters to Carstares about asserting the intrinsic power of the Church.<sup>3</sup> The Church was more and more determined to assert her spiritual independence, and the "Seasonable Admonition" of 1698 made it plain that "equally after the Revolution, as before it, the Church held fast by that principle of her Spiritual Independence under Christ, her only<sup>4</sup> Head."

William's death and the accession of Anne to the throne revived the fears of the Church and the General Assembly of 1703 was opened with a sermon in which the Moderator, George Meldrum, declared the intrinsic power of the Church and the divine right<sup>5</sup> of Presbytery. For reasons which remain unclear, the Royal<sup>6</sup> Commissioner, the Earl of Seafield, dissolved this Assembly.

---

1. Register of Proceedings, pp.iii-iv; Mechie, op.cit., pp. 25-26.

2. William Carstares, State Papers and Letters Addressed to William Carstares, ed. by Joseph M'Cormick, (London: W. Strahan and T. Cadell, 1774), p. 254.

3. Ibid., pp. 364-366.

4. Brown, Church and State, p. 172.

5. Robert Wodrow, Early Letters, ed. by L.W. Sharp, (Edinburgh: The University Press, 1937), p. 258. Vide also Acts of Assembly, 1703. II, III, VIII.

6. Mechie, op. cit., p.,28. Professor Mechie gives a summary of the evidence from contemporary sources.

There is some reason to believe that the major factor in the dissolution of the Assembly was the determination of the Church to assert its inherent power, or that James Hog thought so: for the Presbytery of Dunfermline on August 11, 1703, approved a declaration professing "in the most Solemn manner" its firm purpose to

cleave unto the Doctrine of this church concerning the headship of our Lord Jesus Christ, over his Church, as her Sole King, Lord, and Law-giver; as also . . . to the presbyteriall government [thereof] by an intrinsick power delivered . . . from the Lord Jesus Christ, different from and independent upon the Secular power of temperall princes . . . [and we do promise to defend that government] against all endeavours of Papists, Arminians, Prelatists, Errastians, Independents, and all adversaries whatsoever. . . .<sup>1</sup>

James Hog's signature precedes those of the other twelve ministers and four probationers who joined in the declaration. Thomas Boston observes that the dissolution of the 1703 General Assembly brought about the adjustment in the manner of adjournment, by which the Moderator first did so in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, and then the Commissioner in the name of the civil authority.<sup>2</sup>

When Parliament passed the act giving toleration to the Episcopalians in Scotland, the Whigs sought to provide a guarantee that the Toleration would not afford the Jacobites shelter for their seditious plots. They secured, therefore, the abjuration oath as a rider to the bill. But the Tories, not to be outdone,

---

1. Dunfermline Presbytery Records, August 11, 1703, pp.178-79.

2. Boston, op. cit., p. 145.

determined to make the oath as vexatious for the Presbyterians as was possible, and they fashioned the oath so that those who took it promised to support the succession as established by law. Upon examination of these laws, it was found that they embodied the condition that the sovereign should be a member of the Church of England. It hardly needs to be said that this was a stumbling-block to conscientious Presbyterians, who could not reconcile this stipulation with the oath of the Covenant, the one binding them to approve a clause which provided that the sovereign should be an Episcopalian, and the other binding them to recognize no form of church government save that of Presbytery.<sup>1</sup>

The Commission of the 1711 Assembly addressed the queen on the subject. Though declaring their fullest abjuration of the Pretender and their complete allegiance to Her Majesty, they represented that they could not swear to the conditions referred to by the Act, for they were inconsistent with their principles. They further declared that such a requirement was a contravention of the Treaty of Union which specifically declared that "none of the Subjects of Scotland shall be liable to, but all and every one of them for ever free, of any Oath, Test, or Subscription within Scotland, contrary to, or inconsistent with our present Presbyterian Church Establishment. . . ."<sup>2</sup>

The 1712 Assembly approved the action of the Commission, and because the indication was that the situation would not improve in the Church, pleaded with the queen on behalf of those who for

---

1. Cunningham, op. cit., II. 239. (Vide footnote 3); Story, op. cit., p. 331 f.

2. Acts of Assembly, 1712. XVI.

sake of conscience could not take the oath, that she would "Interpose for their Relief" in order that there might be unanimity in the Church as to loyalty to the Crown, and harmony among themselves.<sup>1</sup> "Carstares . . . knew well that the recent Acts had been carried by the enemies of the Church, whose treacherous ends they would but serve if they allowed themselves to be provoked into hostility to the Crown, or disunion among themselves."<sup>2</sup> Thomas Boston, who, having buried his son Thomas on one day, journeyed to the Assembly the next, tells how the Assembly debated the Abjuration pro and con, and that an outright rupture was only averted by Carstares, "for the which cause I did always thereafter honor him in my heart."<sup>3</sup>

There was a general compliance with the Oath, which tended to widen the breach between the Jurant and Non-Jurant parties.<sup>4</sup> On the last day the Abjuration could be taken as provided by the law—October 28, 1712—Carstares and a large number of ministers at Edinburgh took the Oath—though with an explanation which they termed a "Declaration."<sup>5</sup> In all, about two-thirds of the ministers took the Oath.<sup>6</sup> In the months that followed, many Jurants and Non-Jurants engaged in invective against one another. Jurants preached against those who had the freedom to take the oath.

---

1. Ibid., Act XVII.

2. Story, op. cit., p. 345.

3. Boston, op. cit., p. 191.

4. Ibid., p. 198.

5. Wodrow, Correspondence, I. 321-22.

6. Boston, op. cit., p. 198; Wodrow, Correspondence, I. 323 (footnote).

Some refused to employ the other party at communion seasons. Many Jurants would take the matter against the "Nons" to the Church courts, while many of the people refused to hear a "clear" preacher.<sup>1</sup> "In every representation of Presbyterian wrongs<sup>2</sup> this hated oath was 'the head and front of the offending'."

It was anticipated that a rigid execution of the penalties provided by the law would follow the expiration of the time allotted for the taking of the oath. Besides other incapacities, non-compliers were laid under a fine of five hundred pounds sterling. Thomas Boston noted that this was more than he had made since the day he entered the ministry and and records how he made over his property to his eldest son, and all his other goods to the precentor of the church, in order<sup>3</sup> that "they might not fall into the hands of the government." Though orders for the prosecution of the Non-Jurants were given at least three separate times,<sup>4</sup> and rumors of the prosecution were constantly in the air, Boston remarks, "This storm, which so often appeared on the point of breaking forth, hath been, thro' the mercy of God, averted unto this day [1731]."<sup>5</sup>

Again in 1713 a rupture was narrowly avoided, and again it was

---

1. Wodrow, Correspondence, I. 325, 327, 365, 490; Story, op. cit., p. 349; Boston, op. cit., p. 198.

2. Story, op. cit., p. 346. Cf. Boston, op. cit., p. 198; Gavin Mitchell, Humble Pleadings for the Good Old Way, (1713), pp. 110-117; Protesters Vindicated, pp. 34-79 et passim.

3. Boston, op. cit., p. 194.

4. Wodrow, Correspondence, II. 475-76 cf. Boston, ibid., p. 243, fn. 1.

5. Boston, op. cit., p. 243.

Carstares whose influence was instrumental in the rescue operation. The sixth act of that year's Assembly was the fruit of his labors, an act which called upon the ministers of both sides "to maintain the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace."<sup>1</sup> In an effort to make the oath more satisfactory, an alteration was made to it in 1715, the reference to the Act settling the succession being omitted entirely and the disclaimer made of any intention of imposing any obligation antagonistic to the Scottish Church.<sup>2</sup> Yet another form of the same oath was contrived in 1719, largely through the efforts of the Non-Jurants themselves,<sup>3</sup> most of whom now subscribed the revised oath. However, there were still some thirty or forty recusants, among whom were Hog, Wodrow, the Erskines and Boston.<sup>4</sup> The result was that the Jurants now were so strong that the remaining non-conformers were "treated as aliens by their brethren."<sup>5</sup>

For men like the Erskines, Boston, Wodrow, and Hog the matter of taking a solemn oath was not to be entered into lightly. Since they considered this as a form or part of worship, they did not see how it could be the "fruit of Constraint" through the threats of penalties.<sup>6</sup> They had deep convictions on this issue

---

1. Acts of Assembly, 1713. VI.

2. Boston, op. cit., p. 207; Mathieson, op. cit., p. 236, footnote 2.

3. Boston, op. cit., pp. 238-39.

4. Wodrow, Correspondence, II. 464; Boston, op. cit., p. 239.

5. Boston, op. cit., p. 240.

6. James Hog, Letter Concerning the true State of the Question between the Non-Jurant and Jurant Ministers, (Edinburgh:1718), p. 21. Hereinafter cited Non-Jurant and Jurant Ministers.



and constantly exchanged views with each other and wrote papers presenting their <sup>A</sup> reasons for refusing the oaths. It is interesting to note that Boston, Wodrow, and Hog all three had their views on the Abjuration Oath published without their knowledge or consent!<sup>1</sup> In addition, Hog's own guiding principles were included in a letter to Robert Wodrow, October 15, 1714, which are reproduced in the Appendix of Correspondence, Volume I.<sup>2</sup>

Why was it that James Hog fought the imposition of oaths on ministers by civil authority so tenaciously? What were the principles by which he was guided in his conduct in refusing the oaths of Assurance and Abjuration?

First of all, he believed that the use of oaths was a "last Resort" and that they ought not to be imposed "unless necessity urge." It was a profaning the name of God to invoke any oath except on weighty and necessary grounds.<sup>3</sup> He contended that the oaths were unnecessary inasmuch as he and practically all Presbyterians were loyal to the Civil authority, and prayed for them even "in the Face of great and manifest danger." If this did not show their loyalty, surely they could not ascertain it by the imposition of oaths. It was clearly no disloyalty to the sovereign that made Hog demur, for he was utterly opposed to the Jacobites.<sup>4</sup>

---

1. Boston, op.cit., p.240; Wodrow, Correspondence, I. 253; Hog, Non-Jurant and Jurant Ministers, p.22, "Advertisement".

2. Wodrow Correspondence I.615, 647-48.

3. Hog, Non-Jurant and Jurant Minister p.2

4. Ibid., pp.4-5.

Second, Hog was reluctant to take oaths because he believed it was essential that an oath be carefully scrutinized, and that the person taking the oath should understand it clearly, in all of its requirements. If he could not be satisfied as to the agreement of the oath with the Scripture, it was plain duty to refuse it.<sup>1</sup> It was, in part, a case of definition of terms. Thus, in the Abjuration, Hog pointed out that many disagreed about the interpretation of the "Allegiance" intended in the oath, though all might be clear about what they abjured. If it was answered that the "Allegiance" was to the laws as just and right, he could not swear to that. Or, if it was said that the "Allegiance" was to the "bulk" of the laws, or to the "Fundamental" law, then he still could not assent to the oath: for this would mean an approbation of the Toleration, of Patronage, and of other statutes that the consciences of many could not allow.<sup>2</sup> Particularly, Hog found the Abjuration contrary to the solemn obligation the Scottish nation was under due to the Covenants, for to swear to this oath would involve the approving "one way or another of the Acts of Parliaments

one way or another of the Acts of Parliaments of both kingdoms for Union of the Two Kingdoms, and that we are satisfied or can comport that the Prelatical Government with the Ceremonies attending it be the Government of the Church of England: Thus we bind up our hands from all just endeavours, to procure a Reformation of that Church.<sup>3</sup>

- 
1. Wodrow, Correspondence, I.647.
  2. Hog, Non-Jurant and Jurant Ministers, p.9
  3. Ibid., p. 11; cf. p.21.

To do this would be nothing less than unfaithfulness to God, entangling people in that which was absolutely sinful, or at best doubtful.<sup>1</sup>

Fourth, Hog believed that the clause in the Claim of Right which put the Allegiance Oath in the place of all other oaths required was "doubtful" and ambiguous. It was general and seemed not only to condemn oaths previously enacted, but to preclude the imposing of any other oaths in the future.<sup>2</sup> He thought this ambiguity gave grounds to refuse the taking of the oaths until the matter should be cleared, and so he inquired, "Whether oath upon oath be not a heavy grievance, and hurtful to the ministry, while our Covenants, which contain the best of allegiances, remain neglected and much buried?"<sup>3</sup>

Finally, Hog objected to taking the oaths because the State was classing ministers with others holding office in the civil government, requiring them to swear upon threat of penalties, and he believed this implied "(in the nature of the thing) somewhat prejudicial to the immediate dependence of their office upon the Lord Jesus, whose ambassadors they are."<sup>4</sup> Since the oath of Allegiance engaged the owning of his Majesty's "Dignity", some of which was ecclesiastical, Hog inquired how far the law extended this dignity? He felt this inquiry more needful because he understood that it was the very same, as to matter, as that used by

---

1. Ibid., p.12.

2. Wodrow, Correspondence, II.647-48. Cf. Hog, Non-Jurant and Jurant Ministers, p.21.

3. Wodrow, Correspondence, II.648.

4. Loc.cit., cf. Hog, Non-Jurant and Jurant Ministers, p.18.

King Henry VIII in requiring recognition of his ecclesiastical supremacy.<sup>1</sup> On this point it might be said that Hog was unwilling to yield one inch of ground, either in theory or in practice.

Feeling, then, as he did about the principles involved, Hog held that it was only consistent to refuse the oaths and to endeavour in every way possible to have the offense removed by the repeal of the oaths. He and his non-jurant friends, as long as they did not take the oaths, were free to seek redress, while at the same time the door was left open for a simple and practical obedience.<sup>2</sup>

The second offensive act passed by the 1712 Parliament—and the most far-reaching in its consequences—was that restoring lay patronage, the exercise of which had been a sore spot and grievance in the Church ever since the Reformation. The First Book of Discipline had stated that "It appertaineth to the People, and to every severall Congregation, to elect their Minister."<sup>3</sup> The Second Book of Discipline asserted that patronage was contrary to Scripture, and that it "aucht not now to have Place in this Licht of Reformation."<sup>4</sup> However, in spite of these statements, the people were not able to exercise the rights claimed therein, and patronage continued in force until 1649. In that year Parliament declared that patronages and presentations were

---

1. (Hog, Non-Jurant and Jurant Ministers, p. 19.

2. Ibid., pp. 17, 18; Wodrow, Correspondence, II. 648.

3. William Dunlop, editor, A Collection of Confessions, (Edinburgh: James Watson, 1722), II. 524. (Chapter IV. 2)

4. Ibid., II. 800. (Chapter XII. 10).

an evil under which the people and ministers had long groaned, that it was founded only on common law and was contrary to the Second Book of Discipline, and ought to be, and therefore, was, abolished.<sup>1</sup> The Directory for electing ministers, approved by the Assembly in 1649, provided for the election of the minister by the Session, while the congregation approved or dissented in the choice,<sup>2</sup> and the presbytery was to determine in all cases of dispute.<sup>2</sup> William Cunningham says that while some leaders at this period may have sought to modify the actual exercise of the right of election by the people, neither Rutherford nor Wood, both of whom strongly opposed congregational principles, yielded to this influence.<sup>3</sup> He goes on to say

no evidence has been, or can be produced, that the Church of Scotland, or any of its leading men, had, up till the period of the Restoration, renounced or abandoned the great Protestant doctrine in the First Book of Discipline, that 'it appertaineth to the people, and to every several congregation, to elect their minister',<sup>4</sup>

Laing declared that patronage subsisted as a right from the Reformation until the death of Charles I, though it was protested against as grievance.<sup>5</sup>

---

1. M'Kerrow, op. cit., I. 38.

2. Ibid., p. 39.

3. William Cunningham, Discussions on Church Principles, (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1863), p. 422.

4. Loc. cit.

5. Laing, op. cit., IV. 233-34.

At the Restoration an act was passed which annulled the act of 1649 and restored patronages,<sup>1</sup> and thus the law remained until the Revolution, at which time William grudgingly permitted its abolition.<sup>2</sup> In the act of 1690, provision was made for the payment of six hundred merks to the patron by every congregation as a remuneration for his being deprived of the right of presentation. It further declared that if an election of a minister had not taken place in the ordinary way (by the session and heritors in country parishes, and by magistrates, town-council, and session in burghs) within six months of the vacancy,<sup>3</sup> then the presbytery should be empowered to plant the church.

In the years that followed it is evident that the people had a considerable voice in the choice of their ministers, as the "Large Overtures" of the General Assembly of 1705 disclose.<sup>4</sup> The Form of Call prescribed therein states that the call was prosecuted "with the advice and consent of the parishioners."<sup>5</sup> That the voice of the people was considerable is further substantiated by the statement of Walter Steuart of Pardovan, who records that "When the Presbytery are well informed that a Parish, for the most part, is Unanimous to elect a fit person to be their Pastor,"<sup>6</sup> "THEN they are to arrange for the moderating of a call.

---

1. John Cunningham, op. cit., II. 92-3.

2. Ibid., II. 175-76.

3. M'Kerrow, op. cit., I, 39-40

4. Vide. Acts of Assembly, 1705. XXIX, specifically, Chapter III. Section 3.

5. Ibid., III. 3. 18.

6. Walter Steuart of Pardovan, Collections and Observations, (Edinburgh: Andrew Anderson, 1709), p.3.

"The principle of popular election," reported Thomas M'Crie, "was maintained and inculcated by Park, Rule, Hog, Forrester, Lauder, Jameson, and all the writers in defence of the Church of Scotland, between the Revolution and the Union. . . ."<sup>1</sup>

Thus, the repeal, in 1712, of the Act 1690, on the ground that it had proved inconvenient and had occasioned much turmoil, was a blow at the dearest principles of the Presbyterian Church. That this was the intended and deliberate purpose of the bill is admitted even by the perpetrators of the act. Lockhart of Carnwath confessed that he pressed the Toleration and Patronage Acts the more earnestly, because he "thought the Presbyterian clergy wou'd be from thence convinc'd that the establishment of their Kirk wou'd, in time be overturn'd, as it was obvious, that the security thereof was not so thoroughly establish't by the Union, as they imagin'd."<sup>2</sup> Craik says that the act was, in its inception, "certainly planned to increase the influence of the landed gentry. . . ."<sup>3</sup> The Commission made an address to the queen, representing that the restitution of patronages "can only gratify a few, while, on the other hand, it must necessarily disoblige a far greater part of your Majesty's good subjects, that are now freed of that imposition", and imploring her to "use proper means for preventing this encroachment, so evidently prejudicial to the work of the Gospel and the peace of this Church."<sup>4</sup> Carstares and others were sent

---

1. Thomas M'Crie, Patronage Report, pp.383-84, quoted by William Cunningham, op. cit., p.453.

2. George Lockhart, The Lockhart Papers, ed.by Anthony Aufrere, I (London: Richard and Arthur Taylor, 1817) 418.

3. Craik, op. cit., I. 67. Hetherington, op.cit., p.603(footnote)

4. Acts of Assembly, 1712. X.

to London with instructions to offer the most vigorous opposition to the bill, but it was sent through the necessary barriers with great haste and received the royal assent on April 22, 1712.

For some years the feeling against the acceptance of presentations was so strong among both ministers and people that there was no change in the method of planting vacant churches. Presbyteries were usually permitted to settle vacancies either by jus devolutum, or by the tacit consent of the patron.<sup>1</sup> But by and by the ice was broken and more and more ministers accepted of presentations. Very often the people protested, but often their protests were unsuccessful. Then, in 1717, the Assembly had to deal with the case of Mr. John Hay, who had been presented to Peebles. Though several heritors and elders signed his call, the opposition from the people was so strong that the Presbytery of Peebles refused to proceed. The Assembly, to overcome the opposition, appointed certain brethren to act and vote with the presbytery in their meetings until Hay was settled in the parish.<sup>2</sup> The same year the minister at Bathgate was settled with the protection of troops, the people having opposed his settlement vigorously.<sup>3</sup> Also in 1717 a Mr. Chrystie had been presented to the parish of Dunfermline, where the people were decidedly averse to his settlement. The case was before the

---

1. M'Kerrow, op. cit., I. 40.

2. Acts of Assembly, 1717, (Edinburgh: Andrew Anderson, 1717) Unprinted Act.

3. M'Kerrow, op. cit., I. 44; News from Bathgate, (1718), pp. 11, 50-51.



Commission, which appointed the presbytery to concur with them in transporting Chrystie, and also appointed the Commission members from the Presbyteries of Cupar and Kirkcaldy to concur with the presbytery if necessary.<sup>1</sup> The presbytery delayed, and Sir Peter Kalket and "several of the gentlemen of Dunfermline"<sup>2</sup> demanded that the presbytery comply. But the same day a paper was given in "signed by several heritors, most of the magistrates and town Councillors, Elders and several hundred Heads of Families of that parish shewing their aversion from Mr. Chrysties settlement."<sup>3</sup>

The presbytery referred the case back to the Commission and appointed a committee of four ministers to draw up a paper giving their reasons for doing so. James Hog was a member of the committee, he having all along opposed Sir Peter Kalket in his pursuit of the right of presentation. The paper stated that the presbytery had always exercised a tender regard for the stated principles of the Christian Church which "are most opposite to everything that has a tendency to deprive Church members of the free Choice of their Pastors",<sup>4</sup> and that, in addition, they were merely following the directions of the Synod of Fife, which the Commissions had always expressed regard for. In conclusion, they asserted that

---

1. Dunfermline Presbytery Records, December 11, 1717.

2. Ibid., January 22, 1718.

3. Loc. cit.

4. Ibid., February 20, 1718.

the planting of vacancies in a way so privative of the Rights and priviledges of a Christian people well affected to the present government and foreward to call a minister in the ordinary way, so unprecedented a thing and such an Incrøachment on the priviledge of Church members that at least the mind of a General Assembly should have been known before that Commission or any Inferior Judicatory had gone into it. And therefore we hope that this Reverend Commission will take such measures as not to bring us under the necessity of complaining to the next Assembly of their of their procedure.<sup>1</sup>

This was one case where the presbytery and the people won the victory, and in the end, James Wardlaw of Carnock, a protege of James Hog's,<sup>2</sup> became the associate of Ralph Erskine at Dunfermline.

It was also in this context that Hog preached to his people on the subject of "The Right of Church Members to Chuse their Own Overseers". This sermon, based on Acts 1: 21-23,<sup>3</sup> was published at the desire of some of his people, in 1717. Hog deplored the fact that those who were not Church members in good standing could thrust ministers upon congregations "without any Regard that cometh so much as near unto the Rights, which the Prince of the Kings of the Earth has bestowed upon them."<sup>4</sup> While he expressed respect and esteem for persons of note and influence, he declared, nevertheless, that "No Degree of Elevation, nor any Advantages they enjoy beyond their Inferiors can warrand

---

1. Loc. cit.

2. Ibid., November 20, 1718.

3. James Hog, The Right of Church Members to Chuse Their Own Overseers, (Edinburgh: 1717), Title Page.

4. Ibid., p. 15.

them to attempt any Thing injurious to the Liberties of Christ's Kingdom." <sup>1</sup> The Lord gave the right of choosing overseers to those who adhered to the professed principles of the Churches whose pastors they were to elect—"The Scribes and Pharisees, with their Adherents, would have proven very bad Chusers of an Apostle—" <sup>2</sup> and this right could not be taken from them <sup>3</sup> by any authority whatsoever.

There was now abroad in the Church a strong tide of Moderatism sweeping almost everything before it, and much of its fury was vented on the Evangelicals. But as the latter found themselves losing ground in the judicatories, they found themselves more and more popular with the people who began to push for the possession of those rights which they had not even exercised during the years after the Revolution. Between 1690 and 1712, as has been noted, the right of the people to choose their minister meant that the heritors and elders proposed a minister for their acceptance; now they began to object to the intrusion of persons who had no ecclesiastical status, and to suggest that the people should both call and elect <sup>4</sup> the minister. It did not take a prophet to see that a head-on clash could not be long averted, for the people were determined to assert what they believed to be their rights, in opposition to what they regarded as the defections of the Church; while,

---

1. Ibid., p.9.

2. Ibid., pp. 7-8.

3. Ibid., pp. 7,19.

4. Mathieson, op. cit., pp. 240-41.

on the other hand, the Moderates, waxing ever stronger and stronger, were marked by a growing reluctance to admit the popular claims.

Currie of Kinglassie tells that the occasion of his publishing Jus Populi Divinum in 1727, was a long debate in the 1726 Assembly where

sundry Arguments were advanced, not only against the Voice, but also against the Consent of the People as needful to a Minister's Call. At which Time it was asserted in the Face of the whole General Assembly, That, tho' there was much Talk of the Right of the Christian People to elect their Ministers, yet there was nothing in Scripture to countenance it.<sup>1</sup>

The Assembly of 1730 had before it twelve cases of alleged intrusion,<sup>2</sup> all of which the Assembly apparently upheld. The attempt of some ministers and elders, among whom were Hog and Colonel Erskine, to protest against one of these settlements caused the Assembly to enact that in the future no reasons of dissent should be entered on the record.<sup>3</sup> The following year an overture designed to secure uniformity in the method of settling vacant parishes was sent down to the presbyteries, in accordance with the provisions of the Barrier Act, with the warning that in case presbyteries neglected to send up their opinion, the overture would be submitted to the next Assembly for its action.<sup>4</sup> On the principle that "silence gives consent" this

- 
1. John Currie, The Search, (Edinburgh: 1734), p. 5.
  2. Mathieson, op. cit., p. 241.
  3. Acts of Assembly, 1730. VII.
  4. Acts of Assembly, 1731. IV.

act was passed by the subsequent Assembly.<sup>1</sup> Of this Act M'Kerrow has written,

It is true, as has been affirmed, that this overture imposed no greater restrictions upon the freedom of the people, in the choice of their ministers, than had formerly been imposed by the Act of Parliament in 1690; but there was this great difference, that, in the one case, it was the ministers of religion, the spiritual guides of the people, that were infringing upon the Christian privileges of the people; and, in the other, it was the rulers of the state who, for political purposes restricted the freedom of election.<sup>2</sup>

This same year, 1732, one of the most notorious cases of intrusion on record came by appeal from Dunfermline Presbytery to the Assembly. An overwhelming number of the heritors, elders, and of the heads of families had voted for the issuing of a call to Francis Craig, but unfounded rumors had come to the presbytery that Craig was of divisive principles. Accordingly, he was carefully examined as to his orthodoxy and approved. The real design of the rumors was brought out into the open when the Presbytery of St. Andrews wrote that Craig was tainted with the Marrow doctrines. While the presbytery was determining the matter, there was a new Laird at Kinross, Sir John Bruce, who now joined the few recalcitrants in opposing Craig's call. Although it was obvious to any objective presbyter that Craig was a man of real gifts and piety (in the finest sense of the word), the Synod of Fife voted to lay aside the call. While an appeal was making its course to the Assembly, Sir John found a minister to

---

1. Mathieson, op.cit., p.242; Hetherington, op.cit., p.640.

2. M'Kerrow, op.cit., I.51. Cf. John Willison, Fair and Impartial Testimony, (Glasgow: Printed for John F. Wright, 1765), pp. 70 ff.

his liking, Robert Stark, Junior, and proceeded to force him upon the parish. He thereby incurred the hostility of the people at Kinross and the determined opposit<sup>1</sup>on of Dunfermline Presbytery, which refused to have any share in settling the obnoxious presentee. The Commission ordered the presbytery to settle Stark. They refused and appealed to the Assembly,<sup>2</sup> which referred the matter to the Commission. When the presbytery remained adamant in tis refusal to settle Stark, the Commission did so by means of a "riding committee", and the presbytery was instructed to receive Stark as one of their members.<sup>3</sup> The affair now came before the 1732 General Assembly.

But the Assembly was in no mood to listen to the complaints of the people of Kinross or of the ministers of Dunfermline Presbytery. The complaints were dismissed and the presbytery commanded to enroll Stark and to give him full encouragement in the exercise of his ministry. Notwithstanding, the presbytery remained doggedly resolute. They completely disregarded the Assembly's order and the further ultimatums of the Commission of Assembly in November 1732 and March 1733.<sup>4</sup>

At this juncture, James Hog exerted himself in Dunfermline Presbytery in resisting the despotic measures of the Assembly and Commission. He and James Wardlaw of Dunfermline enlisted some merchants, who in turn secured signatures from people to a petition

---

1. Archibald Murray, The State of The Parish of Kinross, (n. d.), pp. 1-9. Cf. Fraser, op.cit., pp.190-194.

2. Hetherington, op.cit., p. 639.

3. Free Thoughts on the Case of the Presbytery of Dunfermline, (1733), p. 2.

4. John Struthers, History of Scotland From the Union, I (Glasgow: Blackie, Fullarton, and Co., 1828), 623.

anent the "Act for Planting Vacant Churches". The petition, signed by "several hundreds of private Christians", was given in to the presbytery on March 28, 1733.<sup>1</sup> It called upon the presbytery to testify its dissatisfaction with the foresaid act, and to use means to get it rescinded, "that the Lords people may be restored to their ancient privileges"; that the presbytery would sustain no calls that did not have the consent of the heads of families; and that "they would discharge their clerk to enroll Mr. Stark as a member of the Presbytrie, he neither having a Legal Call, nor the people submitting to him as their minister. . . ."<sup>2</sup>

On the same date Hog protested against the enrollment of Stark on the grounds that the presbytery's Commission members had protested that the Commission was "incompetent" to judge in the affairs and "for liberty to complain to the next General Assembly"; as also because the affair was before the Synod, whose decision they were awaiting.<sup>3</sup> All the presbytery save Robert Stark, Senior, Thomas Charters, and Steadman adhered to Hog's protest, and the Clerk refused to enroll Stark, noting in the Record that he was the "servant" of the presbytery.<sup>4</sup>

Sir John Bruce now laid a complaint before the Assembly of 1733 and a warrant was issued summoning some of the members of the presbytery to appear before the Assembly to account for their

---

1. Dunfermline Presbytery Records, March 28, 1733.

2. Loc. cit.

3. Loc. cit.

4. Loc. cit.

obstinacy.<sup>1</sup> The brethren appeared (Hog was not one of them), gave in their complaint against the Commission of the previous Assembly as having no power to meddle in the affair of Stark's enrollment, and were charged to meet with a committee appointed "to remove the brethren's scruples".<sup>2</sup> When the committee failed in its assignment, the Assembly ordered the presbytery, with all its members then present in Edinburgh, to retire at once, receive and enrol Stark, and report the behaviour of each member.<sup>3</sup> The vote was six for and six against enrolling Stark, but it was reported that the presbytery had carried out the commands.<sup>4</sup> The next day a paper was given in by the intrepid reclaimers, one of whom was Hog's son-in-law and assistant, Daniel Hunter.<sup>5</sup> These were severely rebuked by the Assembly for insubordination.<sup>6</sup>

But if James Hog was unable to make the journey to Edinburgh on this occasion, he was by no means ready to surrender to the oppressive measures of the Church. He brought in the report of a committee appointed by the presbytery to "bring in an overture anent the discouraging the acceptance of presentations",<sup>7</sup> which was read and adopted. The first part of this overture is as follows:

- 
1. Struthers, op. cit., I. 623.
  2. Ibid., pp. 623-24.
  3. Ibid., p. 624.
  4. Dunfermline Presbytery Records, May 11, 1733.
  5. Struthers, op. cit., I. 624.
  6. Acts of Assembly, 1733. V.
  7. Dunfermline Presbytery Records, February 20, 1734.



It is overture'd that the Reverend Synod of Fife would Represent to the next Assembly the necessity of addressing the government for Repeall of the Act Restoring Patronages and in the meantime That the General Assembly would be pleased to Discharge all ministers and Preachers within this National Church to accept of Patrons Presentations under pain of high Censure.<sup>1</sup>

The rest of the overture called upon the Synod of Fife to prohibit the accepting of any patron's presentation "under Pain of Suspension in the case of Ministers, and taking from Probationers their License to preach. . . ." <sup>2</sup> It further requested the Synod to discharge all the presbyteries of its bounds from countenancing in any way the acceptance of patron's presentations by ministers without the bounds of the Synod, and to enjoin presbyteries to deal with presentees with a view to their renunciation of any presentation. <sup>3</sup>

On March 10, 1734, the Session of Carnock petitioned Dunfermline Presbytery along the same lines as above, but added a petition for the General Assembly to "repeal the late Acts of Assembly viz. 1st,

repeal the late Acts of Assembly viz. 1st, Act 1730 against recording dissents with the reasons thereof from the Decisions of General Assemblies. It being an Act that seems to deprive people of their just right and natural Liberty and very prejudicial to Truth. 2d. The Act 1732 May 15th Anent Planting Vacant Churches which Act has raised a Great Flame already. . . .<sup>4</sup>

---

1. Loc. cit.

2. Loc. cit.

3. Loc. cit.

4. Carnock Session Records, March 10, 1734.

Finally, papers were given in to the presbytery in the name of Colonel W. Erskine and Hog, signed by Elders, against "the meeting of the Ministers of the Presbytrie in a presbyteriall capacity at Edinburgh in May last without calling the Elders of the Presbytrie thereto, and against all they did in that meeting as void and null."<sup>1</sup> Put to a vote to "Dismiss the Protests or not", it carried "Not" and was referred to the Synod.<sup>2</sup>

Less than two months later James Hog died. However, he lived to see the rescinding of the Acts 1730 and 1732 by the General Assembly.<sup>3</sup> It seems very likely that Hog had made his way to Edinburgh in order that he might be present for the battle, for he died there on the last day of the Assembly.

Hog, and those of the Evangelical party, had been well-grounded in the Presbyterian principles of the First and Second Reformation, and it may be that they were prone to see evidences of corruption where it did not exist, or had made a bare beginning. But these were the principles for which Hog's own flesh and blood had suffered, principles which had been flouted by the avowed enemies of Presbytery. They were not cold formulae to which he gave lip service, nor could they be laid aside with the vicissitudes of the civil government. They were not extraneous and expendable, but valid and vital to the very life of the Church.

---

1. Ibid., March 20, 1734.

2. Loc. cit., Messrs Henderson, Liston, Stark Senior and Junior asked that their dissent be marked.

3. Acts of Assembly, 1734, V. (Dated May, 9, 1734) note.

It was a matter of conscience for him to stand up and be counted for these principles, and to oppose everything that smacked of Erastian interference. He certainly had a goodly company who shared his views, though there were not many who were as bold as Hog in exonerating their consciences. Still, he spoke the mind of a large number of ministers, and a host of the common folk, when he declared,

Seeing Christ alone is the Head of the Church and hath instructed it as to its interests in his Word, no considerations from the Topicks of Political Wisdom, or secular conveniences, ought to influence to the least recession from the same. The Church of Christ is to be governed by his own Laws and not by the Rules of carnal Policie; And the Grand evil of Man-pleasing in the Concerns of Christ's kingdom (which should be managed without respect of persons) is inconsistent with the honour and service we owe to the Lord Jesus, and hath ever been greatly provoking to the eyes of his Glory, and ruining to the Church. . . .<sup>1</sup>

In a time when there was a stirring of new thought and a growing latitudinarianism across the Church and land, James Hog was alarmed to see the "good old ways" being undermined by enemies within and without the Church, and he bent all his energies in carrying out the prayer of his heart: "May the Lord bring us back to the primitive Institution, and let all the Sons of Zion say Amen."<sup>2</sup>

---

1. James Hog, A Casuistical Essay upon the Lord's Prayer, (Edinburgh: John Reid, Jr, 1705.), p. 50. Hereinafter cited, The Lord's Prayer.

2. James Hog, The Right of Church Members to Chuse Their Own Overseers, p. 19.

CHAPTER III

OPPOSITION TO THE 'SEPARATISTS'

Because he was usually out of sympathy with policies of the Church of Scotland, or with those who were in control of the ecclesiastical machinery of the Church, as also because he was often misunderstood and maligned for his position on various issues, the question not unnaturally arises, "Did James Hog remain in the Church of Scotland throughout his ministry?" When it is replied that he did, the logical question is, "Why did he?" Or, it may be inquired, "Would not Hog have joined the Secession had he lived longer, or been younger?" One must beware of giving a dogmatic reply to the latter question, since Hog alone could supply that answer; but there is no difficulty in supplying clear answers to the former queries, and this in turn makes it possible to give a calculated and considered response to the last question. It will be seen that far from leaning towards separatism, Hog was an extremist in the other direction.

In seeking to discover Hog's attitude toward schism it is again necessary to take notice of the state of affairs at the Revolution Settlement. Mention has been made of Hog's dismay at finding two extremes in Scotland when he returned from Holland: some were easy-going in their compliance while others were rancorous in refusing to recognize the Settlement. While the vast majority of the people embraced the new administration in Church and State, some of the "suffering remnant" were very much displeased with the turn which events were taking in the new order of things. The real crux of their dissidence was that the Covenants were neglected in both Church and State and they began to confer amongst themselves concerning what their course should be.

It was almost immediately clear, wrote Gavin Mitchell, the Hebronite lieutenant of John Hepburn and author of Humble Pleadings, that the Covenanting party was divided three ways in opinion and practice.

One group, the Cameronian people (as distinct from their ministers), could see little difference between an uncovenanted Church and State as constituted under James II and the same under the Revolution Settlement. In view of this attitude they refused to recognize William and Mary as King and Queen of Scotland and declined the authority of courts civil and ecclesiastical. These later came to be known as the McMillanites after their minister, John McMillan of Balmaghie. The second group named by Mitchell were the three Cameronian ministers, Thomas Lining, Alexander Shields, and William Boyd, who, though they recognized the imperfections of the Settlement, weary of the divisions and having exonerated their conscience by means of a paper handed in to the General Assembly, subjected themselves to the authority of the new order. The third party was that which deemed it scriptural to concur in what was good in both Church and State, but at the same time held that it was also scriptural to protest and bear witness against defections by seeking redress before the judicatories, while not entirely declining them as incompetent.<sup>1</sup> In addition to these groups alluded to by Mitchell, there were also other small groups, mentioned by Patrick Walker, such as the Gibbites, Harlites, Howdenites, Russelites, Adamites, and Cot-moor folk, all of whom claimed to uphold the covenanted

---

1. Gavin Mitchell, Humble Pleadings for the Good Old Way, (1713), Introduction.

faith.<sup>1</sup> It was with the third of the parties above-named that James Hog had sympathies and with whom he associated in one way or another for many years: So it becomes necessary to take a closer look at this group in order that Hog's views and practices may be properly illuminated and evaluated.

The leader of these people was John Hepburn, minister of Urr in Galloway, who had been ordained privately in London during the persecution by Scots ministers who sought refuge there. He was one of those who preached in the fields before the battle of Bothwell Bridge and in 1680 the Privy Council charged the Earl of Moray to apprehend "these 'Factionous preachers', particularly Mr. Walter Denoon and Mr. John Hepburn."<sup>2</sup> He was imprisoned more than once but seems to have led a charmed life, so that about 1686 he was preaching at Urr. From 1687 onwards Hepburn was in almost constant difficulty with the Church, for while he maintained (and not without good grounds) that he had "both Divine, and Legal right"<sup>3</sup> to remain at Urr as the minister, it is certain that he was never legally settled there by the presbytery.<sup>4</sup> He continued to denounce the Church for its backslidings, preached and baptized outside the bounds of his parish, and in general made of himself a thorn in the flesh of the Church of Scotland. For these irregularities the General Assembly (1696) placed him under sentence of suspension, with the further proviso that he

---

1. William McMillan, John Hepburn and The Hebronites, (London: James Clarke & Co., 1934), p. 10.

2. Ibid., p. 16.

3. Mitchell, op. cit., p. 193.

4. McMillan, op. cit., pp. 21, 28, 29.

should be deposed if he failed to submit to the sentence.<sup>1</sup>

Hepburn disregarded the suspension and the people gave hearty countenance to his ministry. In June of that year three ministers of Dumfries Presbytery attempted to interfere with the worship of the people, but when they failed in their design initiated civil action against Hepburn. The Privy Council summoned him to appear in Edinburgh, where he was charged, among other things, with "exercising his Ministry, and Intruding himself into Churches . . . without taking the Oath of Allegiance and subscribing Assurance."<sup>2</sup> Hepburn's arguments against the taking of the oaths (which were the same as Hog's) and the other charges were unavailing. The Privy Council ordered him banished to Brechin, and after initial imprisonment at the Edinburgh Tolbooth and Stirling Castle, he was taken to Brechin, where he was confined nearly three years. His suspension was removed in 1699 and he returned to Urr,<sup>3</sup> where he continued his ministry until his death, though not without many ups and downs, some of which there will be occasion to refer to in the course of this chapter.

Hepburn's followers, who were called Hebronites,<sup>4</sup> had an organization (similar to that of the Cameronians) which met quarterly and was called the "General Correspondence", dating

---

1. Acts of Assembly, 1696. XXVII. Cf. Mitchell, op. cit., p. 188.

2. Mitchell, op. cit., pp. 192-3.

3. Ibid., pp. 197-204.

4. McMillan, op. cit., p. 11.



from about 1690. Most of their societies were in Nithsdale, Annandale, and Galloway. There were rules laid down for the societies, among which were prohibitions placed upon members to attend "Penny Weddings" or to take any public office or go to law without the advice and consent of the meeting. In matters of discipline nothing was to be done "to encroach on the Ministry or Church-Censures."<sup>1</sup> Their manifesto was Humble Pleadings for the Good Old Way (1713), in the first part of which are thirty-four grievances against the Church of Scotland. Among these grievances are such things as failure of the Church to investigate sinful compliances of its ministers during the persecution, failure of any "Judicial condemning" of the defections of the Church and nation from the covenanted work of reformation, reception of the curates into ministerial communion, assenting to an uncovenanted monarch, the inadequate foundation of the Presbyterian establishment, no assertion of the intrinsic power of the Church, absence of and even opposition to the renewal of the Covenants, insufficient enumeration of the land's sins in causes of fasts, scandal in Elders and Church members, sinful association of Britain with popish princes, state adjournments of Assemblies and acquiescence therein, the sinful taking of the oaths by ministers, tyrannical conduct of the Commissions, absence of any constant testimony against sin in those of high and low places, failure of the Church to oppose the Toleration and the Abjuration, praying for the Hanoverian family (who were only Lutherans), the Church's actual defense of its defections, and proclaiming a Thanksgiving

---

1. Mitchell, op. cit., Appendix, pp. 13-17.

1

for the "Jacobitish" peace with France.

It is manifest that the Hebronites found much more to criticize than to approve in the post-Revolution Church and State. It is also evident that on many points (but not all) Hepburn and Hog were of the same view. It should be said, however, that so were a majority of the Presbyterian ministers. The difference lay in the manner of protest, Hog and his brethren of the Establishment maintaining full communion with the Church while Hepburn and his party were in a state of "NEGATIVE SEPARATION" as one of their writers terms it, and which he defines as "a Withdrawing from Communion with such Persons or Party, in Ordinances of Religion, Viz. In Doctrine, Worship, Discipline and Government."<sup>2</sup>

As early as July 5, 1692 Hamilton Presbytery noted the irregularities of John Hepburn in baptizing and preaching in the bounds of that presbytery, and the records continue to have references to him, though there appears to have been no official action taken against him.<sup>3</sup> About a year later the presbytery cited him to appear before them; when he failed to do so they prohibited him from the exercise of any ministerial function in their bounds.<sup>4</sup> It is very important to note just here that at this very same time Hog himself was absenting himself from the

---

1. Ibid., pp. 6-132; cf. John Hepburn, The Last Testimony of John Hepburn, (1732), passim.

2. Protesters Vindicated, p. 12. Cf. Walker, op. cit., pp.109-110.

3. Hamilton Presbytery Records, July 5, 1692.

4. Ibid., September 19, 26, 1693.

meetings of his presbytery because of his own aversion to the oaths and his disapproval of other compliant policies of the Church.<sup>1</sup>

Hepburn and some of his "set" paid Hog a visit and Hog, knowing the zeal of his friend against the defections of the time and knowing of no legal obstacle ("being assured that no ecclesiastic sentence was passed against him, nor did pass for a long while after"), invited him to preach in his Dalserf pulpit. The result was that the presbytery "almost positively concluded that he had, or would soon comply with a party, which stated a separation from the whole ministry of this church," and Hog adds, significantly, "whereof he abhorred the very thought."<sup>2</sup> In reply to the process begun against him by Hamilton Presbytery, one point in which related to his inviting Hepburn to preach, and another to his supposed separation, Hog gave the following reply. He contended that Hepburn had been served with no libel; that while someone did speak to him just at the moment they entered the church about a prohibition resting upon Hepburn, the informer could give no clear account of the matter; that both he and Hepburn were in similar circumstances with reference to the oaths; that a prohibition of the Synod "not promulgated cannot be reckoned obligatory"; and that it would be "a stretch contrary to all law" to prohibit a minister from preaching before any sentence had been passed; and, finally, that as far as he personally was concerned their meeting was

---

1. Ibid., Hog, Memoirs, pp. 74, 85.

2. Hog, Memoirs, p. 76.

"unforeseen and undesired".<sup>1</sup> The real truth is that the presbytery had magnified this incident out of all proportion to its real importance.

But the last point in the libel was the "weightiest article" for Hog—that which accused him of separating from the Church of Scotland. Against this charge Hog replied with deepest conviction and feeling. It appears that the presbytery had jumped to the conclusion without any effort to establish the supposed facts of the case:

They . . . concluded, that he had stated a separation from the Church of Scotland, without any further inquiry, which, as it was most remote from his thoughts, so the harmless motion of consulting his managements with judicious and godly men gave them as little ground to think it; at least they might have inquired, whether he meant a separated society; to which he would readily have answered, that he understood no such thing: and to this moment [c. 1702] he was never once present in any such society.<sup>2</sup>

Hog tells that his difficulties with the presbytery only increased his aversion to any extremes and that while he "wanted not many and strong solicitations from the Separatists . . . he never did, nor could approve their way. . . ."<sup>3</sup> But Hog's strongest statement concerning separatists at this time is that in which he speaks of them as "ignorant and of a Phariasaical set, highly conceited of themselves, and despising others" and who were generally for "separating to the greatest heights from all who, in every thing,

---

1. Ibid., pp. 95-6.

2. Ibid., p. 97.

3. Ibid., p. 90.

did not agree with them."<sup>1</sup>

In his Journal, Hog notes, "My Soul is much grieved with the pestilent principles of the mountain folk wherein I observe Satans<sup>2</sup> poyson in many respects." Nevertheless, that he still felt sympathetic to Hepburn is evident: "I hear of great things in Galloway under Mr. Hepburn's ministry. My soul is refreshed to hear of the Lord's countenancing his . . . persecuted Servant,<sup>3</sup> and putting the persecutions to shame."

Hepburn was unmolested in his ministry for a period following his liberation from Brechin, but once again his principles and practices brought him under the scrutiny of the ecclesiastical machinery. In 1704, the Assembly passed an "Act against Schism and Disorders" in which presbyteries and synods were enjoined to "censure such persons who do, within their bounds, carry on divisive courses, and that they vigorously use all suitable means for reclaiming misled people, and for the preventing the growth of schism. . . ."<sup>4</sup> But this was not all; the act went on to specify the Cameronian leader, John McMillan, and John Hepburn as the offenders. McMillan was guilty of preaching after his deposition while Hepburn was said to be guilty of exercising his ministry without the bounds of his own parish, either without the permission of, or contrary to the known wishes of, ministers and church courts.

---

1. Ibid., p. 99.

2. Ms. Journal, December 19, 1694. Vide also entry March 3, 1695.

3. Ibid., September 5, 1695.

4. Acts of Assembly, 1704. XVIII.

The Commission of Assembly took Hepburn's case under consideration. At length an able--and sympathetic--committee was appointed to "conferre with these people who separate from the communion of this church, and inform them of their mistakes and to endeavour to convince their consciences and remove their scruples."<sup>1</sup> Those on the committee were Patrick Cuming, Thomas Lining, William Wishart, Robert Livingstone, James Hog, George Mair, William McGeorge, ministers, and Sir John Clerk and James Nimmor, ruling elders,<sup>2</sup> plus several brethren from the Synods of Dumfries and Galloway. The committee met at Sanquhar, February 7-15, 1705, during which period they heard the principles of the Hebronites and conferred with great forbearance and charity with the people, most of the time being used in a minute examination of and comment upon twenty-eight "articles" of grievance presented by the people. The method of discussion was for the article to be read, then for members of the committee to "speak their minds without interruption", and if the people were satisfied they proceeded to the next article; otherwise, they sought to offer the people more "light" and "information".<sup>3</sup> Hog was named to preach one of the sermons on Sunday, February 10, at the request of the minister of Sanquhar, Thomas Shiels.<sup>4</sup> The committee privately agreed upon an overture to the effect that although all the Hebronite grievances

---

1. Historical Manuscripts Commission: Laing Manuscripts, ed. by Henry Paton, II (London: 1925), 102.

2. Ibid., II. 101.

3. Ibid., II. 104.

4. Ibid., II. 105.

did not warrant a separating from the Church, yet in order to remove their scruples, if they would return to Church communion they were to be permitted to draw up a paper of grievances "for the exoneration of their conscience" and to give in the same to the judicatories of their bound, "providing that it be done with due deference to the said judicatory." It was to be recommended to all Church authorities "that wherever any of these people reside they be treated with all obliging kindness and condescendence . . . and that they allow any person or persons in such circumstances the same terms of communion now condescended upon."<sup>1</sup> A formula to be used was drawn up by the committee.<sup>2</sup> The Hebronites had their own ideas about the basis of any future communion, but at length they agreed upon the committee's report and promised to make a favorable recommendation to their societies.<sup>3</sup> There was an omen of things to come, however, for they reported that it would be impossible for them to give a full answer in time for the next Commission meeting, as they were desired to do.<sup>4</sup> In this, the concluding session, Wishart, who was the moderator of the meeting, "had a long discourse on the evils of division and the advantages of union in the Church of Christ." It is revealing to note that it was James Hog who "seconded" Wishart's remarks.<sup>5</sup> Amidst mutual expressions of optimism and good will, the committee

---

1. Ibid., II. 106.

2. Ibid., II. 107.

3. Loc. cit.

4. Ibid., II. 108.

5. Loc. cit. Mair also concurred in the seconding remarks.

and the people adjourned by singing Psalm 132, "We'll go into his tabernacles, and at his footstool bow."<sup>1</sup>

It was with high hopes that the committee reported to the Commission in March. Hepburn was present and was cited to appear at the Assembly where his case was to be deliberated upon, but he failed to make his appearance at first.<sup>2</sup> When he did at length put in his appearance he was unwilling to promise to live in subjection to and communion with his presbytery, and he was deposed.<sup>3</sup> Wodrow wrote in November, 1706, that there was a "project" to transport Hepburn to Fife, where it was understood he would "keep presbyteries" with Allan Logan, James Hog, and George Mair, whom he took for "honest men" than his neighbors in the south.<sup>4</sup> The project, if there was one, never materialized. Hepburn was restored to the ministry—despite his ignoring his deposition—by the Commission in August, 1707.<sup>5</sup> The 1708 Assembly took exception to this irregularity but nothing seems to have been done really to annul the Commission's action.<sup>6</sup>

The Union of 1707, followed by the grievous acts of Parliament in 1711-12, gave the various separating groups a new lease on life. The Hebronites, writes McMillan, saw in the act for Union "nothing

---

1. Ibid., II. 109.

2. McMillan, op. cit., p. 103.

3. Acts of Assembly, 1705. VII. Cf. Mitchell, op.cit., pp.231-37.

4. Wodrow, Correspondence, I. 76.

5. Mitchell, op. cit., pp. 260-1; McMillan, op. cit., pp.110-112.

6. Acts of Assembly, (Edinburgh: George Mosman, 1708), April 23, 1708, (Unprinted).



less than national apostacy."<sup>1</sup> Most Presbyterians had similar opinions. In May, 1712, Hepburn petitioned the Assembly to proclaim a national fast in which causes for lamentation should be set forth in the most lucid terms possible, but this was so extremely worded that members of the committee of overtures challenged much of it.<sup>2</sup> The same year Hepburn sent his representatives to a meeting of the non-jurant ministers at Edinburgh with the customary paper of grievances and a proposal whereby the Hebronites would join in communion with the non-jurants if they in turn refused to sit in judicatories with jurants, or to employ them in preaching.<sup>3</sup> It was a bold attempt to split the Church asunder, but although some of the non-jurants, like Boston, gained nothing by refusing the oaths, since their people were so hostile to the jurants and the Church of Scotland,<sup>4</sup> it is to their credit that they spurned Hepburn's overtures.

Some of the ministers near Hepburn actually withdrew from their presbyteries and met with Hepburn and it was feared that schism was imminent in that part of the country. However, the five ministers concerned maintained that it was thought prudent for them to desert their judicatories for a time, "lest they should entirely lose, both to themselves, and the whole Church, such a great body of sensible and serious people, if they should

---

1. McMillan, op. cit., p. 126.

2. Mitchell, op. cit., pp. 264-69; Wodrow, Correspondence, I. 289.

3. Ibid., pp. 296-303; Wodrow, Analecta, II. 14-5.

4. Boston, op. cit., p. 200.

joint in judicatories with their Jurant brethren";<sup>1</sup> and that they had no intention of separating.<sup>2</sup>

The threat<sup>of</sup> schism persisted and again a committee was appointed to reclaim the erring brethren. Once again James Hog was a member of the committee.<sup>3</sup> The conference with the five ministers was held at Penpont, July 21, 1714 and lasted for three days. In the end, four of the five "resolved never to have meetings with Mr. Hepburn."<sup>4</sup>

Hepburn persisted in his machinations, however, and a presbytery was formed by him, Gilchrist, and Taylor.<sup>5</sup> It is of no real importance, but Hog, Logan, and Cuthbert became involved in the crossfire between Hepburn and some of the ministers of the southwest, notably James Murray of Penpont. They and the Clerk of Assembly were reported to have written Wodrow that Murray and some of his friends had promised to join the jurants.<sup>6</sup> McMillan, in relating what is admittedly a confused correspondence, mistakenly records that Hog had been reported likely to join with Gilchrist and his friends, and says that Murray's comment was that this was a very sudden thing if true.<sup>7</sup> That Murray was really referring to the rumored union of Hepburn and Gilchrist is clear

---

1. Wodrow, Correspondence, I. 76.

2. Ibid., I. 76, 486; Analecta, II. 207-8.

3. Acts of Assembly, 1714. VIII. Others included William Mitchell, Carstares, Wishart, John Flint, James Hart, ministers; The Lord Provosts of Edinburgh and Glasgow, and Erskine of Carnock.

4. Wodrow, Correspondence, I. 562-3 (footnote).

5. Wodrow Manuscript Letters, National Library of Scotland, IX. 26, 31.

6. Ibid., IX. 31.

7. McMillan, op. cit., pp. 166-67.

from the citation to which McMillan refers:

I [Murray] delay'd my writting to you [Wodrow] these two or three days on purpose yt I might be able to give you a certain account whether Mr. Hep: and Mr. Gilch: were join'd or not. . . . It is commonly reported that they are join'd; and some of Mr. Hep: people confidently give it out, yt. Mr. Gilch: was to preach with Mr. Hep: ye last Sabbath to be yesterday at his correspondent meeting in Kirkconnel; which if true, I must say it is a very sudden change and resolution; for Mr. Gil: said lately to ane honest confident of mine, that he was not for Mr. Hep: . . .<sup>1</sup>

One week later, February 15, 1715, Murray wrote, "I take this occasion of a sure bearer to give the certain account of what I could not do in my last to you; and which you may depend upon, viz. That Mr. Hepburn, Mr. Gilchrist, and Mr. Taylor are now united. . . ."<sup>2</sup> In March and May, Hog, Logan, and Cuthbert were actually in touch with Hepburn and opposing Murray for what they deemed his deceitful conduct. Logan wrote a letter to Murray while Cuthbert and Hog made sworn "Declarations" against him for a statement made in Edinburgh to the effect that "you know how difficultly we are stated and my practise is but provisionall withdrawing". The Declaration was done on December 15, 1714 at Culross and witnessed by Allan Logan and John Hepburn,<sup>3</sup> "preacher of the Gospel", son of the minister at Urr. McMillan's interpretation of these papers is in error,<sup>4</sup> though the picture is a rather obscure one, and in view of Hog's later attack on the

---

1. Wodrow Manuscript Letters, IX. 26.

2. Ibid., IX. 31.

3. Ibid., IX. 49, 71, 73.

4. Vide McMillan, op. cit., pp. 165-167.

Hebronites his conduct at this time seems inconsistent.

Whatever the case was, Wodrow continued to refer to the threatened schism<sup>1</sup> and the Assembly continued its frustrating efforts to deal with McMillan, John Taylor, John M'Neil,<sup>2</sup> John Adamson, Hepburn, and other dissenting ministers.

Many years earlier Hog had declared that instead of joining the separatists (he never hesitated to call them by that label) he considered it his duty to do his utmost in preventing others from becoming entangled in that web, and to seek to recover people from such a snare.<sup>3</sup> He appears to have had this in mind in serving on the committees appointed to deal with the dissenters and in maintaining a speaking acquaintance and association with them. But at last even the patience of James Hog wore thin and broke and, despite his years of persevering to reclaim his friends from their errors, he gave them up as irrecoverable.

John Pollock had replied to Humble Pleadings in his Answer to the First Part of Humble Pleadings (1717). About the same time Hog was writing letters against another of several separatist publications, Protesters Vindicated (1716), which defended McMillan, Hepburn, and every other form of separation. The burden of this book will be clearly revealed by citing its full title:

---

1. Wodrow, Correspondence, II. 37, 274.

2. Acts of Assembly, 1715. VI, XV; Acts of Assembly 1717 (Edinburgh: Andrew Anderson, 1717), Unprinted.

3. Hog, Memoirs, p. 102.

Protesters Vindicated: Or, A Just and Necessary Defence of Protesting against, and Withdrawing from This National Church of Scotland; on Account of Her many Gross and Continued Defections. More Particularly, Her Approving of, and Going into the Legal Establishment of the PRELATICK CONSTITUTION of ENGLAND. The Generality of MINISTERS Swearing, in the Oath of ABJURATION, to Maintain ERASTIANISM, PRELACY, and English Popish CEREMONIES. Non-Jurants Joining with Jurants, Judicially Approving that Practice to be free of SCANDAL. The Church's Establishing TYRANNY in Government, against all who will not join in Communion with her, and Approve her PRACTICES without Redress of GRIEVANCES. WHEREIN These and several other Causes of Withdrawing, are proven to be justle Chargeable on this CHURCH, Demonstrated to be contrary to the WORD OF GOD and Reformed Principles of this Church, and Just Grounds of Withdrawing, and Setting up JUDICATURES Distinct from her; and the Objections of Jurants and others fully Answered.<sup>1</sup>

The harsh language and claims of this book and the obstinacy of the separatists fired Hog to write a refutation of the book. He wrote Wodrow concerning the publication of his essay on "Separation", offering him the opportunity to "adventure, or not, and more, or less as you please."<sup>2</sup> Hog's mood at this time is reflected in his remark that concerning "Hepburn and that separating people, I can say little." Some had written in an attempt to "heal the breach", but it is clear he certainly had not nor intended to do so.<sup>3</sup> It should not be thought that Hog's "essay" was a belated attempt to clear himself from the charge of separation: He had said not a little about the subject in his Essay on the Lord's Prayer and in a sermon On Job XXXVI. 8-10, published in 1714. There is no doubt that he had written on the

- 
1. Protesters Vindicated, Title Page.
  2. Wodrow Manuscript Letters, XIX. 45.
  3. Ibid., XIX. 61. Dated July 4, 1718.

subject to his friends, just as he had done about other controversial subjects.<sup>1</sup>

What were the grounds on which Hog remained in communion with the Church of Scotland when he found himself out of sympathy with the course its pilots were steering? How did he look upon those who, like Hepburn, maintained a church within a Church? What positive proposals did he have to offer to the Church in face of the wide divergence of opinions amongst the ministers who had to that time remained in the Church? What rule could men use to determine them to a right course?

The question was simply whether it was right to bear testimony against evils of the Church while remaining in it, or whether there should be a separation from it.<sup>2</sup> Hog took the former position. He asserted that there was only one precedent in the Church of Scotland for setting up separate judicatories, and that was when the Resolutioners refused to sit with the Protesters.<sup>3</sup> He referred to the reluctance of the Reformers to leave the Church of Rome: "They hastened not to go out even from Romish Babel, but staid and laboured amongst them, without taking Share of their known Corruptions, and would have continued to do so much longer, but that they were thrust out by cruel . . . Laws, expressly requiring them to approve the Heresies and abominations of Babel,

---

1. Vide James Hog, Three Missives against Separatists, (Edinburgh: 1717), p. 3. Hereinafter cited Missives Against Separatists. Cf. The Lord's Prayer, p. 59.

2. Ibid., p. 5.

3. Ibid., p. 7.

and to concur with them in their idolatrous Worship."<sup>1</sup>

Separation is the easy way charged Hog; it is much more difficult to swim against the stream. Separatists are in effect saying that those from whom they withdraw are not a true Church, that Christ has no communion with them, and they are virtually excommunicating everyone else and confining the Church to a few extremists.<sup>2</sup>

One of his strongest arguments in reply to his opponents was that they had no genuine ground for separation since "no Man is under a Necessity to approve any of these Evils, every one hath free access to bear honest Testimony against Male-administrations in a way of Church Communion: This is the Lord's Way; and the good old Way; other separating Paths are unscriptural, new, untroden by the Cloud of Witnesses, and of the most dangerous and dreadful Tendency."<sup>3</sup>

Hog's central appeal is not to reason or history, but to Scripture. In this as in every other problem which confronted him, he held to the conviction that "There never was, is, nor shall be any State of the Churches of Christ, wherein the Scriptures of Truth give not sufficient and full Direction. . . ." He searched the Old Testament for guidance and concluded that the Church of God was maintained in spite of the high places and other

---

1. Ibid., p. 8.

2. Ibid., pp. 7-8. 13-14; The Lord's Prayer, p. 55. Cf. Pollock, op. cit., Preface.

3. Ibid., pp. 8-9. Cf. Proposals for Peace and Harmony, p. 15.

4. Ibid., p. 5.

gross sins and Jehovah never required the prophets to separate.<sup>1</sup>  
 In the New Testament he adduced Zacharias, Anna, and Mary;  
 Jesus himself, who took part in the service of the Church and  
 sent lepers to show themselves to the priests; Nicodemus and  
 Joseph of Arimathea who were not commanded to separate even from  
 the Sanhedrin; and the Apostles, who, even after the Resurrection  
 and Ascension, frequented the Jewish synagogues—all of those  
 bore testimony in a way of Church communion.<sup>2</sup> He underscored  
 his judgment by reminding his antagonists that

considerable scandals were tolerated in the Church of  
 Corinth, which notwithstanding, the Spirit of the  
 Lord honoureth with the designation of Sanctified in  
 Christ Jesus, and called to be Saints. The Churches  
 of Asia are likewise owned by the Spirit of the Lord  
 in that capacity, and the Epistles directed to the  
 Overseers of the same, whom the Spirit of God  
 honoureth, praiseth and reproveth in that Relation,  
 and ordereth to rectifie what was amiss, as cloathed  
 with the Authority which that Station doth bear: yea,  
 the Lord himself did walk amidst these Golden  
 Candlesticks, nevertheless, (which is noways to be  
 approven) several great and crying Enormities were  
 suffered among them. . . .<sup>3</sup>

The difficulty, Hog warned the 'Separatists', was that they  
 were being carried into extremes, testifying with so much excess  
 that they were going far beyond the "Boundaries and Land-marks,  
 which our Sovereign LORD and the only Law-giver, has fixed in his  
 word."<sup>4</sup> The way of secession and "Distances", Hog went on,

---

1. Hog, The Lord's Prayer, pp. 66-69; Missives Against Separatists, pp. 10, 15.

2. Hog, Missives Against Separatists, pp. 16-17, 25-41; The Lord's Prayer, pp. 70-77.

3. Hog, The Lord's Prayer, p. 63.

4. James Hog, Abstract of Discourses on Job XXXVI. 8, 9, 10, (Edinburgh: 1714), p.27. Hereinafter cited On Job XXXVI.



"is unpaved, and not so much as trodden by any one of the Cloud of scriptural Witnesses, either the LORD Jesus himself our glorious Head, or the Prophets, or Apostles, and other Believers, who all bore Testimony for the LORD against the Evils in their Day, in a Way of Church Communion, even when Matters were stated yet worse than they are in our Case. . . ."<sup>1</sup>

It is only necessary to say that Hog's rejoinder to the arguments of the separatists on such issues as the Union, the State proclaiming fasts, Presbyterians worshipping in London in the Church of England, and the oaths was that the Church had indeed protested against all these matters and that it was "not guilty" on any of these heads.<sup>2</sup> He defended the jurant ministers against the charge that they had manifested their approval of erastian and prelatie supremacy, and the non-jurants against the charge that by maintaining communion with jurant ministers they were in effect saying that there was no harm in taking oaths. He said that the jurants detested these evils and that he had "already detected the Iniquity of such Dealing, namely, of charging upon any as their received Sentiments the Consequences from their Opinions, which yet they resolutely disown," which is "subversive of all Society, and striking at the Root of Christian Communion," and "directly contrary to that Christian Love, which is the Bond and Cement of Christian Society, and a special distinguishing Badge of Christ's Disciples. . . ."<sup>3</sup>

---

1. Ibid., p. 28.

2. Hog, Missives Against Separatists, pp. 45-55.

3. Ibid., pp. 57-58, 60.

There was another answer which Hog gave to the separatists, and it is one which runs like a golden strand through all the passages which have to do with the subject: Hog made a moving and winsome pleas for the right to differ with one another within the communion of the Church so long as its standards were pure. The only other alternative he could see —and this was the demand of separatists in effect—was a requirement for absolute, universal agreement in every detail as a term of communion, and both Church and State would have to be reconstructed as they were between 1638 and 1649.<sup>1</sup> As long as men know but in part the "sweet Communion of Saints" should not be broken because of differences in sentiments and practices. The way was open for ministers to testify in ways which did not break this fellowship, and it had been his own experience that since they were really "Partakers of the like precious Faith", the remaining differences did not hinder, but tempered and directed him in the ways of Christian Communion (Psalm 15: 4; 84: 10: 16: 1-3; Colossians 1:4).<sup>2</sup> This communion was possible if men would avoid peripheral matters and the importing of worldly politics into Church affairs, and if they would accommodate themselves to one another after the Apostolic admonition to "become all things to all men."<sup>3</sup> It was a pity that the Church of Scotland itself failed to follow Hog's perceptive observations:

---

1. Ibid., p. 20.

2. Hog, On Job XXXVI, pp. 28-29, 63.

3. Hog, Proposals for Peace and Harmony, pp. 10-12.

. . . If a Sameness of Judgment, and Practice . . . even among the Godly, on either hand . . . be made the Standard, no Church Communion shall ever have place, or at least continue for any space while the world standeth. Such a Harmonie never was, nor ever shall be: Neither have we any Ground from the Word to expect it in every thing, while the Church is Militant (tho' a great measure of Oneness may be justly looked for). Hence the making Church Communion to depend upon a Condition impossible, is accordingly, to elide and subvert it entirely.<sup>1</sup>

In view of Hog's fame for doctrinal orthodoxy and his opposition to error it is almost astonishing that he should have written, "The removing of the Land marks set by the Lord himself, as to Church Communion, hath somewhat in it, more subversive to the Being of a Church, than the worst of Heresies!"<sup>2</sup>

The first query, "Why did Hog remain in the Church of Scotland?", has been answered. What about the other one, i.e., "Would not James Hog have joined the Secession had he lived longer, or been younger?"

Admitting that information on this is scant since Hog died so soon after the Secession began, it must be said that there is evidence which gives reason to believe that Hog would have continued in full Communion with the Church of Scotland even after the Secession was made permanent. First, Hog did not secede. This is <sup>a</sup> fact beyond dispute. Second, he continued to do just what he had laid down as his principle, i.e., to testify against defections from the truth while remaining in Church communion. John Currie of Kinglassie refers to a sermon of Hog's which was

---

1. Hog, The Lord's Prayer, p.83.

2. Ibid., p. 82.

evidently preached after the Secession had taken place:

The Reverend Mr. James Hog, in a Sermon a few Months before his Death, declared in the plainest Terms against Separation from the Church of Scotland, or from her Judicatories, affirming, that, 'While our Standards remain pure, and there is a professed Adherence to them, we ought not to separate:' And, having mentioned sundry of the gross corruptions which were in the Churches of Corinth, Galatia, and the Asiatick Churches, said, 'In these Events there is no Warrant from the Lord to the purer Part to sever themselves from the impure, tho' more numerous, and to constitute a distinct Body; nay, they ought to endeavour Reformation, continuing in Communion, and testifying regularly against what it wrong, without turning aside to any crooked Way, Psal. cxxv. 5.' 1

Currie himself appeals to Hog's prints and conduct numerous<sup>2</sup> times in supporting his own arguments against separation.

On the other hand it cannot be denied that the defenders of separation could also appeal to a few places in Hog's writings.

Thus Andrew Clarkson, who wrote a book defending Hepburn, McMillan, and others, brought Hog in as a witness for the defense of

separation.<sup>3</sup> There is a third indication of Hog's fixed design in opposition to separating from the Church of Scotland: his son-in-law, Daniel Hunter, who at one time had been associated with Hepburn,<sup>4</sup> remained at Carnock as the parish minister until his death. This fact did not escape the attention of Currie, who,

---

1. John Currie of Kinglassie, An Essay on Separation, (Edinburgh: T. Lumisden and J. Robertson, 1738), p. 59. Cf. Currie, A Vindication of the Real Reformation-Principles of the Church of Scotland Concerning Separation, (Edinburgh: A. Alison, 1740), p. 192. Hereinafter cited, Essay on Separation and Vindication.

2. Currie, Essay on Separation, pp. 42, 43, 45, 58, 100, 123, 124, 176, 198; Vindication, pp. 81, 143, 181, 191-2, 280, 342.

3. Andrew Clarkson, Plain Reasons for Presbyterians Dissenting, (1731), pp. 56, 114, 162-165.

4. Vide Hepburn's Last Testimony, p. 22.

referring to Hunter, notes, "To his dying Day, [he] was very opposite to all Separation from the Church of Scotland, tho' zealous in opposing every Thing that had the least Appearance of Defection."<sup>1</sup>

If Hog be given the right to speak for himself, the answer appears conclusive, for he held that those who separate from the Church "remove the only scriptural, true and ancient Land Marks, . . . cast all the Churches of Christ unto utter Confusion, and do throw up that great and important Article of our Faith, namely, the Communion of Saints."<sup>2</sup> There is reason to believe that Hog would be out of agreement with the rather liberal position of Gilbert Rule on this point,<sup>3</sup> although it must be remembered that Rule was defending Presbyterians (the Church of Scotland) against the charge of schism which had come from Episcopalians. Yet Hog was so strongly in favor of Church communion that there seems little reason to doubt that, in spite of the claim of the Secessionists that they were in fact "cast out from Communion" by the Church and this alone determined them to form a presbytery,<sup>4</sup> he would have continued to express himself in words similar to these, "Pardon me to say it; I love to live and die with the Cloud of witnesses . . . and have often been put to say it solemnly before the Lord. Let not my Soul enter into the Secret of your schismatical Courses.  
 . . . "<sup>5</sup>

---

1. Currie, Vindication, p. 192.

2. Hog, Missives Against Separatists, p. 62.

3. Gilbert Rule, The Good Old Way, (Edinburgh: Andrew Anderson, 1697), pp. 245-264.

4. Judicial Testimony, iv.

5. Hog, Missives Against Separatists, p. 19.

Live and die Hog did with the "Cloud of Witnesses" in full communion with his beloved "Mother Church". It must be considered one of the highest tributes to this humble country minister that the merit of his Missives Against Separatists was recognized in the nineteenth century (1893) when the first of the three "missives" was republished in his native land.<sup>1</sup>

---

1. Scott, Fasti, V. 9; Erskine Beveridge, A Bibliography of Works, (Dunfermline: William Clark, 1901), p. 172.

CHAPTER IV

PRELUDE TO THE MARROW CONTROVERSY: I. BOURIGNONISM

The Hebronites and other separating groups dissented from the Established Church in the first instance because of their divergent views on policies relating to Church government and discipline. They had no major grievances on the head of doctrine to begin with and it was many years before they could find any serious grounds for complaint on matters of faith. For from the Reformation in 1560 until the beginning of the eighteenth century the Scottish clergy had been generally unanimous in conforming to a pattern of theological orthodoxy. "The throne of Calvin was so firmly fixed that few ventured to shake it."<sup>1</sup> This being the case it would seem that Scotland would have been well insulated against mystical influences, for it has been said that "Scottish religion is proverbially theological, and Scottish theology is notoriously dogmatic."<sup>2</sup> A change was in the offing, however, and the change when it came found James Hog just as ready to oppose doctrinal defection as he was prepared to resist Erastian encroachments and schismatic tendencies. This and the following chapters will show the nature of Hog's Evangelical leadership in the theological sphere in the early eighteenth century, as it was exercised in three controversies: Bourignonism, "Simsonianism", and the case concerning The Marrow of Modern Divinity.

At the end of the seventeenth century Scotland found itself confronted with a growing edge of heterogeneous thought, both theological and religious. The winds of change were blowing

---

1. Cunningham, op. cit., II. 204.

2. G. D. Henderson, Religious Life in Seventeenth Century Scotland, (Cambridge: The University Press), p. 223. Hereinafter cited Religious Life.



everywhere and Scotland was not to escape their "fall-out". The trend was brought to the view of the nation in several ways, one of which was the case of Thomas Aikenhead, a young student who had imbibed and expressed some skeptical opinions about the Deity. For this offense he was tried under an old law, almost fallen into disuse, which made it a capital offense to curse the Supreme Being. Aikenhead was convicted, sentenced to death, and the punishment was carried out in January, 1697. Such was the intolerance of the age, that, to put the best possible interpretation upon the Church's attitude, it may be said that the clergy did not stand in the way of the execution.

In the same year that Aikenhead's case was so prominent in Scotland (1696), a book entitled The Light of the World was published by Christian de Cort, at London. De Cort was a disciple of Antoinette Bourignon, a French Quietist, who had died at Franeker in 1680. At the end of the seventeenth century her writings were widely read in western Europe and her teachings seemed likely to gain a foothold in the modern world. Her writings went through three editions in the Netherlands between 1679 and 1717. Sixteen of her treatises were translated into German, eighteen into Dutch, and three into Latin.<sup>1</sup> However, it was not on the Continent, but in England and Scotland that her teachings were destined to flourish. Bourignonism was so popular in Scotland that it was thought to be a threat to the dominance of Calvinism and in the eighteenth century John Wesley published portions of her writings for the edification of his

---

1. A. R. MacEwen, Antoinette Bourignon Quietist, (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1910), pp. 1, 3.

societies.

It is rather difficult to catalogue the cardinal teachings of Antoinette Bourignon, for she was not always in agreement with herself on some points, and on occasion she was guilty of duplicity, as, for example, when she wrote out her "Confession of Faith" in an effort to check the activities of her enemies who were striving to arouse public opinion against her. Commenting upon this "Creed", A. R. MacEwen observes,

This Confession, while no doubt sincere, had an evasiveness and a generality which made it useless for its purpose. Instead of a profession of belief in the Trinity, there is the unimportant statement that she had been baptized in the name of the Three Persons. The affirmation that Jesus Christ is true God evades the question of the divinity of the historical Christ. . . . As to her declaration that she did 'not doubt of' any one of the articles of the Apostles' Creed, it was notorious that to each of these articles she had in her writings given a significance repudiated by all Christian churches. . . . 1

However, the tenor of her doctrine may be seen in the following brief citations: "There are not in God three persons. When such an expression is used, it is to be understood that there are three powers, of which the essence is love." <sup>2</sup> Concerning the doctrine of election, she wrote, "We must not imagine . . . as ignorant People say, That God hath elected some, and rejected others. . . . But certainly God did elect all Men to Salvation,

---

1. MacEwen, op. cit., pp. 167-8. A. B.'s "Creed" is found in the following: MacEwen, op. cit., pp. 166-7; Antonia Bourignon, The Light of the World, (London:1696), opposite p. liv; and George Garden, An Apology for M. Antonia Bourignon, (London: D. Brown, 1699), p. 4.

2. Bourignon, Light of the World, p. 91.

and none to Perdition. . . ." <sup>1</sup> Of justification by faith alone, she said, "There must needs be very great Fraud in the Doctrines of Men at present, who teach all Sorts of People, both the Good and the Bad, that they shall be saved through the Merits of Jesus Christ, provided they do firmly believe in him. . . ." <sup>2</sup> Further, she identified the false prophets of Matthew 24: 24 as "those Reformers who preach that Men may follow their corrupt Natures, and hope for Salvation only by the Merits of Jesus Christ, without doing anything else. . . ." <sup>3</sup> It cannot be disputed that she claimed a unique inspiration: "I hope they shall no longer seduce those who shall comprehend the Truths contain'd in my Writings, seeing they are the Seed of the Woman which must bruise the Head of the Serpent." <sup>4</sup> While claiming to have no new message, she could write of her teachings that "they explain more clearly the Doctrine of the Gospel, than it is express'd in the Gospel it self, or in any other Authors. . . ." <sup>5</sup> One of the peculiarities of her mysticism is seen in her statement to Christian de Cort that "you are not deceived in believing that I possess the Holy Spirit, because he lives in me and teaches me all that I have told you; for I have never learned anything from any man, neither would I learn of them, because they are in darkness, and do not

---

1. Antonia Bouffignon, Renovation of the Gospel Spirit, (London: 1707), p. 44.

2. Ibid., p. 22.

3. Ibid., p. 58.

4. Ibid., p. 174.

5. Ibid., pp. 172-3.

1

know the Truth in anything.

Hers was a protest against institutionalized, external, and formal religion. She said that those who sought to reform the world by outward worship resembled the Pharisees and that the Christian Church was "worse than Pharisical."<sup>2</sup> Therefore, there was no public exhortation or prayer in her Society, "nor any thing that resembles the external Worship of God; every one Prays be himself, according as is his devotion."<sup>3</sup> She even went so far as to assert that there were no true Christians in the world!<sup>4</sup>

It was not during her lifetime, but between 1695 and 1715—when the overall picture of Scottish religion, Presbyterian, Episcopalian, and Roman Catholic was notoriously enervated—that Bourignonism gained numerous Scottish adherents.<sup>5</sup> Among those who were brought under the influence of her more positive doctrines, there could have been no more zealous disciple than Dr. George Garden, a deprived Episcopalian minister of Aberdeen, who published, anonymously, "An Apology for M. Antonia Bourignon in 1699. Dr Garden, lamenting the party strife over matters of dogma, the abuses which followed in the train of the Reformation, the prevalence of speculative religion, the "Driness and Deadness in most of the Writings and Sermons" of the time, and the great

---

1. Bourignon, Light of the World, p. 423.

2. Bourignon, Renovation of the Gospel Spirit, p. 353.

3. Loc. cit.

4. Garden, op. cit., p. 52.

5. MacEwen, op. cit., p. 209.

"spiritual Famine", felt that Bourignon's emphasis on the love of God and the good life had a definite tendency to promote Christian unity and concord and to remove the blight of party strife which "has banished the Life and Spirit of Christianity from among Men."<sup>1</sup> His attitude and conviction is well summed up in these words, "The Writings of A. B. do tend to take Men off from a dry, barren, dead, superficial and speculative Knowledge of Divine Things, and to lead them to a solid, living, practical and fruitful Knowledge of them."<sup>2</sup>

The Church did not share Dr. Garden's enthusiasm. The Commission of the 1700 General Assembly had had both the book and its author under its inspection. An abstract of the alleged errors to be found in the Apology was given in to the 1701 General Assembly for its action. The Assembly first condemned the book, which was said to contain "a mass of dangerous, impious, blasphemous, and damnable errors."<sup>3</sup> Then, in a separate act, it deposed Dr. Garden from the ministry because of his share in the publication of the Apology; because he had declined to give a positive answer when asked whether Antonia Bourignon was "divinely inspired as she pretends"; because he had declared before the Commission that the Apology represented "the great end of Christianity, which is to bring us back to the love of God and charity"; and because he claimed that the essentials of Christianity were set down in the book.<sup>4</sup> The act went

---

1. Garden, op. cit., pp. 16-38.

2. Ibid., p.25.

3. Acts of Assembly, 1701. X.

4. Acts of Assembly, 1701. XI.

on to point out that even in the condemned book the writings of of Antoinette Bourignon were fraught with the most pernicious doctrines (though they were exhibited to the world "in the fairest dress"), and singled out as the most notorious of many perverse teachings,

The denying of the permission of Sin, and the infliction of damnation and vengeance for it. . . . The ascribing to Christ a two-fold human nature, one of which was produced of Adam before the woman was formed, the other born of the Virgin Mary. . . . The denying of the decrees of election and reprobation, and the loading of those acts of grace and sovereignty with a multitude of odious and blasphemous aspersions. . . . That the will of man is unlimited. . . . The asserting a state of perfection in this life, and a state of purification in the life to come . . . and several other errors. . . .<sup>1</sup>

The vexatious Bourignonian fires refused to be smothered by a mere act of the General Assembly. An Inverness physician, Colin Mackenzie, who had studied abroad, imbibed the quietistic errors and was disinherited by his father.<sup>2</sup> The Rev. James Allan, minister at Rothes, was clearly sympathetic to the condemned teachings, despite his protestations of innocence.<sup>3</sup> The Synod of Aberdeen complained in 1710 of the existence at Roshearty of a kind of monastery of men and women who were Bourignonists, and there was a goodly number in Fife who embraced her teaching.<sup>4</sup>

---

1. Loc. cit.

2. G.D. Henderson, Religious Life, p. 223.

3. Vide James Allan, A Letter to the Moderator of the Next General Assembly, (1707), pp. 18, 21, 34. Allan was eventually deposed for refusing to subscribe the Confession of Faith as a term of ministerial communion.

4. Henderson, Religious Life, pp. 223-24.

Thomas Boston says that these principles made "a considerable noise" at one time.<sup>1</sup> As late as 1714 Wodrow observed that in the north "the enthusiastical foppery of Bourignianism hath grown very much" and considered it "but a step towards Popery".<sup>2</sup>

The 1709 Assembly, noting that the condemned errors were abounding in some places, reaffirmed the tenth act of the Assembly 1701.<sup>3</sup> Again in the following year it was found necessary to take note of the "gross heresies and errors, going under the name of Bourignionism," which were "greatly prevailing in the bounds of several Synods. . . ."<sup>4</sup> Schoolmasters and other teachers of youth were now enjoined to subscribe the Confession of Faith as the Confession of their Faith. Reference was made to "societies of Bourignionists", and the Commission was instructed to "apply to the Government, for hindering of incorrect, false, and spurious translations of the Bible to be spread abroad," and professors of divinity were urged to write confutations of the errors of Antoinette Bourignon.<sup>5</sup>

The surest gauge of the popularity of the condemned teachings, however, is seen in the action of the 1711 Assembly. In that year the Assembly climaxed its legislation with reference to the Bourignian errors by placing this heresy on the same evil eminence with Popish, Arian, Socinian, and Arminian errors, requiring these,

---

1. Boston, op. cit., pp. 186-7.

2. Wodrow, Correspondence, I. 572.

3. Acts of Assembly, 1709. XII.

4. Acts of Assembly, 1710. IX.

5. Loc. cit.

with Bourignonism, to be disowned by all ministers at their ordination.<sup>1</sup> It was not until 1889 that the General Assembly removed this disavowal of Bourignianism from the ordination vows taken by its ministers!

The same year in which the General Assembly condemned Bourignonism and deposed Dr. Garden, James Hog sent to the press his little book, Remarks Concerning the Spirit's Operation, which was aimed in part at combating Bourignonism. Several years later, while these principles were waxing stronger and stronger, a company of French Montanists, persecuted in their own country, sought refuge in Britain. They came from the Cevennes Mountains in southern France and were called the "Cevennois", or the "French prophets". These ecstasies appeared in Edinburgh where they circulated a book of testimonials, A Cry From the Desert, and their prophecies under the title of The Warning of the Eternal Spirit to Edenburgh. One of them positively predicted that judgment would fall on Edinburgh within forty days. James Webster wrote Wodrow that several of the "prophets" were imprisoned by the magistrates for prophesying on the streets of the city.<sup>2</sup> Their books and their maltreatment attracted the sympathies of many, among whom was the Laird of Barns at Crail in Fife.<sup>3</sup> At about the same time (1708) one of Hog's

---

1. Acts of Assembly, 1711. X.

2. Wodrow, Correspondence, I. 169 (footnote 1).

3. G.D. Henderson, Religious Life, p. 224.



admirers—probably Lady Theodosia Maitland—sent him a copy of A Cry From The Desert, asking his opinion of the book and the claims of the sect. The result was that Hog published his Notes About Saving Illumination, with two letters appended treating of the same theme.

Lady Maitland in turn requested Hog to send her more information on the subject and Hog was thus obliged to revise and enlarge the Remarks Concerning the Spirit's Operation, which came from the press entitled Notes About the Spirit's Operations, but with the addition of "Diverse Remarks, for Detecting the Enthusiastical Delusions of the Cevennois, Antonia Bourignon, and others." From these prints Hog's objections to Bourignonism and the "prophets" may be discovered.

A.R. MacEwen disparages all of the anti-Bourignonian writings contemporary with the flowering of the heresy, including the last of Hog's publications.<sup>2</sup> It is true that Hog did not attempt to make an elaborate, detailed, theological dissection and refutation of Bourignonism. He was not writing for the ministerial intelligentsia, but for the Church members who were concerned about the lack of a practical Christian piety in the lives of many

---

1. Vide Hog, Notes About the Spirit's Operations, (Edinburgh: John Moncur, 1709), iii; cf. Hog, Notes About Saving Illumination, (Edinburgh: John Moncur, 1708), pp. 47-8. Hereinafter cited Spirit's Operations and Saving Illumination. Throughout the thesis the 1709 edition of Spirit's Operations is generally used. In those few places where the 1701 edition is cited the full title will appear.

2. MacEwen, op. cit., pp. 12-13.

professed Christians. Was Antoinette Bourignon really right in her teachings? And how could they be tested for their validity? What reply should be made to those who were being ensnared in the Bourignonian web? These were some of the questions that Hog sought to deal with in his writings on the subject. The real truth is that Hog was aware of errors within the Church very different from Bourignonism, errors which he saw to be far more perilous to the Church than these which were making so much noise. These errors he also addressed himself to in his Spirit's Operations.

James Hog saw the problem eye to eye with Andrew Honyman, who declared,

Of all the divisive Sects and Parties that have of late Years infested Christendome, Bourignonism, as it hath made greatest noise ; so it is found to have done most prejudice to the interest of true Religion and Christianity; while sundry of the Divine Attributes have been thereby openly denied or vilified: The Authority of the Holy Scriptures is also brought under contempt, by equalizing, if not preferring the writings of Antonia Bourignon unto them: The sufficiency or necessity of Revealed Religion is cryed down in the exaltation of Nature's Light, or the Mind's withdrawing from all external helps and means of Grace: The Rules and Measures of these truly Christian Graces. . . so frequently mentioned in these Books, are not taken from the Holy Scriptures, nor are taught and practised according to them. . . .<sup>1</sup>

Instead of citing the errors separately and condemning them one by one, as Honyman did, Hog condemned Bourignonism chiefly on the one ground where he perceived it to be utterly defective—namely, in its subversion of the Word of God, which the Reformed Church accepted as the only rule of faith and practice. It was one of his

---

1. Andrew Honyman, Bourignonism Displayed, (Aberdeen: Printed by John Forbes, 1710), 1.

"uncontroverted Grounds" that the scriptures of the Old and New Testaments were given by Divine inspiration and are to be the "alone compleat Rule of Faith, and Life, the only Standard according to which the Spirits are to be tryed, and Doctrines, Practices and pretences whatsoever, to be carefully examined. . . ."<sup>1</sup>

Needless to say, he believed that the Canon was complete and that Christians had no "warrant to look out for, or lay Stress upon" any pretended "revelations." The accepting of new revelations would be a reflection upon God's wisdom and goodness<sup>2</sup> and inconsistent with the demonstrated perfection of the Word.

Observe then, that the Lord is pleased to convey the Influences of his Grace, and the benefits of his Purchase throw the Channel of his Word, without revealing any new Doctrine, detracting from, or altering that which is revealed, but keeping the whole pure, intire, and in its Native Sense.<sup>3</sup>

Hog's rejoinder to Antoinette Bourignon's quietism was that

in whatsoever manner the Christian be exercised about the Word, the Channel throw which the Spirits Influences are carried in upon the Heart, is still the same, whether it be read, pondered in Meditation, conferred about, or prayed upon, and when used as the only Rule for self-Examination, particularly when sincerely preached and received, seing Faith comes by hearing, and hearing by the Word of God. . . .<sup>4</sup>

One of the most pernicious of the Bourignian errors was the divorcing the work of the Spirit from the Word of God, Hog observed.

---

1. Hog, Saving Illumination, p. 48.

2. Hog, Spirit's Operations, I. 21-23, 34.

3. Ibid., I. 14.

4. Ibid., I. 14-15, with Scripture references omitted.

While not limiting the Spirit of God, whose methods and ways are various, Hog confidently affirmed that "the leading of the Spirit, and evidence of the Word, go inseparably together. . . ." <sup>1</sup>

One of the real evidences of the Spirit's work, said Hog, was "Preservation from Delusions, particularly the damnable Extremes of separating the Word from the Spirit, or the Spirit from the Word. . . ." <sup>2</sup>

Hog contended that the "enthusiasts", as he termed them, contrary to the necessary principles laid down in the Word, were laying aside the written Word by their claims to have new light, founded solely upon their authority. If their claims were received at face value, then their writings would have to be received "as so much of new Scripture, given by immediate Inspiration", with the result that the Word of God would be "quite enervated". <sup>3</sup>

If there was to be a Standard for the Church to <sup>4</sup> follow, then no room was left for additions to that Standard.

Flights, and most specious Semblances of Spirituality, do . . . remove the great Barrier against Atheism itself, by undermining the Credit of the only Rule. And tho' a regard to it be pretended to cover the Deceit (which otherways would be too open) yet its Credit cannot be sincerely maintained, unless we bring every thing to this alone Touchstone, and peremptorly refuse to received any thing but that which is contained in, and rightly deduc'd from the Canon.<sup>5</sup>

---

1. Ibid., I. 29.

2. Ibid., I. 68.

3. Ibid., I. 24-25.

4. Ibid., I. 39.

5. Ibid., I.40.

The extra-Scriptural impressions were not a foundation on which faith could rest, Hog reminded his readers, for faith could settle on no other testimony save that recorded in the Word: "This is the King's high Way, and we know no other. . . ." <sup>1</sup>

The peace of the soul "is false, which is not supported, and cannot be instructed by satisfying Evidence from the Word." <sup>2</sup>

Hog supported his argument by the example of Jesus, who, though his own testimony was sufficient to support his doctrine, yet

was pleased to instruct each Point from the written Word, both to evince the pleasant Harmony of every Piece . . . and to shew the indispensable Obligation we are under to advance and receive nothing as any part of the Lord's revealed will, in point of Truth, Duty, or any Religious Concern, save that which the Lord holds forth in his Word. . . .<sup>3</sup>

Hog saw the inherent Arminianism in the Bourignian teaching, and he asserted that man was by nature wholly void of the true knowledge of God, utterly contrary to the product of ~~absaving~~ change, and must needs be transformed by a powerful and supernatural work of the Spirit. <sup>4</sup> It was manifest that there

is nothing in us to procure and further, but every thing that is ours is adapted and set to hinder the foresaid blessed Change, that it must needs be wrought in a most powerful and efficacious manner, and such as effectually overcometh our Enemies within and without . . . both in the Ground-work, and in every bit of the Progress.

---

1. Ibid., I. 80.79

2. Ibid., I. 88.

3. Ibid., I. 18.

4. Ibid., I. 45-50, 103-107.

Hence, both the Foundation, and every Stone of the Building, must be the Product of special Grace and Power, if any thing ever was, is, or can be the Effect thereof.<sup>1</sup>

Another of the weaknesses Hog detected in the Bourignian and related errors was the absence of anything like a Gospel treatment of sin and salvation.<sup>2</sup> It was the experience of those who were "exercised to Godliness" that they found the "Smart of Sin lying upon the Conscience" and they could not "find quiet Repose, till Matters were set right again, and the Joy of God's Salvation restored. . . ." As to sin, believers saw a "sort of infinitness . . . of Evil in everie Sin. . . ." The enlightened person would actually charge himself with original sin, as his sin. Thus, with reference to salvation and God's grace, "he looks upon himself as the greatest Bankrupt, and beholden to Sovereign and free Mercy, beyond any Person who ever breathed upon the face of the Earth. . . ."<sup>4</sup>

There is no doubt that in Antoinette Bourignon and many (though not all) of her disciples there was no evidence of a "work of humiliation", as it was wont to be called. She talked much about the pride of Church members and reflected upon the orthodox doctrines which Church theologians like Hog insisted upon, as though these doctrines were the fabrication of their own minds. If her example and doctrine were to be accepted as the norm for

---

1. Ibid., I. 50-1.

2. Ibid., I. 71 ff.; Saving Illumination, p. 54.

3. Hog, Saving Illumination, pp. 10, 19.

4. Ibid., p. 16.

believers (and this appears to have been her real design) then there is no hesitation in saying that, notwithstanding all her tirades against bigotry in the Church and her acclamation of love and virtue, Bourignonism could lead only to men's establishing their own righteousness and to a haughtiness of spirit equal that of the most notorious hypocrite.

The burden of Hog's remarks on this subject is summarized in the rules he laid down for Christians to follow in testing the claims made by the various enthusiasts. He offers the following suggestions or principles, using as his text I John 4: 1, "Beloved, believe not every spirit, but try the spirits whether they are of God: because many false prophets are gone out into the world." These rules are suggested, not for the public and authoritative use of the Church, but for "private Persons, who are allow'd and enjoin'd not to Assent but upon sufficient Evidence of the Lord's Testimony: As the Bereans, who tho' they received the Word with all readiness of Mind, yet searched the Scriptures daily whether these things were so, Acts. 17. 11."<sup>1</sup>

The first rule he suggests is that "In due Subordination to the Word, the only Rule, let us have regard to the Confessions, and other approved Standards of the Faith of Reformed Churches, particularly our own. Recessions from these are ordinarily (sic) the beginnings of, and introductive to further Errors."<sup>2</sup>

---

1. Hog, Spirit's Operations I. 98.

2. Ibid., I. 100.

The second principle is that a study should be made of the judgment and practices of godly and learned Divines. If it is necessary to differ from them in some things, it ought not to be except on the ground of better light.<sup>1</sup> A third guide to follow in "trying the spirits" is to investigate the sentiments and deportment of the "Lord's People" in former times in the same or similar circumstances. "The Path we chuse, must be a troden one: unpaved ways are Dangerous."<sup>2</sup> The strong sentiments of Hog on this point are seen in the following expansion of this third rule, which is at the same time an excellent summation of his arguments against Bourignonism:

Whatsoever Ground we may find as to our Motions, with reference to Practice in circumstanced Cases, which ought to be wisely managed: Let us beware of establishing Principles without abundant Evidence from the Word, and a due regard to the Footsteps of the Flock in former times, and such whereof the consequences may condemn these whom the Lord approveth, or to be found of any hurtful Influence, with reference to the great Interests of Christ's Kingdom and Gospel, and the faithful Dispensers thereof, tho' under some different Sentiments. . . . Pure Principles are a great Trust received from our Ancestors, and which we are to Transmit to our Posterity. . . .<sup>3</sup>

Hog's animadversions give partial support to MacEwen's conclusion that "the Quietists were condemned not, so to speak, 'on the merits', but because their teaching was hurtful to Churches as institutions and tended to depreciate the worth of their

---

1. Ibid., I. 100-101.

2. Ibid., I. 101.

3. Ibid., I. 101-2.



ministrations."<sup>1</sup> Still, Hog's arguments are sound as far as they go and he did not, as has been said, intend a scientifically critical refutation of Bourignonism.

Mathieson's point is well made that Bourignonism

in so far as it illustrated the Baconian maxim that it is 'better to have no opinion at all of God than such an opinion as is unworthy of Him,' . . . merely anticipated the influx of that liberal theology which was rising to predominance in England amongst the Presbyterians no less than within the Church of England.<sup>2</sup>

This "liberal theology" was making headway in the Church of Scotland and James Hog was already seeking to counteract its influence, even while his ostensible motive was exposing the fallacies of, and supplying the antidote to, the Bourignonian corruption. The sower of the Latitudinarian tares in Scotland was John Simson, professor of theology at Glasgow University, against whose principles Hog took up his pen. The following chapter will treat of the case of John Simson and delineate Hog's role in that somewhat acidulous debate.

---

1. MacEwen, op. cit., p. 105.

2. Mathieson, op. cit., p. 224.

**CHAPTER V**

**PRELUDE TO THE MARROW CONTROVERSY:**

**II. THE CASE OF JOHN SIMSON, 1714-1717**

Bourignianism caused not a little alarm in the Church of Scotland, and might have caused a greater stir, except that before the final disposition of Bourignian matters by the General Assembly, there were other ominous clouds looming up on the horizon. There was at this time at work within the Church a leaven far more deadly than Bourignianism could ever have been, associated as it was with those of known Episcopalian sympathies; whereas the new danger was arising in the citadel of Presbyterian strength—in the west of Scotland, in the divinity Hall of Glasgow University! While Bourignianism was mostly external to the Church, here was clearly a case of the stream's being polluted at the very fountainhead!

The progenitor of the new scheme was John Simson, who gained the unenviable distinction of appearing as defendant before the Assembly in two cases covering in all a period of fifteen years. In the first case, 1714-1717, Simson was accused of teaching Arminian tenets, while in the second, 1726-29, he was charged with Arianism. If there had been almost no theological disputation in Scotland for the one hundred fifty years since the Reformation, the case of John Simson made up, in time consumed, in metaphysical discussion, in intensity, and notoriety, for all the years of relative theological peace.

When one considers the predominancy of doctrinal orthodoxy in Scotland at the close of the seventeenth century, it may seem perplexing that a divinity professor should be found suspect on such serious charges as Arminianism and Arianism. How did it happen that a divinity professor in Presbyterian, Calvinistic Scotland should come to voice these opinions? Was he promiscuously

accused and prosecuted by hyper-critical, supersensitive ministers who had some personal grudge? Was the Church engaged in mere shadow-boxing, or in a determined heresy hunt? From whence came these influences into Scotland? These are some of the questions which arise in connection with the case of Professor Simson.

In any search into the underlying causes of the Simson heterodoxy it is at once evident that this case did not occur in a vacuum, by spontaneous generation. Simson was a man of no mean ability, but he was not the originator of the principles which he propagated. Scotland was a part of a larger scene, giving and receiving, though at this time it must be admitted that she was in the position of receiving more than she gave.

It was inevitable from the very nature of the thing that the Reformation should result in men's questioning and debating all the points of the faith, so that the Church seemed unable to settle even the fundamental tenets. The Arminians and the Calvinists were at each other's throats in Holland, the Independents and the Established Church in England, the Episcopalians and the Presbyterians in Scotland, and, of course, the Protestants and the Roman Catholics everywhere. Beyond these conflicts there were differences within the National Churches, as the Cocceians and the Voetians in Holland, the Neonomians and the Antinomians in England, the Protesters and the Resolutioners in Scotland. The comprehension of the Episcopal clergy by the Church of Scotland would seem to have provided a "fifth-column" within the Church, by means of which latitudinarian theology could, and did, to some extent, secure a hearing. Many Churchmen pointed to the Union

of 1707 as a cause of the troubles and, laying aside the prejudices of most Scottish Presbyterians, it is true that the Union afforded an additional channel by means of which the more liberal thought of the Southern neighbor infiltrated Scotland. However, back of the new scheme of doctrine promulgated by John Simson and his sympathizers, one factor rises Everest-like above all the others that one could mention. This factor is what is called the scientific movement, and is far and away the most significant consideration in any study of the background of the eighteenth century setting.

It was an era of intellectual fermentation when men were searching for new evidences, testing new theories, discarding outworn shells of the past, and declaring their freedom from those doctrines, principles, and forces which had suppressed and confined the inquiring mind. This scientific movement was characterized chiefly by two elements which had no little bearing on the religious scene as it developed in the eighteenth century: It was rationalistic in spirit and it was opposed to or had little reverence for traditionalism.

As to the first of these, it is rooted more distantly in the philosophical discussions of the Middle Ages. But the more proximate cause of rationalism is to be found in the outstanding thinkers of the seventeenth century. It had its inception with Descartes who taught men to look within for their first certainties, and who spread abroad the clear light of geometric reasoning. Descending from Descartes the rationalistic movement produced a long line of philosophers, among whom were Spinoza, Leibnitz, Berkeley, and Hume, each of whom developed the Cartesian

philosophy in his own way. During this period the astronomical discoveries of Newton, Galileo, and Kepler were comprehended. Men saw the paths of the planets mapped out according to established laws, such as Newton's law of gravitation. The microscope was invented and van Leeuwenhoek asserted that he could see sperms millions of times smaller than a grain of sand. The telescope made it possible to see and describe the planets; Torricelli invented the barometer; Boyle perfected the thermometer. The appeal for ultimate authority ceased to be that of ecclesiastical dogma, and hereafter everything had to appear before the bar of reason for trial. Accordingly, rationalism was the dominating influence of the eighteenth century.

Hand-in-hand with the rationalistic temper, and inseparable from it, there was an attack upon traditionalism. Many of the hallowed truths accepted as absolute fact for centuries were devastatingly exploded, or called into question—in medicine, astronomy, geography, physics, and all the other fields of knowledge. Historical authority and antiquity could no longer appealed to with anything like the same assurance of shutting the mouths of the opposition. Basil Willey points out that

As the seventeenth century wore to its close, Nature and Reason began on the whole to gain upon Aristotle and the Rules. The great influence of Descartes . . . told strongly on behalf of 'Moderns' versus 'Ancients'. It was not that one adopted any new standards: supporters of both parties in that controversy seem to have shared the same general scale of values. It was a sense that the world's great age was beginning anew, and that pupillage to antiquity was now unnecessary.<sup>1</sup>

---

1. Basil Willey, The Eighteenth Century Background, (London: Chatto and Windus, 1940), pp. 22-23.

The scientific movement produced a climate of opinion in which supernatural explanations of natural phenomena ceased to satisfy and the universe came to be regarded more and more as a great machine, working by rigidly determined laws of material causation. Although the new philosophy was antisupernaturalistic, it was not at first anti-religious. Most of the great scientists believed that they had rendered the highest services to religion as well as to science, and Descartes, Boyle, and Newton were notable theists.<sup>1</sup>

Be this as it may, it is obvious that religion could not long escape the "fall-out" from this new spirit which was permeating every other sphere of thought and activity. Slowly but surely the impact of the new spirit was felt in the Church. Men who had rejected unsupported tradition in science could not be expected to acquiesce in a system of religion founded on unquestioning adherence to tradition. Francis Bacon had excluded theology from his consideration because, in his opinion, it lay beyond the sphere of human reason. Descartes went out of his way to avoid a collision with religion. But there were other philosophers who were not concerned to tread so softly in the room of theology, and who subjected religious beliefs to the same methods they applied to all other questions of knowing and being. In the end, no Church was free from the new spirit, though "no church was wholly conquered by it. The Roman Church had its Jansenists; France had its Encyclopaedists, Germany its Aufklarung, England its Deists and its Latitudinarians, Scotland its Moderates."<sup>2</sup>

---

1. Ibid., pp. 3-4.

2. A.J. Campbell, Two Centuries of the Church of Scotland, (Paisley: Alexander Gardner, Ltd., 1930), p. 34.

In England the Presbyterians began to admit the right of the individual to criticize authority. They were more willing to co-operate with those who insisted on the necessity of examining traditions in a critical spirit and of rejecting those positions that could not stand up under the scrutiny of rationalistic and empirical proof.<sup>1</sup> The controversy in Holland between the Cocceians and the Voetians would have a liberalizing tendency upon the English students who either observed or participated in the disputes. For though they aligned themselves for the most part on the side of the Voetians and Scholastics, they would, nevertheless, have been encouraged to criticize the basic Calvinistic doctrines. Griffiths theorizes that

Knowledge of the developments of philosophy in Holland . . . impelled the Presbyterians to reject propositions which they had accepted in the theology of Calvin, because in Cartesianism these arguments appeared in a clearer form and were pushed farther towards their logical conclusions. Having arrived at this position, however, it was natural that the Presbyterians should re-examine the Calvinist system in a critical spirit. They were, moreover, now provided with arguments to justify their right to criticize older traditions and to frame their own religious opinion. Henceforth it would be impossible for English Presbyterians to ignore the importance of reason either in their own religious life or in their conceptions of the nature of the Deity.<sup>2</sup>

The re-examination of orthodox religion by the scientific method produced, directly or indirectly, two new religious systems — Arminianism, with its emphasis on man's part in his salvation,

---

1. Olive M. Griffiths, Religion and Learning (Cambridge: The University Press, 1935), p. 53.

2. Ibid., p. 67.



and Deism, with its stress on reason and natural religion. Everything that was happening in philosophy, science, and religion tended to encourage and enhanced opinion of the value and ability of man. Richard Baxter, among others, had indicated that man's efforts played some part in his justification, thereby abandoning the orthodox Calvinistic position.<sup>1</sup> His views found wide and enthusiastic acceptance. Thomas Halyburton, reflecting on the state of religion in England in the seventeenth century noted that

whereas preachers formerly, in order to engage men to a compliance with the Gospel, were wont to press much upon them their guilt, the impossibility of standing before God, in their own righteousness, their impotency, their misery by the Fall, the necessity of regeneration, illumination, the power of grace to make them willing to comply, and that no man could sincerely call Christ Lord, and be subject to him practically, save by the Holy Ghost: Care was now taken to unteach them all this, and to shew how very little they had lost by the Fall, if any things was lost by it, either in point of light to discern, or power and inclination to practise duty. They were told how great length their own righteousness would go, and that it would do their business; they might safely enough stand before God in it; or if there was any room for Christ's righteousness, it was only to piece out their own, where it was wanting.<sup>2</sup>

With the more optimistic view of the capacity for good in natural man there came to be more stress on the importance of natural religion. This was, as Basil Willey puts it, the "Golden Age of natural theology and deistical freethinking. . . ."<sup>3</sup> Religion, which heretofore had rested on revelation, now rested on "Nature".

---

1. Infra pp. 230ff.

2. Halyburton, op. cit., p. 27.

3. Willey, op. cit., p. 3.

There could hardly have been a more representative and authoritative spokesman for the Deists than John Toland, whose thesis was:

we hold that Reason is the only foundation of all certitudes; and that nothing revealed, whether as to its manner or existence, is more exempted from its disquisitions, than the ordinary phenomena of nature. Wherefore, we likewise maintain, according to the title of this discourse, that there is nothing in the Gospel contrary to Reason, nor above it; and that no Christian Doctrine can be properly called a Mystery. 1

Toland agreed with the orthodox that scripture had "the brightest characters of Divinity," but he differed from them when he said that it was "reason finds them out, examines them, and by its principles approves and pronounces them sufficient; which orderly begets in us an acquiescence of faith or persuasion." 2 So strongly did he feel on this subject, that he marshalled Revelation 15: 5, 7, to support his thesis:

Mystery is a Name written on her forehead; that is, all her religion consists in mystery, she openly owns, she enjoins the belief of mysteries. And, no doubt on't, as far as any Church allows of mysteries, so far it is ANTICHRISTIAN, and may with a great deal of justice, though little honour, claim kindred with the scarlet whore. 3

While Scotland was very much aware of and in touch with the developments on the Continent, it was from England that the seeds

---

1. John Toland, Christianity Not Mysterious, 2nd Edition; (London: Printed for Sam Buckley, 1696), p.6.

2. Ibid., pp. 33-4.

3. Ibid., p. 107.

which blossomed into the Simson theology really came. Since the removal of the Court to London in 1603 the road to England had been made both attractive and necessary to many Scotsmen. Scots clergy were brought up to London and Scots nobles took their places at Whitehall. This would result ~~in~~ a freer exchange of ideas. Cromwell's Independent army would have at least some influence in the same direction. Without determining the direction of influence, it is not without significance that the Westminster Confession of Faith and the Catechisms, far from being Scottish documents, were much more English in their evolution than Scottish.<sup>1</sup>

With reference to the influx of Arminian theology, it has been observed that it "came into Scotland, not so much directly from Holland as via England, and associated not merely with hostility to Calvinism, but with hostility to Presbyterianism. . . ."<sup>2</sup> Archbishop Laud was responsible more than any other for introducing into Scotland both advanced views of Episcopacy and distinctive Arminian theology. His disciples tried to get an Arminian appointed, in 1629, to a place in Edinburgh University, and Bishop Sydserf, one of Laud's strongest supporters, was found guilty of preaching Arminianism by the 1638 Assembly. That Assembly did such a thorough-going purging of the Church that for many years thereafter "Scots only differed in the exact shade of their

---

1. G. D. Henderson, Religious Life, p. 67.

2. G. D. Henderson, "Arminianism in Scotland", London Quarterly and Holborn Review, CLVI (October 1932), 493.

Calvinism."<sup>1</sup> Mention of Arminianism was made by the Assemblies of 1647 and 1648, and the 1651 Assembly mentioned Arminianism as the only defect of the Church; but it was considered something of an abomination. Even in the ascendancy of Episcopacy from 1660 to 1689, it is manifest that Calvinism was the order of the day.<sup>2</sup>

After the Revolution Settlement the charge of Arminianism was often made against the Episcopalians, but since the term had come to be used rather carelessly as a sort of vague epithet one cannot safely draw conclusions from this alone. Still, one of the chief aims of theological training seems to have been to school the students in the art of refuting the errors of popery and Arminianism. The General Assembly of 1704 forbade the teaching of Arminianism, and this was one of the heresies repudiated by all candidates for ordination after 1711.<sup>3</sup> Professor Simson was charged primarily on the grounds of teaching Arminianism, but G. D. Henderson suggests that the heretical influences at work were really those of Samuel Clarke and the Deists.<sup>4</sup>

The Church of Scotland was on the alert against the Deistic principles and the General Assembly of 1695-1696 passed an act entitled, "Act against the Atheistical Opinions of the Deists;

---

1. G. D. Henderson, Religious Life, p. 91.

2. G. D. Henderson, "Arminianism in Scotland", London Quarterly and Holborn Review, CLVI. 496-97.

3. Acts of Assembly 1704. XII; 1711. X.

4. G. D. Henderson, "Arminianism in Scotland", London Quarterly and Holborn Review, CLVI. 499-500.

and for establishing the Confession of Faith," in which they took note of the dissemination of Deistic principles which tended to "Scepticism and Atheism"; expressed the fear that there was danger of that "gangrene" spreading in Scotland; and enjoined ministers in places where there was danger of the "contagion" to warn and guard their people.<sup>1</sup>

It is instructive to note that the specific tenets listed in this Act, to be refuted by the ministers, were

the denying of all revealed religion, the grand mysteries of the Gospel, viz. The Doctrine of the Trinity—the Incarnation of the Messiah—His satisfaction to justice—salvation through Him—justification by His imputed righteousness to them who believe on His name—the resurrection of the dead—and, in a word, the certainty and authority of Scripture revelation; as also, their asserting that there must be a mathematical evidence for each purpose, before we can be obliged to assent to any proposition thereanent, and that natural light is sufficient to salvation.<sup>2</sup>

The 1697 Assembly re-affirmed the action of the previous Assembly and in an act against profaneness<sup>3</sup> passed the same year, one of the sins lamented is that of Deism. No further notice seems to have been taken of Deism, possibly because the Church found itself embroiled in other matters of a nearer concern. However, the danger did not disappear; neither was it entirely forgotten nor neglected in the Church. Thomas Halyburton, Professor of Divinity at St. Andrews, whose struggles against skepticism were very similar to those of Hog, launched an offensive

---

1. Acts of Assembly, 1695-1696. XXI.

2. Loc. cit.

3. Acts of Assembly, 1697. XVII.

against the Deists in his Natural Religion Insufficient.

Of this book, published posthumously, it has been said that it is "a scholastic prosecution of Owenian principle."<sup>1</sup> Halyburton, who, as a theology professor must have been in a good position to feel the pulse of the youth of the land, made the following comment concerning the spread of Deism:

The times are infectious, and Deism is the contagion that spreads. And that which has taken many, particularly of our unwary youth, of the better quality, off their feet, and engage them to espouse this cause, is the high pretence that this way makes to Reason. They tell us that their religion is entirely reasonable, and that they admit nothing, save what this dictates to them, and they endeavour to represent others as easy and credulous men.<sup>2</sup>

It is only in the light of the above context that the Simson—and Marrow—theological disputations of the second decade of the century can be appreciated.

Simson had studied as an undergraduate at Edinburgh, then took his Divinity course under the very orthodox James Wodrow at Glasgow. For a time he was librarian at Glasgow; then he proceeded to Leyden, where he studied under Marckius, author of the Medulla, which Simson later used as his textbook at Glasgow. He was first minister at Traquair before taking up his appointment as Professor of Divinity at Glasgow in 1708.<sup>3</sup> Even then there

---

1, John Macleod, Scottish Theology, (Edinburgh:1943), p. 117, citing Professor Knight, Colloquia Peripatetica.

2. Halyburton, op. cit., p. 15.

3. H. M. B. Reid, The Divinity Professors of Glasgow University, (Glasgow: Maclehose, Jackson and Co., 1923), pp. 204-5.

was a hint that the new professor was not likely to adhere to the hard and fast orthodoxy of the Confession. At his ordination by the Presbytery of Paisley (1705) he had signed the Confession of Faith with a declaration concerning the sense in which he understood the word "Covenant" to be used therein.<sup>1</sup>

Between 1710 and 1713 Simson and James Webster, his accuser, had private discussions while on holiday; met in conference with friends; and corresponded with one another. Then at a meeting of the Presbytery of Edinburgh, March 17, 1714, Webster accused Simson of teaching Arminian and Socinian doctrines. The case went by reference to the General Assembly of 1714, and Webster was appointed by that body to prosecute Simson before the Presbytery of Glasgow.<sup>2</sup> At this point Webster, seeing that the burden of prosecution was to rest on him rather than on the General Assembly, determined to give up the affair. He wrote the Edinburgh Presbytery in July, 1714, stating that he had no call from God to prosecute Simson at Glasgow and that he would not prosecute him. There might never have been a prosecution of Simson, or at least not so early, had not Simson resolved to pursue Webster for slander, so that Webster was practically compelled to go ahead with the pursuit.<sup>3</sup>

1. John Simson, A True And Authentick Copy of Mr. John Simson's Letters to Mr. Robert Rowen, ed. by James Webster, (Edinburgh: John Moncur, 1716), pp. 6-7, 16. Cf. John M'Claren, The New Scheme of Doctrine, p. 229. Hereinafter cited Letters to Rowen.

2. Supra, p. 50.

3. Libel, Mr. James Webster, against Mr. John Simson, and Answers to the Libel, (Published without Title Page), [1715?], pp. 71-2. Hereinafter cited Libel and Answers.

Two libels, containing the specific errors with which Simson was accused, were accordingly submitted by Webster to the Presbytery of Glasgow in September, 1714.<sup>1</sup> When the affair came before the Presbytery of Glasgow in March, 1715, the judgment rendered was so unsatisfactory to Webster that he appealed to the General Assembly.<sup>2</sup> The appeal was sustained, and the case was taken up by the General Assembly.

The nature and difficulty of the task confronting the Assembly will be manifest by the variety of charges made against him by Webster, some of which were: That the heathen, by the light of nature, may know that God is reconcileable; that the number of the elect is as great, if not greater than that of the damned, which is more agreeable to the goodness of God; that all infants dying in infancy are saved; that the desire of reward and the fear of punishment may not only be a motive, but should be "the Chief Motive to the Rational Creature in Worshipping the Lord"; that the covenant with Adam was not a "proper covenant"; that original sin comes from the union of the soul—which, coming from the hand of the Creator, is as pure and holy as Adam's was—with the corrupted body; that there is no sinning in Hell after the last Judgment; that there is a necessary connection between the use of means, or moral seriousness, and regenerating grace; and that the moon and other planets were inhabited.<sup>3</sup>

---

1. Ibid., pp. 1-16.

2. Reid, op. cit., p. 209. Cf. State of the Processes Depending Against Mr. John Simson, ed. by John Dundas, (Edinburgh: James Davidson and Robert Fleming, 1728), p. 2. Hereinafter cited State of The Process.

3. Libel and Answers, pp. 2ff.



That Simson was a man of no mean ability must be very evident. No one seems to have denied that. Said John M'Claren, "I freely own, that the professor is a man of learning and parts . . . as also that he seems to be of an agreeable conversation."<sup>1</sup> What the Evangelicals deplored was that "he should have employed his parts, to teach and defend such dangerous errors, as tend to worm out the vitals of our received doctrine, and as it were to bring in another Gospel."<sup>2</sup> The handling of the case was not made any easier, indeed it was complicated considerably, by the fact that Simson claimed to be completely orthodox. Thus, he laid down before his Presbytery as the basis for all his teaching the following foundations:

[I] have, in the first Place, taken for my Rule, the Holy Scriptures, which are the Perfect Rule of faith and manners. I do, in the second place, for a help to follow this Rule aright, set before me that excellent sum of the doctrine of the Gospel, which is contained in our Confession of Faith and Catechisms. . . .<sup>3</sup>

Simson freely admitted that he made use of some propositions which were purely speculative, or only probable, which had no connection with one's faith or practice, and no place in the pulpit.<sup>4</sup>

No doubt one of the most offensive—and at the same time most alluring—things about Simson was his antipathy towards the traditional theology. He had something of an iconoclastic

---

1. John M'Claren, The New Scheme of Doctrine, (Edinburgh: John Reid, 1717), Preface.

2. Loc. cit.

3. Libel and Answers, p. 60. Cf. Letters to Rowen pp. 3, 7, 19, et passim.

4. Ibid., p. 61.

spirit about him. He was also gifted as a teacher, feeling as he did that truth did not necessarily depend upon the old defenses, which were (according to his view) often open to objections, and that the doctrines could be proved and defended and heresies refuted in other ways. He left it up to his students to choose the approach which they found most convincing.<sup>1</sup> He undoubtedly endeared himself to many students of the new spirit when he declared that it was not unreasonable to suppose that some new and useful things might be found out and proposed by any professor, minister, or Christian, who realized that the Westminster Assembly had not designed "to restrain peoples growth in grace and in the knowledge of God, and of the truths of the Gospel: And this will still be allowed by these, who are persuaded that our Knowledge in divinity is not yet arrived at perfection, and that the Spirit is not restrained now more than formerly. . . ."<sup>2</sup>

Such was the man with whom the Assembly had to deal: Obviously it was going to demand no little time, energy, skill, and theological acumen to bring the case to a just conclusion.

The Assembly decided to commit the matter to a committee of thirty ministers and six elders, and instructed them to make an extract from the libel of whatever should be found erroneous, or charged as error by Webster, laying the same down in propositions. Then they were to class the propositions as follows; First, those contrary to Scripture, the Confession of Faith, and Catechisms; second, those controverted among orthodox divines and not

---

1. Ibid., p. 62.

2. Ibid., p. 63.

determined by the Confession and Catechisms; and, third, those not clearly contained either in Scripture or the writings of orthodox divines. Simson was to indicate those which he professed, and those he denied or qualified.<sup>1</sup>

Wodrow writes of the lengthy sessions and the heated opinions expressed on both sides, mentioning specifically that Simson accused Allan Logan of Culross of preaching against him from the pulpit.<sup>2</sup> When the 1716 Assembly met, the Committee had not been able to complete its labors, having been deterred in its work by the Rebellion. But the two antagonists had not been torpid. The priggish Simson published<sup>3</sup> and sold Webster's Libels against him, together with his Answers and an address he made to the Presbytery of Glasgow before giving in the Answers. The persevering Webster, not to be outdone, retaliated by publishing, early in 1716, the letters Simson had written to Robert Rowen, deceased minister at Penningham, in 1711-12, in which Simson had made several unorthodox statements. He also published at, or about, the same time, a short abstract of Simson's printed account of the process. To each of these documents Webster added, at the end as a kind of postscript, a few choice remarks of his own—remarks which were too near the truth not to arouse the ire of Simson and his friends. The last-mentioned of these papers Webster distributed to the members of the General

---

1. Acts of Assembly, 1715. VIII. CF. Wodrow, Correspondence, II. 38 f. and State of the Process, pp. 3-7.

2. Wodrow, Correspondence, II. 31, 34.

3. Vide Wodrow, Correspondence, III. 408.

Assembly of 1716. He found fault with Simson for counteracting "the appointment of the last Assembly, by Selling his Book in publick Shops both at Glasgow and Edinburgh; a Book full of many gross Errors. . . ." <sup>1</sup> The seriousness of the matter was pointed up by the following revelation:

Upon a view of the whole, It's manifest to every Impartial Person, that Mr. Simson hath drunk in many pernicious and dangerous Errors, and is Zealous to teach his Disciples the same; For they not only have his Printed Book in their Hands, but he owned to some Members of the Committee, that even during the Process; and since the last Assembly, he has Taught these Propositions, for he thinks they are Truths, whereof we have given the Abstract: And we are informed, that his Schollars Defend them with a great deal of Warmth.<sup>2</sup>

Webster, alluding to the reputation of the Church for purity of doctrine since the Reformation, wondered whether it would not be wise for the peace and unity of the Church, to "render <sup>3</sup> Mr. Simson incapable to poyson the Candidates for the Ministry" Perhaps carried away by his zeal, Webster made an interesting offer: "I do offer to the very Reverend General Assembly, if they will allow this Affair of Mr. Simsons but one hour of their time, to make evident that he is guilty of Arminianism, Jesuitism, and Socinianism: and that not by any strain'd Consequences, but in plain <sup>4</sup> Categorick Expressions under his own Hand."

---

1. Letters to Rowen p. 37.

2. James Webster, A Short Abstract Taken From Mr. John Simson's Printed Account of the Process Carried on Against Him by Mr. James Webster (Edinburgh: John Moncur, 1716), p. 13.

3. Loc. cit.; Simson, Letters to Rowen, p. 37.

4. Simson, Letters to Rowen, p. 37; cf. State of the Process, pp. 9-10.

When the Assembly met, Simson insisted that Webster prove the charge he had intimated in his print and some four or five sessions of the Assembly were taken up, "very uselessly", wrote Wodrow, in hearing Simson's answers to the eight propositions Webster offered to the judicatory. In the end, the Assembly referred the chore back to the same special committee, meanwhile forbidding the accused professor to teach any of the things charged against him until the committee should complete their work. At the announcement of this decision Simson became very angry and expressed himself in imprudent and defiant language before the Assembly, which both shocked and displeased that venerable body. A cry went up that he be instantaneously suspended. The result was that the Committee was empowered to suspend him if he <sup>1</sup> contravened the instructions.

The Committee got down to serious business in August and September, 1716, but the case began to take a different tack about this time, and Colonel Erskine wrote to Wodrow, "Simson is like to be cleared by the Committee and the libel not found proven."<sup>2</sup> The reason for the changed circumstances was that the Committee had resolved that the witnesses should be limited to the ipsissima verba used by Simson, without any variation, even the least. Allan Logan, Andrew Cameron, and Thomas Lining, members of the Committee,<sup>3</sup> disapproved and gave in reasons of dissent.

---

1. Wodrow, Correspondence, II. 203; State of the Process, p. 11; Acts of Assembly 1716, (Edinburgh: Andrew Anderson, 1716), Unprinted Act.

2. Wodrow, Correspondence, II. 256, Footnote 1.

3. Ibid., II. 256-7, footnotes; M'Claren, op. cit., p. 321.

Final action was taken by the 1717 Assembly, but not before Simson had led the supreme judicatory through his labyrinthine theological paths. He appealed to Scripture, to The Confession and Catechisms, to reason, and even to the Synod of Dort. Wodrow reflected almost pathetically that Simson "explained the covenant, I cannot well tell how. . . . In short, his sense of covenant I did neither ever hear ~~nor~~ understand."<sup>1</sup> The Assembly found him suspect on some points, yet since he disowned all that the Confession made erroneous and professed the opposite truths, it was in a quandary what action to take. At length the pronouncement was made that despite Simson's professions of orthodoxy he had, in his Answers to the Libel, his letters to Robert Rowen, and a letter to the committee,

vented some opinions not necessary to be taught in divinity, and that have given more occasion to strife than to the promoting of edification; that he hath used some expressions that bear and are used by adversaries in a bad and unsound sense, though he doth disown that unsound sense; and for answering more satisfyingly (as he supposeth) the cavils and objections of adversaries, he hath adopted some hypotheses different from what are commonly used among orthodox divines, that are not evidently founded on Scripture, and tend to attribute too much to natural reason and the power of corrupt nature,—which undue advancement of reason and nature, is always to the disparagement of revelation and efficacious free grace.<sup>2</sup>

Simson was prohibited from teaching, or in other ways venting, his propositions and hypotheses.<sup>3</sup> While the vote was unanimous for

---

1. Ibid., II. 261.

2. Acts of Assembly, 1717. IX.

3. Loc. cit.

this action, there were many on both sides who for various reasons were not very well pleased about it.<sup>1</sup>

Since Webster and Hog were close friends and leaders in the strictly Evangelical party, it was to be expected that Hog should have declared himself openly on the side of Webster. His first print in opposition to Simson, an Essay on Natural Enmity, led to a correspondence between the two. In this print Hog had obviously added a section as an "afterthought", as he told Simson,<sup>2</sup> in which he dealt with Simson's views about sinning in Hell. Wodrow wrote Hog in January, 1715,

In harvest, when your Essay came out, he [Simson] expressed himself to me displeas'd with it, and said he would print an answer to it. I advis'd him first, according to his own rules, which he complains Mr. Webster has not kept, first to write to you upon the head, and I doubted not but you would give him all satisfaction, that you design'd not to insinuate he was an athiest, and the like, as he has been told. I am glad he has writt to you, and you to him, upon that head.<sup>3</sup>

In his first letter to Hog, Simson expressed his disappointment that Hog should have attacked him in print and with astute subtlety questioned Hog's learning and motives. Hog replied by posing numerous queries to Simson about his position and Simson rebutted by asking Hog to give him more scripture for his (Hog's) teachings on sinning in Hell. In a fuller reply to both of Simson's letters Hog bade Simson to answer his queries or "I will not Engage to take

---

1. Wodrow, Correspondence, II. 267-69.

2. Wodrow Manuscript Letters, XXXIX. 32.

3. Wodrow, Correspondence, II. 3.

ye least notice of what ye write. I have some what else to do  
wt my precious time yn to answer Shifting Epistles."<sup>1</sup>

Furthermore, said Hog,

I attacqued no person, but did only refute ane opinion,  
I thought erroneous. For as much as you apply the  
assault to yourself, know yt my conscience chargeth  
me not wt rancour and Enmity agt you: I seek yor  
weelfare for time and Eternity, and do pray for it as  
my own, and in this matter I do act through Grace from  
sincere Love.

.....

As to matter of Reputation whither yours or mine, I  
think yt business not worthy the notice, when truth  
and error come in competition. If I have wronged  
the truth, I ought to acknowledge the wrong, both  
before God and man, and if you on the other hand have  
taught error, the practice challengeth a suitable  
resentment.<sup>2</sup>

During the Assembly of 1716 Hog and Hadow were appointed to  
"discourse" Webster on the charge he had made in print about  
Simson's being guilty of Arminianism, Jesuitism, and Socinianism.  
If the design was to bring a retraction or an apology from Webster,  
it failed signally, for Webster replied, "I have found my charge  
against Mr. Simson and givn in my proof of the charge: Let the  
V. R. Assembly judge whither I have provn the charge. . . ."<sup>3</sup>

However, it should not be thought that Hog had done an about-  
face. During the debate on the case in the 1717 Assembly, it was  
found that the Committee had been unable to overtake all the materials  
in hand. It was suggested that another committee (selected from

---

1. Wodrow Manuscript Letters, XXXIX. 32.

2. Wodrow Manuscript Letters XXXIX. 32.

3. Manuscript Papers of the Commission on Simson's Case,  
1715-1717, in the Register House, Edinburgh.



members of the special Committee) be appointed to go through them and report. There were those, however, who insisted that others might be named, whereupon it was moved that "all upon one side who had appeared most against Mr. Simson should be named. Accordingly, to my surprise, this was gone into, and Mr. Allan Logan, Mr. Cameron, Mr. Hog, Mr. Black of Perth, Mr. John Logan of Alloa, Mr. Brough, and two others were named."<sup>1</sup> Then, when the Assembly came to pass the act which finally disposed of the affair, Wodrow relates that "Mr. Hog, Mr. Allan Logan, and some others, were heard in pressing a particular enumeration of the positions to be condemned; but there was no time to do that. . . ." Judging<sup>2</sup> from these two incidents it is quite clear that to the very end James Hog was exerting every effort to have "the gangrene", as he called Simson's scheme of doctrine, completely extirpated, and that he was generally considered to be amongst Simson's most energetic antagonists.

It ought to be emphasized, however, that while Hog threw himself into the process with real verve, there is absolutely no evidence that he was animated by reasons of a personal nature, or personal animosity toward Simson. Even before the process had developed to the heated stage, Hog sought to make clear in print his personal attitude in the controversy:

---

1. Wodrow, Correspondence, II. 260.

2. Ibid., II. 268.

I can solemnly declare, That I write not from any Shadow of Pick, or Prejudice, nor have I met with any Thing disoblising from one or other who are said to be any ways concerned in the Affair; but have, upon the contrary, been treated by them with undeserved Respect, and Discretion, as Opportunities offered.<sup>1</sup>

As a matter of fact, Hog never went as far as his friend James Webster in accusing Simson of Arminianism. Concluding one of the pamphlets he had written with very deep feeling, Hog expressed himself quite candidly:

I have essayed to shew that the Articles I have Animadverted upon, are not Consonant to our Confession of Faith, but rather appear more agreeable to the Style of Arminian tenets: From which Sentiment or any Expressions in the foresaid Animadversions I would have none suspect that I either Think or Charge R. Professor to be Arminian; I am far from Judging so of him: However, as there should be an Abstaining from all Appearance of Evil in Practicals, so there should be in Doctrinals. Further Sir, I hope you will not Construct of this Essay, as if it were the Effort of an Eristick Humour, so I heartily Wish, that, Rabies Theologorum, or the Phrenzie of Disputing about Religious Concerns, were quite Banished from the Church of God, as having been always Fatal to Her. . . .<sup>2</sup>

Hog's position was that Simson's propositions were "new forms of words, different from the form of sound words, and the analogie of Faith contained in the Westminster Confession."<sup>3</sup> He thought that so long as the Glasgow Professor kept them to himself

---

1. James Hog, Letter About Our Natural Enmity, (Edinburgh: 1714), p. 47. Hereinafter cited Natural Enmity.

2. James Hog, An Essay to Vindicate some Scripture Truths, (1716), p. 31. Hereinafter cited Essay to Vindicate Scripture Truths.

3. Ibid., p. 2.

there had not been so much ground of Offence; but his propegating them, by publick Teaching, is what the Judicatories of the Church should watchfully provide against, lest thereby a Door be opened to disseminate such dangerous Tenets, as may prove a Seed of New Errours, or tend to Revive Old ones, or cause Dissensions and Disturbances in the Church.<sup>1</sup>

There is another interesting point in this connection.

Hog made reference in one of his prints to the action of the National Synod of the Reformed Church of France in the case of Testard and Amyrald, where the Synod expressed its dissatisfaction with their novelties and forbad them to use "such Dangerous Distinctions and New Terms in Divinity, as might give Occasion of Stumbling. . . ." <sup>2</sup> He appears, therefore, to have been content with a simple prohibition against Simson's teaching of his tenets, without suspension or deposition which was certainly being demanded by some of his friends. And, interestingly enough, the Assembly ultimately did precisely what Hog here hinted at!.

The rather dark view Hog took of the state of affairs in the Church at this time is seen in the following appraisal, or review, given to an unnamed gentleman to whom Hog dedicated his missives against Deism. He alludes to their conversation which prompted him to write the missives, and recalls,

---

1. Ibid., pp. 2-3.

2. Ibid., p. 32.

It was mutually regretted by us, that many of all Ranks and Ages, and especially of the young Sort, have declined to a kind of fluctuating Scepticism, are unfixed in Principle, and ready to embrace (if they have not actually adopted) the most dangerous Notions, subversive even of the Foundations of Religion: And more especially when these applauded Detections are set off in such Dresses as are fit to recommend them to vain Minds. It is now become Modish, and is reputed a Gentlemanly part to call in question received Truths, and even such of them as are of the greatest Weight and Influence.<sup>1</sup>

It was in defense of these "received truths" and in opposition to the growth of scepticism and rationalism as<sup>5</sup> set forth in Simson's teaching that Hog wrote and published several of his best tractates. It was not for the theologians, however, that Hog sent these works to the press. Rather was it his design to enlighten those private Christians who were not equipped to plod through the wordy and more detailed theological treatises. For this reason Hog professed to avoid the more scholastic aspects of the debate in his writings against the new scheme of doctrine.<sup>2</sup> Hog further seems to have made it his practice not to tamper with what Simson had denied; but on the contrary it was his primary concern to attack the positions which Simson expressly owned and asserted in his printed Answers to the Libel.<sup>3</sup>

---

1. James Hog, Some Missives Detecting and Refuting the Deism or Atheism and Libertinism of our Time, (Edinburgh: 1718), pp. 1-2. Hereinafter cited Missives Refuting Deism.

2. James Hog, A Letter Detecting the Gangrene of Some Errors Vented at this Time, (Edinburgh: 1716), p. 50. Hereinafter cited The Gangrene. Hog, A Letter Concerning the Interest of Reason in Religion, (Edinburgh: 1716), p. 4. Hereinafter cited Reason in Religion.

3. Hog, Essay to Vindicate Scripture Truths, p. 2.

## SCRIPTURE AND REASON

For Hog the crucial point in the whole Simson case was the attitude of the professor toward the authority of the scriptures. In his letter to Robert Rowen, dated November 21, 1711, Simson had posed the question, "Upon what argument is theologie founded or proved to be true?", and his own reply was, "Verbum Dei non est solum principium Theolo: Ratio Humana est etiam Principium et Ultimum fundamentum ejus."<sup>1</sup> Simson said it is true that the scriptures are to be believed because they are the Word of God, but he added, significantly, "None can be obliged to believe them to be God's Word without Proof. . . . Now Reason in this sense [i.e., 'evident propositions naturally revealed'] being the proper and ultimate proof by which we know every Revelation of God to be his,<sup>2</sup> it is truly and properly said to be Principium ultimum Theolo." In his Answers, Simson made a distinction between reason as "intellectual faculty" and as "evident propositions naturally revealed," but he clearly states that "there is a twofold principle of theology, Scripture and Reason, taking principle for a rule."<sup>3</sup> Notwithstanding Simson's adroit explanations, even allowing that he was sincere in his use of the terms in his sense, putting the kindest interpretation upon his his terms, it must be admitted that there are overtones here of Toland and the Deists.<sup>4</sup>

---

1. Simson, Letters to Rowen, pp. 3-4.

2. Ibid., p. 4.

3. Libel and Answers, pp. 254-6.

4. Cf. Toland, op. cit., pp. 33 at passim.

On this basic point of the relation of scripture and reason, or the part of reason in religion, Hog and Simson were obviously poles apart. Not that Hog denied a legitimate place for reason in religion; he admitted that reason was useful in religion, as in erecting a system of Natural Theology, or arranging scripture truth into systems of theology, or refuting errors.<sup>1</sup> Religion was entirely rational and highly reasonable, he gladly yielded.<sup>2</sup> But he would <sup>not</sup> yield the position that religion is above reason,<sup>3</sup> or that the fundamental doctrines of religion all are mystery. His position was that while religion is "most suitable to Reason, pure, and untainted with sin; yet this sublime reasonableness is entirely above, yea and contrary unto corrupt reason, which can be no standard in these weighty and mysterious things."<sup>4</sup> In accord with his fellow-evangelicals Hog maintained that the scriptures are their own evidence,<sup>5</sup> that there is no necessity to "borrow weapons" from natural theology for use against unbelievers and skeptics, as though the scriptures themselves were insufficient. This, said Hog, was like using candlelight to discover the rays of the sun, for "That Light [of Scripture] needs no light for manifesting it. It carrieth its own Brightness of Evidence beyond what can be clothed with words, and setteth other things . . . in a true light."<sup>6</sup>

- 
1. Hog, Reason in Religion, pp. 10-13.
  2. Hog, Missives Refuting Deism, p. 99.
  3. Loc. cit., Reason in Religion, p. 5.
  4. Hog, Reason in Religion, pp. 8-9.
  5. Vide Walker, op. cit., pp. 67ff.
  6. Hog, Reason in Religion, p. 16.

Again, if reason be allowed the ultimate place in determining the authority of the Word of God, then it follows, said Hog, that religion must be resolved into reason as its first principle, and so reason ushers out faith, or faith is at best made to lie prostrate at the feet of corrupted reason which is given the grand and deciding stroke.<sup>1</sup> Summarizing his own views very forcefully and clearly, Hog insisted that

divine Faith is not a conclusion from principles or premises of Reason, (how clear soever) but an assent unto the testimony of the God of Truth, as his testimony. . . . His testimony wants not a full and conquering evidence in its own nature, and needs not its credentials from Reason at its best, and far less from it in its corrupt state.<sup>2</sup>

So long as reason remained in its corrupt state it is an "arch-enemy" in all the concerns of religion, but "when subdued to the obedience of Faith, it proves a choice friend."<sup>3</sup>

Hog put his finger on what he deemed the worst danger in the propositions of Simson when he delivered the following judgment:

Howsoever plausible the Glosses be that are put upon the strange positions in favours of reason, which are advanced in these last and perilous days, wherein it is set up as a 'Principle' and 'Foundation' of Theology; and though with much pains, and straining expressions, which point, the Socinian way, should be garried into an orthodox meaning, yet the poison will be found stronger than the antidote. The sound glosses are very unsuitable to the dangerous positions,

---

1. Ibid., pp. 16-17.

2. Ibid., p. 18.

3. Ibid. p, 19.

and are brought in upon them after that they come to be challenged, and not without uneasiness and violence. In the meanwhile the dangerous expressions remain, and in their plain and obvious meaning look towards the camp of the adversaries of reformed Truth.<sup>1</sup>

#### MAN'S DEPRAVED CONDITION

Hog and Simson also took up different positions on the condition of man in his natural state, and this inescapably colored their approach to all the theological loci. Hog's writings had stressed, all along, man as utterly corrupted in the Fall. This was one of his "uncontroverted" axioms. Thus, in his Otia Christiana he submitted that fallen man is entirely destitute of light, under the power of darkness, devoid of faith, absolutely dead in trespasses and sins. This Reformed doctrine was not to be "diminished" or "enervated" in any way. Just as one who has never been to a country cannot have an accurate conception of it by mere report; or as those born slaves, or blind, cannot have true notions of liberty and light—so man in his fallen state cannot have any real, accurate, or authentic knowledge of revealed truth.<sup>2</sup> He had concluded this section of his book with a final blast at the "great Dagon of Pelagianism" which exalts corrupt man who is only "an empty loathsom Nothing."<sup>3</sup>

---

1. Ibid., p. 18.

2. Hog, Otia Christiana, pp. 127-28.

3. Ibid., p. 161.



There is scarcely a single book, pamphlet, or missive in which Hog fails to delineate the terrible depravity of man. It was the unorthodoxy of Simson on this doctrine which apparently determined Hog to enter the arena of debate against his principles. He devotes a large portion of his Natural Enmity to a discussion of the rise, revelation, recognition, results, and removal of man's natural enmity. He appears to have bordered on a hyper-Calvinism here (if that were possible), for he states that at the Fall man "greedily received that infernal poison which quite extinguished the life of God in us, and rendered us like unto our execrable poisoners. . . . And instead of the Image of God, we had that of Satan deeply imprinted upon us."<sup>1</sup> This hostility towards God got possession of man at the Fall.

Thus, our eyes were entirely darkened, and we utterly lost that light, which was a special, and . . . the fundamental part of our original beauty, as with it, we deleted also whatsoever further belonged unto the Divine Image, and having thereby brought our selves into a State of Death, and under the righteous sentence of the same, all thoughts of a Deity became terrible to us. We fled from him, and plunged our selves into the abyss of enmity. . . .<sup>2</sup>

#### OF AN OBSCURE OBJECTIVE REVELATION TO THE HEATHEN

With such views of natural man Simson was not in harmony. He took a more optimistic view, asserting as one of his propositions, that "by the light of nature, and the works of creation, and

---

1. Hog, Natural Enmity, p. 4.

2. Ibid., p. 31.

providence, including tradition, God has given an obscure objective revelation unto all men, of his being reconcilable to sinners; which the heathen may come to the knowledge of, if they observe and consider it.<sup>1</sup> Simson further stated that "if the heathen would in sincerity and truth, and in the diligent use of the means that Providence lays to their hands, seek from God the knowledge of the way of reconciliation necessary for their acceptable serving of him,<sup>2</sup> and being saved by him, he would discover it to them."

Hog replied to these propositions in six animadversions, as follows: His first observation was that such positions attribute too much to the light of nature and extend the power of depraved man beyond what scripture allows. While acknowledging that heathen, by nature's light, might have "some dark notices" of the existence of a God, they had no knowledge of the true God, far less of the "Trinity of Persons in the unity of essence", and therefore they were ignorant of the only "method and mystery of redemption."<sup>3</sup> Second, in reply to the theory (suggested by Simson's supporters) that pagan polytheism shows that pagans think their gods are reconcilable, and that this is evidence that they know in general that God is reconcilable; Hog agreed that this was a general idea of His being merciful, but that flowing as it did from "the reliques of natural light", it came short of discovering the

---

1. Libel and Answers, pp. 77-8; Hog, Essay to Vindicate Scripture Truths, pp. 3-4.

2. Ibid., p. 80; Hog, Essay to Vindicate Scripture Truths, p.4. Vide Simson, Letters to Rowen, p.20.

3. Hog, Essay to Vindicate Scripture Truths, p.4.

only way this mercifulness was to be attained and applied for their reconciliation in Christ, "which Mysterious Method of Redemption is not knowable but by the Light of Revelation, that specifically differs from the Light of Nature. . . being Supernatural. . . ." <sup>1</sup> Third, these propositions were not agreeable to scripture, which discloses that profound darkness of man's mind which makes it impossible for him to "pierce into the mystery of reconciliation with God . . . [by] . . . the meer assistance of natural Light"; as also that his will is "chained under a servile perpetual propension to what is morally evil, until the saving grace of God create a change on the heart. . . ." <sup>2</sup> Again, Simson's position was averse to the teaching of the Confession and Catechisms both in "sense and style". Hog appealed to several passages in the Confession and Catechisms which state that man is opposite to all good and wholly inclined to all evil. <sup>3</sup> Furthermore, Simson's teaching on this point, contended Hog, was not in accord with the doctrine of other Confessions, such as the Thirty-nine Articles, the New English Confession, and the Synod of Dort; <sup>4</sup> while it "harmonizeth too much with the opinions of Pelagianizing Arminians." <sup>5</sup> Backing up this charge, Hog cited the Arminians themselves and then

---

1. Ibid., p. 6.

2. Ibid., p. 8.

3. Ibid., pp. 8-9; Cf. Confession of Faith, chapters VI and XVI.

4. Ibid., p. 9.

5. Ibid., p. 10.

called to witness against Simson the action of the Synod of Dort rejecting the teaching that natural man is able to use aright common grace so that he may attain evangelical grace, and at length, by degrees, salvation itself.<sup>1</sup>

What use is this doctrine, inquires Hog, except that it can be utilized as a

subservient Hypothesis to pave the way for further erroneous tenets, such as the power of man's will, and natural reason, with respect to spirituals; that men of whatever religion, though of the paganish, may be saved, if they walk conform to the natural light they have; universal grace, universal redemption, etc. As also that it is just and congruous in God, to bestow supernatural light, and special grace upon such as sincerely and diligently improve their natural light and reason. . . .<sup>2</sup>

Simson's tenets require the heathen to do that which they cannot do, indeed, observed Hog, that which few professing Christians really do, i.e., to seek God diligently, in sincerity and truth.<sup>3</sup>

#### THE MORALLY SERIOUS USE OF MEANS

Simson's teaching on the morally serious use of means and the attainment of saving grace may be paraphrased as follows: All are commanded to believe, and all who are commanded to believe are commanded to seek of God grace to believe. All who seek this grace seriously and sincerely shall receive it, according to Matthew 7: 6-7. God has appointed means for obtaining this grace the use of which

---

1. Ibid., pp. 10-11.

2. Ibid., p. 7.

3. Ibid., pp. 8-9.

means is not above the "Reach of Our Natural Ability and Powers". All the means and whatever else is needed God will certainly apply to all who in their natural estate apply themselves seriously. Only the elect apply their natural powers in the right use of the means.<sup>1</sup> In defending himself against charges of Arminianism and Pelagianism on this head of doctrine, Simson called forth all his metaphysical ability,<sup>2</sup> leaving the Assembly in a sort of schizophrenic bewilderment.

To this tenor of instruction, Hog reminded the Church that there were some safeguards which needed to be heeded. Agreeing that there is a connection between the use of means and the attaining of saving grace, he denied that this connection is founded on the morally serious use of the means, so as to support the position that "whosoever seriously useth the means, shall attain saving grace."<sup>3</sup> God has set some apart to everlasting life, decreeing not only the end of this electing love but also the means in the use of which the elect will be saved. The attaining of saving grace must be "resolved intirely into the eternal Decree, and counsel of peace about the salvation of a definite number of sinners, and into the purchase of that salvation made by the Lord Jesus for them, together with the effectual application of the purchased salvation. . . ."<sup>4</sup>

---

1. Libel and Answers, pp. 211-224, cf. M'Claren, op. cit., pp. 251 ff.

2. Vide Wodrow, Correspondence, II. 263-65.

3. Hog, The Gangrene p. 32.

4. Loc. cit.

On the other hand, Hog emphasized that no person has any reason to except against the decree and providence of God inasmuch as "all due Incouragement for using these means is liberally afforded us by a preached Gospel." Man does know the decree either as to his work in time or his eternal estate, so the decree can be no part of man's "Rule", nor is he to take his "measures" by it. Nor does man know whom the Lord Jesus represented in the "Council of Peace" or in his atoning work; these are hidden from man's view.<sup>1</sup>

Acknowledging the difficulties—"the well is deep", he said, —Hog suggested safeguards, the first of which was that all men, elect and reprobate alike, are on the same level in the use of means: "They to whom the Gospel is preached, have the same Adventure in the great Business of Salvation. . . ." The second rule of thumb was that there is an indissoluble connection between faith and salvation.<sup>2</sup>

It is an eternal truth, viz. He that believeth, and is baptized, shall be saved. This we ought to believe firmly, and no person to whom the Gospel is preached, hath any shadow of ground to entertain the least hesitation about it; and it carrieth desirable encouragement to all.<sup>3</sup>

This led Hog to offer some comments concerning the warrant of all to receive the Gospel. He affirmed,

---

1. Loc. cit.

2. Ibid., p. 33.

3. Ibid., p. 34.

Every one to whom this glorious Gospel is preached, is commanded, invited, and fully warranted to receive the offered Salvation. The Lord Jesus 'stretcheth out his hands all day to a disobedient and gainsaying people'; and as Cyrus of old, proclaimed free and full liberty unto all the captive Jews to go out of Babel; so the glad tidings of a salvation bear, That we may, and ought to abandon all our other Lords and Lovers, and freely accept the Lord Jesus, as 'made of God unto us Wisdom, Righteousness, Sanctification, and complete Redemption.'<sup>1</sup>

Though it must be acknowledged, averred Hog, that the sovereign power of God alone determines a sinner to flee to the only Redeemer, and while faith is only the result of irresistible grace; since equal access is given to all in the Gospel dispensation, no one has a right to complain, for "If bank-notes were scattered amongst poor and naked persons, who yet would not so much as take them up, who would not blame themselves for their continued poverty, seeing a taking up the notes dispersed amongst them, would entitle them to the sums contained?"<sup>2</sup>

Hog suggested that Simson's teaching on this proposition was Pelagianism in a new dress, making the way of salvation the covenant of works according to the "Pelagian cant" that man should do his best and God would do the rest. It was contrary to the teaching of Scripture which showed that man is spiritually dead and incapable. Long before, Hog had taught that in the business of salvation "man can do nothing . . . acceptable to the Lord. . . ." <sup>3</sup>

---

1. Loc. cit.

2. Ibid., p. 35.

3. James Hog, The Covenants of Redemption and Grace Displayed (Edinburgh: John Moncur, 1707), p. 24. Hereinafter cited, Redemption and Grace.

Even earlier he had declared that man is as unfit for spiritual exercises as the dead are for the business of life.<sup>1</sup>

Hog went on to say that while the use of means was a commanded duty and all men were obliged to it; and while ministers should "enjoin and press" a vigorous use of means upon all since they did not know the elect from the reprobate;<sup>2</sup> moral seriousness itself is only a gift of God, unattainable by corrupt nature. More than this, many who are morally serious do not attain the state of grace. To Simson's use of Matthew 7:6-7 in support of his theory, Hog rebutted, that something of faith is wrought in the very asking, and marked that the asking in faith is quite different from moral seriousness. Depraved men could not ask in faith, but only in a natural and corrupt way,<sup>3</sup> which was not what God commanded.

Winding up his argument, Hog declared that those who seek to resolve the connection between the use of means and saving grace into the divine decree understood the decree in a Pelagian sense, which

placeth the Sinner in favourable Circumstances; and amidst a Train of Motives which he taketh by the right Handle and accordingly resolves upon such a Course of Seriousness as brings him over into a gracious Estate by a good Use of his natural Powers. Thus the wretched Sinner casts the Ballance, and makes himself to differ from others.<sup>4</sup>

- 
1. Hog, Remarks Concerning the Spirit's Operation, p. 121.
  2. Hog, Redemption and Grace, p. 24.
  3. Hog, The Gangrene, pp. 35-39.
  4. Ibid p. 39.



## THE COVENANT WITH ADAM

Indubitably, one of Simson's most offensive heterodoxies was that which denied that the covenant with Adam was "a Covenant Properly so taken, in the strict Sense of Lawyers."<sup>1</sup> His views on this subject appear to have caused the first questioning of his teaching.<sup>2</sup> He taught that though the old dispensation is called "a covenant of works" in the Confession, it is neither in the Confession nor Catechisms called a "covenant" in the strict and proper sense as distinct from and opposed to a Law.

What the Confession says agrees to a Law, and has the same sense, as if it were said, 'The first Covenant was a Law of Works'. . . . And so where ever this 'Covenant' is mentioned in our Confession or Catechisms, if you put the word 'Law' for it, with a suitable change of the Particles, the sense will be the same.<sup>3</sup>

He reminded his critics that many scriptural expressions were not used in the strict and proper sense and that on this same basis<sup>4</sup> scripture supported his interpretation of the covenant with Adam.

Here, once again, Simson was trampling on some precious truths of the orthodox Calvinists. If there was any position that could be termed the common denominator of all theologians of that era, it was the Federal theology. It was the rule and

---

1. Libel and Answers, p. 104.

2. Simson, Letters to Rowen, p. 6.

3. Loc. cit.

4. Ibid., p. 10.

there were few who would dare to risk the stigma which would most surely follow the sullyng of that beloved foundation of theology. There were differences among the orthodox concerning some of the details of the Covenant system, but Simson must have been the first Scottish divine publicly to adopt the "improper" conception of the covenant.

As would be expected, Hog was a thorough-going Federal theologian, having taken up his pen some ten years earlier to clear up some points regarding the covenants of redemption and grace and to show the evil of mixing the covenant of works and of grace.<sup>1</sup> In his reply to the Simson distinction, Hog gave a very excellent resume of the orthodox Federal position. It was manifest that the Westminster Confession asserted Adam's Federal headship, Hog claimed, for the Confession designed "that transaction" by the express name of a "Covenant", and the Catechisms state that the covenant was made with Adam, not only for himself, but for his posterity. With this other Reformed confessions<sup>2</sup> agreed, said Hog; but Simson would not allow that it was so. It was admitted that the Westminster divines understood such a covenant was could take place between God and man, and no real Christian would put that "high transaction upon the same level with covenants meerly humane"; nevertheless, "the Covenant ceaseth not, upon that Head, to be a Covenant in the true and proper sense of the word, but in a way suiting the divine glory,

---

1. Covenant of Redemption and Grace Displayed (1707) and Notes Detecting a Mixture of the Covenant of Works and Grace (1706).

2. Hog, The Gangrene, pp. 9-10. Cf. Simson, Letters to Rowen, p. 15.

and competent to a creature which hath its all from its Lord. . . ." <sup>1</sup>

In this Covenant there were contracting parties—God and our first parents, with their posterity; the Law of the Covenant; threatening; promises; and sacraments. <sup>2</sup> AS to the transaction not being called a "Covenant" in Scripture, even were it so (and Hog will not grant that it is), no reason for denying it can be founded on the omission, inasmuch as the words "Trinity", "Sacraments", "Hypostatical Union", and others, do not occur in the Bible; but this does not give grounds for denying the mysteries expressed in these terms, for they are taught in other words which convey the teaching. <sup>3</sup>

If it be denied that the transaction was properly a covenant, and is admitted to be only a Law, and if Adam's federal headship be denied, then the "gangrene" is revealed. What is the "gangrene" which Hog finds here? First, no ground is left for the imputation of Adam's sin to his posterity. Yet scripture says, "By one man's disobedience many were made sinners," (Romans 5: 19 cf. I Corinthians 15: 20-21). It must be explained that Simson did not deny the imputation of Adam's sin: it was his method of doing so that disturbed Hog. He derived imputation not from man's federal relation to Adam according to the orthodox way; rather, claiming the support of the Confession, he founded it upon the "Natural Relation and the Sanction of the Law or Covenant of Works." <sup>4</sup> Hog contended that a mere law, or the

---

1. Ibid., p. 10.

2. Loc. cit.

3. Ibid., p. 11.

4. Simson, Letters to Rowen, p. 10.

natural relation, did not suffice for upholding imputation.

Illustrating his point, Hog argued,

The posterity of a traitor, or other criminal, may indeed suffer by their parents transgressing the law. . . .

But in such events the sin of the criminal parent is not the sin of any of his posterity; it cannot be said they commit the treasonable crime in him, and as little can they be reputed to die in him. They suffer indeed, and cannot escape to be the worse of his treason, for that the enjoyments of which the parents treasons do justly deprive him, cannot descend to his posterity; nevertheless, the treason of the parents is not . . . properly imputed to the children.<sup>1</sup>

Adam did not sin as a private, but as a public person, a federal Head, and man's corruption proceeds from the **guilt of Adam's sin** imputed to him. The federal relation is implied in the very nature of the thing, Hog held.<sup>2</sup> If this was no proper covenant, then there was no federal headship, and if there was no federal headship, then imputation of sin to Adam's posterity was an impossibility. In the Covenant system, this meant the undermining of the whole scheme of redemption, for imputation of sin was founded on the federal relationship.<sup>3</sup>

Hog noted that the second "gangrene" resulting from Simson's teaching on the covenant was that his denial of the Federal theology destroyed the scriptural comparisons between the first and last Adam, given in Romans 5 and I Corinthians 15. The first Adam and the last Adam, said Hog, are both public persons, each representing those under them as their "Heads" and "Representatives".

---

1. Hog, The Gangrene, pp. 12-13.

2. Ibid., p. 12.

3. Ibid., pp. 15-16.

The first Adam stood or fell for his posterity; and the second Adam represented, stood for, and purchased the benefits of redemption for "each of these whom he represented, and for whom he undertook in the eternal Counsel of Peace."<sup>1</sup>

The first Adam forfeited the Whole for himself, and all his posterity. In him we all die according to the express sanction of the Covenant made with him, and us. And the last Adam, that mighty One, upon whom help is laid, according to the eternal counsel, the last Adam, I say, retrieveth these ruins, and doth as effectually and compleatly save his elect by price, and power, as the first Adam ruined all his posterity, or they destroyed themselves in him.<sup>2</sup>

The third "gangrene" Hog saw in Simson's position was an undermining influence upon the whole mystery of redemption. The accepted teaching had been that the Lord Jesus, as the Head of the elect, gave full satisfaction by obedience to the full demands of a broken covenant. But if there was no covenant to begin with, then Christ had not taken the place of elect sinners in obeying a covenant, but had only obeyed a violated law. This laid the Church under the necessity of contriving new and "perverse glosses for plain texts which hitherto spoke a quite other language in the ears of the whole body of sound divines, and the Lord's people. . . ." But Romans 5: 12-20 taught decisively a "Federal representation". It would follow, then, according to the new doctrine, that if Christ's obedience and death did not fulfill that righteousness demanded by the broken covenant of works, there

---

1. Ibid., pp. 13-14.

2. Ibid., p. 14.

3. Ibid., p. 15.

was no place left for the imputation of Christ's righteousness to those effectually called in justification. If Adam's sin could not be imputed, neither could Christ's righteousness be; if Adam was not a federal representative, neither could Christ be. If one cannot be, neither can the other. The natural—and to Hog most tragic—consequence of this teaching was stated in these words:

We are at a Non-entry as to any satisfying account of that great and fundamental article, namely the Justification of a sinner before God, which (as the Great Martin Luther observed) is the article of a standing or falling Church. And seeing the several lines of the Lord's gracious dispensations do here meet, as in a noble center, I am sorry that I have too good ground to lament, that these new schemes, or rather old errors revived, do not only sadly disturb and confound the known and received methods of Gospel grace, but also undermine them. . . .<sup>1</sup>

Finally, the denial of the federal relationship was directly contrary to the actual experience of the humbled sinner who "chargeth himself before God, as guilty of Adam's first sin, and moveth no doubt of his having broken covenant with God in him." At the same time the sinner's praises are "raised to the highest pitch, upon sweet displays of the last Adam, to whom, as a federal Head, they have their recourse by saving faith."<sup>2</sup> Here is revealed that for Hog the federal relationship was no mere theory, no metaphysical speculation, but a down-to-earth, practical, and absolutely essential doctrine of faith. Imputation for him is real, vital, and actual imputation, whether it be the imputation of Adam's

---

1. Ibid., p. 16.

2. Ibid., pp. 16-17.

sin or the righteousness of the Redeemer. Only by the Federal theology could Adam's sin be really the sin of his posterity, and only by the Federal theology could the righteousness of Christ be the elect believer's righteousness. To tamper with this marrow of theology was nothing less than to expose the doctrine and life of the Church to a self-destroying gangrene! Hog was in a noble line of theologians in his understanding of this vital point of theology.<sup>1</sup>

#### OF INFANT SALVATION AND THE NUMBER OF THE ELECT

It has already been noted that Simson took a decidedly optimistic view of man's natural estate. So it was not surprising that he laid more stress on the mercy of God than his justice. Thus, he was led to propose that more are elect and saved than are reprobate and damned, that no one is condemned except he be guilty of actual sin, that baptized infants are saved, and that it was more consistent with the Word of God and the nature of God to take an optimistic view of the chances of the salvation of the children of pagans and infidels dying in infancy.<sup>2</sup>

Simson taught that the way of salvation had been proclaimed to the world in the time of Adam and of Noah, and that it was only due to man's sin that this knowledge had been obscured. Hog had his doubts about some of Simson's deductions from Scripture on this point, but his chief objection was that while it was granted that the substance of the gospel was made known to Adam, it did not

---

1. Heinrich Heppe, Reformed Dogmatics, tr. by G.T. Thomson, (London: George Allen and Unwin Ltd., 1950), pp. 332-333.

2. Libel and Answers, pp. 104-20; cf. Hog, The Gangrene pp.17-19.

therefore follow that his posterity was brought into a covenant state. Adam did represent man in the covenant of works, but not in the covenant of grace, Christ being the only representative in that "bargain". He emphatically asserted that there was no universal covenant of grace, as had to be inferred from Simson's propositions.<sup>1</sup>

If all infants are born in the state of grace, so that they continue therein and shall be saved unless by actual sin they cast themselves out of that state, then the salvation of infants is not merely "probable", as Simson held, but "certain". Then it would follow that all infants should be baptized and receive the seal of the covenant where Christian education was undertaken. Even if there was no education undertaken, so long as they are said to be in the covenant, what reason could be advanced for refusing the seal? If this doctrine be held, it would be better for an infant to die in infancy than to live, for if it lived its future salvation would be in doubt, which it would not be if it died in infancy! The perseverance of the saints is undercut since all are born within the "Bond of the Covenant of Grace", or "in a state of Favour"—whichever term is used—yet some fall away and are totally and finally lost.

I can . . . positively assert, that this opinion rendereth all the privileges of infants born within the visible Church, utterly void. Here, they are all set upon the same level, whether they be born within, or without the Church, whether of godly, or ungodly parents, whether under the old, or new Testament dispensation of the Covenant of Grace, there is no difference, they are all descended of 'Adam' and 'Noah', and born within the Covenant, sure the Scriptures carry this otherwise.<sup>2</sup>

---

1. Hog, The Gangrene, pp. 19-20.

2. Ibid., pp. 22-23; Cf. Hog, Essay to Vindicate Scripture Truth, pp. 20-21.



Hog inquired what the sins were which cast men out of the "happy Estate" wherein "the Scheme" puts his birth, and suggested that if every actual sin cast man out of that estate, then it must be a state of the covenant of works rather than of grace. Moreover, since no one could be charged with the guilt of rejecting Christ until he knew that salvation had been offered, the heathen who die before they have rejected the Gospel must therefore be better off than Christians, for the sin of neglecting that great salvation is sooner committed, and punishment incurred, under "a bright sunshine of the glorious Gospel."<sup>1</sup>

On the affirmative side, Hog stated that scripture gave more ground to believe that God can save all infants, than that he will do it. The very fact that the Confession used the term "Elect infants" implied that not all infants were "Elect". Hog alluded to the visible Church, out of which, according to the Confession and Reformed teaching, there normally is no salvation, and which is said to consist of all those who believe, together with their children.<sup>2</sup> The plain truth, said Hog, is that "by the disobedience of one, many were made sinners" and that infants come into the world guilty in Adam. There is, therefore, no severity in whatever the Lord decreed concerning infants, since "it is only of free mercy, through Christ, that saving grace is given to one or other; and therefore there can be no severity in the withholding of it. . . ."<sup>3</sup> Hog alleged that "the scheme considereth

---

1. Hog, The Gangrene pp. 29-30.

2. Hog, Essay to Vindicate Scripture Truth, pp. 18-20.

3. Hog, The Gangrene, pp. 28-9.

not infants as sinners, and the truth is, it subverts the very foundations of the imputation of Adam's sin."<sup>1</sup>

Concluding his criticism of this position, Hog said that Simson's view extends the saving benefits of the covenant of grace to those who are outside its pale, and that it savored strongly of Arminian teaching.<sup>2</sup>

Concerning the number of the elect, Hog appealed to scripture<sup>3</sup> to support his view that more are reprobate than are saved. But his most convincing appeal was to the plain evidence and experience in day to day life. Salvation is a difficult matter, he declared; yet people generally avoid and shun whatever appears to be beset with difficulties. They much prefer worldly ease. Moreover, those who have no knowledge of the means of salvation—"which is the unhappy condition of the most part of the world"—cannot attain a state of salvation. To these there must be added the visible Church, which has so many "Antichristians" or "popish", the latter of whom live and die according to principles which prevent their salvation. All in all, lamented Hog, "they will be found very few in the world who are sincere and through practioners (sic)<sup>4</sup> of piety, without which, no man can see the face of God in mercy."

Since scripture states that every sin deserves God's wrath and that man is justly cast into hell, though out of sovereign and free love and mercy some are saved, Hog inquires, "Shall we not

---

1. Ibid., p. 29.

2. Hog, Essay to Vindicate Scripture Truth, p. 22.

3. Ibid., pp. 11-15, 16.

4. Ibid., pp. 14, 16-17.

take his own testimony upon it? and shall not this end the controversie? If puny novices be allowed to forge exceptions at random, and to coin articles of faith at their pleasure, what shall become of religion? and what security can we have for any one article thereof?"<sup>1</sup>

#### MAN'S CHIEF END

Professor Simson denied the article of the libel in which Webster accused him of saying that the desire of reward and fear of punishment should be the chief motive in worshipping God, claiming that this was not a "distinct and true account" of his opinion.<sup>2</sup> Nevertheless, as John M'Claren saw it, Simson "unnecessarily separates God's end, and man's ultimate end, as if they were not the same: for he makes God's end the glorifying his attributes; and man's ultimate end, his own happiness in the full enjoying of God; whereas man's last end, and aim should coincide with God's end, viz. the glorifying of God."<sup>3</sup> Simson certainly does not sound very convincing in his defense as when he states,

No rational creature can love any person or thing but under the notion of real or apparent good, or what is pleasing to it self; nor can it hate or shun any thing, but under the notion of real or apparent evil or uneasiness to it self. Good real or apparent with respect to it self, being the adequat object of love in a rational being; and real or apparent evil relative to it self, being the adequat object of the rational creatures hatred or aversion.<sup>4</sup>

- 
1. Hog, The Gangrene, p. 25.
  2. Libel and Answers, p. 135 ff.
  3. M'Claren, op. cit., p. 141.
  4. Libel and Answers, pp. 135-6.

Hog rejected Simson's charge that many ministers taught this head of theology as "a necessary branch of self denial, that we be denied to our own salvation".<sup>1</sup> He resolved the question into this clear point, "Which of the two as to matter of duty should be chiefly eyed as the principle motive"?<sup>2</sup> It was the experience of those "exercised to Godliness", said Hog,

that in sundry periods of a Christian life the honour of God is so much indereared to the believing soul, that, for some time all considerations of his own happiness are out of view, and a tender regard to the glory of God even filleth the soul. Thus it was with Moses and Paul, in their high and heroical wishes or prayers. . . .<sup>3</sup>

Hog said that Simson taught "subtilized self" and that this was "selfish divinity". It undermined the believer's sanctification, seeing it made him self-centered rather than God-centered. It also subverted the comfort of the believer amidst his adversities, for it is always difficult, Hog suggested, for the believer to see the hand of God working out his good in the thick clouds of his battles and distresses. The thread that has carried many a weak soul through the labyrinths is the confidence that God will "raise a revenue of glory to his name out of all these troubles." This source of consolation was devitalized by the Simsonian poison which directed men to self for strength and grace and comfort.<sup>4</sup>

---

1. Ibid., p. 155; cf. Hog, The Gangrene, p. 40. Vide also M'Claren, op. cit., p. 139.

2. Hog, The Gangrene, p. 43. Vide also Wodrow Manuscript Letters, XXXIX. 32.

3. Ibid., p. 41.

4. Ibid., pp.43-4.

## SINNING IN HELL

Simson's somewhat novel notion that "there will be no sinning in Hell, after the last Judgement"<sup>1</sup> evoked a considerable amount of antipathy on the part of James Hog, who refuted the theory in at least three of his prints, i.e., Natural Enmity, The Gangrene, and Essay to Vindicate Scripture Truth,<sup>2</sup> as well as in his correspondence with Simson. Hog protested that Simson's assertion tends to "extinguish the fear of hell"; that this teaching if true would mean "a wonderful metamorphosis", since in this scheme men of corrupt nature in Hell do not sin, and this being true, the devil and the damned are made eminent saints. Hell becomes a holy place. This doctrine is utterly irrational, for it would mean that the inhabitants of Hell are in a state of utter darkness, yet of freedom from actual sin.<sup>3</sup> Hell would not be Hell to a humbled mind, chided Hog, while referring Simson to the opinions of orthodox divines.<sup>4</sup> The real reason Hog felt such an abhorrence of this proposition was because it seemed to him to bring Heaven and Hell near to one another; whereas, they were, to him, diametrically opposed the one to the other. He made his feelings unmistakably clear when he wrote,

---

1. Libel and Answers, p. 233.

2. Supra, pp. 193-94.

3. Hog, Natural Enmity, pp. 37 ff.; The Gangrene, pp. 45 ff.; Wodrow Manuscript Letters, XXXIX. 32.

4. Ibid., p. 41.

Whatever be the R. Professor's speculation about this matter; for my own part I ever thought, that Heaven and Hell were just Antipodes to one another, and that the infernal inhabitants are distant toto coelo, from these who dwell above, not only as to local residence, but chiefly as to their spiritual state. . . . That one kind is perfectly holy, the other irreparably unsanctified; the one lives a spiritual life, the other lies under spiritual death in sin: the one is like the Holy Angels in Glory, the other like their Father the Devil in the Pit, who having sinned from the beginning, will never cease to do so: and the one is perpetually praising God, the other quite out of tune for this joyous exercise. . . .<sup>1</sup>

It might be thought from some of Hog's arguments in the Simson case that he was a cold-hearted hyper-Calvinist. Actually, the Marrow controversy showed him in a very different light, as will be seen in the next chapter. Nevertheless, there is a statement of James Walker which is worthy of note just at this place. He observes,

These men were not cold and heartless speculators. They were teeming, many of them, with Christian sympathies and kindnesses. But they had learned to lose themselves so utterly before the glorious majesty of the Eternal, that they shrank from everything that had even the appearance of a right or a claim upon Him from the creature as destructive of His absolute independence—in fact, taking away His crown. You have, besides, in this extreme phase of our theology, a protest against Arminianism, which—I do not say in respect of individuals, but as a system—does tend to bring down the Almighty from His throne of sovereignty, and make Him simply the best and most excellent of beings.<sup>2</sup>

The prohibition of the Assembly seemed to have little effect on Simson. Just two weeks after the Assembly rose, Wodrow wrote to David Erskine, "People say the act of Assembly charges him with

---

1. Hog, Essay to vindicate Scripture Truth, pp. 29-30.

2. Walker, op. cit., p.78.

teaching 'unnecessary things tending to strife and debate', and that the first time he preached after it . . . he made good the charge.<sup>1</sup>

An anonymous writer, in a letter to the Commission of the 1722 Assembly, referring to the Simson and Marrow cases, relates how Simson still recommended his "Apologiam", as expressing and clearing his sentiments, and also that he had added to his own apology the works of Socinus for his students to read.<sup>2</sup> Clearly this was common knowledge, judging from Wodrow's remarks on the subject.<sup>3</sup>

Simson was beyond any doubt a master at "the art of teaching heresy orthodoxly", as Lord Grange so aptly put it.<sup>4</sup> Furthermore, he was<sup>SO</sup> brazenly confident in his naked practice of the art that he practically forced an unwilling Church to suspend him from teaching.<sup>5</sup> It is a complete justification of the contention of Hog and Logan<sup>6</sup> that Simson's errors should have been specified in the 1717 act when it is known that in his second trial the professor claimed that he had not been found guilty of error!. He complained against those who said he had been condemned for Arminianism and rebuked for it in 1717, asserting that this was false!<sup>7</sup>

---

1. Wodrow, Correspondence, II. 272.

2. Videte Apologiam Nostram Contra Webster, (1722), p. 16.

3. Wodrow, Correspondence, III. 408-9.

4. Ibid., II. 261.

5. Vide Acts of Assembly, 1729. VI.

6. Supra, p. 195.

7. Wodrow, Correspondence, III. 303, 389.

When the second Simson trial came off Hog was a much older man and he was overshadowed by the younger generation of ministers. Even so he was a member of the 1727 and 1728 Assemblies which had the case before them, sent by his presbytery no doubt because they wanted their redoubtable debater present at such a crucial juncture. When the 1727 Assembly was unable to complete the case and suspended Simson, while continuing the matter, Hog was among those who moved that the Assembly should add a clause to its act which made it clear that it did not reckon suspension an adequate censure for what had already been proven. Once again there was not enough time to consider the motion and once again, for the sake of peace, Hog did not press his motion. But he made it clear that he was for deposition.<sup>1</sup> When the final suspension was ordered in 1729 Hog was again on the scene<sup>2</sup> to plead for the highest censure against the heretical professor. Once again he was fighting in a losing cause.

Up until the conclusion of the first Simson case, Hog and other Evangelical leaders, had been waging an offensive war against the new scheme of doctrine; but almost immediately upon the conclusion of the case, Hog's party found itself faced with the necessity of yet another struggle for the truths which they loved. This was the controversy over the book, The Marrow of Modern Divinity, in connection with which Hog's name has been remembered in the nearly two and a half centuries since the debates exploding about that book were ignited.

---

1. Ibid., II. 318.

2. Ibid., III.444.



**CHAPTER VI**

**JAMES HOG AND THE CONTROVERSY**

**CONCERNING "THE MARROW OF MODERN DIVINITY"**

No sooner had the Assembly closed—for a time—one case than it took an action which set another violent debate in motion. The very same day in which Simson's case was disposed of it condemned the then much-discussed, and now famous, "Auchterarder Proposition". This proposition was one of several articles set down in the form of a creed by the Auchterarder Presbytery and proposed to one of their candidates, William Craig, as a test of his orthodoxy. The condemned article stated, "I believe that it is not sound and orthodox to teach that we must forsake sin in order to our coming to Christ, and instating us in Covenant with God."<sup>1</sup> Since this statement, to be appreciated, must be seen in the context of the situation then prevailing in Scotland, and also since its condemnation led to the publication of The Marrow of Modern Divinity—and the Marrow controversy—it will be necessary to discover the design of the Auchterarder Presbytery in their proposition and also to show the reasons for the Assembly's strong disapproval of that proposition. In order to accomplish this and to set the stage for the full-blown debate which ensued, one must pose and answer the question, "What caused the Marrow Controversy?"

In answer to this query various solutions have been offered as connected in a larger or smaller degree with the rise of the Marrow Controversy. Some, like W.M. Hetherington, indicate it was the diffusion of Arminian tenets by the Episcopalians before, and the indulged ministers following, the Revolution which laid the foundation for the dispute.<sup>2</sup> A strong case might be made out for

---

1. Acts of Assembly, 1717, Act X. Cf. Wodrow, Correspondence, II. 269-71.

2. Hetherington, op. cit., p. 622 cf. Macleod, op. cit., p. 154.

the new, rationalistic influence then engulfing the land, evidenced in the Simson teachings. There is definite weight in the psychological argument adduced by James Walker, who, referring to the seeds of discord sown in the controversy between the Resolutioners and the Protesters, maintains that it put "ill blood" into the life of the Church "which a century and a half did not expel."<sup>1</sup> Related to this argument is an ecclesiastical one, that of the forming of "parties", which will be developed<sup>2</sup> in its more direct relationship to the Marrow disputations. As a matter of fact, all that has been written in the foregoing chapters serves as a backdrop for the controversy which, more than any other, has placed the name of James Hog on the pages of ecclesiastical history.

When all of these theories, with their consequents, are assessed, however, it is clear that some other ingredient is required to explain the intensity, vigor, acrimony, and magnitude which characterized the Marrow controversy. The debates that raged around the Marrow involved a basic difference of theological approach, the origins of which, like the Simson heterodoxy, can be traced to England.

About the year 1645 London ministers were divided over the question of the right of a sinner to come to Christ without conscious fitness to receive mercy. The dispute had begun several years earlier when Dr. Tobias Crisp of Brinkworth, zealous for the preaching of free grace, moved to London. The fervor of his

---

1. Walker, op. cit., p. 104.

2. Infra, pp. 254-58.

preaching aroused immediate attention and decided opposition from many of the ministers there. Dr. Crisp's stay in London, though memorable, was short-lived, for he died in 1642, but his death did not put an end to the debate which had begun with his appearance. One of his adherents, having made notes of Dr. Crisp's sermons in shorthand, sent them to the press with the title, Christ Alone Exalted, <sup>1</sup> one volume in 1643, a second in 1644, and a final volume in 1646. The author of The Marrow of Modern Divinity, first published in 1645, alludes to the two extremes of legalism about which the controversy then raged, and observes:

Now both these Paths leading from Christ have been justly judged as erroneous, and to my Knowledge, not only a matter of eighteen or twenty years ago, but also within this three or four years, there hath been much ado, both by preaching, writing, disputing, both to reduce Men out of them, and to keep them from them; and hot Contentions have been on both Sides, and all I fear, to little Purpose. . . .<sup>2</sup>

One of the renowned participants in these debates was Richard Baxter, chaplain in the Commonwealth Army, who was disdainful of anything that smacked of antinomianism. His particular tenets are set forth in his Aphorismes of Justification, published in 1649. In solving the problem, "How the righteousness of Christ is made ours," Baxter found fault with the orthodox doctrine of imputation which taught that

---

1. Agnew, op. cit., pp.233, 242.

2. Edward Fisher, The Marrow of Modern Divinity, (Edinburgh: Printed by John Masman and William Brown, 1718), v-vi. Hereinafter cited, Marrow 1718.

in Gods esteem and in point of Law wee were in Christ obeying and suffering . . . and thus (say they) is Christs Righteousnesse imputed to us, viz. his Passive Righteousnesse for the pardon of our sins and delivering us from the penalty; his active Righteousnesse for the making of us righteous and giving us title to the kingdom. . . . 1

One "mistake" with this view, contended Baxter, was that it made Christ to have fulfilled the preceptive part of the Law in man's stead in as strict a sense as he had borne<sup>2</sup> the punishment of the Law in man's place. He spoke of a new Law prescribed by Christ with conditions easier<sup>3</sup> for the sinner to fulfill than those under the old covenant, and he stated frankly that he did not think those "worth the confuting, who tell us, That Christ is the only party conditioned with, and that the new Covenant, as to us, hath no conditions. . . ." <sup>4</sup> One of Baxter's propositions was,

Though Christ hath sufficiently satisfied the Law, yet it is not his will, or the will of the Father, that any man should be justified or saved thereby, who hath not some ground in himself of personall and particular right and claim thereto . . . so that no man by the meer Satisfaction made, is freed from the Law or curse of the first violated Covenant absolutely, but conditionally only.<sup>5</sup>

In showing that "somewhat of man" intervenes in justification, Baxter distinguished between a legal righteousness wholly without man in Christ, and an evangelical righteousness consisting in man's

---

1. Richard Baxter, Aphorismes of Justification (The Hague: Abraham Brown, 1655), p. 31.

2. Ibid., p. 32.

3. Ibid., pp. 47-48.

4. Ibid., p. 58.

5. Ibid., p. 60.

own actions of faith and Gospel obedience, so that while Christ satisfied the conditions of the Law, it is man who must personally perform the conditions of the Gospel.<sup>1</sup> He understood the conditions of the new covenant to include not merely faith, but repentance, praying for pardon, forgiving others, love, sincere obedience, and works of love, though he admitted that since faith was the principal condition, it was possible to call it the only condition, provided, of course, that it was understood to include the secondary conditions.<sup>2</sup> The emphasis, nevertheless, lay upon man's effort in justification, man's resolution, man's achievements of moral character, so that in his efforts to guard against antinomianism Baxter prepared the way for those who had inclinations to pure legalism, and they were not reluctant to take their opportunity.

Half a century after the debates had begun they were renewed and the argument intensified. At the time of the Revolution, opposition to the doctrines of free grace was much in vogue and Dr. Crisp's works<sup>3</sup> were republished in 1690 by his son, Samuel Crisp. At their earlier publication these works had been charged with antinomianism; Baxter declared them to be more dangerous to truth than many Roman Catholic apologetics; and the Westminster Assembly ordered them to be burned.<sup>3</sup> The new edition caused no immediate sensation; indeed, it was recommended by twelve nonconformist ministers, some of whom were certainly not antinomian. It was

---

1. Ibid., pp. 66-72.

2. Ibid., pp. 149-151, 185-187, 199.

3. Griffiths, op. cit., p. 99.

not long, however, before the opposition brought out its heavy artillery.

Dr. John Edwards, of Cambridge, an honored divine in the Church of England, wrote a severe book, entitled Crispianism Unmasked. The same year, 1692, the most celebrated of all the anti-Crisp volumes, Gospel Truth Stated and Vindicated, appeared. It was written by the able Presbyterian divine, Dr. Daniel Williams, who "composed in his own language a series of errors, which he said were necessary inferences from Dr. Crisp's phraseology, and were, therefore, Dr. Crisp's errors. The accusation against the preachers of consolation, viewed as the first aspect of the Gospel, were summed up in the one portentous word, 'Antinomianism'.<sup>1</sup>" On the other hand, Dr. Williams and his party were accused of teaching justification by works. Because of their teaching that after conversion man's imperfect good works were accounted as satisfying the Law, through the merits of Christ, they were designated "Neonomians".

The disputation turned about the natural powers of man and the value of man's works in justification, and a more objective contemporary account of the matter cannot be found than that given by Robert Trail, the Scots minister of the Presbyterian Church at Cranbrook in Kent. Trail observed that both sides agreed as to a doctrine of the justifying grace of God in Christ and both feared its abuse, one by turning God's grace into licentiousness, the other by corrupting it with a mixture of Works.<sup>2</sup> The views of the

---

1. Agnew, op. cit., p. 91.

2. Robert Trail, A Vindication of the Protestant Doctrine Concerning Justification, (London: Printed for Dorman Newman, 1692), p. 2.

respective sides is contrasted clearly. Those accused of antinomianism taught "That a Law-condemned Sinner is freely justified by God's grace through the Redemption that is in Jesus Christ, that he is justified only for the Righteousness of Christ imputed to him by God of his free grace and received by faith alone as an instrument, which faith is the gift of the same grace."<sup>1</sup> They further taught the "impossibility of a natural man's doing any good work, before he be in Christ; of the impossibility of the mixing of man's righteousness and works, with Christ's righteousness in the business of justification. . . ." <sup>2</sup> This reveals quite clearly that there was no ground or room left in this view for man's merit in relation to justification.

By contrast, the Neonomians, appropriated the Baxterian tenets, and held

That Christ's Righteousness is our legal Righteousness; but our own is our Evangelical Righteousness; that is, when a Sinner is charged with Sin against the Law of God, he may oppose Christ's Righteousness as his Legal Defence; but against the charge of the Gospel, especially for unbelief, he must produce his faith as his defence or righteousness, against that charge.<sup>3</sup>

The Neonomians no longer denied the connection of good works and conversion and drew back in horror from what they felt would be the inescapably harmful results of the free grace preaching, so that Trail represented them as holding that Christ would only save those who could "bring good evidence of their having complied with

---

1. Ibid., p. 5.

2. Ibid., p. 9.

3. Ibid., p. 39.



the terms and conditions of the Law of Grace."<sup>1</sup>

The discussions lasted for seven years, at the end of which time the Presbyterians were committed to Arminianism and Independency to a stricter Calvinism.

Scottish ministers were well read on the controversy which was raging in their neighbor country and the writings of Crisp, Williams, Trail, and others would be read with keenest interest, particularly if it had been discovered that the same issues were making an appearance in Scotland itself. As a matter of fact, there are indications that legalistic doctrines were not altogether a recent innovation in the Church of Scotland.

The General Assemblies of 1645 and 1650 lament over ministers who

labour not to set forth the excellency of Christ in his person, offices, and the unsearchable riches of his grace; the new covenant, and the way of living by faith in him; not making this the main and chief theme of their preaching, as did the apostle, I Cor.ii.2; not preaching other things with a relation to Christ, and pressing duties in a mere legal way; not urging them, as by the authority of God's commands, so from the love of God, and grace of the gospel; not pointing and directing people to their furniture for them in Christ; oftentimes craving hard, but giving nothing wherewith to pay.'<sup>2</sup>

About the year 1676 the Rev. James Fraser of Brea, in a remarkable paragraph of his Memoirs, noted the changing climate of Scottish religion:

---

1. Ibid., p. 9.

2. John Brown, Gospel Truth, p. 2.

I perceived that our divinity was much altered from what it was in the primitive reformers' time. When I read Knox, Hamilton, Tindal, Luther, Calvin, Bradford, etc., I thought I saw another scheme of divinity, much more agreeable to the Scriptures and to my experience than the modern. And though I plainly enough saw the errors of the Antinomians (for their errors lay very near truth), yet I perceived a gospel spirit to be in very few, and that the most part yea of ministers did wofully confound the two covenants, and were of an Old Testament spirit; and little of the glory of Christ, grace, and gospel, did shine in their writings and preaching. But I abhorred and was at enmity with Mr. Baxter, as a stated enemy to the grace of God, under the cover of opposing some Antinomianism.<sup>1</sup>

It is not surprising, therefore, that the scene of battle was transferred from England to Scotland at the beginning of the eighteenth century. There are numerous allusions early in the century to the new strain of doctrine, called variously "Neonomianism", "Baxterianism", "Legalism", and sometimes "Arminianism", and the Evangelical ministers joined in a chorus of lamentations over the evils of this strain of preaching.

Thomas Boston relates how a young man coming before the Presbytery of Chirnside (of which Boston was a member) for trial had mentioned the "conditions" of the covenant of grace. Boston "quarrelled it", and the presbytery directed the candidate to deliver an exegesis on the question of the conditionality of the covenant. Boston's dissatisfaction with the handling of the assignment is apparent.<sup>2</sup>

In his introduction to Hog's Covenants of Grace and Redemption Displayed (1707), James Webster bemoans the fact that many who had

---

1. James Fraser of Brea, Memoirs (Edinburgh: The Religion Tract Society, 1889), p. 233.

2. Boston, op. cit., pp. 153-154.

high pretensions to orthodoxy are "strangers to the Tenor of the Covenant, [and] are carried away by a legal Spirit; than which there cannot be a worse Temper and Disposition. . . .

I am inclined to think, that one chief Reason why the Gospel hath so little Success in our time, is the legal Sermons. . . ." <sup>1</sup>

Thomas Halyburton, an acute student of the time, comments on the presence and danger of legal preaching in his Memoirs:

I saw the Evil of legal Preaching, which lies in one of two Things, or in both. 1. In laying too much Stress upon the Works of the Law, our Duties and Strength, or, 2. In pressing evangelical doctrines without an Eye to that which is the Spring of the Church's Edification, the Spirit of the Lord. Some press to Duties, so that they seem to think that their Reasonings are able to enforce a Compliance; or at least, they do not take Care to keep up upon themselves and Hearers both a constant Sense of the Contrary in Order to engage to Eagerness in Dependence upon the Spirit of the Lord: this is legal Preaching. O Lord, thou knowest how much of it is in this poor Church. <sup>2</sup>

Alexander Hamilton of Airth, in the Preface to his Catechism published in 1714, says that Baxterian doctrines were "upon the growing hand" in the Church. <sup>3</sup>

None of these men, however strongly they felt, surpassed James Hog in his detections and revelations of the legal strain of preaching. It would not be an exaggeration to say that from his first printed work to the last, the one thing which he most laments is the making of the covenant of grace a covenant of works,

- 
1. Hog, Redemption and Grace, Introduction by James Webster.
  2. Thomas Halyburton, Memoirs, (Edinburgh: Andrew Anderson, 1714), pp. 145-46.
  3. Alexander Hamilton, A Short Catechism Concerning the Three Special Divine Covenants, (Edinburgh: John Moncun, 1714), Preface, p.16.

or a too high opinion of man's ability in the matter of justification. His first work reveals his zeal for a proper distinction between the Law and the Gospel. Its full title is, Remarks Concerning the Spirit's Operation, and the Difference betwixt the Law and the Gospel (1701). His text for the "Remarks" is Galatians 3: 2 and on the title page one of the texts quoted is Romans 3: 28: "Therefore we conclude that a man is justified by faith without the deeds of the law." Even more revealing of the state of the times are Hog's Notes Detecting a Covered Mixture of the Covenant of Works and of Grace which was first published in 1706. In this work Hog proposed to reveal the ways in which there was a practical mingling of the covenants of works and grace, and he took note of the manner in which

. . . Faith is spoken of as a thing of no great difficulty, and promiscuous Multitudes pressed to an Acceptance of the LORD JESUS, as freely offered in the Gospel, without any Essay to discover the Vail upon the heart, and the utter impossibility we are under, of knowing him, until the face of the Covering be removed from our eyes, by the New Creation of that Light which before was not.<sup>1</sup>

It caused him much distress to "hear or read judicious and pathetick Discourses about Faith, without any discovery of the crossness of our Natures to it, and the impossibility we in our fallen Estate are under, to believe, as well as to fulfill the whole Law. . . ." <sup>2</sup> Comment to the same purpose is found in Otia Christiana (1708) <sup>3</sup> and in some of his sermons published at a later date.

---

1. James Hog, Notes Detecting a Mixture of the Covenant of Works and Grace (Edinburgh: James Watson, 1706), p. 13. Hereinafter cited Covenant of Works and Grace.

2. Ibid., p. 14.

3. Hog, Otia Christiana, p. 135 et passim.

From these contemporary lamentations and complaints it is seen that those who followed a legal strain of preaching were guilty of a two-fold error: on the one hand there was the passive aspect, seen in the simple omission in their preaching of man's spiritual incapability in his unregenerate state; and, on the other hand, the active aspect, seen in the urging of these unconvinced, unconvicted persons "to a variety of Duties, and to Cherish, yea excite their ignorant and selfish Propensity, towards a crowd of Vows and Purposes. . . ."<sup>1</sup>

The task of the Evangelical ministers who sought to counter this strain of preaching was made all the more difficult by the very subtlety of the evil. Though written by Hog when the Marrow controversy was at its highest, the following remarks disclose something of the problem which confronted these men from the very beginning of the new mode of preaching:

This [legalistic] Opinion is the more dangerous, that it hath severals, who were reputed good Men, to countenance it; and the lurking Poison is the less discernable, because it is set off with the specious Pretext of Holiness, and religious Duties; and that it may be the less Suspected, it is covered with an Evangelical Tincture; and thus the Heart of the unwary Reader is soon captivated, and, by Reason of the Subtlety of this legal Set of Spirit, the Danger is not so easily seen.<sup>2</sup>

---

1. Ibid., pp. 8-10.

2. James Fraser of Brea, A Treatise, Concerning Justifying or Saving Faith, (Edinburgh: James Mosman, 1722), Preface, ii-iii. One of the most concise and at the same time most comprehensive surveys of the setting for the Marrow controversy is to be found in this Preface which, though written anonymously, from internal evidence and external circumstance manifests its author to have been James Hog.

Nevertheless, in spite of the difficulties, the Evangelical ministers did in fact offer strenuous resistance and opposition to the Baxterian intrusion, not only in their sermons, but also in various prints, in both of which they were at great pains to clear up the matters that were in dispute, particularly concerning the basis of acceptance before God. In addition to several pamphlets which he published, Hog also engaged in a correspondence, between 1710 and 1712, with one of his brethren concerning the conditionality or absoluteness of the covenant of grace.<sup>1</sup> This correspondence is partially preserved and is in the New College Library in manuscript form.

More significant than Hog's earlier works, insofar as the development of the Marrow controversy per se is concerned, is the catechism of Alexander Hamilton of Airth which touched off the first official act in the debates. Hamilton had shown his mettle as a student at the University of Edinburgh during the Covenanting days, when under the cover of darkness he removed the head of James Guthrie of Stirling from a pike to which it had been affixed after his martyrdom, and where it had since remained for the public view. This pious minister noted the legal spirit and embodied his views in a manuscript catechism in which he maintained that the promises of the Gospel were made "to Sinners of Mankind indefinitely, without distinction of one from another"; spoke of faith only as a "Mean" or an "Instrument" and that even it was a promised grace; denied there were conditions to the promises, in a strict and proper

---

1. Thomas M'Crie, "The Controversy Concerning the Marrow of Modern Divinity", The Edinburgh Christian Instructor, XXX (1831), 542-43. Hereinafter cited "Marrow", The E. C. I.

sense; and held that the mediation of Christ was of such intrinsic worth as to be "sufficient in itself for the redemption of the whole world of lost men."<sup>1</sup> Hamilton showed the catechism to some of his friends in order to ascertain their opinion of it and copies must have been made from it. Principal Stirling of Glasgow had taken offence at something said by Hamilton in a sermon at Stirling, and having procured a copy of the catechism (still in manuscript), he showed it to some members of the 1710 General Assembly. The result was that an overture was hastily introduced and enacted.<sup>2</sup>

The act referred to the use of expressions and opinions as to some points of religion which were not agreeable to the Standards of the Church, and prohibited all ministers from the use of such unsound opinions and expressions. It concluded by further enacting

that no minister or member of this Church presume to print or disperse in writing any Catechism, without the allowance of the Presbytery of the bounds and of the commission; and the Presbytery is hereby appointed to lay any such Catechism before the commission; and the General Assembly does enjoin and require Synods and Presbyteries carefully to advert to the observation of this act, and that they notice the transgressors thereof.<sup>3</sup>

Hamilton suspected that he was the person aimed at and offered to defend anything he had written, but his request was dismissed.<sup>4</sup>

Following this Assembly, Hamilton and Principal Hadow of

---

1. Hamilton, op. cit., Preface, pp. 34-5; 15, 17, 38.

2. Thomas M'Crie, "Marrow", The E. C. I., XXX. 542.

3. Acts of Assembly, 1710. XII.

4. Thomas M'Crie, "Marrow", The E. C. I., XXX. 542-43.

St. Andrews carried on a friendly correspondence in which Hamilton declared, among other things, that it was never his design to print or disperse his catechism, while at the same time he denied that there was any heresy in it.<sup>1</sup> In order to correct the misrepresentation which had gone abroad, Hamilton eventually published his Catechism (1714).

One interesting and revealing result of the preliminary clash in the 1710 Assembly was the passing of an act by the Synod of Fife appointing all ministers to

gard against the propagating all Novelties in Doctrine any manner of way, Shun all unusual phrases and expressions in anything, or teaching contrary to or inconsistent with the said form of Sound words, as they would not have a sinful hand in divyding both ministers and people; and also that they studie in their matter and expressions to accomodat themselves to the capacities of their hearers. . . .<sup>2</sup>

Thomas M'Crie concludes from a letter of Gibb of Cleish to Wodrow, dated October 1, 1711, that James Hog was "troubled in consequence of this act" of Synod, but this can be only a matter of conjecture since the "affliction" referred to by Gibb may have been physical rather than personal.<sup>3</sup>

Just at the time when the debates appeared to be gaining momentum and nearing a climax the debaters had their attention diverted by the swiftly moving events of 1711-12.<sup>4</sup> With the Church

---

1. Ibid., XX. 543, footnote.

2. Synod of Fife Record, September 26, 1710.

3. Thomas M'Crie, "Marrow", The E. C. I., XXX. 543.

4. Supra, pp. 102ff.



in agony over the Abjuration Oath, Patronage, and toleration for the Episcopalians there was no time for theological debate. Hard on the heels of these events there came the beginning of the Simson process, and 1715 Rebellion, and the concentrated and united efforts of the strictly orthodox against Simson. It was as though a truce had been declared. But the feelings were unchanged and the fires were smoldering. The Baxterian strain of preaching rode the crest of Simson's popularity to increasing favor while the Evangelical ministers withstood its extension militantly. It could be only a matter of time until the repressed issues would burst out into furious contention. So it was that the Auchterarder Presbytery, by its measures to defend the doctrines of grace against the advance of legalism, furnished the occasion which brought the eruption of the pent-up feelings into a full-blown controversy.

The facts which have been related to this point disclose that the answer to the question, "What caused the Marrow controversy?", must be sought for chiefly in the marked increase of Baxterian doctrine, or more accurately, in a legalistic practice and doctrine.

The Presbytery of Auchterarder, cognizant of these developments, manifested its zeal for Evangelical teaching by resolving to give the young men who came before them for trials a more rigorous and, for those willing to be instructed, enlightening examination. It was in pursuit of this resolution that they proposed the articles previously referred to, to William Craig. Craig passed the trials and was actually licensed to preach, but he had failed to satisfy the presbytery on the points set forth in their articles, and so they refused to give him an extract of his license to preach,

notwithstanding the fact that he had been approved by them and was actually licensed to preach!<sup>1</sup> Craig forthwith appealed to the General Assembly, giving them the facts of his case. The Committee for Bills reported the history of the matter to the Assembly, noting particularly that Craig had failed to satisfy the presbytery on "some articles of faith required of him by them", one of which was the objectionable proposition which came to be called the "Auchterarder Proposition", or, as some christened it in jest, the "Auchterarder Creed."

A considerable debate followed. Those for the presbytery contended that the presbytery was only manifesting its zeal for purity of doctrine and that the disputed proposition was capable of a soft as well as a harsh sense. Their opponents, who had been in favor of "sensing" Professor Simson's propositions, "appeared absolutely against sensing this" and thought it "great presumption in a Presbytery"<sup>2</sup> to define in debatable points and make new articles of faith. When the smoke of the debates cleared, the Assembly ordered the presbytery to give Craig the extract desired; instructed all prebyteries not to "require subscriptions of any young men to be licensed to preach the Gospel, or ordained . . . to any formula but such as is or shall be agreed to and approved" by an Assembly; and further declared "their abhorrence of the foresaid proposition, as unsound and most detestable, as it stands, and was offered by the said Presbytery to be subscribed by Mr. Craig. . . ."<sup>3</sup> The representatives of

---

1. Acts of Assembly, 1717. X.

2. Wodrow, Correspondence, II. 270.

3. Acts of Assembly, 1717. X.

the Auchterarder Presbytery had not been present to explain the intent of the disputed article and the Assembly, determined to call them to account, required them to appear before the Commission of the Assembly the second Wednesday of August to give an explanation of their "Creed".<sup>1</sup> It was not without significance that although the presbytery gave the Commission a satisfactory answer, they reported that the presbytery's phrasing had been "very unwarrantable and exceptionable", admonished them, and prohibited them from making any use of the obnoxious article in the future.<sup>2</sup>

Years later, about 1730, Boston, writing the memoirs of his life, observed with reference to the 1717 General Assembly: "And here, namely, in the condemnation of that proposition, was the beginning of the spate, that for several years after ran, in the publick actings of this Church, against the doctrine of grace, under the name of Antinomianism. . . ."<sup>3</sup>

The severe treatment given the Auchterarder Presbytery and the benevolent handling of Simson indicated the swing of the ecclesiastical pendulum, for even in the act in which Simson's case was concluded, there was a shot fired in the direction of the disputants in the legalistic-free grace contest, but with more sting for the Evangelicals than the legalists. All ministers and professors were enjoined not to "vent any doctrines not agreeable to our Confession of Faith and Catechisms, especially such

---

1. Loc. cit.

2. Acts of Assembly, 1718. VIII.

3. Boston, op. cit., p. 218.

opinions as either ascribe too much to corrupt nature, or tend to encourage sloth among Christians, or slacken people's obligation unto gospel holiness."<sup>1</sup> This actually constituted an accusation of antinomian licentiousness against upholders of free grace, and it was not the last time the charge was to be heard.

The Evangelicals observed the trend of events with understandable apprehensiveness. They did not need to be very astute to realize the sort of treatment they could now expect from the "higher powers" in their efforts to combat errors as well as in their essays to inculcate the doctrines of grace. There was the reluctance of the Assembly to prosecute Simson when his case first began. There was the refusal of the Assembly to specify in the "Act for Purity of Doctrine" any particular tenets that were censured. There was their willingness to put a favorable construction on <sup>N</sup>may of Simson's teachings and hypotheses. It had taken the Church a considerable time, even allowing for political eruptions and ecclesiastical machinations, to come to grips with and conclude the Simson matters. Finally, considering Simson's absolute impenitence and self-confident attitude few could deny that he had escaped without any bona fide censure. The conduct of the Auchterarder case was a study in contrast. The matter was quickly taken up and dealt with in a near-arbitrary fashion in view of the fact that the presbytery itself was not given opportunity to appear in its defense. No objective Churchman could have had the least doubt of the intention

---

1. Acts of Assembly, 1717. IX.

of the Auchterarder Presbytery in its articles, for it was conspicuous in its contendings for orthodox doctrine and requirements of a strictly holy practice. Yet the supreme court had condemned them with most efficient promptness, though in doing so they had to fix upon the article in question the worst possible interpretation instead of using the judgment of charity which they had so freely exercised in the Simson process.

Following the appearance of the Auchterarder Presbytery before the Commission, Hog wrote a letter in which he offered some observations upon the controverted article, explaining and defending it. He confessed that the position appeared strange at first hearing, but upon a less cursory consideration it was apparent that

The real meaning of the Reverend Presbytery, and that which I always took to be their sense, is just, in a Word, That nothing which is savingly good, can have place in one or other, e're they be in Christ; or this viz. Seing a going off from Sin, and into Christ, is saving Faith; such a motion cannot have place before it, and in order to it.<sup>1</sup>

This apology, published that same year (according to the record in the National Library of Scotland), is not listed by any of those who have compiled a bibliography of Hog's works. However, Thomas M'Crie does refer to it in a footnote to Wodrow's Correspondence, II. 271. Principal Hadow also had occasion to refer to it in his Antinomianism of the Marrow of Modern Divinity Detected, page 37.

---

1. James Hog, A Letter Concerning the Auchterarder Affair, (n. d.), p. 4. Hereinafter cited Concerning The Auchterarder Affair.

James Hog was a member of the 1717 Assembly, and he and his friends appear to have conferred both during and immediately following the Assembly, in which consultations they discussed possible ways and means of combatting the rising tide of legalism. They agreed that the most efficient course open to them was the writing and publishing of new works which exhibited the doctrines of grace, and in the meantime they determined to republish old works written in an evangelical strain. Several of Thomas Boston's most popular works were the result of this decision.<sup>1</sup> Hog showed no little interest in the republishing of the older treatises<sup>2</sup> by orthodox divines who insisted on the doctrines of grace. It was undoubtedly this interest of Hog's which accounts, in part, for his publishing The Marrow of Modern Divinity. The story of the way in which this book came to be published in Scotland, however, is one of the most fascinating accounts of its kind in Scottish Church history, and demands to be related somewhat in detail.

While the discussions on the "Auchterarder Creed" were going on, Thomas Boston, minister of Ettrick, was conversing with John Drummond, of Crief, a member of the Auchterarder Presbytery, his subject being the sense of the gospel offers made in Isaiah 55: 1 and Matthew 11: 28. Boston mentioned, almost incidentally, that he had gotten light on the subject from a book called The Marrow of Modern Divinity, for which he expressed his high regard. Drummond inquired for the book in the Edinburgh bookshops and

---

1. Thomas M'Crie, "Marrow", The E. C. I., XXX. 544.

2. John Brown, Gospel Truth, p. 46.

managed to secure a copy only after some difficulty. Before he could read it, James Webster, had borrowed it, and Boston relates that Webster was "taken therewith". Drummond had scarcely read the Marrow when James Hog got it.<sup>1</sup> He read the book at once and found it an excellent work, much to his taste; but there was no thought on his part of issuing a Scottish edition of the Marrow. It has been suggested that Hog had no sooner read the book than he instantly determined to publish it with his recommendation;<sup>2</sup> that such was not the case appears from the account of the events which brought about the publication of the Marrow, an account which can be regarded as authoritative since it was taken from a manuscript written by Hog himself.<sup>3</sup> What really happened was that some of the Evangelical leaders came to Hog and discussed the possibility of a Scottish edition of the Marrow. They seem to have fixed their minds on such a project and they desired Hog to write a preface to the new edition, and he "complied with the motion."<sup>4</sup> In the Preface by Hog, dated "Carnock, Decemb. 3d, 1717", he relates the circumstances which prompted the new edition of the book:

---

1. Boston, op. cit., pp. 218-19.

2. Donald Beaton, "The 'Marrow of Modern Divinity' and the Marrow Controversy", Records of the Scottish Church History Society, I (1926), p. 117.

3. Boston, op. cit., p. 247.

4. Loc. cit.

This Book came to my Hand by a merciful, and most unexpected Disposure of Providence, and I read it with great, and sweet Complacence. 'T is now entirely out of Print, tho' much desired, and highly prized by diverse exercised to Godliness, who had the Happiness to see, and peruse it. But, in regard one Copy could not serve many, and the Demands for it are strong by sundry . . . Persons . . . The Motion of a new Impression fell in as a native Result from Desires of more Light. . . .<sup>1</sup>

In addition to his Recommendatory Preface Hog would appear to have made some revisions of a minor nature, having to do chiefly with the footnotes (which he took from the margin and placed at the bottom of the page) and the Scripture texts (which were incorporated in the body of the book), to which he assigned proper places, many of them having been cited in the wrong place. Hog also placed the Appendix found at the end of Part II of the Marrow, entitled, "The Difference between the Law and the Gospel," at the end of his edition, which contained only Part I of the Marrow.<sup>2</sup>

It has been noted<sup>3</sup> that The Marrow of Modern Divinity was originally published near the middle of the seventeenth century, during the debates in England between the so-called "legalists" and "antinomians". The title page discloses that it was the author's design to walk "the middle Path" between the two extremes and that to accomplish this end he used the dialogue form. The interlocutors, four in number, are Evangelista, a minister; Nomista,

---

1. Edward Fisher, Marrow 1718, Preface.

2. Edward Fisher, The Marrow of Modern Divinity (n. p., 1726), With Notes by Thomas Boston, Preface. Cf. James Adams, The Snake In the Grass (Edinburgh: 1719), Title Page. Hereinafter cited The Snake.

3. Supra, p. 230.



a legalist; Antinomista, an Antinomian; and Neophytus, a young Christian. The book is primarily a compilation from the writings of Reformed and Puritan divines, the chief of whom are Luther, Calvin, Lightfoot, Reynolds, Goodwin, Hooker, and Perkins, among others. Since these divines were more or less "modern" when the Marrow was written, it is easy to see how Fisher fixed upon the title.

There is no clue to the authorship save the fact that the initials "E. F." occur on the title page, the dedicatory epistle, and the preface of both parts of the book. But who was "E. F. "? It has been established that there were two men of the same name, Edward Fisher, who were contemporaries, either one of which could have been the author. One Edward Fisher is said to have been a gentleman commoner, a graduate of Brasenose College, Oxford, and skilled in ancient languages and ecclesiastical history. He was also an author, some of his works being preserved in the British Museum. Some have thought that this Edward Fisher was the author of the Marrow. Others attribute it to a Puritan of the same name who was a barber, though an uncommon one since he was a member of the Guild of Barber Surgeons. He, too, was a writer and found favor with some of the Independent divines. His writings, all in dialogue form, were published between 1647 and 1650. Each one bears the initials "E. F.". Each is approved by the Puritan censor of the <sup>1</sup>press. M'Crie prefers to leave the question

---

1. D. M. McIntyre, "First Strictures on the Marrow of Modern Divinity", The Evangelical Quarterly, X (January 1938), pp. 62-63; Edward Fisher, The Marrow of Modern Divinity, ed. by C. G. M'Crie, (Glasgow: David Bryce and Son, 1902), xvi-xix. Hereinafter cited Marrow 1902.

of authorship unsolved; McIntyre offers a convincing argument for his conclusion that anyone who has examined the writings in question "even cursorily" cannot fail to see that it was Edward Fisher the Puritan barber who wrote the Marrow.<sup>1</sup> The question is of no particular importance although it was one of the points paraded onto the battleground when the debates in Scotland were at their peak.<sup>2</sup>

Concerning the contents of the book it need only be said here that it is a presentation of the Federal theology based on a distinction between the Law in the covenant of works and covenant of grace. It is strongly Lutheran in many of its teachings, as for example in the doctrines of justification by faith imputed to the sinner. It speaks straight to the heart of the sinner and offers him a real and complete salvation in Christ, if he will but take him.

Joseph Caryl, the official censor of the Westminster Assembly, gave the work his warm commendation at the time it was published, stating that he found it "tending to Peace and Holiness, the Author endeavoring to reconcile and heal those unhappy Differences which have lately broken out afresh amongst us. . . ." Other recommendations were added to subsequent editions.<sup>3</sup>

Not all the reactions were favorable, however, even then. The first attack on the book was made in 1646, when the third edition was nearly exhausted, by "I. A." (John Angel of Grantham?). He noted

---

1. Ibid., p. 63.

2. Infra, p.

3. Edward Fisher, Marrow 1718, vii.

several errors, the most offensive of which was the teaching that there were no evangelical preparations to faith in Christ.<sup>1</sup>

Richard Baxter censured it for the same reason; for the distinction made between the Law as the covenant of works and as the Law of Christ; and for several other weaknesses. Nevertheless, he went on record to the effect that he greatly valued most of the book; commended the author for his industry and moderation; and evaluated it as a "useful" work.<sup>2</sup>

By the time a seventh edition was called for, in 1648, Fisher added to the Marrow a second part, devoted chiefly to an exposition of the Decalogue. This part, inferior to the first, never was very widely read, or at least it never approached the popularity of the original work.

While the Marrow had considerable popular appeal and went through seven editions in four years, there is little in its early history to distinguish it as superior to many other evangelical pieces of the day. That it refused to bow out of the picture is evident from the fact that there was a tenth edition in 1699. Even so, it was hardly known at all in Scotland judging from the extreme difficulty with which it was secured in 1717.

What was it, then, that made James Hog read the Marrow with such pure elation? Why did he write such an enthusiastic recommendation of the book? When it was attacked by the Church's heavyweights, why did he defend it so unwaveringly? Conversely, what was it in the

---

1. McIntyre, op. cit., p. 66 cf. James Hadow, The Antinomianism of The Marrow of Modern Divinity Detected (Edinburgh: John Mosman and Co., 1721), p. 6. Hereinafter cited Antinomianism.

2. Baxter, op. cit., pp. 262, 276-81.

Marrow and in the Church of Scotland that brought such an uncompromising attack upon the book and its recommender?

It is at this point that it becomes necessary to examine more closely the theological and religious climate (exclusive of the Baxterian tenets per se) prevailing in the Church of Scotland at the time the Marrow was published by Hog, without which the events that followed hardly make "sense".

There had been for nearly seven decades two schools of thought within the Church, as James Walker has pointed out.<sup>1</sup> These schools formed as a result of the public resolutions, and while the Resolutioners and the Protesters were agreed about most fundamental points, they were all the same distinguishable from each other. The former, represented in men like David Dickson, were the more precise theologians, orthodox in every particular, careful to guard the gospel against abuse, and of a Scottish flavor in theology and religion. The latter, by contrast, were of the school of Samuel Rutherford. They were more evangelical and they also had distinctively Puritan leanings. They were aware that the gospel could be abused, but they rejoiced to declare the grace of God to men.<sup>2</sup> The passing of time did not result in any resolution of the divergent theological approach of these two schools of opinion. In fact, the cleavage was made more pronounced by the development of a metaphysical abstraction in the Reformed theology of the latter half of the seventeenth century, in which the religious element was

---

1. Supra, p. 229.

2. Thomas M'Crie, Jr., "The Marrow Controversy", B. F. E. R., II. No. V(1853), 418-22.

overridden in the dogmatic system.

Calvin had guarded against his ideas of election, predestination, and the plan of salvation becoming mere metaphysical abstraction by teaching that redemption was at the end of the process. But the revival of Aristotelian study brought a crust of scholasticism into Reformed theology, so that in this period the tendency was to make the eternal decree a metaphysical vehicle for explaining the relation of the Supreme Being to the universe, and not an evangelical instrument whereby a loving Father can reclaim the sinners of mankind. There was more and more concentration upon the metaphysical aspects of predestination, and less and less attention given to its evangelical aspect. Theologians were inclined to focus their thoughts on the eternal divine plan rather than on the implementation of that plan on the plane of history in the redemption of sinners.<sup>1</sup> The effects of this on preaching was of no little significance. There came to be prevalent in Scotland a hyper-Calvinism drawn largely from the writings of Dutch theologians, in which scheme of doctrine all the offers of the gospel were made only to those who were already qualified to receive them, i.e., the elect alone. Even the more general promises of the gospel were said to be conditional and they were, in practice, made only to the elect. Theirs was a dry, stiff, narrow religion, of the kind which James Walker calls the "Judaic theory of the world's conversion."<sup>2</sup> To this school belonged

---

1. T.M. Lindsay, "The Covenant Theology", B. F. E. R., CIX(July, 1879), 533-34.

2. Walker, op. cit., p. 58.

Principal Hadow of St, Andrews, (of whom more will be said),<sup>1</sup>  
 Principal Wishart of Edinburgh, Professor Hamilton, Allan Logan,  
 M'Claren, Flint, and Goldie, all good and godly men of real ability.

The practical result of this kind of theological approach was that the sinner was full of doubts and questionings as to whether he had the right to accept the offer of Christ in the gospel. "Am I an elect person?", he inquired of himself. He examined himself for evidences of grace rather than looking outward to Christ as the source of spiritual life. It was an unduly<sup>2</sup> introspective and onesided presentation of the gospel.

Such theology as this called for reaction. It came in two different ways, one of which is described in the following remarks:

Hyper-Calvinism is not a creed for a man to grow warm and eloquent about, to be earnest in pressing home upon the acceptance of others; it is not a gospel of 'good tidings of great joy to all people'. And so in the course of time men grew tired of preaching it; they became heartless in declaring a system of truths and a series of steps which concerned only some of their hearers, and they betook themselves to something else which applies to all, appeals to all, something broad and deep, wide as the race, lasting as the eternities. They became preachers of duty, of the moralities, of the honest, the true, the good, the beautiful.<sup>3</sup>

It is important to note, however, that this change evolved gradually and that Hadow and Logan were preachers of the narrow Calvinism to the end. It was the younger ministers who, in escaping the severe Calvinism of men like Hadow, came to be the out-and-out "legal" or "Moderate" preachers.

---

1. Infra, pp. 270, 291, 293, 305ff.

2. Macleod, op. cit., pp. 141-143.

3. C.G. M'Crie, "Studies in Scottish Ecclesiastical Biography", B. F. E. R., XXXIII (October, 1884), 715-16.

The other reaction was a very different one. It was an effort on the part of the Federal theologians to bring Reformed theology down to the facts of everyday life, to plant it in time as well as in eternity. Their purpose was to bring Reformed teaching back into a vital connection with the historical development of the plan of redemption in the lives of men and women, to bring salvation near to them, to show them that they were partakers of the same salvation as that shared by God's people in all ages past.<sup>1</sup> Conspicuous in this school in Scotland, though by no means the only Federal Theologians, were Boston, Webster, Hog, and the Erskines, to name a few. These men set out in their preaching and printing to bring the swing of the pendulum back to the center from the extreme position to which it had been impaled. They were eager to demolish the barricades that had been erected around the offers of salvation and to do justice to the broad statements of the Gospel offer to all men. While they were orthodox in their doctrine of election and reprobation, their evangelistic interest constrained them to say little about election and much about God's gracious offers to sinful men. They were less logical than their hyper-Calvinist opponents, but they were more religious. This, says Stewart Mechie, explains why they found the "Auchterarder Creed"<sup>2</sup> acceptable while their counterparts detested it utterly.

---

1. T.M. Lindsay, "The Covenant Theology", B. F. E. R., CIX(July 1879), 534-37.

2. Stewart Mechie, "The Marrow Controversy Reviewed", The Evangelical Quarterly, XXII(January, 1950), 28-9; cf. Edward Fisher, Marrow 1902, xxvii-xxix.

While it is important to avoid a narrowly defined grouping of these factions into parties, it is not misleading to say that there were, in 1717, speaking broadly, three schools of theological thought in the Church of Scotland, and these may be represented as follows:

<u>HYPER-CALVINISTS</u>	<u>EVANGELICALS</u>	<u>RATIONALISTS</u>
Hadow, Logan, M'Claren	Boston, Hog, Erskines	Simson, younger ministers
Logical Calvinism	Religious Calvinism	Latitudinarian Calvinists
Impersonal, theoretical	Personal, practical	Humanistic, moralistic
"Purity-men", Baxterian	"Free-grace men"	Semi-Pelagian, Arian

All three schools claimed to be orthodox. Each constantly declared its loyalty to and admiration for the Standards. In the Marrow controversy the collision was primarily between the two most orthodox schools, the hyper-Calvinists and the Evangelicals, and it is this difference of theological and religious orientation which accounts for the ensuing clash concerning The Marrow of Modern Divinity.

Returning now to the question of why James Hog and his friends welcomed the Marrow, it must be said that they did not relish this book because they had gone over it with an eye to the fame of its author, its literary finesse, or its logical superiority. They certainly did not publish it because it was novel doctrine or because they desired to foster party spirit.

About the year 1700 Thomas Boston was having his personal struggles with questions related to a legalistic practice when he came across The Marrow of Modern Divinity in the course of a pastoral visit at Simprin, where he was then the minister. Having purchased it from his parishioner, he read it, found that it resolved the very points he was in quest of, and therefore



"rejoiced in it, as a light which the Lord had seasonably struck  
up to me in my darkness."<sup>1</sup>

The book came under Hog's inspection just at the providential moment, when the Auchterarder proposition was making a stir in the Church, and he read it with the same experience as Boston. Let it not be thought that James Hog was seeking an answer for himself in the disputed subjects; he had had his convictions about the relation of law and gospel for many years, and everyone knew that his hearty support was with those who loved to preach the doctrines of grace to sinners. What distressed and grieved the Evangelicals was the unholy alliance of hyper-Calvinism and Baxterianism (and one might add Simsonianism) which was undermining evangelical religion under the pretense of orthodoxy. They found themselves in something of a dilemma, for it appeared that any efforts they might make in defending the doctrines of grace would be resisted by processes in the Church courts, but they could not in good conscience stand aside and give free rein to their opponents who were, as they saw it, subverting the life and witness of the Church they loved. When Hog, who had no qualms about defending the doctrines to which he was attached, was approached by his friends who suggested that the Marrow would be worth publishing and urged him to supervise a Scottish edition, it occurred to him that the book had, in the Providence of God, come to the Church for such a time as that. Concerning his opinion of the book and his reasons for recommending it, Hog wrote,

---

1. Boston, op. cit., pp. 151-2.

It contains a great Deal of the Marrow of revealed, and Gospel Truth, selected from Authors of great Note, clearly inlightened, and of most digested Experience. And some of them were honoured to do eminent, and heroical Services in their Day. Thus the Christian Reader hath the Flower of their Labours communicated to him very briefly, yet clearly, and powerfully. And the Manner of Conveyance, being by way of Amicable conference, is not only fitted to afford Delight to the Judicious Reader, but layeth him also at the Advantage of trying, through Grace, his own Heart, the more exactly, according to what Echo it gives, or how it relisheth, or is displeas'd with the several speeches of the Communers. Touching the Matter, it is of the greatest Concernment, viz. the stating aright both Law and Gospel, and giving true, and clear Narrations of the Course of the Cloud of Witnesses, in the following of which, many have arrived at a glorious Rest. The excellent Accounts are managed in such a Manner as to detect the Rocks on either Hand, upon which the Danger of splitting is exceedingly great. Here we have the greatest Depths, and most painted Delusions of Hell, in Opposition to the only Way of Salvation, discovered with marvelous Brevity, and Evidence, and that by the concurring Suffrages of burning and shining Lights, Men of the clearest Experience, and honoured of God to do eminent Service in their Day, for advancing the Interest of our Lord's Kingdom and Gospel.<sup>1</sup>

Insofar as Hog was concerned, the Marrow was an echo of his own convictions, a carbon copy of his own experience, and an embodiment of those sentiments which he sometimes experienced difficulty in expressing clearly and forcibly in print. More than this, it was so full of the "marrow" of Reformed and British divines of great note that he almost certainly thought it would pacify the ruffled feelings in the Church, and he clearly had no thought that there were those who would have the audacity to launch an attack upon a book which was hardly more than a compilation of

---

1. Edward Fisher, Marrow 1718, Preface, ii-iii; cf. James Hog, The Controversie Concerning the Marrow of Modern Divinity, Dialogue I., (1721), pp. 106-7. Hereinafter cited Dialogue I.

their salient teachings. Beyond this, the Marrow had the imprimature of Joseph Caryl and recommendations from men who were respected for their judgment and irenic spirit. The Marrow was, furthermore, a work of Covenant theology, so that it could find no criticism on that score, he thought. Thus the Marrow appeared to be nothing less than a theological and religious prescription for the Church of Scotland, both from the standpoint of its strong proclamation of the doctrines of grace and from its supposedly inoffensiveness to the hyper-Calvinistic school. Hog and his friends sent it to the press with unbounded joy, and the appellation of "Marrowmen" assigned to them at a later date was no misnomer, for they never felt any shame for their recommendation and defense of the doctrines exhibited in the book.

The book itself was given an enthusiastic reception. It was widely circulated in the peasant cottages and was the topic of conversation in towns and villages, in market places and in homes, and wherever people came together. Its doctrines were assimilated by devout ministers who began to dwell upon its gracious themes and to recommend the book to their parishioners. In a short time the Marrow became a staple in the religious diet of a large part of Scotland, taking its place alongside the Bible, the Catechism, and the Psalter. A host of people read it with the same "sweet complacency" which James Hog experienced, and the flickering flame of evangelical fervor began to burn with a white heat once again.

It was not long, however, before Hog discovered to his dismay that he had miscalculated the temper of the rival schools. While the humble folk were satisfying their thirsty souls with draughts of the Marrow, the brows of the strictly orthodox and of the disciples

of Simson were raised in indignation. "The publishing the Marrow of Modern Divinity, with a preface by Mr. James Hog, is much reflected upon", wrote William Wilson of Perth to Wodrow<sup>1</sup> on January 24, 1719. The more they heard of the popularity of the book, the more they read it with their "critical microscopes", the more their feelings rose to the boiling point. The Marrow, with its threefold distinction of the Law, its teaching of the absoluteness of the covenant, its citations from Luther which left no room for works in the matter of justification, its teaching about the nature of faith, its universal deed of gift and grant to mankind sinners, and its six paradoxes relating to the distinction in the Law ran afoul of their theological temperament and they felt such a book had to be dealt with. It was a case of divergent theological tendencies which the hyper-Calvinists could no more help than the Evangelicals could their own theological bent. This reaction is compared by Thomas M'Crie, Jr. to that which one would expect when a group of jovial gentlemen fresh from the drinking table walk merrily into the room of a gathering of total abstainers, sitting as cool as the beverage to which they confine themselves.<sup>2</sup> The lines began to form for battle, and one can imagine that during the year 1718 there were many informal discussions by the respective schools as they had occasion to meet in the cities and in their various Church courts. Those ministers who were most averse to the book attacked it from their pulpits and warned their people against it

---

1. Thomas M'Crie, "Marrow", The E. C. I., XXX 544 (footnote).

2. Thomas M'Crie, Jr., "The Marrow Controversy", B. F. E. R., II(1853), 428.

as a damnable book, fraught with soul-destroying doctrines.

Finding that the Marrow was accused of fostering antinomian licentiousness, among other things, Hog felt compelled to reply to the charges which were being openly proclaimed. This he did in a letter understood to be written to Ralph Erskine, dated September 25, 1718, which would be perhaps six months after the publication of the Marrow. In this print Hog refers to the occasion of the letter in these words: "You was pleased to acquaint us, That sundry Presbyterian Ministers do either more directly express, or otherwise insinuate their fears of ANTINOMIANISM; and that some of them do more resolutely assert that this Church is partly tainted with that ~~poys~~onous Leaven, and is also in further Danger thereof."<sup>1</sup> Hog indicated that he had other matters which he preferred to be doing and that his only concern or interest<sup>2</sup> in writing was the honor of God with regard to truth and duty. Throughout the letter he never mentions the Marrow by name, or hints that that book is the cause of the excitement, but it is obvious that both the accusers and the vindicator have it in mind. In the earlier part of the missive Hog laments the manner in which the charges have been made, as also the spirit in which they were made. He felt that the law of love had been violated by making charges against ministers without any supporting evidence, whereas it would have been the office of a Christian to avoid public accusations based upon mere

---

1. James Hog, A Vindication of the Doctrine of Grace from the Charge of Antinomianism, (Edinburgh: Printed by Robert Brown, 1718), p. 3. Hereinafter cited Vindication.

2. Ibid., p. 4.

suspicion. The actual method of accusation was not only in speaking to the congregations from the pulpit, but also by ministers "speaking to the LORD in Prayer"<sup>1</sup>! Hog replied to the insinuations that he did not know any minister in the Church of Scotland who could be accused as an antinomian, that he and his friends held to the orthodox doctrine regarding the Law, and that for his own part, "there is scarce any Thing I more pressingly desire, than that such Tenets be particularly condescended upon, and enumerated; and that the Persons guilty . . . have the Charge instructed against them."<sup>2</sup> In the latter part of the work he sought to prove that in matters of Law and Gospel he and his friends "keep closs to the Scriptural and Apostolical Doctrine, and are at just Removes from Antinomian Errors."<sup>3</sup>

As in the case of so many of Hog's writings, this one is vague, being "on behalf of unnamed suspects against unnamed accusers",<sup>4</sup> as has been said. At the same time this very thing demonstrates how Hog sought to avoid dealing in personalities and the calling of names, that he was exercising the restraint and judgment of charity which he was pleading for in behalf of his friends. "The beauty of the tractate," writes M'Crie, "is in the rich exhibition made in it of gospel truth, and in the

---

1. Ibid., p. 5.

2. Ibid., p. 6.

3. Ibid., p. 4.

4. C. G. M'Crie, "Studies in Scottish Ecclesiastical Biography", B. F. E. R., XXXIII(October, 1884), 683.

1

Christian temper and humility displayed by the writer."

About the same time there came from the press the second edition of Hog's Notes [on] The Covenant of Works and of Grace, presumably to show the soundness of his own position as well as to offer rebuttal to the legalists. No mention is made of this second edition in literature of the Marrow controversy, and it is of no significance except that it shows Hog was actively engaged in withstanding the neonomians and in asserting Evangelical opinions. At the same time the reader is conscious of the fact that Hog sent both these prints to the public, not to generate debate but, if possible to pour oil on the waters.

It is appropriate at this place to present some of the history of this charge of antinomianism which was levelled against the friends of the Marrow. The charge was not a new one to the Evangelicals, for Simson, in reply to the charges made against him by James Webster, hurled back the Counter-charge of universalism and antinomianism, though he, too, failed to offer any real evidence for his charge.<sup>2</sup> Professor Simson appears to have been the first to raise the cry of antinomianism in the Church of Scotland, and there is hardly any reason to doubt that he did it to shift the Church's attention from himself. If that was the case, he failed utterly, for no one took the charge seriously and he himself never had any evidence to support a case against his antagonist.

---

1. Loc. cit.,

2. Libel and Answers, pp. 155, 168, 269-70, 273, 276, passim; cf. Simson, Letters to Rowen, p. 37 (Advertisement by Webster).

There can be no doubt that there were a considerable number who lifted up the antinomian charge as a means of revenge, or in ignorance of the facts. On the other hand there were certainly men who brought the charge with a clean conscience, motivated only by honest fears of antinomianism. After all, there is such an error, and they understandably dreaded the appearance in the Church of that which would encourage men in the indulgence of sinful practice. Allan Logan, John Flint, and John M'Claren were probably in this category, but this fear is expressed notably in the preface to the Collection of Confessions, written by the very able William Dunlop, and published just as the Marrow case was gathering a full head of steam. Having expressed his opinion concerning those who ensnare the "Generality" of the people by showing a disesteem of the Law on the grounds of a high regard for the grace of God, this young theologian then continues,

We are sorry that there should be Occasion to mention one Performance of this Kind, which hath been lately reprinted and propogated with so much Industry: Tho' one would have thought, that the many valuable and approved practical Pieces which the Church enjoys, might have rendred it needless; as some Things contained therein seemed to make it noways expedient. The Reader will easily perceive that it is THE MARROW OF MODERN DIVINITY which is hinted at.<sup>1</sup>

Dunlop goes on at great length upon the Marrow, alleging that if it did not dissolve the obligation to obedience and allow licentious liberty, it certainly weakened the force of the Law and tended to cool the zeal of Christians in seeking a life of holiness.

---

1. Collection of Confessions, ed. by William Dunlop, I (Edinburgh: James Watson, 1719), cxxv.



Even making allowance for the explanations which had been made in defense of the teachings, Dunlop felt that whatever good might be in the book and its recommenders only made it that much more dangerous for the Church, seeing its teaching was indeed more modern than that of Christ and the Apostles.<sup>1</sup>

The intensity of feeling about the dangers from antinomianism on the one hand and neonomianism on the other contributed much to underscore and magnify the differences between the two sides, so that an acute student of the times was led to comment that

while both Parties profess the same Zeal for the Purity of the very same Doctrine, and alarmed with what, I hope, we may call an imaginary Danger of Antinomianism, breaking in on the one Side, and Baxterian, or, as some call them, Neonomian Notions on the other, the Church is brought into real distress between both, by the Heats, Animosities and Divisions, which this must needs produce.<sup>2</sup>

Notwithstanding Hog's efforts to avert strife, "a mighty stir" was made about the publishing of the Marrow, especially in Fife, so that he found himself obliged to publish, early in 1719, an Explication of Passages Excepted Against in the Marrow of Modern Divinity.<sup>3</sup> In this "explication" he deplored the treatment which its opponents had accorded the "Great and eminent Divines, . . . some of them eminent Reformers . . ." and expressed his wonder that those who attacked the Marrow should represent that as belonging to the author which came in fact from divines of great reputation. Moreover, he was surprised that the book should be so badly treated

---

1. Ibid., cxxv-cxxxvii.

2. Robert Riccaltoun, A Sober Enquiry, (1723), pp. 11-12.

3. Boston, op. cit., p. 245.

when many had told him how much benefit they had derived from  
its perusal.<sup>1</sup>

One of the first things Hog did in this pamphlet was to admit that there were some things in the Marrow which he could not approve or defend, and which he admitted to be in need of interpretation. There were such dubious teachings as these: That if our first parents had eaten of the Tree of Life, they would not have fallen; that Adam fell the same day he was created; that Melchizedek was Christ; and the classifying certain passages of Scripture as belonging to the Law while excluding them from the Gospel.<sup>2</sup> Hog admitted that the Marrow had its imperfections, but he was definitely inclined to make excuses, to minimize its more superficial statements, and to interpret it with a rather high degree of charity. One cause of embarrassment to the recommenders of the Marrow was the obvious deficiencies and flaws that could be picked out of it. Hog endeavored to take the chief points which had been objected to in the Marrow, and to show that these points were in harmony with the received and orthodox doctrines in every case. In all, he deals with nearly a score of exceptions, and in the end feels that he has demonstrated that in no vital doctrine does the Marrow lie open to the charges that were being launched against it.

The fact that so much interpretation and explication was necessary reveals not only the greatest weakness of the Marrow,

---

1. James Hog, Explication of Passages Excepted Against, (Edinburgh: Robert Brown, 1719), pp. 3-5. Hereinafter cited Explication.

2. Ibid., pp. 6, 7, 8, 21-22. Cf. Marrow 1718, pp. 13, 30-32, 35, 267.

but also another of those complicating factors in this age of the Church, namely, the hairline distinctions which different schools of thought were accustomed to make. It was the case in this period that arguments often hinged on the particular nomenclature employed by the controversialists on either side. Each system had its own vocabulary which it used in its own sense, so that any misapplication of a word might lead to serious discrepancies in the development of the position being explained or applied. If the debaters did not come to an understanding and interpretation of terms at the beginning, then rational discussion was very nearly impossible. In the Marrow disputes, writes John Macleod, "There was a good deal of cross-shooting due to misunderstanding as to the precise scheme of the Covenant in regard to which the dispute raged. For there was a variety of schemes."<sup>1</sup> Riccaltoun felt that the parties were agreed on most things and that the arguments had to do more with meanings and senses of the author of the book than with truth itself:

When the present Controversies began first to peep out, the main Question was . . . Whether the Marrow were not an erroneous Book . . . And the prime Points in Debate were only about the Sense and Meaning of the Author, while Parties seemed well enough agreed upon the Things themselves. But as the Debate came by Degrees to grow hotter, the Managers . . . began to charge one another with Unsoundness in some of their Expressions. . . . It was no wonder, if in such intricate Points some real Difference began to appear; tho' after all, I am satisfied, could they be ~~thoroughly~~ enquired into, it would appear, that where there were any such, they lay rather in different Ways of speaking the same Things, or at least, in such Things as have been allowed to pass for Problems among our best, and most judicious Divines. . . . 2

---

1. Macleod, op. cit., p. 148.

2. Riccaltoun, Sober Enquiry, pp.2-3.

Hog's Explication was not effectual in containing or suppressing the debates, for Principal Hadow had already determined by this time—March 1719—that he would avail himself of the opportunity to declare war on the Marrow when he preached the Moderatorial sermon at the opening of the Synod of Fife. Thomas M'Crie, Jr. describes Hadow as

a very different man from Hog, and is said to have retained a grudge against him ever since they had quarrelled while prosecuting their studies together in Holland. He was a worthy man, and orthodox too, in the sense of verbal adherence to the doctrines of the Westminster Confession; but one of the old Dicksonian school, one of those who, instead of wearing these doctrines about them in the graceful folds of life, seemed rather to be swathed in them as in the cerements of the dead. Coldly correct in phraseology, there was wanting in him that perception of the breadth and bearings of the gospel system which is necessary to its full and efficient exhibition, and without which nominal soundness in the form will not save from real heresy in the spirit of Christianity.<sup>1</sup>

The reference by M'Crie to the "grudge" held by Hadow against Hog has been discarded by later writers. The earliest reference to it would seem to be by John Brown of Whitburn.<sup>2</sup> C.G. M'Crie alludes to it and then rejects it on the grounds that he could not find any historical basis for the assumption that Hadow studied in Holland.<sup>3</sup> M'Crie may or may not be correct in saying that there is no historical evidence of a grudge between the two men,

---

1. Thomas M'Crie, Jr., "The Marrow Controversy", B. F. E. R., II(1853), 426.

2. John Brown, Gospel Truth, p. 483.

3. C.G. M'Crie, "Studies in Scottish Ecclesiastical Biography", B. F. E. R., XXXIII(October, 1884), 703.

but he is in error when he states that Hadow never studied in Holland. Hadow was a student there, he was at Utrecht at the same time Hog was there, and he was not a shirker when it came to taking part in discussions. John Erskine of Carnock noted in his Journal, November 28, 1685, "There was two publick disputes this day, the first defended by James Hadow, a Scotsman. . . ." <sup>1</sup> Moreover, anyone who reads Principal Hadow's contributions to the literature of the Marrow controversy may discover grounds for suspecting that there was behind his vituperative pen <sup>more</sup> than a love for truth and dogmatic conventionality. One almost senses a feeling of delight at times in Hadow's abusive attacks upon the recommender of the Marrow. Having said this much, it must be admitted that the evidence is not conclusive (though it gives grounds for suspicion) and that, in any case, the true significance of the controversy lies in considerations much more vital than any personal animosity which Hadow may have harbored from Utrecht days.

One of these considerations, aside from Hadow's motives, was the sermon above referred to, in which Hadow attacked the Marrow doctrine that assurance enters into the nature of saving faith. In the same sermon he attacked Walter Marshall's Gospel Mystery of Sanctification, a book for which Hog had the highest regard. The sermon was so well received that the Principal was asked to print it so that all could see the evil of the Marrow. <sup>2</sup> When it was published Hadow took the liberty of including, in an Appendix,

---

1. Erskine, op. cit., p. 168.

2. Synod of Fife Record, April 8, 1719; Boston, op. cit., p.245.

what purported to be selections from a new scheme of doctrine which was supposed to be in the making, and shortly to appear. This is one of the more invidious deeds in the evolution of the quarrel, as well as one which has been completely overlooked by those who have investigated the controversy. It was well known to Robert Riccaltoun, who, in discussing the circumstances which contributed to the action of the Assembly in condemning the Marrow, writes,

But there was another Thing, which, I am afraid, contributed not a little toward this Decision; there was about that Time a Report, by whom raised, or on what Views, continues yet a Secret, of a New Scheme of Divinity then a framing, and which as was then said, should very soon see the Light, consisting mainly, if not only of Refinements upon the Antinomian Scheme. This was convey'd from Hand to Hand, with the Air of a very important Secret; nor was it any wonder, if the Confidence with which this was advanced, together with the Novelty of the Thing, and the Concurrence of some Circumstances, too well known in this Church should have made considerable Impressions on, Peoples Minds.<sup>1</sup>

Just when this rumor was begun is not known, but that it was prior to Hadow's sermon at the Synod of Fife is clear inasmuch as Riccaltoun goes on to say that when Hadow's sermon did appear in print, with "that Mass of Absurdities which he has thrown into a Scheme at the End of it", many received it with absolute credit as an abstract of the whispered "new scheme", and as the real opinion of the Marrowmen. Riccaltoun thought that "one shall not be much mistaken, who looks upon the Jealousies and Misapprehensions, occasioned by this one Report, as what has, as much as any one Thing, contributed toward raising and fomenting our unhappy Differences.<sup>2</sup>

---

1. Riccaltoun, Sober Enquiry, pp. 4-5.

2. Ibid., p. 5.

The wild rumors of an antinomian scheme together with the open declaration of war on the Marrow by Principal Hadow brought the disagreement into a new phase. The Marrow controversy proper should be considered as having begun with Hadow's sermon on April 7, 1719. From that time, and continuing for some four years, there came forth a flood of polemical literature on both sides of the controversy. It was James Hog who carried the battle against Hadow and his party in the period immediately following this date. It would serve no purpose to list in detail the prints here. The entire literature of the controversy, arranged in chronological order, will be found in Appendix B of this thesis. The chief contributors to the "paper war" as it was sometimes called, were Hadow, James Adams of Kinnaird, Hugh Maxwel, and James Bannatyne on the anti-Marrow side, and Hog, Gabriel Wilson, John Williamson, and Robert Riccaltoun on the pro-Marrow side. There were also, as usual, a number of pamphleteers whose identity remained unknown.

A complaint was made against the Marrow to the 1719 General Assembly and a reference was made to the Commission of Assembly which, though conceived in general terms, was known to have the Marrow in mind.<sup>1</sup> The Assembly, in its act, directed the Commission to determine how the prohibition against the Presbytery of Auchterarder had been observed; that they make inquiry into the publishing of books and pamphlets sympathetic with that "scheme of opinions"; and that "recommenders of such books or pamphlets,

---

1. James Hog, Conference Betwixt Epaphroditus and Epaphras, (Edinburgh: Printed by Robert Brown, 1719), p. 4. Hereinafter cited Conference. Boston, op. cit., pp. 245-6.

or the errors therein contained, whether by word or print, be called before them to answer for their conduct in such recommendations. . . ." <sup>1</sup> Boston tells that a complaint made against Simson in this Assembly for violating the prohibition of the Assembly was dropped and a "motion for enquiring thereinto <sup>2</sup> repelled."

The Commission lost no time in starting to carry out its assigned task. It appointed a committee which it called "Committee for Preserving Purity of Doctrine", which in turn named a sub-committee to sit at St. Andrews to consider persons who should be called to appear before the committee, and to draw up a list of queries to be proposed to the accused ministers. The St. Andrews committee prepared excerpts out of the books and prints, and sent their remarks to the Edinburgh committee. <sup>3</sup> At length Warden of Gargunnoch, Brisbane of Stirling, Hamilton of Airth, and Hog—all non-jurants and free grace men—were called to appear before the committee at Edinburgh. When they met on April 11, 1720, these brethren were informed that they would be required to answer some questions which were to be put to them regarding books and pamphlets they had written or recommended. When they requested a list of the questions this was denied, whereupon they protested that they were being treated as guilty men before they had had opportunity to say anything in their own

---

1. Acts of Assembly, 1719. XI.

2. Boston, op. cit., pp. 245-6.

3. Boston, op. cit., p. 246; Thomas M'Crie, "Marrow", The E. C. I., XXX. 546.



behalf. Nevertheless, they agreed to give their answers in order to exonerate themselves.<sup>1</sup> Hog, the last to be called, was before the committee on April 16, and he left a manuscript narrative of the deliberations in the committee, which has been cited by several writers, one of whom is Boston. He records how Hog acknowledged his part in the publishing of the Marrow and continued to express his appreciation for it, owning "that he had received more light about some important concerns of the glorious Gospel by perusing that book, than by other human writings, which Providence had brought into his hands."<sup>2</sup> They did not take offense at Hog's admission, and Warden wrote Wodrow, "I hear they parted very friendly".<sup>3</sup> At the end of the conference, Hamilton related that "they declared that they were very much satisfied with our answers, and gave us by this to know, that they would make a favourable report, which, I hear, they accordingly did to the next Assembly. . . ."<sup>4</sup> At the time Hog and his friends left the committee it was expected that all judicial proceedings would be dropped.

When the committee of the Commission reported to the Assembly, it recounted what had transpired and that it was well pleased with what the ministers had to say on the points in question, but went on to state that there yet remained certain other positions and expressions in the writings which would require further

---

1. Thomas M'Crie, "Marrow", The E. C. I., XXX. 546

2. Boston, op. cit., p. 247.

3. Thomas M'Crie, "Marrow", The E. C. I., XXX. 547, footnote.

4. Ibid., XXX. 548.

1  
 consideration. An overture of the Committee for Preserving the Purity of Doctrine, with some extracts from The Marrow of Modern Divinity was brought in by the Committee of Overtures and laid upon the table for the perusal of members of the Assembly, and a meeting of the Committee for Overtures was appointed to consider the report and the "propositions", with the understanding that any minister of the Church might be permitted to reason on the matters before the committee.<sup>2</sup> The Commission which had appointed the original committee had never received a report from its committee.<sup>3</sup> This was on Monday, May 16, 1720.

On Wednesday the overture concerning the Marrow was debated before a committee of the whole house, where Gabriel Wilson, John Bonar, and James Hog spoke in defense of the Marrow. Hog was not a member of the Assembly, but took advantage of the opportunity afforded him by the action of the Assembly to speak to the issue.<sup>4</sup> His manuscript account of the proceedings provides the information that their argument on behalf of the Marrow was that in its general scope and substance it was sound; that it should not be condemned because a few injudicious phrases; that many sound divines were guilty of some harsh expressions at one time or another, but they were not censured for that because of their acknowledged orthodoxy; that the author should be allowed

---

1. Ibid., XXX. 549.

2. Acts of Assembly 1720, (Edinburgh: Andrew Anderson, 1720), unprinted Act; Thomas M'Crie, "Marrow", The E. C. I., XXX. 549.

3. Hog, Dialogue I, p. 108; T. M'Crie, "Marrow", The E. C. I., XXX. 549.

4. Thomas M'Crie, "Marrow", The E. C. I., XXX. 549.

to interpret his meaning in one place by his direct treatment of the same subject in another place; and that the errors charged against the book were rejected by the author in other places. After some time the committee pronounced that such latitude of explanation was not permissible and that the book taught the errors with which it was charged.<sup>1</sup>

The following day the Assembly passed, with only four dissenting votes,<sup>2</sup> an "Act Concerning the Marrow of Modern Divinity". In the Preamble to the act reference is made to the "ample Recommendation" prefixed to the condemned book and to the passages collected out of the book. These passages are then cited, under the following five heads: concerning the nature of faith; of universal atonement and pardon; holiness not necessary to salvation; fear of punishment, and hope of reward not allowed to be motives of a believer's obedience; that the believer is not under the Law as a rule of life. Six "Antinomian Paradoxes" were also listed and some harsh expressions were thrown in for good measure. The five heads of doctrine were condemned as contrary to Scripture, to the Confession, and the Catechisms.

---

1. Cited by Thomas M'Crie, Ibid., XXX. 549-50. Cf. Brown, Gospel Truth, pp. 46-9. The manuscript of Hog's referred to does not appear to be now extant. It obviously covered much the same ground as Dialogue I, which has phrases and a strain very much like Hog's. Wodrow thought the author of the Dialogue was John Williamson (Correspondence, II. 649). Agnew suggests the author was Riccaltoun. But the better bibliographical students ascribe both Dialogues to James Hog: Vide Dictionary of Anonymous and Pseudonymous English Literature and Low in Appendix to Boston, General Account, pp. 362-3. For all these reasons it seems likely that Hog was the author of the Dialogues.

2. Gabriel Wilson, John Grant of Auchinleck, Andrew Burgh of Maddertie, and Robert Willock of Echt.

The distinction of the Law as the Law of Works and the Law of Christ, on which the author defended the paradoxes, was declared to be "altogether groundless", while the selected expressions were adjudged "exceeding Harsh and offensive".<sup>1</sup>

Having made the pronouncement against the itemized errors, the Act continued,

And therefore the General Assembly do hereby strictly prohibit and discharge all the Ministers of this Church, either by preaching, writing, or printing, to recommend the said book, or in discourse to say any thing in favour of it; but on the contrary they are hereby enjoined and required to warn and exhort their people, in whose hands the said book is, or may come, not to read or use the same.<sup>2</sup>

The truth of the matter is that the Committee on Purity of Doctrine deliberately looked for and selected expressions from the Marrow which they hoped would be condemned. They produced, as John Macleod thought, "a partisan document and not a judicial report."<sup>3</sup> The Assembly itself was guilty of several irregularities in the handling of the overture which, whether deliberately calculated to do so or not, were favorable to the prosecution. Among these, for example, was the submitting of the condemnatory overture to the Committee of Overtures rather than to the Commission to which the Committee for Purity of Doctrine was responsible; the Overtures Committee transmitted the draft of the act to the Assembly and the Assembly remitted it to a

---

1. Acts of Assembly, 1720. V.

2. Loc. cit.

3. Macleod, op. cit., p. 158.

Committee of the Whole; the committee denied the defenders of the book permission to compare the citations in the act (drawn up by Hadow's committee) with the context in the Marrow; and the bringing the matter in surreptitiously to a diet of the Assembly which had been set apart for another item. It was said that those who did attempt to speak for the Marrow were "run down" by the prosecutors and that scarcely a tenth of the members of the Assembly were acquainted with the book in question, or had seen it except in the hands of others.<sup>1</sup> The Marrowmen were left in no doubt about the continuing policy of their opponents, who, swaggering with their complete majority, renewed the act instructing the Commission to appoint a committee to examine books and pamphlets, with power to call the author or recommenders.<sup>2</sup>

As if this was not sufficient affront to the friends of the Marrow, the Assembly three days later passed an "Act for preaching Catechetical Doctrine" which sounds as though it should have satisfied all concerned in its theological orthodoxy. It calls upon ministers to observe the former acts for preaching doctrine, and directs them in so doing to insist more especially upon the fundamental truths of the Standards, such as the being of God, the authority of the scriptures, the doctrine of the Trinity, the eternal deity of Jesus Christ, his satisfying divine justice, "of free justification through our blessed Surety, the Lord Jesus Christ, received by faith alone", and of the necessity of holiness

---

1. Hog, Dialogue I, pp. 108-110; Gabriel Wilson, A Letter to A Gentleman at Edinburgh, (1721), pp. 3-9. Hereinafter cited London Letter.

2. Acts of Assembly, 1720. VI and Unprinted.

for obtaining everlasting life.<sup>1</sup> The reference to "piety in practice" and the necessity of a holy life rubbed salt in the wounds of the Marrow supporters; but even more offensive to them was the exclusion (and it was no accident) of the words of the Catechism, "only for his Righteousness imputed to us", from that part of the act referring to justification. A motion was actually made for the inclusion of these words in the act at the appropriate place, but this was set aside.<sup>2</sup>

One of the clearest and most forceful of Hog's writings was his Letter To A Private Christian which was published not long after the Assembly rose. In this Letter he rejects the charge of antinomianism by showing that receiving the Law as the Law of Christ is the only sufficient means for removing hindrances to obedience, the only effective motive to obedience, and the only method for setting the believer upon a course of new obedience and continuing him in that course to the end. This is perhaps the most winsome of all the literature which came forth during the entire Marrow controversy, notwithstanding Hadow's slur to the effect that the "stile" and "superficial way of writing" disclosed the identity of the author.<sup>3</sup>

In the Fall of that same year Boston, Wilson, and Davidson were returning to their homes from the meeting of their synod. They were discussing the failure of their own efforts to initiate

---

1. Acts of Assembly, 1720. VIII.

2. Representation and Petition, (Edinburgh: 1721), pp. 19-20. Hereinafter cited Representation.

3. Hadow, Antinomianism, pp. 4-5.

procedure for getting redress from the Assembly, and it was suggested that Boston should write Hog recounting the happenings in their meeting and indicating their readiness to concur with others, to "seek redress therein, of the Assembly itself immediately." This Boston did at once.<sup>1</sup> First Ralph Erskine, and then James Hog, responded to the letter, each indicating his readiness to concur with others in "seeking redress of the injury done to truth by the Act of Assembly. . . ."<sup>2</sup> Hog and Erskine presently sent Boston a draft of a "Representation" to the Assembly which was rewritten by Boston and a copy sent to the Fife brethren. A meeting was arranged for the supporters of the Marrow, to be held at Edinburgh toward the end of February, 1721, to complete their plans.<sup>3</sup>

The meeting was held as planned in the house of William Wardrobb, an apothecary in Edinburgh, with nine ministers present. After some time in prayer it was resolved to go ahead with the Representation, further revision of which was committed to Ebenezer Erskine. Another meeting was held at the same place in the end of March, at which time there were more alterations and additions, and those present signed the Representation. It was agreed to meet again on the night of the Assembly's convening. Hog was so deeply involved in the Marrow because of his prefacing the Edinburgh edition that his friends had judged it "expedient"

---

1. Boston, op. cit., pp. 249-50. Boston's letter is reproduced in Donald Fraser's Ralph Erskine, pp. 169-70.

2. Ibid., p. 251.

3. Loc. cit.

that he refrain from the previous conferences, but he was present at the meeting in May. The unexpected appearance of some other ministers encouraged the little group, but the newcomers wanted to propose their own pet schemes and caused the meeting to degenerate into an effort at compromise in order to please them. Some alterations were made in the document and early in the morning the Representation was signed by the twelve "Representers", the other brethren lacking the courage to take open stand with these stouthearted men. Those who signed the Representation, and the other papers which were later submitted to the Commission and Assembly, were: James Hog of Carnock, Thomas Boston of Ettrick, John Bonar of Torphichen, John Williamson of Inveresk, and Musselburgh, James Kid of Queensferry, Gabriel Wilson of Maxton, Ebenezer Erskine of Portmoak, Ralph Erskine of Dunfermline, James Wardlaw of Dunfermline. Henry Davidson of Galashiels, James Bathgate of Orwell, and James Hunter of Lilliesleaf. (The names appear in this order in the printed copies of the Representation and Petition.) It is these twelve Evangelical ministers who were called variously, the "Marrowmen", the "Representers", "The Twelve", or "The Twelve Apostles". That afternoon, May 11, 1721, James Kid handed in the Representation to the Committee of Bills, thus advancing the Marrow controversy to yet another, and in many regards the bitterest, stage in its development.<sup>1</sup>

The Representation was worded in cautious, deferential language and does not leave the impression that the brethren acted

---

1. Boston, op. cit., pp. 252-255 cf. Thomas M'Crie, "Marrow" The E. C. I., XXX. 694-96.



from personal resentment or with a contumacious spirit. It expresses, in an introductory section, a strong aversion to the antinomian tenets which the Assembly had condemned, "all which our Hearts do abhor, as egregious Blasphemy" and it commends the zeal of the Assembly and of the ministers for endeavoring to stifle "such monstrous Brats in the Birth, whensoever they do really begin to appear."<sup>1</sup> On the other hand, it alludes to the proneness of depraved men to seek righteousness and salvation by the works of the Law rather than by faith; reminds the Assembly that the latter danger has to be guarded against just as much as the other, lest man frustrate the grace of God; and, concluding the prefatory remarks, says,

And since we do apprehend that the late General Assembly of this Church, has not sufficiently adverted to the Danger of that Side, but that by their Act, intituled, "Act concerning a Book intituled the Marrow of modern Divinity, dated at Edinburgh May 20 1720, Gospel truth has suffered, and it is likely, will suffer more in the rising and succeeding Generations, unless a Remedy be timely provided. We beg leave with all Humility and Deference, to lay before this venerable Assembly, some (of the many) Things which in the said Act are stumbling to us and many others in this Church.<sup>2</sup>

In the body of the paper it is denied that the Marrow is inconsistent with the Confession or scriptures, as accused in the act. Where, by shrewd omission in the said act, the Marrow was misrepresented, explanations and references to the context are made. In general, the Representation places the scope of the book in a much better light than the Committee on Purity of

---

1. Representation, p. 4.

2. Ibid., p. 5.

Doctrine and the Fifth Act had allowed. A reply is given to each of the main heads of the Fifth Act and also an expression of their grievance at the Eighth Act, which they stated served only to confirm their fears that religion was being turned into "meer Morality". They regarded the action of the Assembly more as an "oversight" than as an overt act against truth, and hoped that such action would be taken as would bring an end to the dangers they feared. That is, they petitioned that the condemnatory act be rescinded and the "Act for Preaching Catechetical Doctrine" amended to include their suggestions.<sup>1</sup>

The Marrowmen had given their paper a soft name, but it was much more a remonstrance and a complaint than it was a Representation and Petition. Wodrow and others caught the sting in the paper and thought that some of its expressions inferred a censure of the Assembly.<sup>2</sup>

The Representation was read before the Committee of Bills and transmitted to the Assembly. Without reading it before the body,<sup>3</sup> the Representation was referred to the Commission of the Assembly. The reason for this unexpected turn of events was that the Royal Commissioner, the Earl of Rothes, had become seriously ill and it was thought advisable to adjourn the Assembly and refer its work to the Commission.<sup>4</sup> This came as a blow to the hopes of the

---

1. Ibid., passim.

2. Wodrow, Correspondence, II. 581 cf. Thomas M'Crie, "Marrow" The E. C. I., XXX. 811.

3. Boston, op. cit., p. 255; Acts of Assembly, 1721. IV.

4. Wodrow, Correspondence, II. 582; John Warrick, The Moderators of the Church of Scotland, (Edinburgh: Oliphant, Anderson and Ferrier, 1913), p. 270.

Representers since the Moderator of that Assembly was Thomas Black, one who was known to be of "pronounced evangelical sympathies",<sup>1</sup> and an associate of one of the representing brethren. Pressure had also been brought to bear on this Assembly by the King in his letter to the Assembly, in which he expressed the hope that the Assembly would "guard against all Matters of Contention, since you cannot but foresee the many unhappy Consequences with which Division among you may be attended."<sup>2</sup> This Royal hint was quickly forgotten by the Commission under the goading of Principal Hadow, and the Church was deprived of an opportunity to rescue itself from the bitter strife which was certain to follow the course upon which Hadow was embarked.

The day following the adjournment of the Assembly the Representers attended the Commission. Their paper was read and James Hog spoke briefly in its defense. Then the opposition took the floor. For three hours, and thirteen or more speeches, they attacked the Representation and its supporters. Mitchell, Hamilton, Hadow, Blackwell, Logan, Hart, Millar, and even Warden were some of the censurers.<sup>3</sup> In addition to attacking the book,

It was observed, that they themselves did not approve of the book in many of its expressions; that the attack they had made upon the truth, and the authority of the Assembly, looked ill, and seemed to flow from the regard they had to one of their number, Mr Hog, his recommending that book, and by such a paper they went about to distinguish themselves, and form a party in the Church. . . ."4

---

1. Warrick, op. cit., p. 270.

2. Acts of Assembly, 1721. II.

3. Wodrow, Correspondence, II. 583-4; Hog, Dialogue I. pp. 137, 145; Boston, op. cit., p. 255; Thomas M'Crie, "Marrow", The E. C. I., XXX. 812.

4. Wodrow, Correspondence, II. 585; 597.

Wodrow took pleasure in this flood of oratorical denunciation, but Thomas Boston reflected sadly that he and his friends "were run down, and the audience imprest."<sup>1</sup> The discussion continued for some days and ended with the appointment of a sub-committee to frame an overture "for vindicating the Assembly, and stating the doctrine of this Church as to the believer being free from the covenant of works, and the doctrine of Christ's Suretyship. . . ." <sup>2</sup> The twelve brethren were warned to be present at the August meeting. When August came the accused were there, though they were not called before the Commission for three days. When they did appear they were informed that an overture had been passed and transmitted to the Assembly—yet they had never been heard upon any point in the overture.<sup>3</sup> It was this overture, with some alterations made later, which afterwards was embodied in the Act of Assembly 1722 which terminated the process.<sup>4</sup> Other measures were being contemplated, but the Marrowmen were kept in ignorance of this. The Committee on Purity of Doctrine was to meet in September and the Representatives were ordered to be ready for another meeting of the Commission in November.

When the committee met in September it drew up a series of queries relating to the points of the Representation and framed so as to give grounds for counter-charges against the Representatives. There were, interestingly enough, exactly twelve queries, and it

---

1. Boston, op. cit., p. 255.

2. Wodrow, Correspondence, II. 585.

3. Hog, Dialogue I, pp. 144-45; Boston, op. cit., p. 256.

4. Thomas M'Crie, "Marrow", The E. C. I., XXX. 813.

is generally admitted that they were based on Hadow's Antinomianism of the Marrow, a book which had greeted the public in July, 1721.<sup>1</sup> Riccaltoun adds to this that Hadow's book was also the "Standard" by which the answers to the queries were judged.<sup>2</sup> Hog and his allies received the queries with a protest against such a precedent, stating that they did not consider themselves obliged to answer them, but that for the sake of truth, and because they were not ashamed for their sentiments to be known, they would give in their answers to the Commission in March, 1722.<sup>3</sup>

The answers were begun by Ebenezer Erskine, but revised and enlarged by Gabriel Wilson, who was the possessor of a large library.<sup>4</sup> From the evidence available it is impossible to tell whether Hog and the majority of the other brethren shared any real part in the drawing up of these answers, except possibly in their conferences, in letters, and in the final revising of the answers which took place immediately before they were given in. However, they are indubitably an expression of those things which were most surely believed by each and all of the Representers.

The questions had been addressed to "Mr. James Hog, and other Ministers, who gave in a Representation in Favours of the Marrow,

1. Thomas M'Crie, "Marrow", The E. C. I., XXX. 815; cf. Gabriel Wilson, The Trust, (Kilmarnock: Peter M'Arthur, 1781), iv, Queries to the Friendly Adviser, (1722), p. 35.

2. Riccaltoun, Sober Enquiry, p. 10.

3. "Paper Given In to the Commission", November 9, 1721. This is bound with the Answers to the Queries. Cf. Boston, op. cit., pp. 258-59.

4. Boston, op. cit., p. 260.

to the General Assembly 1721." At the beginning of their Answers, it was made clear that this title (which was also prefixed to the Commission's Overture) gave a "wrong Colour" to the Representation, as if though it was their chief design to plead for a book rather than for the truths of the gospel. They again declared their esteem of the Marrow as useful and edifying, while also asserting that it was not, nor had it ever been, their intention to hold it up as an infallible book.<sup>1</sup> They supported their answers in a bibliographical appendix in which more than seventy divines, British and foreign, and numerous Confessional statements are cited.<sup>2</sup> This appendix was also given in to the Commission along with their answers to the queries. Having given in their answers the Representers ended their paper by stating that they still<sup>3</sup> adhered to their Representation and Petition in all points.

A sub-committee previously appointed took the answers under consideration and when the Commission met on May 8, 1722, their remarks and the answers were taken up. Eventually the remarks of the sub-committee were reduced to a size and form which permitted them to be incorporated into the overture agreed upon the previous August, and this was to be submitted to the Assembly.

Before proceeding to the account of the final disposition of the Marrow case by the 1722 Assembly, it will be revealing to take note of some of the efforts made by the Evangelicals to defend themselves against the misrepresentations ascribed to them and also to show the arbitrary methods used to quash them.

---

1. Queries and Answers, (1722), p. 10.

2. Ibid., pp. 87-120.

3. Ibid., p. 85.

Following the action of the General Assembly in 1720, the dutiful ministers launched a new war against the heretical book. One divine is said to have spent several Sabbaths exhibiting the many errors of the Marrow and warning his people to beware of the book. This, and similar assaults, had a somewhat unusual result, as described by Gabriel Wilson with unusual jocularity:

Now this happening e're his People had either seen or heard of the Marrow, they were mightily alarmed, and had much discourse among themselves on that Subject; but cou'd not agree upon the true Name: Some aleged it was the 'Marrow of Morality', But they were corrected by others who told 'em, it was the 'Mother of Divinity' . . . scarce two of 'em agreeing on the same Title: However, they were all of 'em very desirous to see the Book.<sup>1</sup>

Some clergymen carried the Act of Assembly from house to house, pointing out to their good people the errors classified in that act. Some spent their time "preaching up Holiness" as the condition of the covenant of grace. One went so far as to say that believing was almost "meritorious", another cautioned his flock not to "make a Plaister of Free-grace to heal their Sores";<sup>2</sup> and others declared believers were under the covenant of works! Later the Representers were "run down publicly, as a Set of Men that had cashier'd the Ten Commandments, and had espoused Antinomian Principles", and Principal Hadow's Antinomianism of the Marrow

---

1. Gabriel Wilson, London Letter, p. 31; cf. John Brown, Gospel Truth, p. 11.

2. Loc. cit.

1

was "exalted to the Skies".

Riccaltoun refers to the discovery of many "new abominations" in the Marrow by those who were going over the book with a fine-toothed comb. Those who disagreed with these findings were accused of violating their consciences, or of being secret antinomians, and "accordingly, every Thing they say, or do, must be narrowly pried into, and every Expression weigh'd, with the utmost Scrupulosity, lest there should be some latent Poison in it. . . ."

Principal Hadow was at great pains in his Antinomianism of the Marrow to play upon the prejudices and fears of the Scottish people against schism and Independents. He charged that the author of the Marrow was a tool of the Independents, was a minister in a separating, or Independent, congregation, and that he was an opponent of Presbyterian government. Hadow also cast aspersions upon the author as a barber who had taken it upon himself to preach and write when he was obviously not qualified.

D. M. McIntyre, who, as has been said, ascribes the authorship of the book to Fisher the barber, concludes that it is "impossible" to see in Fisher a tool of any party, since even those who hotly opposed his tenets were willing to do honor to him as a man. He also refers to a statement of Fisher that he was a member of a Presbyterian Church in which Sir Henry Rolles served as a "ruling elder".

---

1. Sober Verity, (1722), p. 51.

2. Riccaltoun, Sober Enquiry, p. 10.

3. Hadow, Antinomianism, pp. 9-12; McIntyre, "First Strictures on 'The Marrow'", Evangelical Quarterly, X. 64.

4. McIntyre, Ibid., X. 64-5; C.G. M'Crie, "Studies in Scottish Ecclesiastical Biography", B. F. E. R., XXXIII(1884), 701.



In his Politick Disputant, or "Choice Instructions for Quashing a Stubborn Adversary, Gathered from, and exemplified in, the Learned Principal Hadow's Conduct in His late Appearances against The Marrow of Modern Divinity, and its Friends;" Robert Riccaltoun puts his finger on the guiding principles of the Principal, one of which applies to these two charges of "antinomianism" and "Independentism": "You must take care to provide some frightful and odious name for your adversary, made so either by being affixed to some abominable Heresie, or carrying in it some what Harsh and shocking to the Generality of Readers."<sup>1</sup>

One of the major complaints of Hog and the Representers was that they were accused by their opponents as seeking only to stand up for a book, when it was really their concern for truth that motivated them. James Hog explains that every way they turned,

This . . . hath . . . been the Turn they have given our Representation; . . . This, we find to be the Common Cant in all the Attacks we meet with from Ministers or others without Doors: This is the Notion that is inculcated upon People with the greatest Care [and] with such Success that they have not another Notion of our Appearance in this Cause, but a keen struggling for the Support of that Book; and Endeavours are used to make People believe we set up for it, as if it were a Standard, or a Confession of our Faith.<sup>2</sup>

While the Marrowmen were not defending The Marrow of Modern Divinity to save their own pride, they felt that they had a right to complain when the book was condemned, not in its true teaching, but according to a sense which the Committee on Purity of Doctrine had fixed upon it, completely disregarding the actual distinctions

---

1. Robert Riccaltoun, The Politick Disputant, (Edinburgh:1722), p.12.

2. Hog, Dialogue I, pp. 137-138.

made in the book.<sup>1</sup> Riccaltoun has a lengthy section in his Politick Disputant<sup>2</sup> devoted to illustrations of this principle. Hog recalled how Rutherford, in Spiritual AntiChrist, had given twelve rules which he (Rutherford) used in interpreting certain harsh passages in the Reformer. Having illustrated Rutherford's method of interpretation by long citations of Luther's harsh statements,<sup>3</sup> Hog made his point forcefully:

These Expressions, (many of which, I do acknowledge sound Harsh) the holy Rutherford candidly Constructs and Interprets according to Luther's known Sentiments, and agreeably unto his Scope: He does not run them down with hard Words, and Uncharitable Constructions, as some do these Harsh Expressions quoted from him in The Marrow.<sup>4</sup>

The appearance of the Representation gave their prosecutors another opportunity to disparage the Marrowmen. It was now charged that the brethren were defying the authority of the Church and that they were dishonoring its highest Court.<sup>5</sup> Riccaltoun said that the "Magisterial Briskness" evident in Principal Hadow's book was

- 
1. James Hog, Dialogue II, (1722), pp. 36-9.
  2. Riccaltoun, Politick Disputant, pp. 25-38 cf. Sober Inquiry, pp. 78-79.
  3. Hog, Dialogue I, pp. 85-102.
  4. Ibid., p. 102.
  5. A Friendly Advice for Preserving the Purity of Doctrine, (Edinburgh: John Mossman, 1722), pp. 2, 8, 131, et passim; Some Observations Upon the Answers of the Brethren, (Edinburgh: Printed for John Paton and John Martin, 1722), Preface; James Hadow, Antinomianism, Preface; pp. 5, 8, 15, 95, 98, et passim; Riccaltoun, Sober Inquiry, pp. 8-9; Hog, Dialogue I, pp. 52, 74, 76.

the new Character he has assumed, and the Confidence he has, That now He's appearing for the Assembly's Act, and embark'd upon the same Bottom; that none can open his Mouth against him without impeaching the Assembly: It's this gives him these pompous Airs, and that Authority he assumes to alter at once the Names and Natures of Things: To call Quibbles Demonstrations, and Orthodox Scripture Doctrine, "Antinomian" Heresie; to pose the Vindicator [James Hog] with very Trifles, and aw him from answering, with the Church's Authority.<sup>1</sup>

It was all too evident that obedience to the General Assembly on the grounds of its absolute authority smacked<sup>of</sup> a popish despotism. The very words of the condemnatory Act of 1720 forbidding anyone to say "any thing" in favor of the Marrow or to read it, demanded an implicit faith in itself, as Hog was careful to suggest to his readers.<sup>2</sup> However, there appears to have been another evil far more exceptionable than, though akin to, this. In his "London Letter" Gabriel Wilson reflects on the "ill-savour'd Mints" which were being made to "restrain the Liberty of the Press," which he denounced as a thing "too odious to all, who have any Value for either Religion or Liberty."<sup>3</sup> The same charge is repeated in a different vein later in the controversy. At the end of the Protestation given in by the Marrowmen in 1722, and later printed as a testimony to their conduct, there appears the following "Advertisement":

---

1. Riccaltoun, Politick Disputant, p. 15.

2. Hog, Dialogue I, pp 140-141; cf. Wilson, London Letter, p. 30; Sober Verity, pp. 7-10.

3. Wilson, London Letter, p. 30.

N. B. Here the Publisher, in the Name of all Printers and Booksellers, desires the Members of the Committee for Purity of Doctrine, or the next General Assembly, That in their printed Acts they would give us a List of all these Books that should be printed, sold, and bought without Danger. . . .<sup>1</sup>

Such were some of the activities which went on at the peak of the Marrow controversy. Such were the flagrant and offensive measures by which the "Hardownians" protected themselves and sought to override the defensive attempts of the representing ministers. It is a part of the story which has been by-passed, possibly even denied, but which is written down in black and white for all who have eyes to see.

It is not difficult to imagine the wave of tension and expectation which built up as the time for the 1722 Assembly to meet approached. Neither is it surprising that there had also developed differences of opinion with<sup>in</sup> the Anti-Marrow forces regarding the proper action to be taken, or the method of procedure to be followed. Some were for the simple repeal of the Fifth Act; some were for a modification of it; and many were extremely dissatisfied with the high-handedness of the managers and fearful that there would be a schism if the Assembly persisted in following the course laid out for it by the Committee on Purity of Doctrine and the Commission. . . . Lengthy debates were held in the Assembly concerning the procedure. At length the papers in the Report of the Committee for Purity of Doctrine and of the Commission were ordered to be read in the Assembly, an action which was considered

---

1. The Protestation of Several Ministers, (1722), p. 16. Hereinafter cited Protestation.

1

unfavorable to the Marrowmen.

Following the reading of the Reports, which were now in the form of an overture, they were remitted, along with the Representation and Petition, to the Committee of Overtures. A meeting was set at which all other members of the Assembly could speak, and the subscribers of the Representation were directed to be present.<sup>2</sup> Again there was a lengthy debate as to whether the Representers should be heard; it was agreed that such permission should be granted. They were not permitted to reply to the overture, however, and they could only protest against the juridical handling of their case by the Commission. Next the affair was committed to a sub-committee of some eighteen ministers and elders, among whom were their chief antagonists. This committee met and while some, like Allan Logan, sought moderation; and while the Representers were heard at length; yet the committee reverted to the posing of questions to the Marrowmen, who, profiting from their previous encounters, refused to answer save in the words of the Standards! Several sessions were taken up in preparing the papers for final presentation, and on May 21, 1722, the Assembly passed its "Act concerning Doctrine, Confirming and Explaining the Acts Fifth and Eighth of the General Assembly Anno 1720."<sup>3</sup>

---

1. Thomas M'Crie, "Marrow", The E. C. I., pp. 821-22; Acts of Assembly 1722, (Edinburgh: Andrew Anderson, 1722) Unprinted Act of May 15, 1722.

2. Acts of Assembly 1722, (Edinburgh: Andrew Anderson 1722), Unprinted Act, May 16, 1722.

3. Wodrow, Correspondence, II. 646-7; 649; 651-53; Boston, op. cit., p. 260; T. M'Crie, "Marrow", The E. C. I., XXX. 821-24.

This act, fourteen pages long in the printed Assembly minutes, ordained that the Marrowmen assent to the Confession of Faith and Catechisms in certain specific terms, as defined in the act. It further prohibited dissemination of the Marrow "errors" under pain of the censure of the Church, called on the courts of the Church where the Representers resided to take measures to see that their instructions were observed; refused to repeal the Fifth and Eighth Acts 1720; and appointed their Moderator to admonish the offending brethren.<sup>1</sup> Rejecting as "foul reproaches" and "injurious and undutiful aspersions" the the statements made in the Representation, the act justified and vindicated the actions of the Assembly; asserted the orthodox position maintained on certain disputed points by direct citations from the Standards; and demonstrated that the intentions of the Assembly in their previous acts had been solely to preserve the endangered doctrines from errors contained in the Marrow, which passages were "condemned only in so far as they import the said erroneous opinions. . . ." <sup>2</sup> But any student of this controversy will readily ascertain that in exonerating their actions against the Representers and the Marrow, the Assembly continued to force the Marrow and its friends to say what was clearly denied in their Representation and Answers, as well as in their individual writings; or, on the other hand, the Assembly asserted the same doctrine which Hog and the other brethren asserted, but made it appear that the tenets were really denied by the Marrowmen.

---

1. Acts of Assembly, 1722. VII.

2. Loc. cit.

The perspicacious Boston foresaw the outcome of the matter and brought with him to the Assembly <sup>1</sup> a protestation which the eleven brethren (Bonar had been unable to appear) subscribed and laid on the table. The protest reaffirmed their loyalty to the Standards and their judgment of the condemnatory Act 1720 as contrary to both scripture and Confession, and declared,

We dare not, any manner of Way, no not by Silence, consent unto, or approve of them, nor the Acts of this Assembly relative thereunto: And that it shall be lawful for us, agreeable to the Word of God, and Standards . . . to adhere, to profess, preach, and still bear Testimony unto the Truths condemned, or otherways injured by the said Acts of Assembly; notwithstanding of the said Acts, or whatsoever shall follow thereupon.<sup>2</sup>

Although a guinea of "instrument-money" was given in with the protestation it was utterly disregarded by the Assembly which neither read it nor alluded to it in their records. <sup>3</sup> There was some uncertainty concerning the immediate results of the Assembly's treatment of this protest, some apparently feeling that the Marrowmen would take further steps. But nothing did happen to further cloud the picture, for they had left their testimony for future generations to see, which was all that they intended, this exonerating their consciences.

It is interesting to note that within the space of a few months

---

1. Boston, op. cit., p. 260.

2. Protestation, pp. 5-6.

3. The Sober Verity, pp. 6-7; Boston, op. cit., p. 260  
Ralph Erskine, Faith No Fancy, (Edinburgh: Printed for William Gray, 1745), Appendix, p. 28; Wodrow, Correspondence II. 653-54.

it was being confidently affirmed that no protest had been lodged by the brethren!<sup>1</sup> The publication of the Protestation by a friend of the Marrowmen effectively squashed that rumour at the time, but some two decades later Willison of Dundee was declaring that the Representers "'did not openly complain'" against the Act 1722.<sup>2</sup> Ralph Erskine produced the evidence which refuted the charge.<sup>3</sup> H. F. Henderson takes it for granted that it was the contemptible treatment of the Protestation by the Assembly managers which really touched off the bitter feud between the "High-Flyers" and the "Moderates", finally ending in the Secession.<sup>3</sup> In reality this is only a theory, and a very poor and inaccurate one at that, for the truth is that while the Marrowmen may at the moment have been vexed, and their pride hurt, it was better for them and better for the Church that there should be no more debating the issues in the Assembly. ~~The only course~~ The only course left to the Assembly in case they had taken up the Protestation would have been some sentence to enforce their act, and this would have split the Church asunder. As it was, the controversy was concluded without a single deposition and ran its course in the lower courts.

While the General Assembly had been occupied with these matters which have been detailed, the lower courts of the Church were embroiled in the polemics.

---

1. The Sober Verity, p. 7.

2. Ralph Erskine, Faith No Fancy, Appendix, p. 28.

3. H. F. Henderson, The Religious Controversies of Scotland (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1905), pp. 32-34. Hereinafter cited, Religious Controversies.



Gabriel Wilson of Maxton preached a sermon before the Synod of Merse and Teviotdale in 1721, published under the title of The Trust, with which some of the presbyters found fault. A process was begun against him which lasted for nearly two years, being resolved by the General Assembly. Boston says the sermon was "before four Synods, as many committees of the Synod, before the commission, and at length came before the General Assembly. . . . It may easily be guessed, what a toss . . . these affairs . . . would occasion."<sup>1</sup> In the decision the Assembly referred to its action in 1722 and prohibited Wilson from teaching in any way any of the condemned points, though he had denied the propositions with which he was charged.<sup>2</sup>

At Gladsmuir, where there was a minister sympathetic to the Marrowmen, it was said that there were many writers taking down the sermons for Professor Hamilton.<sup>3</sup> The Synod of Fife had its "secretaries", too, and Bathgate, Ebenezer Erskine, and Ralph Erskine were before the Synod for publicly recommending the Marrow, for aspersions cast on the Assembly act, and for expressions said to favor the Marrow doctrine.<sup>4</sup> Thomas Boston complained that he had had some expectation of moving from Ettrick until he fell under the Church's "displeasure in the affair of the Marrow, which I reckon to have staked me down in it."<sup>5</sup> For the same reason, Ebenezer

---

1. Boston, op. cit., pp. 257-58.

2. Acts of Assembly, 1723, XI; cf. Thomas M'Crie, "Marrow", The E. C. I., New Series, I. 78-82.

3. Thomas M'Crie, "Marrow", The E. C. I., New Series, I. 75.

4. Synod of Fife Records, September 28. 1721.

5. Boston, op. cit., p. 229.

Erskine's name was not permitted to be put on the list at an election in Kirkaldy,<sup>c</sup> and his translation to that parish was prevented after it had been brought before the Assembly.<sup>1</sup> Ralph Erskine tells how when any student or candidate was supposed to be "tinctured with the Marrow", no quarter was given: "Queries upon queries were formed to discourage them, and stop their way, either of being entered upon trials, or ordained unto churches; while those that were of the most loose and corrupt principles were universally most savoured and furthered."<sup>2</sup> The truth of this statement is adequately substantiated by the case of several candidates or ministers, but particularly of Francis Craig.<sup>3</sup> After being approved by the Presbytery of Dunfermline and called by the Parish of Kinross, this young man's settlement was arrested by aspersions cast upon him by members within St. Andrews Presbytery. In direct contravention of the Act of Assembly forbidding any Presbytery to require a subscription other than that ordered by the Assembly, it was ordained that Craig, being suspected on some of the points of the Marrow, should answer some queries. The queries, twenty in number, were prepared under the auspices of the Synod, and Craig was required to give in his written answers the same day he received them. This he did. His answers show his intellectual acumen, his desire to avert trouble, and a healthy piety. But he had declined to answer this question: "Do you approve of the acts of Assembly respecting the Marrow?"

- 
1. Thomas M'Crie, "Marrow," The E. C. I., New Series, I. 86.
  2. Ralph Erskine, Faith No Fancy, Appendix, p. 31.
  3. Supra, p. 119.

Though several ministers urged the dropping of the question and Craig humbly requested to be excused from replying, assuring the Synod that he admitted the particular acts were the Acts of the Assembly and that he had no intention of challenging them or even talking about the matter. But nothing would do except that the question be answered. Craig offered it as his opinion that if the Assembly had acted with less haste and considered the Representation, the affair might have been worked out in a way which would have conduced to the peace of the Church. He admitted that his sympathy lay with the Marrowmen, with whom he was willing to stand or fall. The die was then and there cast, and although the parish and Dunfermline Presbytery sought to pursue the call the Synod laid it aside on the grounds that Craig's answers to the queries were not satisfactory and that the changed situation in the parish made it expedient that Craig's call be dropped. An appeal and protests to the Assembly were, of course, unavailing.<sup>1</sup>

Some of these cases are much better known than that of James Hog, but no single individual took more abuse, scorn, derision, and misrepresentation than he at the hands of his antagonists. Hog had replied to Principal Hadow's sermon in his Conference, in which he reiterated that he did not defend the Marrow en toto, frankly admitting that it might be at fault in several expressions, but at the same time defending the book against what he judged to be unjust reproaches.

---

1. Synod of Fife Record, April 2, October 1, 1729; Dunfermline Presbytery Minutes, April 23, 1729; Thomas M'Crie, "Marrow", The E. C. I., New Series, I. 88-92.

James Adams of Kinnaird had already published his Snake in The Grass, which was full of invective against Hog for recommending a book

so visibly stuffed, with Errors, and erroneous Insinuations that i'm fully perswaded, those Excellent Ones of the Earth, who were so pressing upon the Publisher for a new Edition of it, had shown themselves much more Wisdom's Children, by letting it ly among the Rubbish of Sectarian Writings; than by the reviving of it. . . .<sup>1</sup>

He wondered whether "ever the Spirit of Truth would send Men of Learning and Piety, to the most dark, divided, and perplex<sup>2</sup> Period of the Church, for Light?" The whole was full of the same kind of sarcasm, couched in the very words of Hog's Preface to the Marrow.

In due time Principal Hadow replied to Hog's Conference. Some of this pamphlet is serious writing, but Hadow spent much ink in such sallies as this:

You have placed Principal Hadow's Name in the Frontispice of your Pamphlet, that in solemnizing the Victory you have obtained over him, he might be led a Chain'd Captive, before your triumphant Chariot: But the Concealment of your Name having deprived you of the publick Honour that is due to your Merit, you satisfie your self with the secret Pleasure of having touted your Adversary: And therefore will not grudge that a Monitor whisper in your Ear, 'Respice post te, Hominem mementote',<sup>3</sup>

---

1. Adams, The Snake, p. iv.

2. Ibid., pp. iv-v.

3. James Hadow, Review of A Conference Between Epaphroditus and Epaphras, (Edinburgh: John Mosman, 1719) p. 4, et passim. Hereinafter cited Review.

The ugliest attack against Hog came in a second pamphlet from James Adams. Adams trampled Hog's Explication under his contemptuous foot, ridiculed his "Letters" and "circular Missives", accused him of being "visibly embarked in a Project for dividing and inflaming his Mother-Church", charged that the Marrow "to my certain Knowledge, is put into several Peoples Hands, as containing a more clear Discovery of Gospel-Truth" than the Standards, and defied any man of common sense to read the Preface to the Marrow without perceiving that Hog "designed it, as an Improvement upon the received Doctrine of the Church."<sup>1</sup> He closed this bitter piece with a list of over twenty queries directed to Hog, some of which must be cited for the light they may shed on the controversy, as well as to show the insults Hog had to endure.

Q. 3. Whether the Testimony of a few well meaning Women and Tradesmen, in Favours of this Book, be equal to the Declarations of the whole Judicatories of the Church against it. Or in short, Whether common Laicks or Divines, best understand Matters of Controversy? . . . Q. 7. Whether a new Edition of the Prefacer's own Works in a clear, distinct and intelligible Stile, had not been as necessary, and as a probable Mean for advancing true Religion? . . . Q. 9. Whether keeping by the Scriptures, Confession of Faith, and Directory, be not as Probable a Mean for preserving Orthodox Principles, as going back to Cromwel's Time, for making up a new Creed? . . . Q. 17. Whether the publishing and recommending this Book so warmly, be not in good Earnest, to toss poor Christians betwixt the received Doctrine of the Church, and a new Scheme? . . . Q. 21. Whether the Prefacer ever subscribed the Confession of Faith and Directory? . . . Q. 22. Whether his conscience, upon serious Reflection can tell him, he has answered these Solemn Vows and Engagements he came under at his Ordination, particularly, that through the Tract of his Ministry, he has followed no divisive Course? <sup>2</sup>

---

1. James Adams, The Cromwelian Ghost Conjured (Edinburgh: 1720), pp. 6-16 et passim. Hereinafter cited The Ghost.

2. Ibid., pp. 85-88

Meanwhile, the Synod had instituted a process against Hog which was destined to drag on for nearly fourteen years, ending less than a year before his death.

Shortly after the 1719 General Assembly rose, Hog disowned the "Scheme" affixed to Principal Hadow's sermon, and challenged him and others of like mind to form a libel against the pretended antinomians and prosecute them in the prescribed manner. He declared, "For my own part I am not acquainted with any Antinomian Minister of our Communion, and do very freely declare that no Man who owns these Abominations ought to be a Minister."<sup>1</sup> Hadow accepted the challenge and proceeded to pursue Hog with methods which smacked of the Inquisition.<sup>2</sup>

It all began officially with the following Act:

It being noted in the Synod that there is a pamphlet published in print Intituled A Vindication of the Doctrine of free Grace from the charge of Antinomianism which seems to import as if some ministers of this Church have been guilty of Branding the doctrine of free grace with the odious name of Anti-nomianism, which pamphlet being called for, and a part thereof read, and the Synod finding that it is I. H. and that it is generally reported that the Reverend James Hog . . . is the Author thereof. They do hereby appoint the . . . Presbyterie of Dunfermline to inquire of him if he be the author of the said pamphlet, and that if he own the same, he be required to condescend upon any minister of this Church, of whom he has ground to say, That they charge the Doctrine of free grace with Antinomianism, that the Synod may proceed, to censure them if convicted, and in their bounds, according to the dement of a fault so hainous and Scandalous . . . and that the presbyterie report their diligence therein to the next Synod.<sup>3</sup>

---

1. James Hog, Conference, p. 40; cf. Letter Detecting Errors in The Snake in the Grass (Edinburgh: Robert Brown, 1719), p. 16. Hereinafter cited, Errors in the Snake.

2. James Hadow, Review p. 67.

3. Synod of Fife Records, October 1, 1719.

The shape of things to come was revealed in the action of the Synod concerning the second part of the Marrow which it was rumored was about to be reprinted. The Synod warned the Presbytery of Dunfermline "to take care that none of their members publish or recommend" that book and directed their Clerk to inform the Commission of the Assembly that

it is their earnest desire they may be pleased they may take the most proper and effectual measures for preventing the reprinting the Marrow of Modern Divinitie or any part thereof, and that no encouragement be given thereto . . . by recommendation, Subscription or any other way whatsoever. . . . 1

When the Synod met in April, 1720, the Presbytery of Dunfermline reported by means of a letter from Hog, in which he declined to answer the Synod's query, "in regard it imports the design of ane Ecclesiastical prosecution."<sup>2</sup> At the same time Hog declared,

In so far as gospel ministers who preach sincerlie the doctrine of free grace, are on that head, or because of the doctrine they preach, charged with antinomianism, and other Errors, He thinks the doctrine of grace doeth accordingly suffer, and ought to be cleared, and that ministers of this church, who have subscribed the Confession of Faith, are challenged as savourers of such errors, is notoriously known, being published to the World. Hence untill the persons pretendedly guilty be condescended upon and the charge formed and presented, he desires to be excused from giving any further answers.<sup>3</sup>

Five of the Marrowmen (Hog, the two Erskines, Bathgate, and Wardlaw) were members of the Synod of Fife, along with some of their

---

1. Loc. cit.

2. Ibid., April 7, 1720.

3. Loc. cit.

chief antagonists, Hadow, Logan, and Alexander Anderson. The Synod resolved scrupulously to observe the Fifth Act 1720, and did so well that Gabriel Wilson certainly had them in mind when he wrote, "They zealously . . . set about the Observance of it, many even to Superconformity: For in every Church . . . there are, I understand Supraconformists; who in their full Career drive a great Way beyond the Rules of the Church. . . ." <sup>1</sup> All its ministers were enjoined to be on guard against any innovations in doctrine or expressions, and to give public testimony against such evils. <sup>2</sup> In addition all the ministers of the Synod were appointed to subscribe the Confession of Faith and the Formula 1711 as a means of "documenting their zeal for and adherence to the Doctrine, <sup>3</sup> Worship, Discipline, and Government of the Church of Scotland." The subscribing of the Confession was understood to be tantamount to declaring agreement and submission to the Fifth Act 1720, so that Hog and the other Representers had to make a "declaration" to the Synod to clear their position: They declared that they had no hesitation in signing the Confession in its own sense as received by the Assembly 1647, as well as the Formula 1711, and they offered to do both if the Synod would allow them the "common justice of having this marked in the minutes that our Signing and Subscribing at this time is not to be constructed as homologating of the 5th Act of Assembly 1720 as we apprehend <sup>4</sup> to have been designed by this late act of the Synod of Fife."

---

1. Wilson, London Letter, p. 30.

2. Synod of Fife Records, September 28, 1721.

3. Loc. cit.

4. Ibid., April 5, 1722.



Their request was refused and the matter referred to the General Assembly.

At this same meeting of the Synod it was inquired of Hog whether he was the author of five pamphlets--Vindication, Letter Concerning the Auchterarder Affair, Review of a Conference, The Covenants of Redemption and Grace Displayed, and Otia Christiana. When Hog refused to answer a committee headed by Hadow was appointed and dutifully reported Hog censureable. They demanded that he give direct answers, but Hog gave in a paper in which he gave his reasons for refusing to answer: The Synod had declared "their form'd design of ane ecclesiasticall prosecution" in case he admitted the authorship of the pamphlets and he was obliged "not to be mine own accuser which Principle is a refuge to the Innocent"; he could not make his own case a precedent to bring others into danger who might be suspected as authors; and he was doing no more than the Lord Jesus himself in declining to answer. Moreover these same matters had been before the Committee for Purity of Doctrine and he had replied to their satisfaction. The paper ended with a very interesting request:

With all due respect to the Reverend Synod I humbly suggest that in regard the Reverend principle Hadow has annexed a Scheme of Principles to his Synodical Sermon . . . and ascribes them to a set of Ministers of the Communion of this Church of whom I have cause to reckon my self one. I humbly move that the Reverend Synod may act ane impartiall part in oblidging him to form and instruct his Libell.<sup>1</sup>

It will come as no surprise that the Synod took no action on Hog's motion, but continued their inquisitorial methods until they at length

---

1. Loc. cit.

compelled him to admit that he was author of all the pamphlets.<sup>1</sup>

Continuing their concentration upon the Carnock minister, the Synod addressed a set of queries to him which bore upon the burning issues of the day, to which Hog gave his replies.<sup>2</sup> These answers will be included in that part of this chapter which relates to the presentation of the theological position of Hog. He was also interrogated at a later date about his part in the writing and spreading of what the Synod called "that Scurrilous Pamphlet entituled Sober Verity",<sup>3</sup> but he refused to reply. In 1725 Hog thought himself in "a dieing condition" and earnestly entreated the Synod to conclude his process inasmuch as he was loathe to die "in the uneasie posture of prosecution by his Reverend Brethren, whom he justlie respects and wishes heartilie well, as he would his own soul." The Synod could not find time to accommodate their brother and the following year a committee was appointed to meet in Hadow's house (Hadow himself being the first-named of the committee) and report. The committee found that the overtures prepared by a former committee did not "contain Censures to be inflicted on Mr. Hog, adequat to his faults and offencies", and that Hog, in his letter to that Synod, had "rather Justified himself, than expressed any sense of the things laid to his charge." It was moved that the Committee of Overtures meet with Hog and report to the next Synod. That Committee in turn referred the matter to a

---

1. Loc, cit.

2. Loc. cit., C. G. M'Crie, "Studies in Scottish Ecclesiastical Biography", B. F. E. R., XXXIII. 708.

3. Ibid., April 4, 1723; September 25, 1723.

"Select Committee of their own number, viz. principal Hadow . . . ", which again met in Hadow's "Vatican", and again failed to overtake all the things "exceptionable in Mr. Hog's papers and answers.<sup>1</sup> This procedure was repeated year after year, and it was not until Hog was near the end of his life that the Synod managed to bring itself to a resolution of the process. In reply to another letter from Hog,<sup>2</sup> that court admonished him "to guard for hereafter against all such Expressions, as may seem not to agree with our Standards, particularly as to these things formerly quarrelled by the Synod, and on this agree to conclude the whole of the former process against him. . . ."<sup>3</sup>

The evidence of the Church courts discloses that Hog was never cowed into recanting those doctrines which made him a leader in the Evangelical party. He loved the peace of the Church, but not to the extent that he would violate his own conscience to renounce truth, or to sacrifice his convictions, to escape the wrath of Hadow. He wrote and spoke with deep feeling, and it would be pointless and a misrepresentation to maintain that he always maintained mastery of his passions in the face of his pursuers, or that he was coldly disinterested in the presentation of his views. There is, nevertheless, a good illustration of his meekness and aversion to name calling in his reply to Principal Hadow's vituperative assault in Review of A Conference, to which Hog rejoined,

---

1. Ibid., April 8, 1725; April 5, September 28-29, 1726; April 2-3, 1727; et. passim.

2. Vide Appendix C.

3. Synod of Fife Records, September 27, 1733.

"I Read the Review, wherein I found a great deal of Raillery, Banter, and ill Humour, to which I think not my self obliged to give any Reply: I only Pray, the Author may be restored to more Sobriety of Mind."<sup>1</sup> It is only argument from silence, but under the circumstances it is rather conclusive to point out that no accusation was made against Hog for violating the prohibition of the Assembly regarding the recommendation of the Marrow, or teaching the positions condemned by the Assembly, although he certainly disapproved of the prohibition and he did not alter his preaching to conform to the Assembly's injunctions. The important thing is that it is evident that he did not consciously prolong the debates. If his letters to the Synod of Fife may be taken at face value, then it may be confidently affirmed that he did not even harbor any personal grudge or animosity toward those who were his bitterest ecclesiastical prosecutors. Wodrow, whose anti-Marrow feelings were well known, could, nevertheless, "heartily sympathise"<sup>2</sup> with him during the height of his trials.

That the Marrow sometimes expressed itself in words and phrases which grate on one's ears has been stated. It has been demonstrated that the anti-Marrow men had recourse to personal invective and obscurantistic argument. Allusion has been made to the fact that in many things—it could be said in most things

---

1. James Hog, Remarks Upon the Review of A Conference, (Edinburgh: Robert Brown, 1719), p. 2. Hereinafter cited Remarks.

2. Wodrow, Correspondence, III. 7.

though one would hardly believe it possible from reading the polemical pieces—they were not far apart, and the difference was in many cases more in the way of expression than in the thing expressed. All of this and more might be said by way of explanation and qualification; but when it is all said, the evidence is that these two sides were split on some very vital theological positions. It now remains to explain the positions of the two schools, but with slight attention to the details of the party of Principal Hadow, while a relatively full presentation of the views of James Hog and the Evangelical party will be outlined. In so doing, it will be expedient to include Hog's teaching as delivered throughout his ministry rather than limiting it to the period of the Marrow controversy more strictly taken. Having set forth his principles in this controversy, the chapter will be concluded with a postscript to the Marrow controversy, a postscript which ends in the twentieth century.

#### THE NATURE OF THE COVENANT OF GRACE

One of the positions which was debated before the Marrow was published by James Hog, and bound up with the disputes that followed, was a discussion concerning the nature of the Gospel or covenant of grace. The point debated was whether the covenant of grace is absolute or conditional, a question which leads one back to Richard Baxter. Those of the Baxterian leaning spoke of conditions to be met prior to one's being instated in the covenant of grace, some making the condition to be faith, others repentance, and some repentance, faith, and

new obedience. It will easily appear that Hadow was of this leaning.

Hog was willing to use the term "condition" if rightly understood. He could speak of a conditionality from the viewpoint of God, since this meant Christ the Redeemer having laid the foundation of the covenant by a complete satisfaction<sup>1</sup> of justice and purchase of all the blessings of that covenant. He also admitted the conditionality of the covenant of grace if by this was meant the humbled sinner's "approving of, and closing by faith, with the only way of salvatione revealed in the Gospel . . . being Drawn and Determined thereunto by the efficacious influences of Irresistible grace . . .", which is the<sup>2</sup> only way the sinner can enjoy the blessings of the covenant. Since faith is the "Mother Grace", setting in motion the other graces of the Spirit, it was permissible to term faith the condition, although the abuse of this way of speaking by the Neonomians made Hog wary of it. He preferred to say that faith is the "condition to instruct us in Christ", or, that faith is the<sup>3</sup> instrument and the mean of our union with Christ.

Hog was careful to guard his position against the charge of Baxterianism, as one would expect, and he showed that he was far from that position when he warned that his idea of the covenant of grace as conditional must not preclude faith's being promised.

---

1. James Hog, Manuscript Correspondence on the Conditionality of the Covenant, (New College Library), p. 5. Hereinafter cited, Conditionality of the Covenant.

2. Loc. cit.

3. Ibid., pp. 7, 15.

What God required, he also promised, and faith was as much promised, and as absolutely promised, in the covenant of grace as any other grace. If faith was not promised, neither could anything else be promised, for "without faith it is impossible to please him", and "whatsoever is not of faith is sin", Hebrews 11: 6 and Romans 14: 23.<sup>1</sup> The faith required and promised is wholly the Lord's work from the beginning to the end of it. No "efficiency" may be ascribed to corrupt nature, "nor even the new creature be said to act in any other way than as acted and influenced from above."<sup>2</sup>

Having laid down these initial "cautions", Hog gave forthright expression to that which was the heart of the matter for him:

In a peculiar manner we must guard against the assigning unto faith that place in the Covenant of Grace which works had in the Covenant of Works, as if a compact right to Eternal life were founded upon believing in the Gospel Covenant as perfect obedience would have afforded it in the first Covenant had we stood therein. Thus would we make the Covenant of Grace materially and essentially one and the same with the covenant of Works to an intire perversion of the Gospel of Christ and a manifest contradiction to all the ends of his coming, he and he only is the Lord our Righteousness; in him, and in him alone have we righteousness and strength. There's no standing before the Tribunal of Justice save only with a perfect righteousness, and no other can heaven or Earth afford but his, which is made ours by Imputatione.<sup>3</sup>

It is clear that life is not promised to those who before were dead upon any condition to be performed by them. Since all is

---

1. Ibid., pp. 6, 21; cf. Errors in the Snake, p. 20.

2. Ibid., p. 6.

3. Loc. cit.

promised absolutely, then the covenant of grace must be absolute; there is no proper condition.<sup>1</sup> Hog liked to illustrate this absoluteness of the covenant from scripture: "It runneth not thus viz. I will if he shall do thus or thus. But I will (sayeth the Lord) and ye shall. I will be your God and ye shall be my people. I will write my law in their hearts, I will cause them to walk in my statutes. . . ." From<sup>2</sup> this it is clear, he observed, that God had positively and absolutely promised all that man is to do as well as what he himself will do. The practical question he posed was, "if man believes the covenant is absolute as to what God will do, because of his word, why should man hesitate about its being absolute as to all that God required of man?"<sup>3</sup>

If it be objected that man cannot be the recipient of the benefits of the covenant of grace apart from meeting the conditions required, Hog's answer is that of the Shorter Catechism, Questions 29 and 30, to the effect that man is made a partaker of this purchased and promised redemption by the work of the Spirit of God, who works faith in him, uniting him to Christ. That which is completely the work of the Spirit of God cannot be said to be done conditionally, nor can it be taught that the Spirit works some things in man upon the condition of his working other things. All is of God's free grace. Every stirring of faith and other graces is wholly the work of the

---

1. Ibid., pp. 8-11; Lord's Prayer, pp. 331-33.

2. Ibid., p. 11; cf. The Lord's Prayer, pp. 218-219.

3. Ibid. p. 12.



Spirit of God.<sup>1</sup> It was objected that the Catechism itself spoke of God's requiring faith and repentence, and the use of means, but Hog's rejoinder was that the Westminster Divines and their Catechisms never intended any condition, for

they only teach the method wherein the elect of God are made to escape his wrath and curse due for our sin, namely by that faith which interests them in Christ. . . . Now this faith is the source of Evangelical Repentence. . . . For confirmatione hereof it is to be remembered that the Catechisms premise the definitione of faith to that of Repentence unto Life, and they ascrib that faith intirely unto the Spirit of the Lord who worketh the same in us, and thereby uniteth us to Christ in our effectual calling. Thus all runns fairly and consequentially without any Condition. . . .<sup>2</sup>

Another objection raised was that the conception of the covenant of grace as a system of promises was open to abuse when proposing these promises to "a mixed congregation". God's promises must be fulfilled, but how can they be made to all people? "Doth the Lord promise grace and glory to them all?" If so, then all are saved. Hog responded to this by resorting to the doctrine of election, it being taken for granted by him that the gospel promises were made to the elect alone.<sup>3</sup> This, however, in no way prevented the offer of the gospel to all the hearers thereof.<sup>4</sup> This is the point which came to be so hotly debated in the Marrow controversy and which must be developed

---

1. Ibid., p. 13; Otia Christiana, pp. 152-53.

2. Ibid., p. 25.

3. Ibid., p. 24.

4. Ibid., p. 24.

fully at this time.

Before doing this, however, it should be pointed out that in all this teaching on the conditionality of the covenant, Hog was expressing the opinion of the Reformed teachers and many Covenant theologians.<sup>1</sup> Melancthon, for example, on this point taught that "the gospel is the promise of the grace or mercy of God"; that the New Testament promises grace and blessing without condition; and that "it is the glorious gospel that bestows salvation gratuitously, without ~~any~~<sup>2</sup> regard to our righteousness or any proof of our works." It is abundantly clear that Hog was at one with Calvin's views on the same point:

We make the foundation of faith to be the gratuitous promise; for on that faith properly rests. . . . For it seeks in God for life, which is found, not in precepts nor in denunciations of punishments, but in the promise of mercy, and in that only which is gratuitous; for a conditional promise, which sends us back to our own works, promises life to us only if we find it in ourselves.<sup>3</sup>

Hog's understanding of the gospel is that all grace, first and last, is wholly and entirely bound up with, and conveyed by, the promises of the covenant of grace, through the manifestation of the Lord Jesus.<sup>4</sup> He wrote what he calls his "8th Dialogue"

---

1. Heppe, op. cit., pp. 382-85.

2. Philip Melancthon, The Loci Communes of Philip Melancthon, translated by Charles L. Hill, (Boston: Meador Publishing Co., 1944), pp. 145, 219.

3. John Calvin, Institutes of the Christian Religion, translated by John Allen, 8th American Edition, Revised, (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1949), III.ii. 19. Hereinafter cited, Institutes.

4. Hog, Redemption and Grace, p. 22.

(never published), the thesis of which he stated as, "That the Habits of Grace do in Order of Nature follow our Union with Christ as being the Native Result thereof; and cannot be said in order of Nature to Preceed that Union, which would infer, that the Person is endowed with all the Habits of Grace; and yet in order of Nature is not in Christ."<sup>1</sup> His doctrine concerning the nature of this covenant he summarized in these words, "I understand then by the Covenant of Grace, The Doctrine of Christ's purchased Salvation, with whatsoever belongeth unto it, as the same is digested into a System and Cluster of Great and Precious Promises. . . ."<sup>2</sup>

#### THE OFFER OF CHRIST IN THE GOSPEL

The hyper-Calvinistic school were not opposed to conceiving of the covenant of grace as absolute promise, if it was rightly understood. According to their manner of expression, an absolute gift of Christ in the gospel is made to the elect alone. In this way the right to the gift of Christ is not conveyed to any save the elect.<sup>3</sup> Hadow could cite Preston on this point, who spoke of "the 'absolute covenant of Grace, which is particular only to the Elect. . . .'"<sup>3</sup> To teach that God has made and endorsed his absolute promise to all men, thus giving them a claim to Christ and all his benefits, is inconceivable, irrational, and blasphemous. If God has made an absolute promise, or "declaration

---

1. Hog, Otia Christiana, Postscript, pp. 219-220.

2. Hog, Redemption and Grace, p. 11.

3. Hadow, Review, pp. 51-52.

of his immutable purpose", he is bound by his nature to effect his promise—yet it is clear that all are not saved. Consequently, the promise is not to all. The unbeliever has no claim or title or right to salvation, having excluded himself from the terms of the offer.<sup>1</sup> There is no ground whatsoever to assure every man that Christ has died for him.<sup>2</sup> In this system, the legatees of the promise are the elect alone and the offer of Christ is made to these only. At the same time all were bound to believe by the command of God, and they held to this even when they acted as though Christ was not offered to all.<sup>3</sup> Thus, Principal Hadow's exegesis of I John 5: 11, 12:

'To us', importeth, that this Gift of eternal Life is not given to all and every one of fallen Mankind: For all are not brought into the Possession of it, neither have all a Right to it by Justification and Adoption, neither is the absolute Promise which is declarative of the eternal Purpose of God, made unto 'all': For tho it be sometimes proposed indefinitely, yet it is to be understood as made unto God's Elect, whom he hath given unto the Son, and who shall come unto him, Joh. 6. 37. and to Christ's Sheep, . . . Joh. 10: 27-8. And as to the conditional Promise; 'He that believeth shall be saved' it is made to Believers only, exclusively of others.<sup>4</sup>

James Adams utilized similar exegetical principles in his exposition of passages such as I Corinthians 15: 22 ("For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive.");

---

1. Ibid., pp. 50-52.

2. Adams, The Snake, p. 33.

3. Macleod, op. cit., p. 166.

4. James Hadow, The Record of God and Duty of Faith Therein Required, (Edinburgh: John Mosman and Company, 1719), pp. 10-11. Hereinafter cited, Record of God.

I John 2: 2 ("And he is the propitiation for our sins: and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world."); and Mark 16: 15 (" . . . Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature."<sup>1</sup>)

Hadow, in his Synod sermon, claimed that the Marrow presupposed, as a foundation for its faith, "some kind of universal Redemption, and thereupon a Gift and Promise of eternal Life to Mankind; and that every one under the Gospel Dispensation, is called to make Application of this to himself in particular. . . ." He inquired of the Synod how any minister could tell every man that Christ had died for him "without the Supposition of an universal Redemption?"<sup>3</sup>

The Marrow passage which caused so much disputation as to its interpretation has Evangelista, the Gospel minister, say to Neophytus, the young Christian,

I beseech you consider that God the Father, as he is in the Son, Jesus Christ, moved with nothing but with his free Love to Mankind lost, hath made a Deed of Gift and Grant unto them all, That whosoever of them all shall believe in this his Son, 'shall not perish, but have eternal Life,' and hence it was, that Jesus Christ himself said unto his Disciples, Matth. xvi. 17. 'Go and preach the Gospel to every Creature under Heaven,' that is, go and tell every Man, without Exception, that here is good News for him, Christ is dead for him, and if he will take him and accept of his Righteousness, he shall have him.<sup>4</sup>

- 
1. Adams, The Ghost, pp. 53-55.
  2. Hadow, Record of God, p. 26.
  3. Ibid., p. 27.
  4. Edward Fisher, Marrow 1718, pp. 119-20.

Hog defended the Marrow against the charge of universal redemption by calling Hadow's attention (as he had done in his Explication) to several places where particular redemption was asserted.<sup>1</sup> To this Hadow retorted that the Marrow was inconsistent in that it taught both universal and particular redemption,<sup>2</sup> just as Arminians did. He also went one step further and in a round about way accused Hog himself of teaching universal redemption, the nearest he ever came to formulating a specific charge against his opponent.<sup>3</sup>

In all his attacks against the Marrow and James Hog, it is interesting to see how Hadow poses question after question about Marrow teaching on universal redemption, without ever specifying his own position. One must rather infer, from the deliberative questions employed, Hadow's own answer. For example, attacking Hog's Conference, Hadow addresses these queries to the author:

You frequently mention the Extent of Christ's Death, 'Such, and just so much,' as is necessary to found the general Offer. . . . May it be asked, what that just Extent is . . .? Is it larger than the Elect World? Is the Death of Christ to be extended to all in the visible Church? Or to all unto whom the Gospel may come? Or to the whole Race of fallen Adam? Do you think, you have no Warrant to say to your Hearers, 'If ye believe, ye shall be saved?' Unless you believe that Christ died for every one of them.<sup>4</sup>

To each of these, Hadow's reply is a most emphatic, "No!"

- 
1. Hog, Conference, pp. 14-15.
  2. Hadow, Review, pp. 41ff.
  3. Ibid., pp. 46, 49.
  4. Ibid., p. 49.

It was useless for the anti-Evangelicals to charge Hog with a denial of the doctrine of election. They knew his position better than that <sup>1</sup> and he never gave them the least grounds to suspect him. That he was as firm a believer in election and particular redemption as Hadow is evidenced in his insisting, "the Scriptures teach, that the Elect are given to the Lord Jesus, and chosen in him, before the Foundation of the World, and He Himself is said to be Fore-ordained, and the Names of the Elect to have been written in the Lambs Book of Life." <sup>2</sup> When Hog was asked by the Synod of Fife, April 5, 1722, if he believed "Christ offered himself in Room of the Elect only?", his pointed reply was, as the Clerk recorded, "in the affirmative" <sup>3</sup>. In words equally as direct he also declared, "I am not for universal Redemption, neither do I know any of my Friends to be of that Mind." <sup>4</sup> He referred to election as the "delicious Security" of the believer. <sup>5</sup> It is obvious that any arguing of election or particular redemption was <sup>6</sup> extraneous to this whole controversy.

What James Hog was contending for with uncompromising determination was the right to offer Jesus Christ to all men, and

---

1. Supra, pp.207, 215.

2. Hog, Redemption and Grace, p. 5; cf. pp. 6, 9, 24; Conditionality of the Covenant, p. 24; Conference, pp. 33-34; Dialogue I. pp. 113-114.

3. Synod of Fife Records, April 5, 1722; cf. Conference, pp.33-4.

4. Hog, Conference, p. 31.

5. Hog, Otia Christiana, p. 139.

6. Walker, op. cit., pp. 55-6.

it was concerning the ground, or foundation of this offer that he wrote most convincingly. Insofar as the Marrow teaching was concerned, Hog explained that the words to which Hadow and others took exception meant, "If he will take him, and accept of his Righteousness, he shall have him which I understand to be the import of that plain Scriptural Passage, Joh. 3. 16. . . . Go and tell him these good Tidings, that if he will come in, I will accept of him, his sins shall be forgiven him, and he shall be saved. . . ." <sup>1</sup>

He supported the Marrow not out of any "Party View", as he said, but because he was wrestling with this problem in a practical way. It was not a theological exercise for him, nor was it because he loved argumentation; it was the outgrowth of an evangelical concern which he felt as a minister. He was not satisfied with the solution offered by the scholastics, i.e., that Christ is offered to all in the gospel dispensation, but only to the elect among the crowds. The generality of the offer is due to the fact that men do not know what is written in the divine decree; hence, the offer must be made to all since no one knows the difference between the elect and the reprobate. It is beyond doubt that the divine intent is that only the elect shall accept the offered salvation; but the nature and design of the offer imports that all and every one to whom they are made <sup>2</sup> ought to believe.

Hog was honest enough to say that if the offers were made to

---

1. Hog, Explication, p. 15.

2. Hog, Conference, pp. 33-34.



the elect only, he could not see upon what grounds unbelievers could be condemned, seeing the offer of Christ, according to this explanation, was not a genuine one. If non-elect are not required to believe, it would be presumption in them to believe! Yet Christ reproved unbelievers, John 5: 40.<sup>1</sup>

It is the great Sin of those who live under a Dispensation of the Gospel, and it's properly their condemning Sin, That they will not accept of the Lord Jesus freely offered to them in the Gospel; for did they accept of him, and Salvation offered through him, their other Sins would not prove their Ruin. . . .<sup>2</sup>

His view is that the unbeliever aggravates his guilt by his unbelief.<sup>3</sup> The very commandment of God is that men should believe, said Hog, and it is "a Duty incumbent upon all to close with him", I John 3: 2. This was one of the warrants for the offer of the gospel adduced by the Marrowmen. Every minister who sincerely preaches the gospel makes general offers of Christ and salvation, but such offers ought to be founded on a proper foundation.<sup>4</sup> This was Hog's interest in the disputes. It was his fixed persuasion that "no Man can preach the Gospel, unless he be warranted to say, to any Man, yea, and to the worst of Men,<sup>5</sup> 'If ye believe ye shall be saved!'"

What, then, is the foundation for the offer of Christ in the gospel?

- 
1. Ibid., p. 35.
  2. Ibid., p. 36. Cf. Remarks, p. 14.
  3. Hog, Remarks, p. 14.
  4. Hog, Conference, p. 31.
  5. Loc. cit.

Without any elaboration Hog replies that the "Deed of Gift and Grant", or the promise of Christ, is founded by God himself upon his love to the world and the giving of his Son: "God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten son, that whosoever believeth in him should . . . have . . . life."<sup>1</sup> Scripture leaves no room for debate on this point, Hog felt.

Taking this as his basis, Hog goes on to posit two primary foundations for the general offer of Christ, the first of which is the completeness, the sufficiency, the "suitable Extent" of Christ's death and purchase. The generality of the offer established in the scripture must of necessity imply that the remedy is sufficient and complete, without any defect, seeing that Christ offers himself as able to save to the uttermost.

There's Fullness of Sufficiency in the Remedy. That he is full of healing Virtue, that the greatest and heaviest Masses of Sin may be swallowed up in the vast Ocean of Pardoning Mercy, is what the dispenser of Gospel Mysteries is well warranted to assert. Were it not so, it would be utterly impossible for the Gospel Minister to rear up any sufficient Bullwark against the Seas of Despair, which otherways would not fail to swallow up the Sinner, when . . . God . . . hath awakened his Conscience.<sup>2</sup>

Hog felt so strongly on this point that he went on record to the effect that he would never have had the presumption to open his lips to offer Christ in the gospel if he did not believe that there was a sufficiency in Christ to afford him a warrant to offer the wickedest of sinners salvation in Christ.<sup>3</sup>

---

1. Ibid., p. 17.

2. Ibid., p. 37.

3. Hog, Conference, pp. 15-16.

It is a crucified Savior who is offered to men: Does this not give warrant to offer this Savior to all the hearers of the gospel, to the extent that they are obligated to accept him? Would any man say that the Lord obliges sinners to accept a Savior, as crucified, who in no sense was crucified for them? If an Apostle enjoined Simon Magus to pray—which prayer would be offered with an eye to the Mediator—does this not imply an interest for all in the Mediator, just so much as is essential to oblige them to pray in his name?<sup>1</sup> These were some of the queries which Hog posed to his counterparts in the Marrow controversy. What Hog is asking in these questions is whether the offer of Christ is a bona fide offer. He did not hesitate to declare that the offer must be a genuine offer and that the sufficiency of the remedy in Christ makes it genuine.

Another argument advanced in erecting a foundation for the gospel offer is that Christ offers himself freely to all men indiscriminately. He invites all the ends of the earth to look unto him; he sends his servants into the highways and hedges to bring in all who are found to the marriage supper. Nothing is demanded of them, nothing required, they bring no money, no price, they meet no condition, nor is a previous disposition expected.<sup>2</sup> All are invited to receive life and salvation in him. Nevertheless, there is one thing implied in the offer of Christ, this being the acceptance of the offer, or of Christ offered in the gospel. Hog uses four illustrations to unfold his meaning.

---

1. Hog, Remarks, pp. 11-15.

2. Hog, Conditionality of the Covenant, p. 25.

Christ's offer of himself is compared to the offer of a marriage in which nothing is asked save consent to the marriage. The simile of the branch being ingrafted into the vines is used, stressing the necessity of a separation from the old root. Hog compares the offer of Christ to the giving of a liberal dole to the poor, which offer need only be taken, and to the proclamation of pardon to rebels by their king, the rebels needing only <sup>1</sup> to consent to and embrace the offer made. But it was Jesus himself who gave the warrant of the offers, Hog pointed out, for he said of himself that he came to seek and to save the lost and that it was the sick who needed the physician. Christ offers himself to all men, and ministers, in his stead, are commanded to offer him to all men, II Corinthians 5: 20, Isaiah 45: 22.<sup>2</sup>

Hog brought forward to support his views the "Sum of Christian Doctrine" and "The Practical Use of Saving Knowledge", which were included in the Confession and Directory, which teach that the gospel affords ample and sufficient warrants and motives for sinners to believe. He cited enough from these sources to show the essence of the doctrine, and made the following inference: "So much of the Extent of Christ's Death must needs be acknowledged, as leaveth no Room to one or other, yea to the very worst of Sinners, for framing any <sup>3</sup> valid Objection against the Invitation given him to believe or to come to CHRIST."

---

1. Loc. cit.

2. Hog, Conference, p. 34.

3. Ibid., p. 39; cf. The Confession of Faith, Fifth Edition, (Edinburgh: Printed for James MacEuen, 1717), pp. 382-388.

It must be noted here that Hog edited and published<sup>1</sup> what he called "Some Choice Select Meditations" of James Fraser of Brea, which set forth this same tenor of doctrine, as seen, for example, in the following:

All are commanded to come and take this [offer] as their own. Oh, then, here is Matter of Comfort, that not only Help is in Christ, but your Help; Yours, in respect of Appointment, and work of Christ; Yours in respect of the Promise of Christ, giving it freely to you. O come to him, seek from him, . . . and meddle boldly with that which is your own. 'Whosoever will, let him come, and take of the Water of Life': Stand not a-back, . . . he came to save Sinners.<sup>2</sup>

Twice, in 1722 and again in 1728, Hog went on record before the Synod of Fife with statements regarding his belief concerning the foundation of the universal offer of the gospel, the last of which is a succinct summation of Hog's teaching on this point. Asked by the Synod, "What do ye take to be the foundation of the Universal offer of the Gospel", he responded, "The Infinite overflowing Sufficiency of Christ's death and purchase together with the command of Christ to preach the gospel to every Creature and whatever the Lord has declared in his word to enforce and encourage obedience to that command!"<sup>3</sup>

Hog rejoiced to point the sinner to the death of Christ as the proper and all-sufficient object of saving faith. To the sinner he said, Look not upon yourself, neither to the secret councils

---

1. Vide Brown, Gospel Truth, p. 438.

2. James Fraser of Brea, Some Choice Select Meditations, ed. by James Hog, (Edinburgh: 1726), pp. 8-9.

3. Synod of Fife Record, September 25, 1728; cf. Synod of Fife Record, April 5, 1722.

of God, but look to the Savior who is crucified, "is dead for thee", who is sufficient for all, and who is actually offered to all for them to accept and embrace. He could not preach unless he was warranted to say so much to every hearer of the gospel. He was frank to acknowledge that the sacrifice was only effectual to the elect, but he was not concerned with "fencing" the gospel offer so much as demolishing the logical and theoretical barriers erected by Hadow and his school. He was well within the bounds of Reformed teaching when he did so,<sup>1</sup> for Heppe notes that the covenant of grace rests upon<sup>an</sup><sub>2</sub> "essentially universalistic basis".

#### THE NATURE OF SAVING FAITH

The energetic inculcation of the warrant to offer Christ to all men indiscriminately was one of the ways in which Hog and others sought to counteract the withering blight of anxiety, doubt, and gloom which had swept across the Christian people of Scotland in the face of the hyper-Calvinistic theology. The "therapeutic method" had left the grace of assurance in the background, leaving this for those who attained to an advanced stage of Christian maturity and who were qualified to appreciate it. Under this type of preaching people would not presume to take Christ as their own unless they were qualified as convinced sinners to lay hold of him. The tendency was for the Christian to be thrown into a maelstrom of questioning with reference to his

---

1. Heppe, op. cit., pp. 474-77 cf. Calvin, Institutes, II vii. 8.

2. Ibid., p. 371.

good estate amidst the changing vicissitudes of life. It was fitted to play into the hands of the legal spirit bent on winning God's favor by preparing itself for receiving Christ.<sup>1</sup>

James Hog found this to be one of the most difficult problems he faced in his pastoral ministry, and he often spoke to the point. It is one of the primary themes he treats of in his Otia Christiana. and Essay on the Lord's Prayer. The lack of assurance in believers and the uncertainty as to their state, said Hog, is due to ignorance of the covenant of grace: Christians needed to know that what God has begun he will complete. Doubt also arises because believers cannot see the distinguishing fruits at once: they have an anxious solicitude, whereas they should simply rest in The Vine and derive the fruits of the Christian life from him. What is the remedy for doubt? Look in faith to the light that God has manifested concerning himself, and his everlasting love, and do not seek for the evidences of his favor within.<sup>2</sup>

There is a very interesting passage in this same work in which Hog shows how the problem of doubt had deprived believers of the benefits of partaking of the Lord's Supper. In discussing who should be admitted to the Supper, Hog addresses himself to the doubting believers. He reminds them that Christ is present and promises the influence of his grace, not by way of encouraging promiscuous attendance at the Table, but as a confirming of his

---

1. Macleod, op. cit., pp. 165-66.

2. Hog, Otia Christiana, pp. 66-72; The Lord's Prayer, pp. 148-159, 194-197, et passim.

own work in the heart of believers. "The Lord, for His own Name's sake, keepeth House with His People, notwithstanding many Faults which follow them. . . ." <sup>1</sup> Both in this book and in his Remarks Concerning The Lord's Supper (1706), he is careful to insist that ministers and elders be faithful in examining those committed to their care, and that they ought not to "fly in the face of plain duty". Yet

nothing in all this is designed, in the least, to discourage the poorest weakling, who hath even the smallest Sparkle of the Life of God. And though . . . it is a dreadful thing to be guilty of the Body and Blood of our Lord; . . . yet I heartily agree with that which our L[arger] Catechism containeth for encouraging the weak and doubting Believer.<sup>2</sup>

The Marrow of Modern Divinity was a most fit instrument to counter this prevalent doubt, for it taught the sinner to accept the offer of Christ and the believer to seek assurance. Here, certainly, was one reason for the enthusiastic recommendation Hog gave the book. Said Evangelista to the doubting believer, Neophytus, who thought he might be one of the reprobate,

So long as the Lord . . . offers the Pardon generally to all, without having any Respect either to Election, or Reprobation, surely it is great Folly in any Man to say, it may be I am not elected, and therefore shall not have Benefit by it: And therefore I will not accept of it, nor come in. . . . Wherefore I beseech you, do not you say, it may be I am not elected, and therefore, I will not believe in Christ, but rather say, I do believe in Christ, and therefore, I am sure I am

---

1. Ibid., p. 112.

2. Ibid., p. 113.



elected, and check your own Heart, for meddling with God's Secrets. . . . Say then, I beseech you, with a firm Faith, the Righteousness of Jesus Christ belongs to all that believe; but I believe, and therefore it belongs to me. . . . O! Print this Word ("me") in your Heart, and apply it to your own self, not doubting but that you are one of those to whom this ("me") belongeth.<sup>1</sup>

Such teaching was directly opposite to the ultra-Calvinistic position.

Hadow's view may be seen in a brief passage from his Antinomianism Detected, where he says,

The Thing proposed in the Gospel to a Sinner, to be believed by the direct Act of justifying Faith, is not that Christ is his, and hath died for him in particular; nor, that God hath loved him, and pardoned his Sins; nor, that Christ hath purchased Redemption for every one of Mankind without Exception, and for him in particular, and that he shall be saved by Christ; . . . But the Thing proposed, is the Testimony of God concerning Christ the Saviour, and the Method of Salvation thro' him: And every hearer of the Gospel is called not only to give his Assent unto the Truth revealed, but also his Consent unto the Way of Relief and Salvation proposed to him, and so to accept of and receive Christ and to rest on him alone for Salvation. . . .<sup>2</sup>

Here is another example of the logical mind of Hadow, dissecting the stages of the Christian life, whereby in this case, the first action is an assent to the plan of salvation, followed by application of it to himself, then a life of holy obedience, and only after some while--indeed, often never at all--does the believer find any measure of joy and assurance of his being in

---

1. Edward Fisher, Marrow 1718, pp. 121-123.

2. Hadow, Antinomianism, Preface to the Reader viii.

a state of <sup>1</sup> grace.

With this view of his, it is no wonder that Hadow arraigned the Marrow and Walter Marshall's Gospel Mystery of Sanctification— which Hog recommended— for defining faith in terms which made assurance the essence of faith.<sup>2</sup> James Adams joined in the assault by alleging that the Marrow was antinomian in its conception of faith.<sup>3</sup> Following suit, the first charge on which the Marrow was condemned by the Assembly was that it made assurance to be the essence of faith.<sup>4</sup>

The anti-Marrow men had a basis for their fears, for the pure antinomian view was that God justifies the believer before he believes— that he is justified from the death of Christ on the cross, or from his birth, or from eternity, in respect of God's decree. Faith then becomes a mere assurance that he is one of those of whom this is true, thus making faith and assurance the same thing. It was this view which Hadow attributed to the Marrow.<sup>5</sup> James Adams gave it practical expression when he said that one of the most difficult tasks of the minister is to "beat ignorant and presumptuous Sinners from this full Perswasion, and Assurance. . . . It's as clear as the Sun shines, I must accept

---

1. Stewart Mechie, "The Marrow Controversy Reviewed", The Evangelical Quarterly, XXII (January 1950), pp. 26-27. Cf. Walter Marshall, Gospel Mystery of Sanctification, (London, 1714) pp. 166-67.

2. Hadow, Record of God, pp. 23-26.

3. Adams, The Snake, pp. 30-32.

4. Acts of Assembly, 1720. V; cf. 1722. VII.

5. Hadow, Antinomianism, pp. 27-36; Cf. Stewart Mechie, "The Marrow Controversy Reviewed", Evangelical Quarterly, XXII. 25.

of Christ in the Offer of the Gospel, [the Direct act] before  
 ever I can rationally conclude that Christ is mine  
 [the Reflex act] . . . ."<sup>1</sup>

Granting that the Marrow contained expressions which gave  
 ground for suspicion and that the defenders of the book had much  
 explaining to do in order to harmonize the book with their  
 orthodox view on the matter; it nevertheless follows that a  
 considerable amount of time and energy would have been spared  
 if those hostile to the Marrow had lent a more objective ear to  
 the Evangelical position, and had not arbitrarily denied that any  
 kind of assurance was possible in the nature of saving faith.

Hog (and others of his school) guarded against the erroneous  
 view of faith by means of a distinction which he may have  
 discovered originally in Marshall's Sanctification,<sup>2</sup> the  
 distinction between a direct faith in the object and a reflex  
 faith in the subject. The latter faith is in the subject,  
 "namely a Soul in which there are strong Remainers of Corruption",  
 "Liable to manifold ups and downs, Uncertainties and Doubtings."<sup>3</sup>  
 It is "the Christian's reflecting under the divine conduct upon  
 his faith", or "that in the Lord's strength he hath believed",  
 which is "not so much a proper faith as an inquiry into the matter",  
 which "in the real Christian, presupposeth faith".<sup>4</sup>

---

1. Adams, The Snake, p. 32.

2. Marshall, op. cit., pp. 168-9.

3. Hog, Remarks, p. 8.

4. James Hog, Letter to Mr. Gray in Glasow, printed in  
 Brown's Gospel Truth, p. 51.

Hog cited, with very obvious and hearty approval, a passage from Marshall:

His Words are, 'Observe diligently, that the Assurance directed unto, is not a Perswasion that we have already received Christ, and his Salvation, or that we have already been brought into a State of Grace, etc.' And a little after, 'This Doctrine doth not at all tend to breed Presumption in wicked and unregenerate Men, that their State is good already, but only encourageth them to come to Christ confidently, for a good State. I acknowledge' saith he 'That we may, yea, many must be taught to doubt, whether their present State be good . . . And that we must find out the Certainty and Sincerity of our Faith and Obedience by Self-examination, before we can have a well grounded Assurance, that we are in a State of Grace and Salvation already; and that such an Assurance belongeth to what they call the Reflex Act of Faith, (if any Act of Faith can be made of it, it being a Spiritual Sense or Feeling of what is in my self) and, 'N. B. 'is not of the Essence of that Faith, whereby we are justified and saved. . . .'<sup>1</sup>

The direct act of faith is without the believer, in "Idea" or "in the Abstract", as Hog said. It is an assurance of Christ's sufficiency to save, or the receiving and apprehending Jesus Christ.<sup>2</sup> Long before Principal Hadow ever made his charges, Hog had strongly maintained that saving faith is self-destroying in nature, a "disclaiming utterly everything as ours but Sin alone, and is the going out of our self for Righteousness, Life and Strength. . . ."<sup>3</sup> The very same doctrine is declared in his sermon on Mark 9: 23, page eleven, published in 1715. Hog did not ground the believer's assurance on the reflexive act, but on the Object of faith.

---

1. Hog, Conference, pp. 25-26: cf. Marshall, op. cit., p.168.

2. Hog, Remarks, p. 8; Conference, p. 27; Explication, pp. 14, 19.

3. Hog, Redemption and Grace, p. 14.

The distinction is set forth in several works, but most distinctly in the Representation, where the Marrowmen contrast the two kinds of assurance:

The Assurance of Faith has its Object and Foundation without the Man, but that of Sense has them within him: The Assurance of Faith looks to Christ the Promise and Covenant of God, and says, 'This is all my Salvation, God has spoken in his Holiness, I will rejoice'; But the Assurance of Sense looks inward at the Works of God, such as the Person's own Graces, Attainments, Experiences, and the like: The Assurance of Faith [gives] and Evidence to Things not seen. . . . But . . . the Assurance of Sense is the Evidence of Things seen and felt. The one says, 'I take him for mine;' the other says, 'I feel he is mine': . . . The one says, 'Though he should kill me, yet will I trust in him'; the other, 'He smiles and shines on me, therefore will I love and trust in him.'<sup>1</sup>

There are chiefly three things which James Hog was concerned to clarify in his writings with respect to the nature of faith. First, he made it clear that he did not hold assurance to be the essence of faith. He was deeply conscious of his own doubts, fears, and unbelief. He was acquainted with the "Shocks" and "Staggerings" which believers experienced, and to hold that the essence of faith consisted in assurance would "entirely extinguish the Joy and Comfort of many a precious Soul, and pass Sentence against them as Unbelievers. . . ." This would be an "unmerciful Opinion." Furthermore, he was utterly averse to anything that would offer ungodly men opportunity to "strengthen themselves in their Wickedness, by giving them to understand, that Christ died for them." Finally, Hog said he had never known or heard of

---

1. Representation, pp. 70-72; Cf. John Colquhoun of Leith, A View of Saving Faith, (Edinburgh: Thomsons Brothers, 1824), p.263.

any truly godly person who held assurance to be the essence of faith, and that it was inconsistent with the experience of religion.<sup>1</sup> Hog actually taught that faith always had its difficulties and conflicts and that there were advantages in this, one being that the believer "dare not give way to Security," and another that he is taught more and more to maintain a "Life of believing Dependence upon the Lord Jesus, our glorious Head of Influences, and Government."<sup>2</sup> Such declarations speak for themselves.<sup>3</sup>

At the same time Hog maintained that in the very nature of the thing faith must be exercised in "an appropriating or applicative manner. . . ."<sup>4</sup> He believed that "somewhat of assurance"<sup>5</sup> is a necessary ingredient of faith, and he demonstrated that Hadow did not have a monopoly on logic when he argued that to follow the Principal's doctrine to its logical conclusion would be to say that nothing of assurance whatsoever belongs to faith, that saving faith might have all its essentials without the least degree of assurance. But, he went on, if it be granted that the nature of faith is to resist and struggle with doubt, then there must be "somewhat of Assurance of our Salvation

---

1. Hog, Conference, pp. 28-29; Cf. Remarks, p. 7; Lord's Prayer, pp. 220-222.

2. James Hog, Abstract of Discourses on Mark IX. 23, (Edinburgh: 1715), pp. 17-19.

3. This same tenor of doctrine on the nature of faith is found throughout Hog's "Letters to A Society in Edinburgh", in manuscript, in New College Library. Excellent statements are found in this correspondence as follows: pp. 12, 47-50, 53, 61, 73, 126; Letter No.14, dated December 25, 1731, which is most excellent; Letter dated May 13, 1725; et passim.

4. James Hog, Letter to Mr.Gray of Glasgow, cited in Gospel Truth, p. 52.

5. Hog, Explication, p. 14; Conference, p.24

in Saving Faith."<sup>1</sup> What Hog is saying is that a total exclusion of all assurance from the nature of faith would mean the sinner would never embrace the offers of the Gospel, or apply Christ to himself, Hebrews 11: 6: 7: 25. The sinner must believe that there is a sufficiency to save in Jesus Christ.<sup>2</sup>

Finally, Hog contended that it was a necessary part of Christian maturity "to surmount, through Grace, his doubts, fears and hesitations with respect to his own gracious estate and his eternal welfare."<sup>3</sup> Doubt belonged not to faith but to unbelief.<sup>4</sup> He steadfastly adhered to the position that Evangelista in the Marrow often accommodated himself to Neophytus' varying postures as a real but weak and doubting Christian, and that this was the case in the passages attacked by Hadow. Nevertheless, it was not the book which was under debate; it was the right of the minister to "speak comfortably to the poor tossed believer in the Words of Scripture," Isaiah 54: 11; 40: 1, 2: 49: 13-14.<sup>5</sup> He wanted to make religion "less of a form and more of a reality".<sup>6</sup> He was not much concerned with analysing the religious experience; his concern was with the unanalysed, intuitional personal experience.

---

1. Hog, Conference, pp. 22-23.

2. Ibid., p. 24.

3. James Hog, Remarks Concerning the Rooting, Growth, and Ripeness of A Work of Grace, (Edinburgh: 1715), p. 37. Hereinafter cited, Work of Grace.

4. James Hog, Letter to Mr. Gray of Glasgow, printed in Brown's Gospel Truth, p. 52.

5. Hog, Conference, p. 12.

6. H. F. Henderson, Religious Controversies, p. 38.

Faith, for Hog as for Calvin, was more of the heart than the head, from the affections rather than the understanding.<sup>1</sup>

Hog and his companions never seem to have gone as far as Calvin, Luther, Melancthon, and others did in making their special Fiducia to be of the essence of faith, but they adduced these Reformers and an imposing array of distinguished Reformed theologians, all of whom maintain their fiducia, confidence, or appropriating persuasion spoken of in the condemned Marrow passages.<sup>2</sup> They also claimed, and rightly so, that they were in harmony with the received doctrine of the Church of Scotland.<sup>3</sup> Finally, Ralph Erskine in effect gave this charge (of making assurance the essence of faith) its coup de grace when he engaged in a correspondence with John Wesley and lamented that so much of "a delusive, enthusiastick spirit is aloft, leading poor souls to rest upon impulses, impressions, motions, and what they feel within them, as if these were to be the ground and reason of their faith and hope: where the true feeling and sealing of the Spirit is the fruit and effect of faith. . . ."<sup>4</sup>

#### REPENTANCE

An attendant debate with that on the above issues was one concerning the doctrine of repentance—specifically, as to the order of repentance, which was the real point in the Auchterarder position.

---

1. Calvin, Institutes. III. ii. 8.

2. Representation, pp. 107-118.

3. Ibid., pp. 11-13.

4. Ralph Erskine, Faith No Fancy, Appendix, p. 36.



Hadow, taking as his text Isaiah 55: 7, "Let the wicked forsake his way . . .," taught that the evangelical duty of repentance goes before pardon of sin in the Divine order; that the Divine promise annexes remission of sin and repentance; that the Catechism taught the necessity of repentance in order to escape the wrath of God; and that, therefore, when ministers preached they should press it upon sinners to repent of their sins and forsake them in order to their coming to Christ and obtaining pardon. He believed that the Marrow teaching and the Auchterarder position was injurious to morality because it taught people to delay the duty of repentance and was apt to induce sinners to make light of sin. He stressed that part of the Confessional statement which says that no sinner may expect pardon without repentance.<sup>1</sup> Here, again, is seen the work of the analytical mind, coldly spelling out the theory of the Christian experience.

Hog preferred to place repentance as a consequent of faith, and this was the way he understood the Auchterarder position: "Sin is never really forsaken in or by any Deed, save only that of Saving Faith."<sup>2</sup> Where Evangelista entreats Nomista to "believe, that you may reform your life, and do not any longer work to get and Interest in Christ, but believe your Interest in Christ . . . and then you will not make the Change of your Life, the Ground of your Faith . . .",<sup>3</sup> Hog explains the meaning is that "acceptable

---

1. 1. Hadow, Antinomianism, pp. 40-63. Cf. James Bannatyne, Essay on Gospel and Legal Preaching, (Edinburgh: James Davidson), pp. 20-36; Adams, The Snake, pp. 7-9, 38-39.

2. Hog, Auchterarder Affair, p. 4.

3. Fisher, Marrow 1718, p. 191.

Reformation of Life, doth not go before, but followeth Faith."<sup>1</sup>

If the sinner comes to God with his repentance and amendment of life as the "price in his hand; here's a Notable Market indeed, but not the Gospel one, which is, "without Money and without price", for the Apostle teaches that God justifies the ungodly,  
<sup>2</sup>  
 Romans 5: 5. Hog illustrated the point for which he contended:

Put the Case, that the LORD had wrought Faith in the Heart of a profligate Sinner, and had drawn forth his whole Soul to flee to the LORD JESUS, and to accept of the Ransomer and Ransom, would any Person . . . peremptorily deny to speak Comfort to such an one who gives undoubted Evidences of his believing, but would needs wait (who know how long) until he saw his Life reformed.<sup>3</sup>

On Once again it is a case of the two sides looking at the truth from completely different angles, in which they could hardly be expected to come out with the same answer. However, it must be acknowledged that in this, as in so many other points, Hog was much nearer the Calvinistic teaching than was Hadow, for Hog was in truth saying the same as Calvin had written, "Those who imagine that repentance precedes faith, than is produced by it, as fruit by a tree, have never been acquainted with its power. . . ."<sup>4</sup>

- 
1. Hog, Explication, pp. 17-18.
  2. Hog, The Lord's Prayer, p. 331-32.
  3. Hog, Explication, p. 18.
  4. Calvin, Institutes III. iii. 1.

## CONCERNING JUSTIFICATION

The doctrine of justification runs like a silver thread throughout the entire Marrow controversy, so that it is not necessary here to treat of this point in great detail, seeing that it is really incorporated in other parts of the debate. It is clear that the Baxterians and those influenced by their teaching had a strong inclination to import into the justification of the sinner some measure of man's own work. The sinner had to be unqualified, penitent, convinced, prepared, and reformed sinner in order to be saved. He was already well on the road to recovery before he was in a covenant relation. It was this approach which made the Auchterarder proposition so objectionable to the legalistic party.

The Evangelicals considered the legalistic teaching just as opprobrious as their own doctrine was offensive to the legalists. Hog gave full expression to the Evangelical viewpoint, affirming that in justification there was not room for even the least degree of man's works. In the covenant of grace life is promised only to perfect obedience and only in Jesus Christ is there that perfect satisfaction and obedience which gives right and title to the covenant of grace. It is not possible for man to obey perfectly and the gospel points man to the Mediator in whom alone perfection is found. It is Christ's perfect righteousness imputed to the sinner which entitles him to life. Faith, as opposed to all works, is a "most exactly fitted Instrument in the great Business of the Justification of a Sinner before God, and leaveth no room to Repentance, Love, and

New-Obedience. . . ."<sup>1</sup>

The Assembly omitted the words "imputed to us" in that part of their "Act for Preaching Catechetical Doctrine" relating to justification, and in so doing they properly reflected the general practice of the legalists. It was this omission which the Representation remonstrated against, since the Marrowmen felt that "the great Doctrine of Justification was winded up in such Terms, as gave Shelter to the erroneous Doctrine of Justification, for something wrought in, or done by the Sinner, as his Righteousness, or keeping of the NEW or GOSPEL LAW. . . ." <sup>2</sup> These men could conceive of justification in no other way than that of gratuitous regeneration: it was the justification of the ungodly sinner who fled for refuge to the sufficiency of Christ the Lord our Righteousness.

#### THE RELATION OF THE BELIEVER TO THE LAW

The Baxterian disciples and the Moderates felt that the Evangelical stress on the righteousness of Christ imputed did an injustice to the Law of God and that it was prone to encourage antinomian licentiousness. Their opposition to the Evangelicals brought about something of a renewal of the controversy begun in apostolic times by the Judaisers who opposed the Pauline doctrine of grace as making the Law void, and the same controversy rekindled by Luther's attack on the legalism of the Roman

---

1. James Hog, Redemption and Grace, pp. 11, 16-18; Errors in The Snake, pp. 19-21; Work of Grace, p. 32; Spirit's Operations, I. 6; II. 13-16.

2. The Representation, p. 19; cf. p. 9.

1  
Church.

The Judaistic party in the Church of Scotland was ably represented by Principal Hadow, their spokesman. In his zeal to protect, or rescue, the Law from its pretended assailant, Hadow taught that the Lord Jesus as Judge, Law-giver and King prescribes the Moral Law to all men as a perpetual obligation. This Law is his Law, obedience to which is commanded by his authority. "All the Coaction or Compulsion of the Law is moral, it consists in its commanding and binding Power, which it derives from the Authority and Power of God, the Sovereign Lord and Law-giver. . . ." <sup>2</sup> The offers of grace from the Redeemer, and his holy Laws, in order that they might not be despised by carnal and secure sinners, are armed with "most terrible Threatnings of Wrath and Vengeance". While the threats of eternal death are to be executed only upon unbelievers, "the Law is not deprived of its penal sanction even with respect to believers, the threatenings being directed also to them." The sins of believers make them liable to punishment, and believers ought to be motivated to obedience not only from their own experience of God's love, but also by the love of God to sinners and the authority of the Law-giver, and ought to have respect unto the promises and threats annexed to the Laws. <sup>3</sup> Throughout his attack on the Marrow in this book, he constantly enforces the

---

1. Donald Beaton, "'The Marrow of Modern Divinity' and the Marrow Controversy", Records of the Scottish Church History Society, I. 122.

2. Hadow, Antinomianism, p. 68.

3. Ibid., pp. 73-77.

binding power of the Law by the sovereign authority of the Lord Creator and Redeemer.

The Marrow distinction in the Law as it is the Law of Works and as it is the Law of Christ <sup>1</sup> and its whole tenor in respect of the relation of the believer to the Law was bitterly attacked. Hadow contended that the book in teaching the moral Law to be the Law of Christ did not ascribe to it the authority and force of a binding Law with a commanding and binding power, but made it a "passive rule, a Doctrine, a meer Monitory directing and instructing" the believer; that in describing the Law of Christ no commanding force or authority was attributed to it from the Divine authority of the Mediator; that by limiting the Law of Christ to believers, Christ's authority was sharply limited; that the Law of Christ was not understood to allow a threat of death or wrath to disobedience, but only fatherly chastisement; and that all this removed believers from restraints against sin, and discouraged holiness of life. He asked whether God as a Redeemer in Christ had divested himself of his right, power, and authority as Creator; whether the assumption of the Moral Law into the gospel dispensation deprived it of its original binding power on the believer; and whether the grace of Christ <sup>2</sup> exempted a believer from subjection to the perpetual Law?

Hadow was so wrought up on this subject that he said when Hog taught that the unregenerate man is under the obligation of the Law to obey it and suffer the penalty until, or unless, he flee

---

1. Fisher, Marrow 1718, pp. 199-203.

2. Hadow, Antinomianism, pp. 89-115.

to Christ's perfect righteousness, this was legal doctrine which taught men to establish their own righteousness! He himself asserted that unregenerate man is not under the Law but under the gospel, since the Law was abrogated.<sup>1</sup> He also used his expert juggling to demonstrate that Hog taught assurance to be the only adequate and proper means of effecting obedience to the Law!<sup>2</sup> This treatment of Hog and the Marrow led Riccaltoun to refer to the "Confusion" Hadow had brought upon the whole discussion by his "lawless" handling of the Law of Christ.<sup>3</sup>

In the Fifth Act of 1720 the General Assembly had censured the Marrow heavily on four counts related to the Law: It was said that the Marrow taught that holiness is not necessary to salvation; that fear of punishment and hope of reward are not allowed to be motives of a believer's obedience; that the believer is not under the Law as a rule of life; and that the distinction in the Law as the Law of Works and the Law of Christ was used to teach six antinomian paradoxes. The paradoxes referred to are:

1. A Believer is not under the Law, but is altogether delivered from it.
2. That a Believer doth not commit Sin.
3. That the Lord can see no Sin in a Believer.
4. That the Lord is not angry with a Believer for his Sins.
5. That the Lord doth not chastise a Believer for his Sins.
6. That a Believer hath no Cause, neither to confess his Sins, nor to crave Pardon at the hands of God for them, neither yet to fast, nor mourn, nor humble himself before the Lord for them.<sup>4</sup>

---

1. Ibid., pp. 64-67.

2. Ibid., pp. 71-2.

3. Riccaltoun, Sober Enquiry, p. 87.

4. Edward Fisher, Marrow 1718, pp. 198-99. For a remarkably similar passage, cf. Hog, The Lord's Prayer pp. 58-59.

In their haste to condemn the Marrow the Assembly left themselves open to counter-charges of a very serious nature from the Marrowmen, which were made in their Representation. Therefore, in 1722, though confirming their previous Act, the Committee on Purity of Doctrine and the Commission had to protect themselves by explanations, by claims that the Assembly had been "unfairly represented", and did not intend to teach what the words might be understood to imply.<sup>1</sup> If the Marrowmen had explaining to do in behalf of the Marrow, the Commission had the extraordinary task and necessity of interpreting, explaining, and defending the meanings of an Assembly Act on major points of theology, and these from the hand of several theological professors!

James Hog taught that with respect to the Law men had different relations, depending on whether they were regenerate or unregenerate. Those in the state of nature were under the Law as a covenant of works. They were thereby obliged to obey the Law perfectly or to suffer the penalty. The Law, by virtue of Adam's sin, has ceased to be a means of salvation, and no one could possibly attain to life by virtue of personal obedience to it. Nevertheless, the breach of the covenant in no way removed its obligation. All men who under any pretext seek righteousness by the Law are under the covenant or Law of Works and must "make<sup>2</sup> good their Title" by the Law of Works. ~~Those~~ under the Law as the

---

1. Acts of Assembly, 1722. VII.

2. Hog, Redemption and Grace, p. 10. Vindication, pp. 8-9; Errors in the Snake, pp. 12-13; Synod of Fife Record, April 5, 1722; A Letter to A Private Christian, (n. d.), p. 3. Hereinafter cited Private Christian.



Law of Works incur legal guilt, have to do with God as an offended Judge, are subject to his vindictive wrath, and can only obey the Law in a slavish manner. But the Law is nevertheless of use to discover the righteousness which is necessary for salvation.

While the soul is perplexed about the righteousness required, continues Hog, the gospel reveals that righteousness manifested in Jesus Christ, which is imputed to the elect sinner, who being ingrafted into Christ goes on in the power of Christ to maturity. The believer is no longer under the Law as it is a Law or Covenant of Works "in a way of justice, Christ having satisfied."<sup>1</sup>

The believer's relation to the Law is radically different, indeed, diametrically opposed to that of the unregenerate person.

He stands in a quite other Relation to his Lord and Law-giver: For being espoused unto Christ, he is happily raised (may I so express it) to another, and a better holding as to every Thing. God is to be considered in Christ in all the Communications of his Grace to him, and in all his Applications to the Father. He goeth to him in the Name of Christ, under the Influences of his Spirit. Thus as the Apostle expresseth it, 'He is under the Law to Christ',<sup>2</sup>

Does this mean that the believer is not under the Law as a rule of life, as charged by Hadow and the Assembly?

Hog's reply to this is a resounding, unequivocal, and absolute, "No!" From the earliest of his writings to the latest he inculcated the "indispensable obligation" of the Law resting upon

---

1. James Hog, Annotations to Gilbert's Guilt and Pardon of Sin, Manuscript in New College Library. Hereinafter cited Annotations.

2. Hog, Private Christian, pp. 3-4.

the believer. "How is the Gospel opposed to the Law?", inquires Hog, and answers: "Not as obscuring the Doctrine of the Law which instead of being darkened is set in the purest light". The Christian is "engaged more and more to the most exact strictness of truly Spiritual and Evangelical obedience; 'For the Law is not made void, but established by Grace'.<sup>1</sup>" Neither does the gospel diminish the obligation of the Law which "both as to Mandate and Sanction, is owned to be full and untouched, and nothing impaired"; nor by covering the transgression of the Law, the aggravations of which are discovered by the gospel; nor by "enervating the use of the Law in Subserviency to the Gospel, for Convincing, wounding, and humbling the Sinners: in all of which . . . it is a School-master to lead us unto Christ. . . ."<sup>2</sup>

In suggesting ways of remedying the legalistic evils of the times, Hog urged a resolute declaration of evangelical truth, but warned,

Only we would be careful, in a peculiar manner, to inculcate and inforce the indispensable Obligation of the Law, as a Rule, and not in the least made Voide, but Established through Grace, ~~seing~~ manifold Experience hath evinced that the most Faithful and Cautious Indeavours to discover and remeed the Abuse of the Law, are ordinarily aspersed with the abominable Blot of Antinomianism, altho that Mystery of Iniquity can never be opposed efectually in any other way.<sup>3</sup>

---

1. Hog, The Spirit's Operations, Part II, pp. 6-7.  
Cf. Lord's Prayer, pp. 210-11.

2. Ibid., II. 7-8; vide Part I. p. 65.

3. Hog, Covenant of Works and Grace. p.24. Cf. Vindication, p.7; Private Christian, pp. 2-3.

What Hog did differ with Hadow about considerably was the motives for a believer's obedience. This point had arisen in another way in Simson's case.<sup>1</sup> The believer's receiving the Law as the Law of Christ did not mean that he was relieved of obedience to the Law, but it bound him to obey upon very different grounds—"Gospel grounds"—as a means of testifying his gratitude for the great salvation bestowed upon him, as well as to "serve out his apprenticeship for heaven in a way of obedience".<sup>2</sup> The believer came under "the pleasant Obligation to Obey the Law as his Heavenly Father's sweet Will," in the relationship of a child to his Lord and Father.<sup>3</sup>

One of the chiefest hindrances Hog had experienced in his ministry, he said, was "hard and heavey Impressions of our good and gracious Lord." He observed that the main reason the one talent man hid his talent was that "he looked upon our gracious Lord as 'Hard' and 'Austere'. . . ." So long as the believer yields obedience to one whom he dreads, and without hope of being accepted, that obedience cannot be "Vigorous and Cheerful", neither can such impressions be removed by legal convictions, but only by "Displays of the Glory of Christ", in which both majesty and mercy conspire in such a way as to produce "Gospel-Obedience". Thus, concluded Hog, "taking up the Law as the Law of Christ is the only effectual Method for attaining Obedience unto it."<sup>5</sup>

---

1. Supra, pp.221-22.

2. Hog, Annotations, p. 23.

3. Hog, Private Christian, p. 4.

4. Ibid., p. 7.

5. Ibid., pp. 8-9.

It was faith looking to Christ as Lawgiver and Surety, and a view of the Gospel Covenant as consisting in promises which were essential to encourage the believer to the proper motives of obedience, said Hog.<sup>1</sup> Some might, indeed, yield a slavish conformity to the Law out of fear of the Lord as a righteous and sin-avenging Judge, but this was a sub-Christian disposition toward the Law, the very life and essence of which is love. Scripture teaches that love and slavish fear stand opposite the one to the other, I John 4: 18.<sup>2</sup> It is the love of Christ which constrains the believer to obey more than all the threats of the Law or terrors of Hell.<sup>3</sup> Hog did not hesitate to enforce the Law by the authority of Christ the Mediator, but he much preferred to speak of it as the "sweet will" of a loving Father. He did not like the stress laid upon obedience out of fear of punishment or hope of reward because it was fitted, if not actually intended, to encourage utilitarianism in Christian ethics.

He showed that the "Antinomian Paradoxes" of the Marrow were not intended to foster licentiousness in believers. For example, he explained that God saw no sin in believers "by way of vindictive Justice, so as to bring under condemnation for it; neither does he require confession of sin as a malefactor to a judge."<sup>4</sup> He did not agree that believers ought not to mourn for sin; on the contrary, he thought "the Manifestations of Christ

---

1. Ibid., pp. 14-15.

2. Ibid., pp. 5-6.

3. Hog, The Spirit's Operation, Part II. pp 10, 28.

4. Hog, Vindication, p. 16.

do carry the Believer while in Time, to the sweetest, and most plentiful Strains of deep Mournfulness. . . . Nevertheless it is equally certain that Gospel Mournfulness should be manag'd in Hope, and ought not to be tainted with Doubts, Fears, and Jealousies of Unbelief."<sup>1</sup> The believer, though entirely delivered from wrath, due to his sins, whether past, present, or to come, nevertheless has the threatened punishments inflicted upon him "as fatherly chastisements, proceeding from everlasting love, and ordered for his amendment."<sup>2</sup> Far from antinomianism, Hog spoke of the delusions of antinomians who under the pretense of highly exalting Christ and free grace, betrayed it by encouraging "Sloth and laxness of Walk," while teaching "a state of more constant Joy" in absolute contrast to the wrestlings of believers.<sup>3</sup> He insisted that it was the principle and practice of Christians to guard against sin, to acknowledge every day, and to seek pardon of sin in Jesus Christ. He said that it was their desire to make their lives "Transcripts" of the Scripture, "Little children, these things write I unto you, that ye sin not. And if any man sin, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous: And he is the propitiation for our sins. . . ." (I John 2: 1-2a)<sup>4</sup> The believer's being pardoned serves to fill him with shame and sorrow, and does not make him abuse the grace of God.<sup>5</sup> A person's being "in Christ"

---

1. Ibid., p. 17.

2. Hog, Annotations, p. 23.

3. Hog, The Spirit's Operation, Part II, p. 17.

4. Hog, Vindication, p. 16.

5. Hog, Work of Grace, p. 21.

serves to aggravate the guilt of sin and leads to death and ruin, Hog insisted, so that there is an "indissoluble connection" between sin and eternal death.<sup>1</sup>

What Hog does go on to say is this: That while the believer cannot "reap the fruits of Grace in a way of sin", he is really delivered from condemnation by virtue of his being in Christ, Romans 8:1, and will never be cast out of the state of justification.<sup>2</sup> He also reminded his accusers that they, by their behavior, were undermining<sup>3</sup> both Law and Gospel, and were in spirit and practice, antinomian.

Hog's personal views, far from encouraging impurity of life, went very far in the other direction. He believed that receiving the Law as the Law of Christ was the only way effectually to pull up the roots of sin. This Law makes holiness of life the "Believer's Element" and the love of Christ effectuates that which "Hell opened up before him" could never do.<sup>4</sup> In an entirely different context, Hog avers, "I know not any one Thing that more discrediteth Religion, and strengthens the Prejudices of Libertines and Atheists more against it than when a selfish, unjust, unkindly, and an unprofitable Conversation, is covered with a great and specious Profession of Religion."<sup>5</sup>

---

1. Hog, Vindication, p. 18.

2. Hog, Errors in the Snake, p. 16; Vindication, p. 18; cf. Calvin, Institutes II. xvi. 18.

3. Hog, Vindication, pp. 20-24.

4. Ibid., p. 19.

5. Hog, Missives Refuting Deism, p. 38.

And again, he declares it is

the great and . . . predominant ambition, to attain under the influences of Heaven, perfection in Holyness. . . . The Believer can never be Holy Enough, he is insatiable in pressing after more evidence, and thoroughness of Light, Vigour of Life, and increase of Spiritual Strength, . . . Fighting against, and overcoming Tentations.. It is his Element, and one thing, under the breathings of Heaven, to press after the Lord, as his 'Alpha' and 'Omega'.<sup>1</sup>

One of the most impressive and poignant passages in Hog's works is his defense of Martin Luther—and thus the Marrow—against the charge of antinomianism. He confessed that the words of the Marrow which spoke of the Law as "accursed", "arraigned,<sup>2</sup> and as a Thief, and cursed Murdered of the Son of GOD . . ." were "rude and unpolished", but he pointed out that they were Luther's words, not Fisher's. He refers to Luther on Galatians, to the Reformer's "flights" and "Magisterial Briskness" of style, and to his battle against the abuse of the Law by the Papacy, particularly in bringing the Law into justification. He was confident that anyone who seriously and impartially considered the man, the times, and the task "will not think it strange that the Blessed Reformer used a Liberty of Stile peculiar to himself in resenting that Wickedness."<sup>3</sup> He then adduced the following words of Luther used in the Marrow: "Out of the Matter of Justification we ought with Paul, Rom.7. 12, 14 to think reverently of the Law, to commend it highly, to call it

- 
1. Hog, Lord's Prayer, pp. 19-20.
  2. Edward Fisher, Marrow 1718, p. 115.
  3. Hog, Explication, pp. 9-11.

Holy, Righteous, Just, Spiritual, and Divine: Yea, out of the Case of Justification, we ought to make a GOD of it." <sup>1</sup> With tongue in cheek Hog chidingly remarked that Luther had bent the Law just as much to one extreme as he had to the other, and presumed the Reformer would be "allowed some Credit when he expounds his own Words." <sup>2</sup> He also prodded the memory of his opponents by reminding ~~them~~ that Scripture itself had harsh expressions, such as those which stated Christ had been made "sin" and "a curse" for man, (II Corinthians 5: 21, Galatians 3: 13). <sup>3</sup>

There are two of many passages which may here be cited by way of summation of Hog's theological position on the disputed points. The first is from one of his sermons in which he shows the necessity of a working faith:

The Christian cannot be deprived of Life: His Life is hid with Christ in God (Co. 3. 3; Jn. 14. 19), he must breathe, and even at his worst and lowest, the Desires of his Soul are towards the Lord, and to the Remembrance of his Name. (Is. 26. 7-8; Rom. 7. 22) Saving Faith breathes forth into Gospel Holiness in a native, tho' supernatural Way; for as the Body without Breathing . . . is dead, so Faith without Works is dead also; (Js 2. 26; Phil. 3. 13) it is no true Faith, it is but an empty and loathsum Carkass of it. Nevertheless, spiritual Maladies do so oppress that noble Life, that this Breathing is performed with Difficulty and Pain.<sup>4</sup>

---

1. Ibid., p. 12; Edward Fisher, Marrow 1718. p. 165.

2. Ibid., p. 13.

3. Loc. cit.

4. Hog, Abstract of Discourses on Psalm XLI. 4, p. 16. Cf. Remarks Concerning the Spirit's Operation, p. 126.



The second passage supplies an excellent statement concerning the source of the believer's acceptable obedience to the Law.

Its Manifest . . . that all, and every part of acceptable Obedience can only be attained by Virtue derived from Christ. 'As the Branch cannot bear Fruit, unless it be in the Vine,' nor in any other Way, 'Save by Virtue derived from the Vine; so true Obedience to the Law, or Gospel Holiness,' can never take Place, save only by the Persons being in 'Christ the True Vine', John 15: 1, 2, 3, 5. . . . Sure he whose Obedience proceeds from Faith in the Son of God, must therein necessarily consider the Law, as the Law of Christ, and I would think the true Believer would rather part with Life, if thereunto called, than with this ingaging Consideration of the 'Holy, Just and good Law'.<sup>1</sup>

The Marrowmen were decisively defeated in the General Assembly and in the lower judicatories. Ralph Erskine tells how the Marrow supporters in Fife stood condemned by their acts, which they could not in conscience obey, and were more "pannels at the bar" than they were members of the court, answerable to them for whatever censure they should inflict upon them for their "disregard to their inquests".<sup>2</sup> The Synod of Fife did not and would not meet in the bounds of the Presbytery of Dunfermline for some ten years, between 1718 and 1728.<sup>3</sup>

The defeat of the Marrowmen was accomplished not because they were unpopular with the people, but because of skillful maneuvering and management by their antagonists. Outside the church courts, however, it was a different story. Communion occasions at Ettrick and Carnock were thronged with pilgrims who

---

1. Hog, Private Christian, p. 16.

2. Ralph Erskine, Faith No Fancy, Appendix, p. 31.

3. Vide Synod of Fife Records.

flocked to hear the Evangelical ministers declare the good tidings of great joy, and Hog and Boston never preached to larger audiences than they did when the persecution against them was at its apex.<sup>1</sup> The list of places where John Ronald, an Edinburgh Christian, had his soul "refreshed," looks like a roll-call of Marrow parishes, and Carnock leads the list.<sup>2</sup> Even Principal Hadow admitted the popularity of the Evangelical ministers, as well as the success of their labors:

I am aware of the Force of Arguments arising from two different Topicks; These Ministers are, in the Course of Providence, encouraged by the Countenance they have from the People, more than others: For their publick Administrations are more frequented, by not only the mixed Multitude, whose Affections cleave to them, but even by the truly Godly, who are remarkably edified by them: Therefore they (these Ministers) seem to have God's Call for what they do.<sup>3</sup>

Moreover, The Marrow of Modern Divinity did not expire just because of an Assembly Act, or more accurately, two Acts. Boston, who had completed his notes on the Marrow in July, 1722, published them with Part I of the Marrow in 1726, though he did so anonymously out of respect to the authority of the Church.<sup>4</sup> While there is no possible way of estimating the extent of the circulation of the book, the large number of editions found in New College Library show that it was popular for many years. A copy of it was found in St. Kilda in 1729.<sup>5</sup> Many testimonials

---

1. Carnock Session Minutes, October 26, 1719: Boston op.cit. p.256.

2. John Brown, Gospel Truth, p. 34, footnote.

3. Hadow, Antinomianism, Preface, pp. xiii-xiv.

4. Boston, op. cit., p. 261.

5. John MacInnes, The Evangelical Movement in the Highlands of Scotland, (Aberdeen: The University Press, 1951), p. 177.

were given to the book. James Harvey in England and Alexander Whyte in Scotland both thought highly of it. Thomas Chalmers recorded in his diary in 1812 that he was reading it and found in it

much light and satisfaction on the subject of faith. It is a masterly performance, and I feel a greater nearness to God, convincing me that Christ is the way to Him, and an unconditional surrender of ourselves to Christ the first and most essential step of our recovery. . . . I feel a growing delight in the fulness and sufficiency of Christ. O my God, bring me nearer and nearer to Him.<sup>1</sup>

The leaders of the Secession were literally baptized in the Marrow doctrines, for the Secession came about and waxed strong not only as a protest against the abuse of the rights of the Christian people in the settling of ministers, but its popular appeal came largely from the warmth of its preaching, which, in turn, was derived from The Marrow of Modern Divinity<sup>2</sup> and the writings of its disciples. The "Act Concerning the Doctrine of Grace" of the Secession Church is nothing more or less but a rehearsal and review of the doctrines of grace around which the Marrow controversy turned.<sup>3</sup> Adam Gib, James Fraser of Alness, Archibald Bruce of Whitburn, and a host of others were in the Marrow succession. It should be made clear, nevertheless, that there were many lovers of the Marrow who remained within the

---

1. Thomas Chalmers, Memoirs, William Hanna, Editor, (Edinburgh: Sutherland and Knox, 1850), I. 298.

2. Hugh Watt, "The Influence of Martin Luther on Scottish Religion in the Eighteenth Century", Records of the Scottish Church History Society, VI. 150.

3. Vide Act Concerning the Doctrine of Grace, (Glasgow: John Bryce, 1766).

Established Church and formed the nucleus of the Evangelical party.

More than a century after the original act condemning the Marrow had been passed, the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland found John Macleod Campbell guilty of teaching universal atonement and assurance as the essence of faith to be necessary to salvation. The basis of the decision was the 1720 Act, which was applied as the law of the Church<sup>1</sup>

Interest in the Marrow controversy and appreciation for Marrow teachings has persisted right into the present century. When John Brown of Whitburn published the second edition (1831) of his Gospel Truth, an excellent collection of Marrow material, he found several distinguished ministers of the Church who were willing to give his work a cordial recommendation. In 1850 a friend said to Dr. Mackintosh of Tain, "'That was the Marrow doctrine you gave us today'. . . ." <sup>2</sup> Thomas M'Crie manifested a remarkable interest in and knowledge of the controversy in his account in the Edinburgh Christian Instructor, while his son, Thomas M'Crie, Jr., and his grandson, Charles G. M'Crie, both contributed articles on the subject, and the latter edited and published the last edition of the Marrow in 1902. In more recent times, Donald Beaton, H. F. and G. D. Henderson, Principal Hugh Watt, Professor Stewart Mechie, and several others have reviewed various aspects of the controversy.

The Marrow theology spread to the American colonies and a

---

1. H. F. Henderson, Religious Controversies, pp. 152 ff.

2. MacInnes, op. cit., p. 177.

heated debate took place when Dr. Joseph Bellamy attacked the Federal theology.<sup>1</sup> When the union of the Associate Presbyterian and Reformed Presbyterian Churches was being discussed in 1779, propositions were drawn up which were adopted as a basis for that union. The first four propositions state that Jesus Christ died for the elect only, that there is an appropriation in the nature of faith, that the gospel is indiscriminately addressed to sinners of mankind, and that the righteousness of Christ is the alone proper condition of the covenant of Grace.<sup>2</sup> When Dr. Robert Lathan published his history of the Church which resulted from that union he gave a detailed account of the Marrow controversy, in which he printed in full the Answers of the Marrowmen to the twelve queries put to them by the Commission, and referred frequently to the part James Hog played in the controversy.

There is an even more interesting development in the Confession of Faith of the Presbyterian Church in the United States. Despite the difficulty—one might in all truth say practical impossibility—of securing any change in the Westminster Confession, that Church added (in 1942) a chapter to the Confession, entitled, "Of The Gospel". The entire chapter might well have been written by James Hog, and indeed, there are expressions in the chapter which are identical with those Hog and the Marrowmen used, as may be seen from the following excerpt:

---

1. Edward Fisher, Marrow 1902, Preface by C.G. M'Crie.

2. Robert Lathan, History of the Associate Reformed Synod of The South, (Harrisburgh, Pennsylvania: 1862), p. 177.

GOD in infinite and perfect love, having provided in the covenant of grace, through the mediation and sacrifice of the Lord Jesus Christ, a way of life and salvation, sufficient for and adapted to the whole lost race of man, doth freely offer this salvation to all men in the gospel.

.....

It is the duty and privilege of everyone who hears the gospel immediately to accept its merciful provisions; and they who continue in impenitence and unbelief incur aggravated guilt and perish by their own fault.<sup>1</sup>

James Hog himself could have done no better in summarizing the doctrines of grace which he taught, published, preached, corresponded about, and contended for in the Church of Scotland, the leading principles of which, to use the words of Thomas M'Crie, Junior, may be comprised in two words,<sup>2</sup>  
 "FULL ATONEMENT AND FREE SALVATION".

---

1. The Confession of Faith of the Presbyterian Church in the United States, (Richmond: Presbyterian Committee of Publication), X. 1, 3. Cf. C.G. M'Crie, The Confessions of the Church of Scotland, (Edinburgh: MacNiven and Wallace, 1907), pp. 262-66.

2. Thomas M'Crie, Jr., "'The Marrow' Controversy," B. F. E. R., II(1853). 438.

SUMMARY  
AND  
CONCLUSIONS

In the more than forty years of his ministry in the Church of Scotland, beginning shortly after the Revolution and ending shortly after the Secession, James Hog addressed himself to every problem which appeared in the Church. No theme escaped his acute observation if it was of any importance, or if there was any divergence of opinion. In what many think was a drab, arid, almost contemptible age of the Church, it is pleasing to find in Hog one who never failed to make religious life interesting. Perhaps if he had been able to look into the future in 1689 he would never have left his peaceful retreat in Holland for the ecclesiastical upheavals of his native Scotland. On the other hand, once his lot was cast with the Church of Scotland, all the powers of earth could never drive him from the scene of conflict.

"Moderation" and "prudence" were the vogue-words of the time. Men were sorely tempted to conform to the wishes of the king because they did not wish to revive the old struggles and contentions. Scotland had a Presbyterian Establishment and that was the basic and important thing. They would not offend William by making unwise demands. All of this was well and good, up to a point; but when William sought to press his will upon the Church by demanding that they receive the Episcopalian clergy into the government and communion of the Church, even the more liberal-minded Presbyterians began to balk. Following the abrupt adjournment of the 1692 Assembly by William, there came recurring postponements of the Assembly's meetings, renewed insistence on the comprehension of the curates, and the imposition of the oaths of Allegiance and Assurance as terms of ministerial communion. James Hog was completely loyal to William, but he saw in these



measures the violation of the Church's inherent rights and privileges, and he refused to accede to such schemes. But the "court party" of the Church, eager to have regular Assemblies and to please William, apologized for the Church's behavior and blunders and promised to satisfy the king's desires if they were given another opportunity. Against these time-serving and expedient policies Hog raised his voice in strongest protest, for he believed that the Church, the Kingdom of Christ, should never be guilty of temporising or man-pleasing, that it was inconsistent with serving Jesus Christ to act from "politic considerations". He could understand, though not agree with, William's policies, for he had not been properly instructed in Presbyterian polity in Scotland; what he could not understand was the Church's compliant attitude and practice. Others, who felt much as Hog did, expressed themselves, too, but too many of these people were among the dissident separatist groups who had been unwilling to enter the Revolution Church in the first place.

The climax came when Hog was elected to the 1694 Assembly. Since he had refused the oaths he was confronted by the civil authorities, chiefly by the Royal Commissioner, who not only challenged his right to sit in the Assembly but strictly forbade him to do so. When Hog made it clear that he intended to carry out his commission, the Church managers attempted by flattery and gentle persuasion to dissuade him, but with no more success than the civil powers. Although threatened with imprisonment, offered face-saving alternatives, and brought under the pressure of the combined powers of the Church and State, Hog never wavered in his position, and in the end he took his seat in the Assembly.

In this episode of ecclesiastical history James Hog stood alone, no man taking his part. Much has been written of Carstares' mid-night visit to William and of his leadership in the interest of the Church, and no one would or could take away any praise from Carstares. The difference between the two is that Carstares had the whole Church solidly behind him, and he knew it. Hog, by contrast, had to oppose, not only the civil government, but also his own Presbytery of Hamilton, the Synod of Glasgow, and the managers of the General Assembly. In his ringing trumpet-call for the Church's spiritual independence, Hog takes second place to no minister of his generation: He attested his doctrines by his deeds,

Like many others of his period Hog was immoderate and uncharitable in his attitude toward Episcopacy and toleration, as also in his antipathy to the Union. Nor is there any need to make apologies for him: he was simply the child of his age. He looked upon these policies as violations of the Covenant engagements and this sufficed to make them anathema to Hog. For to the end he clung tenaciously to the belief that the nation was bound to the Covenant obligations, the casting off or denying of which constituted nothing less than national perjury and apostasy. His unflagging zeal for the Covenants is another of his characteristics as an Evangelical leader of the early eighteenth century.

In the company of nearly all Presbyterian ministers, Hog was aghast at the restoration of the exercise of lay patronage. Here again, he asserted, was a flagrant violation of the rights and liberties of the Christian people. What kind of a relationship could an intruded minister have with a congregation

which had no freedom of choice? Surely this was not a scriptural foundation for the ministerial relationship. Hog's arguments on the subject were no different from those advanced by others then and later. It was his resolute action in Dunfermline Presbytery and before Commissions of Assemblies which showed him to be not a man of words so much as one of action when the tide was running strongly against the rights and liberties of the people and the Church.

One of the outstanding aspects of Hog's Evangelical leadership is that of his vigorous appearances against Erastian interference in Church affairs and for the liberties, rights, and privileges of the Church of Scotland, in which he helped to preserve the spirit of the Calderwoods, the Bruces, and the Knoxes during a crisis period of the Scottish history.

Hog's convictions and testimonies against the Church's defection, together with his friendship with John Hepburn, led some to charge him with an intended separation from the judicatories of the Church. Perhaps the most grievous charge ever hurled against Hog was that by James Adams and others that he was deliberately embarked on a project to divide the Church.<sup>1</sup> If there is an impression abroad that Hog was of strong separatist leanings, the impression is an erroneous one. The evidence is that while he could not acquiesce in the moderate and prudential policies that seemed to sway men in the post-Revolution Church, and while he found himself in disfavor with the ecclesiastical

---

1. Supra, p. 303.

and theological leaders, he never had any thought of associating himself with those who withdrew, or held themselves aloof, from the Established Church. He loved his Church so much that he thought it his duty to seek to reclaim those who had so separated themselves. This he believed could be achieved, not by ostracizing them, but by the exercise of patience and Christian charity. Therefore he showed much forbearance in his efforts to win the separatists back to the Church. It is true that he was in sympathy with their views in many respects, but at last Hepburn's deceitful and offensive policies made Hog abandon his association with them and he wrote his blast against the 'Separatists'.

Hog had his convictions for which he would wage uncompromising warfare, and he undoubtedly made himself so obnoxious to the moderates that they would gladly have been rid of him. But one of his convictions was that so long as the Church officially maintained the Standards, and so long as there was opportunity to testify against defection from those Standards in practice, there was no ground for separation. When the opportunity for testimony was taken away in the Assembly, Hog still found avenues open to him in other ways to seek redress, and he continued to maintain that there should be no separation from the judicatories of the Church of Scotland. Therefore, he did not join the Secession. Neither did the three ministers who had been most under his influence by virtue of pastoral and family connections: James Wardlaw of Dunfermline, who had been an elder at Carnock, in close agreement with Hog, before he entered the ministry; William Hunter of Lilliesleaf, who married one of Hog's daughters; and Daniel Hunter, who married another of Hog's daughters and became

his successor at Carnock. It was unthinkable to Hog that a minister should break the "sweet Communion", as he could call it even in the days of Simson's first trial, of the Church. His plea was for <sup>the</sup> exercise of Christian charity among those who differed about current issues; for the give and take of candid discussion with one another; for caution in censuring others and severity in judging self; and for remaining in the "Paved Way", the way of Christ and the prophets and Apostles, namely the way of Christian Communion within the Church.

Judging from his teaching and his actions, the only thing that would have forced Hog to separation was for the Church to repudiate the Standards. At this point he and some of his Evangelical friends differed: He was more of the mind of John Currie of Kinglassie and of John Willison of Dundee than of Ralph and Ebenezer Erskine. On the other hand, it cannot be doubted that in his fierce contendings for the pure Presbyterian government of the Church, for doctrinal purity, for the doctrines of grace, and in his correspondence with the Societies and his publishing activities, Hog contributed (though not from any formed design) to the swelling current of disaffection which helped to prepare the way for, and fostered, the Secession. At the same time, one could point—as the Seceders did—to the despotic measures of the Church, to its censure of the Marrowmen and their teachings, and to its indulgence of Simson and his disciples as bearing no little responsibility for the Secession.

Hog was an intrepid leader against those who would endanger the freedom of the Church in the exercise of its Presbyterian polity;

but he was just as forthright in leading the Evangelical forces in the theological concerns which occupied the attention of the Church in the early eighteenth century.

The first theological matter to which Hog directed his attention was the Bourignonian movement. While the Church was alarmed by Bourignonism, it was in truth a passing phenomenon which waxed strong only in the northeast of Scotland where Presbyterianism had a somewhat tenuous hold. Nevertheless, it did give Hog the opportunity of declaring his sentiments about the sufficiency of the scriptural revelation for doctrine and life, a position which illustrated his hearty acceptance of the Confession of Faith. He asserted that the Word of God was then and always would be sufficient for the guidance of the Church in any and every circumstance. For him it was always the standard by which all doctrine and practice was to be tested (Bourignonism being the case in point), the "Truth unchanged, unchanging", "the chart and compass" by which alone the Church could be guided safely through the "mists and rocks and quicksands" to the will and purpose and truth of God.

Hardly had the Church recovered from the shock of the toleration, the abjuration oath, and patronage when, in opposition to this received opinion and attitude toward the scriptures, and toward the orthodox doctrines of the Church, there came the manacing ground-swell of the scientific movement, hurling itself against the old foundations of religious belief. The Deists and Arminians preached on the theme of man's ability, the rationality of religion as opposed to its supernaturalness and mystery, and of the need to question the doctrines of the Church. When John Simson,

professor at Glasgow, took up this theme, James Hog began to write and publish small treatises designed to show that Simson's views were anti-scriptural, anti-Reformed, and anti-religious.

Against Simson's optimistic views of man's natural abilities and of his being able to discover the way of life by moral seriousness, Hog affirmed most strongly the utter depravity of man, who, he declared, in his natural state, is destitute of light and incapable of any acceptable spiritual motion, even the least. Man's only hope, he taught, lay in a supernatural and transforming work of saving grace, through faith. This saving faith is only the work of the Spirit and is quite different from moral seriousness, which, while much to be desired, does not guarantee that the seeker will be saved. The idea that more are elected and saved than damned, as Simson taught, is attractive, but without scriptural or rational foundation in view of man's corruption and aversion to the things of God. Nevertheless, all men are on the same level in the use of means, since the eternal decree is not revealed to men. The offer of Christ in the gospel is genuine, and all are warranted to flee to the only redeemer of God's elect. Simson's teaching that the covenant with Adam was not to be understood in a proper sense was highly offensive to Hog, who saw in it the demolishing of the foundation for the imputation of sin. Simson actually founded imputation upon Adam's natural relation to race. Hog objected that if Adam did not represent the race in the covenant of works, Christ could not do so in the covenant of grace, and man was, therefore, in this scheme, still under the covenant of works. Such teaching imperiled the whole Covenant system of theology, Hog rightly observed.

One of the most unusual debates of the period, and surely even of the century, was that concerning Simson's proposition that there is no sinning in Hell after <sup>the</sup> judgment. In opposing this theory Hog shows how strongly he held to the belief that there was no middle ground between those who were regenerate and those who were unregenerate. Heaven and Hell had to be, for him, diametrically opposed the one to the other. This, and the rest of Simson's propositions, show that he was an innovator and a debunker of the orthodox positions; though such tactics did not commend Simson to Hog, it was because he was leaning too close to Arminianism and semi-Pelagianism that Hog opposed his teachings by means of his little treatises, which, incidentally, reveal Hog as a widely-read and acute theologian.

If one were to leave Hog in his contendings against Simson one would have a most unbalanced and erroneous view of the man. The controversy over The Marrow of Modern Divinity reveals a different side of Hog, and while his contribution to ecclesiastical history in the earlier part of his ministry, and in the earlier theological arena, is not to be passed over as unimportant, it is not without reason that he is remembered more especially for his Evangelical leadership in the disputations concerning the doctrines of grace as exhibited in that book.

Underlying the Bourignian and the Simson episodes was a growing influence of Baxterian, legalistic teaching. Whereas the orthodox opinion was that man was justified by the act of God's grace, not out of anything seen in, or done by, the sinner, but only for the righteousness of Christ imputed and received by faith alone, those under the influence of Arminian and Baxterian doctrines urged their



hearers to live a holy life, to repent of their sins, to examine themselves for the evidences of grace, and then to take the offer of Christ. The gospel offer was full of conditions as they preached it. The more they heard about the necessity of obedience, the more the moralities were stressed from the pulpit, the more the doctrine of election was opened up by the hyper-Calvinists—the more perplexed, distressed, and downcast the people became. When they saw their own moral failures and shortcomings and a "frowning providence", they could hardly avoid concluding that they were not of the elect, but were reprobate; or, at best, they never felt sure, secure, and joyful in their salvation, even when they knew that they had believed. When the convinced sinner cried out, "What must I do to be saved?", there were not many outside the Evangelical school who would be so bold as to reply, "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved." In a greater or lesser degree, depending upon the individual, something of man's works was imported into justification. Added to this was a theoretical, logical, and speculative approach to the whole Christian experience which sounded good in the divinity halls, but did not equip the young ministers to deal with the far different experience of people in their parishes.

James Hog detected the legal strain almost as soon as it made its appearance, and in his first published work, Remarks Concerning the Spirit's Operation (1701), as well as in most of the publications which followed, he sought to unmask the Baxterian evil, to show the difference between the covenant of works and of grace, and to lend practical assistance to those who were troubled about the new strain of preaching. He was well fitted to do this because

in his student days in Holland he had wrestled with the same problems himself. He also found the doubt of his people one of the greatest obstacles in his ministry, and most, if not all, of his printed sermons, are concerned to discover the legal spirit and to instil a true faith in his doubting believers.

When he read The Marrow of Modern Divinity in 1717, he saw that it touched upon the very points in which the people of Scotland were most in need of instruction. When, therefore, the suggestion was made that he assist in the publication of the book, and that he write a recommendatory preface to it, he was only too happy to oblige his Evangelical friends. The book was published, circulated, warmly received by some, hotly attacked by Principal Hadow and others, and at length condemned by the 1720 General Assembly, chiefly on the grounds that it taught universal redemption as to purchase; that it made assurance to be of the essence of faith; and that it was antinomian. Although Hog and the eleven other Evangelicals who drew up their Representation and Petition endeavored to correct the misrepresentation of the book and of their own teaching of the doctrines of grace, showing that they were definitely in the Reformed tradition, the 1722 Assembly, under the expert prodding of Principal Hadow, refused to retract its position: The Marrow remained condemned and its cardinal teachings under the ban of the Assembly.

Hog has been criticised for his unqualified recommendation of the Marrow and he has been represented as qualifying his evaluation of the book only after it had inflamed a public controversy. However, in his Vindication of the Doctrines of Grace from the Charge of Antinomianism and Explication of Passages

Excepted Against in the Marrow, both of which were published before Principal Hadow's public attack, Hog stated that there were exceptionable statements in the book and that he did not endorse its every word. He also sought to demonstrate that he, and others who preached free grace, was utterly averse to antinomianism. Granted that The Marrow of Modern Divinity has some unusual propositions—even as Simson had; granted that it is lacking in preciseness and systematic orientation; granted that Hog should have warned his readers that the book was deficient at some points: the fact still remains that when he and others attempted to qualify their endorsement they were not given an honest hearing. Applying the standard of criticism which Hadow used against the Marrow and James Hog, there is no book and no author which would survive unscathed, no, not even the Bible! Moreover, considering the growing rift in the Church over legalistic practice and teaching, one cannot help but wonder whether it would have been possible to avoid an eventual controversy between the hyper-Calvinists and the Evangelicals.

There is considerable evidence to support the view that the hyper-Calvinists, particularly Hadow and Adams, were responsible for the bitterness of the controversy. The pretended antinomian scheme of doctrine which Hadow advertised in the appendix to his sermon, The Record of God, was considered by Riccaltoun as one, if not the chief, cause of the animosities and rancor which arose. By putting words and meanings into the mouths of the Evangelicals while discrediting their explanations, and by taunting them with the authority of the Church, the legalists and their allies did nothing to resolve the differences between the schools. Several

Evangelicals of that day expressed the belief that the condemnatory Fifth Act of 1720 was directed against Hog, and Hadow's vituperative writings and ribald conduct do little to discredit that deduction. It is not surprising that Gabriel Wilson could write, in 1721, "I sympathize with the worthy Man under his Reproach and Contempt. He needs not, I hope, be put in Mind, There is a Resurrection of Names and of Books too, as well as of Persons."<sup>1</sup> If Hog was not wholly above the weaknesses of human nature, at least he never engaged in name-calling and personal invective, though Hadow and Adams gave him ample grounds to do so. To the extent that he was involved in the publication of the Marrow, Hog must share the blame for the controversy which ensued. The book itself, while containing several imperfections, has not a few remarkably superior passages, and Thomas Chalmers, among many others, found it a vital and vivifying work.

Having acknowledged that there is a darker side to the dispute, it is well and good that the controversy be seen, even as Hog himself would wish, not as a clash of personalities and wrangling about words and meanings in a book, but from the Evangelical viewpoint as an attempt to present the doctrines of grace to the Church. This is what Hog did in his teaching and preaching, and this he sought to do in his writings both before, during, and after the Marrow controversy. In these doctrines the real Evangelical is seen most winsomely.

---

1. Wilson, London Letter, p. 36.

Hog held that the warrant to offer the gospel, and Christ, to every man is inherent in the very nature of the gospel. His favorite passages of scripture were those which presented the universal offer of the gospel: "Ho, every one that thirsteth, come ye to the waters, and he that hath no money: come ye, buy, and eat; yea, come, buy wine, and milk without money and without price." (Isaiah 55: 1) "Come unto me . . . and I will give you rest." (Matthew 11: 28) "Him that cometh to me I will in no wise cast out." (John 6: 38) "Preach the gospel to every creature." (Mark 16: 15) "If any man hear my voice and open the door, I will come in." (Revelation 3: 20) From scriptures such as these, he showed that Christ offered himself to all and that it followed that ministers were not only warranted to follow Christ's example, but obligated to do so. He would not have the heart to preach the gospel at all unless he was fully warranted to say to the worst sinner, "If you believe, you shall be saved." In this awareness of the "Whosoever" of the gospel covenant, Hog and his school anticipated the development of, and sowed the seeds for, the missionary movement which flowered a century later. This emphasis certainly had its influence in fostering earnest gospel, or evangelistic, preaching not only in Scotland, but also in The United States, where to this day, there remains in the Presbyterian Churches, a strong evangelistic note in the preaching and teaching. Hog proclaimed a gospel for all.

In proclaiming the offer of Jesus Christ to all men, it followed that Hog, inculcated in the strongest fashion the absolute and complete sufficiency of the sacrifice of Christ, so that the

sinner was directed, not within, not to his own strivings and works, but without to "Christ the Lord our Righteousness". While holding the "received opinion" concerning election, as he amply demonstrated in his writings against Simson, as well as by his assertions during the Marrow controversy, Hog was constrained by the contemporary situation to say little about election, and much about the sufficiency of the Savior. There was a flavor of universalism in his message, but no more than there had been in many other orthodox Reformed theologians, and no more than is found in scripture. He was always careful in his writings to state that the extent of Christ's death was "so much, and just so much" as made it possible for him to make a bona fide offer of Christ to all men.

Hog did not teach, as hyper-Calvinists claimed, that assurance was of the essence of faith, or that a believer must have a full assurance of faith; but he certainly did teach that in the direct act of faith there must be an appropriating persuasion, a personal application, a receiving, an acceptance of Christ and salvation in him. Nothing else was required of the believer save that he accept the "marriage offer". It was not enough to say that Christ had died for others; it was essential that the sinner believe that Christ "loved me and gave himself for me". There had to be this persuasion in the direct act of faith or no one could ever believe, asserted Hog. Whereas Hadow and Adams thought that men ought to be beaten off from assurance, lest they use their faith presumptuously, Hog, looking at the doubts of his congregation, taught that assurance was a blessing and a grace to be sought, though it could never be possessed in its plerophery in this life.

If he dwelt much on this theme, it was because he saw the need of it as a rebuttal to the hyper-Calvinists and for the spiritual health of his own people.

Finally, Hog inculcated holiness of life from the highest motives. He was not guilty of proclaiming the grace of God in order to foster antinomian licentiousness, nor did his doctrines tend in the least to that in practice. He adhered to the obligation of the Law in its fullness, but, like the Marrow, he held that obedience to it came not from its promulgation as the covenant of works, not from the thunderings of Sinai, not even out of its authority from the hands of the Creator, or the authority of the Mediator, but from receiving it as "the Law of Christ", out of the hands of the "good and gracious Lord". The legalists demanded obedience to the Law because of the authority of God, because disobedience brought Hell while obedience brought the reward of Heaven. They may not have intended it, but in practice the result of their teaching was that men sought to merit salvation by their holiness. They were saved by their obedience and the obedience of Christ. Hog loved to declare the glad tidings of an accomplished salvation. He asserted in clear-cut language that "a man is not justified by the works of the law, but by the faith of Jesus Christ." (Galatians 2: 16) But appropriating Christ's righteousness did not mean that men could abuse God's grace. He made a constant plea for holiness of life, without which men showed that they had nothing but a dead, a false faith. While men might obey the Law out of slavish fear or selfish desire for reward, Hog thought the highest motive for obedience was gratitude to a loving Father.

and glorious Redeemer. First, however, there must be the ingrafting into Christ, the union with the True Vine, apart from whom there was no life, no power, no fruit. Hog's position was that which Isaac Watts expressed when he wrote, "Love so amazing, so divine, Demands my soul, my life, my all."

The content of this teaching transformed preaching for those who received it. No one could have worked up much enthusiasm for hyper-Calvinism with its legal demands, its forcing the sinner to look within for help, and its spawning of doubt in the minds of believers. There was something glorious to declare to men, and to every man, in the gracious gospel of the Marrowmen. If Hog painted the terrible depravity of man in its boldest and ugliest colors, if he rejected the natural ability of man to do any spiritual good, it was only because he had a glorious gospel of salvation, full and free, in Jesus Christ, to be preached to sinful men. No wonder, then, that even Hadow had to admit that the ministry of the Marrowmen was "countenanced" by the people much more than that of his own school.

What was the overall effect of the Marrow controversy on the Church? The voting in the Assemblies and the decisions of lower courts reveal that the Evangelicals fought a losing battle in the judicatories. Where Hog and his brethren did triumph was in the country parishes, and it was Hog and others of his convictions, who, by striving for the rights of the people and preaching the doctrines of grace, laid the foundation for the success of the Secession Church when the break did come. The Marrow controversy did not convert ministers from one point of view to the other. Indeed, each side was more firmly entrenched in its position after the final



decision had been rendered. There was a clearer line of demarcation between the Evangelicals and the other schools than previously, and the gulf between the two basic parties, Evangelical and Moderate, became wider and wider.

The claim is not made in this thesis that Hog was the chief leader of the Evangelicals, though the assertion can be made that no one was more their leader in the post-Revolution Church than he. He has justly been called "the leader of the Marrowmen". He was among the earliest to detect and publicly refute the legalistic strain of doctrine; the first to defend The Marrow of Modern Divinity when it was attacked; first to suffer reproach for his views; first in the degree to which he was subjected to the inquisitorial measures of the Church; first in the esteem of the twelve ministers themselves, for his name appears first on every official document of the twelve ministers: on the Representation and Petition, the protestations given in to the Commissions on two occasions, the Answers to the Queries, and the Protestation given in to the 1722 General Assembly. Even the Queries of the Commission were addressed to "Mr. James Hog and other ministers". He was in truth the "leader of the Marrowmen".

Throughout his ministry, as Churchman, theologian, author, publisher, and pastor, James Hog, adhered firmly to the ancient and received doctrines of the Reformed Church. He was not in truth a creative thinker, an innovator, or a deviator from the old paths; but an agitator, a proclaimer, and a propagator of the Reformed theology. One change of emphasis alone appears in his teachings: From about 1718 he was at greater pains to

articulate more forcibly and boldly than he had previously done the love of "our good and gracious Lord". This love he could affirm most constrainingly when he was sorely afflicted by virtue of his recommendation of the Marrow and his preaching the doctrines of grace.

An appeal for and courageous testimony to the spiritual independence of the Church; the Word of God the only rule of faith and practice; the depravity of natural man; God's sovereignty in grace; justification by faith alone; the sufficiency of the Savior; the grace of faith; purity of life in gratitude to the love of God in Christ; and the Communion of Saints: this was the emphasis of James Hog as an Evangelical leader. The words, grace and faith, are the two keynotes of his teaching. If Hog were asked to state in a few words the quintessence of his message to Scotland, his quick reply would almost certainly be, "The sufficiency of the sacrifice, and the suitableness of the Savior for all, and for every man, who will take him as he is offered in the gospel." In the final analysis, it was not only the nature and emphasis of his message, but also his sterling character, his indomitable spirit, and the impact of his dynamic personality, which was of an Evangelical color in itself, that constituted James Hog an Evangelical leader in early eighteenth century Scotland.

APPENDICES

## APPENDIX A

CONCERNING THE USE OF THE LORD'S PRAYER  
AND THE IMPOSITION OF FORMS OF PRAYER

The controversy about the use of the Lord's Prayer in worship as a form, which called forth two publications from Hog's hand, was an old one resurrected. The first liturgy of the Reformed Church in Britain was that of Edward VI (First and Second Prayer Books), which was superseded in Scotland by the Genevan Book as modified by Knox<sup>1</sup> (The Book of Common Order). The Book of Common Order remained in force officially until it was replaced by the Westminster Directory. During this period Sir William Brereton, an English Puritan visiting Scotland in 1635, praised the reading of a prescribed prayer, while the Bishop of Galloway, William Cowper, mentions with apparent approval the use of extemporaneous prayer. The Lord's Prayer was repeated in the Book of Common Order liturgy at the end of the long prayer of thanksgiving and intercession, followed by the Creed. In 1638 the Church leaders were equally hostile to Laud's liturgy and to those Puritans who favored the abolishing of liturgical forms altogether, but the Brownist influence was spreading, especially in the southwest of Scotland. One of the "innovations" mentioned by Andrew Ramsay, moderator of the 1640 Assembly, in a paper written sometime after that year, is the omission of the Lord's Prayer at the end of public prayers. The Commission of the 1642 Assembly

---

1. Vide William McMillan, The Worship of the Scottish Reformed Church, 1550-1638, (London: James Clarke, [1931]), pp. 29-73. Hereinafter cited Worship.

threatened with deposition some ministers in the south and west who had given up the Lord's Prayer, the Doxology, and kneeling for devotions in the pulpit upon entering for the service.<sup>1</sup>

It was in part to remove the pretexts for these innovations that Alexander Henderson was entrusted with the preparation of a Directory, though he and Baillie soon had their doubts about the wisdom of the project.<sup>2</sup> The Westminster Directory did not commit itself to either approval or disapprobation of forms of prayer, but it did approve the use of the Lord's Prayer, not only as a pattern, but as a form to be used in worship.<sup>3</sup> However, John Watson speaks aright when he says that at the Westminster Assembly<sup>4</sup> the Kirk lost its liturgy.

The decline of Reformed worship in Scotland continued: the doxology came to be omitted after the psalms; lengthy extemporaneous prayers came into fashion; the Apostle's Creed and the Lord's Prayer fell into increasing disuse.<sup>5</sup> At the 1649 Assembly, if Sir Hugh Campbell's report is true, a highly respected minister appealed for the abolition of the Lord's Prayer in worship on the grounds that it was being ignorantly and superstitiously repeated. The Moderator, being instructed by the Assembly to form an act which they would pass, was unable to find words to this effect

---

1. W. D. Maxwell, A History of Worship in the Church of Scotland, (London: Oxford University Press, 1955), pp. 88-97; John Watson, The Scot of the Eighteenth Century, (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1907), pp. 98-9; McMillan, Worship, pp. 13-31; Story, op. cit., p. 176.

2. The Westminster Directory, ed. by Thomas Leishman, (Edinburgh: William Blackwood and Sons, 1901), vii-viii.

3. C. G. M'Crie, The Public Worship of Presbyterian Scotland, (Edinburgh: William Blackwood and Sons, 1892), pp. 194-200; Maxwell, op. cit., p. 103; The Westminster Directory, viii-xvii.

4. Watson, op. cit., p. 98. Cf. The Westminster Directory, xviii.

5. Maxwell, op. cit., pp. 106-7.

and suggested that without passing an act all the members of that Assembly forbear to use the Lord's Prayer and report to their presbyteries "that it was the will of the Assembly, That the publick use of the Lord's Prayer, which was formerly practised, should after that day be universally forborn in all the Churches of this Kingdom." This the ministers agreed to do, though no act to this effect was passed.<sup>1</sup>

During the Cromwellian period the deterioration continued. The "innovations" were highly favored by the Protestors, and in that period most ministers went their own way without anything to stop or hinder them, with the result that many Reformed traditions fell into desuetude.<sup>2</sup> Between 1660 and 1688, no radical changes were made, probably because the experiment of 1637 was still vividly remembered! However, the bishops at Aberdeen, Edinburgh, St. Andrews, and Dunblane all insisted that the Lord's Prayer and the doxology be reinstated at all services. At the same time, the practice seems to have varied from congregation to congregation, and the difficulty of securing obedience to the instructions of the bishops is seen in their frequent repetition.<sup>3</sup> The outed ministers, while following the general pattern of worship, appear to have omitted in their services most of the proposals made by the bishops. Thus, the use of the Lord's Prayer, the reading of scripture, the doxology,

---

1. Sir Hugh Campbell, An Essay on the Lord's Prayer, (Edinburgh: Andrew Symson, 1704), pp. 11-13, 52. Hereinafter cited, Essay.

2. Story, op. cit., p. 176; Maxwell, op. cit., p. 111

3. J. Cunningham, op. cit., II. 143-44; Maxwell, op. cit., pp. 112-3.

the recitation of the Creed, all came to be associated in the minds of the people with Episcopacy, despite the fact that they belonged to the Reformed tradition of John Knox!<sup>1</sup> Shortly after the Revolution, it was possible to distinguish between Presbyterian and Episcopalian ministers primarily because the former refused to use the doxology and Lord's Prayer, while the latter used them both.<sup>2</sup> More and more these matters became party badges. It was around the Lord's Prayer that the battle was fought in the first decade of the eighteenth century.

In 1702 there was published the English translation of a small treatise, The Use of the Lord's Prayer Vindicated and Asserted, by Monsieur Jean D'Espagne, A French Presbyterian who had come to London. Two years later Sir Hugh Campbell of Calder published his Essay on the Lord's Prayer, in which he appealed for the restoration of the Prayer in worship. He also wrote, between 1705-1708, numerous letters to leading Presbyterian ministers, notably William Carstares, George Meldrum, and William Wishart, urging them to get the Assembly to restore the ancient practice. At the same time he sought to secure a minister for his "tennants" at Ardersier, in Inverness-shire, who, loyal to their laird's convictions insisted on a minister who would use the Lord's Prayer in worship. He engaged in correspondence with the Presbyteries of Inverness and Forres concerning this, and even wrote the General Assembly insisting that a certain minister be translated

---

1. Maxwell, op. cit., pp. 117-121.

2. Maxwell, op. cit., pp. 124-25.

to the long-vacant charge.

Sir Hugh obtained little satisfaction from Carstares and Wishart, nor did the Assembly have any inclination to yield to his overtures. The replies he received—some of his letters were ignored—were generally courteous, but evasive. Nevertheless, the General Assembly 1705 passed an act for observing of the Directory for Worship which was clearly the result of his efforts.<sup>2</sup> His objection was that it was not sufficiently specific, which seems a fair criticism since the act only "seriously recommends to all ministers . . . the due observation of the Directory for the Publick Worship of God. . . ." On the other hand, it was clear enough for John Anderson of Dumbarton, who, on the first Lord's Day after his return from the Assembly began to introduce the Lord's Prayer after the sermon. In reporting the Assembly's directive, he stated, that though the Directory had been received "in the purest times of Presbytery . . . with the greatest joy", and added,

Yet there are some things in that Directory that for some time have been in desuetude, among others the use of the LORD'S Prayer, which now we have begun to introduce. The words of the Directory concerning it are these:— 'And because the prayer which CHRIST taught His disciples is not only a pattern of prayer, but a most comprehensive prayer in itself, therefore we recommend it to be used in the publick prayers of the Church,' upon which I hope none of you will stumble at it, or at any other thing in the Directory; there being nothing therein but what is most agreeable to Presbyterian principles, as well as undoubtedly lawful in itself.<sup>4</sup>

---

1. Vide Sir Hugh Campbell of Calder, A Collection of Letters, (Edinburgh: Andrew Symson, 1709), pp. 9-10, 55-56, 75-158. Hereinafter cited Letters.

2. Ibid., p. 8.

3. Acts of Assembly, 1705. X.

4. John Anderson, "The History of the Introducing The Usage of the Lord's Prayer in Dumbarton", Transactions of the Scottish Ecclesiological Society, I(1903), p. 166.



Hog's first print was a reply to the argument set forth in D'Espagne's print and Campbell's Essay and in order to present Hog's position it will be necessary to give a summation of the views set forth in these works.

D'Espagne's argument against the "innovators" and "enthusiasts", as he called those who objected to the use of the Lord's Prayer, is summed up concisely in his concluding remarks:

It is our duty to say it, because Christ put it in our mouth. We ought to say it, because it is the marrow and abstract of all other Prayers. We ought to say it because it is the rule and Pole-star to guide us in our Applications to God. We ought to say it, for redressing the imperfections of all our other Prayers. We ought to say it, because of its universality, as to all purposes, persons, times, or places. It is a Prayer said by all the Churches in the World: And it is no small comfort to me to bear my part in such general Harmony. 'Tis a Prayer I can make use of in prosperity or adversity, in Peace or war, in Sickness and Health, in Life and Death. A Prayer that may be said by Young or Old, Rich and Poor, Prince and peasant.<sup>1</sup>

Sir Hugh Campbell dedicated his Essay to his grandson and in the prefatory section addressed a letter to the Lord High Chancellor of Scotland (the Earl of Seafield) in which he appealed to him to have Queen Anne instruct the Royal Commissioner to the General Assembly to inform the Assembly "how acceptable it would be to her" to restore the Lord's "Form of Prayer". Ministers were bound to obey the Supreme Magistrate in lawful things, and since this was undeniably lawful, they would have to obey her desires.<sup>2</sup> This argument was also repeated in several of his letters to the Moderators

---

1. Jean D'Espagne, The Use of the Lord's Prayer, English translation, (Edinburgh: Andrew Symson, 1702), pp. 43-4.

2. Campbell, Essay, Prefatory Letter.

of the Assembly.<sup>1</sup> He referred to his conversations with  
 Episcopalian ministers who used the Prayer constantly, and  
 alleged that since these ministers were not admitted to the  
 government of the Church the Assembly was not properly constituted.<sup>2</sup>  
 If, as he had been told, the Prayer was regarded as a badge of  
 Episcopacy, would Presbyterians reject it simply because it was  
 used by Episcopalians? He also inquired whether Presbyterians  
 could show as much warrant for their system of judicatories as  
 for the use of the Lord's Prayer in worship?<sup>3</sup> The Church of  
 Scotland, he went on, differed from all the Protestant Churches  
 in the world in its practice, for even the Church at Geneva used  
 liturgies and forms of prayer!<sup>4</sup> Since even the Catechism admitted  
 it as a special rule to direct us in prayer, by which, he said, was  
 meant it "'tis the best Directory", and that the Lord's Prayer  
 "may be used as a form of Prayer", why, he asked, was it not so  
 used?<sup>5</sup> However, his first and primary argument for the use of  
 the Prayer was that the disciples had asked to be "taught a form  
 of Publick Prayer", and that Jesus had given it to them to be so  
 used, with the command, "Say ye. . . ."<sup>6</sup> What would Jesus have  
 said, he inquired, if the disciples had replied, "Master, this is a  
 very good form; but we will not be obliged to say it every word;

---

1. Campbell, Letters, pp. 37-8, 47-50, 70.

2. Campbell, Essay, pp. 1,15.

3. Ibid., pp. 50, 55, 32.

4. Ibid., pp. 29-30.

5. Ibid., pp. 30-31.

6. Ibid., pp. 7,10,58, 68.

but must be at Liberty, to use the gifts and graces, which thou hast given us, in our own form of words; which shall be as near the form, thou hast Set us, as we can; which we judge will be more expedient. . . ."<sup>1</sup> Such an attitude would have been "intolerable ignorance", hardly short of "blasphemy".<sup>2</sup> It was evident that Sir Hugh attributed just such an attitude to Presbyterians.

James Hog had written an exposition of the Lord's Prayer in the form of a catechism which he used in his parish as a sort of compendium of theology rather than as an exposition in the usual sense. In fact, it should be said that it was in no small measure an anti-Baxterian catechism in which Hog set down the orthodox Reformed opinion. When this catechism was published at the request of his friends, Hog took the occasion to append to the book, which is his longest work in point of size, his reply to the above-mentioned works. It is this appendix which was the center of the polemics that followed. Expressing at the beginning a "high Veneration for this Compleat Pattern", Hog suggests that Sir Hugh had insinuated that Presbyterians are "of another Mind" or did not value the Prayer so much as he, or that they wanted to discard it. Thus, he had perverted the whole question.<sup>3</sup> For his own part Hog adjudged the use of the Prayer

---

1. Ibid., p. 68.

2. Loc. cit.

3. Hog, Lord's Prayer, p. 296. Walter Steuart of Pardovan describes the practice of the Church of Scotland in the use of the Lord's Prayer at this period: Vide Steuart, op. cit., p. 112.

a matter of "indifference", and felt that "in so far we have no Cause to break Established Order, to affect Novelty, and to beget Scruples of conscience in these of our Communion. . . . I cheerfully acknowledge all that Lawfulness, Necessity, and Expedience, which the Lord hath Reveal'd in his Word."<sup>1</sup> He admitted that the Prayer was instituted as a rule of direction and that believers might use the same words, both in public and private devotions, for "they sound pleasantly from the Hearts, and Mouths of Believers. . . ."<sup>2</sup> The matter under debate, he said, was whether Jesus had "prescribed this Prayer, as a part of the Regulation of publick Worship", to be constantly used as a form; whether the Lord Jesus had so restrained liberty of use that these identical words must be used in the same order, without any change whatsoever; and whether the constant annexing of them as "a kind of Appendix to Publick Prayer", especially after the sermon, was the use the Lord required?<sup>3</sup>

His argument runs something like this: Jesus gave his Prayer, not as a form to be imposed, but as a directory for prayer, and there is no scriptural evidence that this prayer was considered a requirement by the disciples.<sup>4</sup> The command to use the words is given, but their use is "enjoined" rather than "imposed", and the disciples would be directed "by his free Spirit" in its use. Those who argue for the use of the Prayer as a form base their argument on

---

1. Ibid., p. 299.

2. Ibid., pp. 299-301.

3. Ibid., pp. 301-2.

4. Ibid., p. 305.

the account in Luke, but they use the words of Matthew, which is inconsistent with their reasoning.<sup>1</sup> "A new Gospel is coined" by those who say, as Sir Hugh, that the Prayer was prescribed as an appendix to be "put up" so that any sinful weaknesses in his prayers will not be imputed to the sinner.<sup>2</sup> Is it absolutely necessary that believers must always be repeating these words verbatim and that this must be done after the sermon?, Hog inquires, and goes on to ask, in words which have been taken out of context and in some measure misrepresented,<sup>3</sup> "Were not this a manifest prostitution of them, and a downright turning all into a Lifeless, sapless, and Loathsome Form?"<sup>4</sup> It was the rigid use of the Prayer as a sort of appendage as though it had a kind of magical power which Hog objected to as making this Prayer "an Engine of Hell".<sup>5</sup> These are harsh words, but at least Hog's critics should do him the courtesy of adding, as he did,

I desire not to be mistaken, as if I charged all our Antagonists, as perverters of the Gospel of Christ, far be it from me to Entertain such a thought; nor do I think that the guilt is Equall, even of these, whose practise Leadeth that way. I Reverence the Protestant Reform'd Churches, and have a due regard for great and Eminent Divines, who yet retain this Form in the manner aforesaid, and hope, that Impartial, and unbyassed observers will not asperse me with anything contrary to this just Veneration; seeing my remarks point at Things more than Persons. . . .<sup>6</sup>

---

1. Ibid., pp. 313-315.

2. Ibid., pp. 307-8.

3. Vide Maxwell, op. cit., pp. 134-35 and Watson, op. cit., pp.100ff

4. Ibid., p.318.

5. Ibid., p. 320.

6. Ibid., p. 320-21.

Hog agrees with Sir Hugh that it is not "superstition" to use a form of prayer composed by Christ in public worship,<sup>1</sup> but he contends that no one should impose what the Lord did not, and also that the Westminster Assembly only made "a simple Recommendation" to use the Prayer.<sup>2</sup> If Episcopalians can offer the Lord's Prayer at the end of their prayers, with acceptance to God, cannot Presbyterians offer acceptable prayer except they repeat the Lord's Prayer, queries Hog, and adds that if no prayers but perfect prayers are accepted, then "no meer Man could ever be heard."<sup>3</sup> Hog also took exception to Sir Hugh's "strong itch" for greater liberty to the Episcopal clergy and his overtures to the government for its support of his project.<sup>4</sup>

Replying to D'Espagne's reasons, Hog reaffirms his appreciation of the Lord's Prayer and states, "I know no Presbyterian against using the Words of the Lord's Prayer, as it may please the Lord to direct."<sup>5</sup> But he feels that the Word of God does not warrant an imposition of this Prayer, and hence no power on earth has the right to "lay on us a Confinement",<sup>6</sup> which cannot amend the faults of the sinner's prayers, is contrary to "a becoming variety", and is a restraint on the liberty which the Lord has given.<sup>7</sup> While

---

1. Ibid., p. 337.

2. Ibid., pp. 338-9.

3. Ibid., pp. 335-36.

4. Ibid., pp. 340-41.

5. Ibid., p. 345.

6. Ibid., pp. 348-49.

7. Ibid., pp. 353-54.

agreeing with D'Espagne that the Lord's Prayer may be used both as a prayer and a directory, Hog feels that his plea for its being heard often as a form

is contrary to our stated Judgment in the Main. And as to all he considereth in his Answers, It is the Imposition of a constant Repeating the Words, and Appending them, as aforesaid, that we deny and oppose. . . . Do we suppress this Prayer who have an exposition of it in our Catechisms, not Inferiour to any that ever was given, and open it up both in doctrine, and Catechizing, besides the use both of matter and words in Prayer, as it pleaseth the Lord to direct unto them?<sup>1</sup>

When Sir Hugh read Hog's Appendix to his "Casuistical Essay", he renewed his efforts to secure the imposition of the Lord's Prayer as a form by the Assembly.<sup>2</sup> But he went further. He called upon Carstares to bring the Appendix before the Assembly and have them "put a mark of their displeasure upon it, and by their Act ordain the publick Prayers of the Church to be concluded with our Blessed Lords perfect Form."<sup>3</sup> Carstares ignored the letter and others followed, in which Sir Hugh referred to the "wretched and . . . Blasphemous Appendix, and the more wretched Author of it,"<sup>4</sup> and expressed hope that Carstares would "concurr to have the Appendix Condemned and the Author found out and censur'd."<sup>5</sup> These letters and other papers, with their replies, were published by Sir Hugh in 1709, with his Essay reprinted at the end of the collection.

---

1. Ibid., p. 369.

2. Campbell, Letters, p. 31 ff.

3. Ibid., p. 26.

4. Ibid., p. 54.

5. Ibid., p. 63.

Others, of whom Robert Calder was one, joined in the war of words. Hog refers to it as "one of the Controversies of our Day".<sup>1</sup>

Hog considered Sir Hugh's Letters an answer to his Casuistical Essay on The Lord's Prayer, and this, plus the other works he read and the discussions on the subject, brought forth his other treatise in this field, which addresses itself to the question of the imposition of forms in worship. In this print Hog seeks to answer two questions: First, under the New Testament dispensation, has the Lord empowered any to enjoin forms of prayer and worship and to confine the Church as to "Matter, Order and Words?" Second, should a person using the best of these forms confine himself only to them without seeking a more "unhampered performance" of these duties?<sup>2</sup>

He concedes that forms may be used sincerely and even profitably, and that "Directories for Social Prayer" are necessary and "even useful". On the other hand, he thinks the opposition will concede that it is lawful to perform acts of worship without a prescribed form, that it is not essential to use only the forms at all times,<sup>3</sup> and that forms are not binding on everyone in every circumstance. The burden of his argument is that since the Lord has not imposed forms in the Word, it is "intolerable presumption" in men to take away this liberty. If such an attempt is made

---

1. James Hog, The Unlawfulness of Imposing Forms of Prayer and other Acts of Worship, (Edinburgh: John Moncur, 1710), p. 1. Hereinafter cited Forms of Prayer.

2. Ibid., pp. 28-29.

3. Ibid., pp. 10-19.



we ought to stand fast to the liberty wherewith Christ has made us free, and not to suffer our selves to be intangled with any contrary yoke of bondage, in the wreathing of which yoke about our necks, the imposer as he is tyrannical, so he manifestly assumes the place of the Spirit of Supplications, in as far as he prescribes the Matter and Words of our Prayers.<sup>1</sup>

Forms are destructive of spirituality in worship, Hog avers. The needs of people are constantly changing, yet forms are stinted and unvarying. Even if it be said that they are changed (which seldom occurs), this only supports the inadequacy of forms!

Ministers know the particular needs of their people better than any others can, and as to the suggestion that extempore prayers are often imprudent, he replies that the Spirit of God guides ministers to the exercise of Christian prudence when they pray.

Finally, forms, while necessary for those "in an infant state",<sup>2</sup> restrict attainment and growth of gifts and graces. It is "praying in the Holy Ghost" (Jude 20) which scripture enjoins, and nothing right and acceptable to God is produced but by the Spirit of God.<sup>3</sup> Hog was not hesitant to affirm that

tho a Society of the ablest Divines and Politicians of the Nations were erected into a Court of Form-Makers, such is the infinite variety of different Dispensations of Providence with respect to that Church or Nation, that it were impossible for them by their utmost diligence and carefulness to furnish any competent number of proportionable Forms.<sup>4</sup>

---

1. Ibid., p. 43.

2. Ibid., pp. 53-66, et passim.

3. Ibid., pp. 32ff.

4. Ibid., p. 57.

At the end of his book Hog refers to Robert Calder's book  
 in defence of set forms<sup>1</sup> which he had read only after completing  
 his treatise, in which, says Hog, the author "Fights with his own  
 shadow, having never once stated the Question."<sup>2</sup> Calder countered  
 this latest of Hog's prints by his Answer to Mr. James Hog,  
 suggesting that Hog's Essay on the Lord's Prayer and his letter  
 on Forms of Prayer were "full of Behmanistical flashes, Enthusiastick  
 rattles; and that his partie's Worship is Nonsense and Blasphemie. . . ." <sup>3</sup>  
 He reviewed the contents of his earlier treatise on the subject, which  
 he hints Hog had never read, and charges him with using the same  
 argument against set forms as the Quakers and "giddiest Enthusiasts",  
 which is, that "set forms limit the Spirit".<sup>4</sup>

Apparently Hog perceived that the debates had gone far enough  
 and were reaching a lower level, for he made no reply to Calder.  
 He had stated that this issue was not worth the making of a division  
 in the Church.<sup>5</sup> In addition, there were other and more crucial  
 concerns before the Church. That the controversy did not cease  
 entirely, however, is clear, for the separatists, especially, alluded  
 to it in their works, and in their "Solemn Acknowledgement of Publick  
 Sins, and Breaches of the National Covenant and Solemn League and  
 Covenant", the McMillanites bewailed "'some using the Lord's Prayer  
 as a set-form, which ought to be used as a rule of direction in all

---

1. The Lawfulness and Expediency of Set Forms of Prayer Maintained  
 (1706).

2. Hog, Forms of Prayer, p. 68.

3. Robert Calder, An Answer to Mr. James Hog, (Edinburgh:1710), p. 11

4. Ibid., pp. 18, 39-47.

5. Hog, Lord's Prayer, p. 299.

our prayers, and not as a dead form of words'.<sup>1</sup>" While several authors have ridiculed Hog's words, which are admittedly harsh in a few phrases they have plucked out of his prints, his view in this controversy was apparently shared by Carstares, Meldrum, and Wishart, and his opinions were neither as novel nor as extreme as some have represented.

---

1. Cited in Hugh Watt, Recalling the Scottish Covenants p. 74. Vide also Queries to the Scots Innovators in Divine Service, (1712), pp. 27-32.

## A CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE OF LITERATURE RELATIVE TO THE MARROW CONTROVERSY

PRO-MARROW	DATE	ANTI-MARROW
Hog, Scots Edition of <u>The Marrow</u>	1717, Dec. 3(Preface)	
_____, <u>Covenant of Works and Grace</u> , 2nd Edition	1718	
_____, <u>Vindication</u>	1718, September 25	
_____, <u>Explication of Passages</u>	1719, c March	
	1719, May 14	Hadow, <u>The Record of God</u>
	1719, c May	Adams, <u>The Snake</u>
_____, <u>Conference</u>	1719, c June	
_____, <u>Errors in The Snake</u>	1719, c July	
	1719, c September	Hadow, <u>Review of Conference</u>
_____, <u>Remarks on The Review</u>	1719, c November	Dunlop, <u>Confessions</u>
	1720, c January	Adams, <u>Cromwellian Ghost</u>
_____, <u>Passages Collected from The Marrow</u>	1720, Early in	
	1720, May 20*	Act V vs. <u>The Marrow</u>
_____, <u>Letter to a Private Christian</u>	1720, c June	Maxwel, <u>Beauty and Purity</u>
Wilson, <u>London Letter</u>	1721, April 20	
<u>Representation and Petition</u>	1721, May 11*	
	1721, July 22	Hadow, <u>Antinomianism</u>
Hog, <u>Dialogue I</u>	1721, c October	
	1721, November 8*	<u>Queries to Mr. James Hog</u>
"Protest" to the Commission	1721, November 9*	
	1722, Early in	<u>A Friendly Advice</u>
<u>Letter to Author of Antinomianism of The Marrow</u>	1722, Early in	
<u>Reasons Against Dunlop's Preface</u>	1722	
<u>Answers to the Queries</u>	1722, March 12*	
Hog, <u>Dialogue II</u>	1722, c May 1	
Boston, <u>Queries to The Adviser</u>	1722, c May 1	
Riccaltoun, <u>Politick Disputant</u>	1722, c May	
Williamson, <u>Marrow</u> , Part II	1722, May 12	
	1722, May 21*	Act VII vs. <u>The Marrow</u>
<u>The Protestation</u>	1722, May 21*	
Williamson, <u>Scope and Substance of The Marrow</u>	1722, c July	
	1722, c July	<u>Observations on The Answers</u>
	1722, c July	<u>Remarks on The Answers</u>
	1722, November	
<u>The Sober Verity</u>	1722	
Fraser, <u>On Saving Faith</u> (with Preface by Hog)	1722	
Riccaltoun, <u>Review of Essay</u>	1723	Bannatine, <u>Essay</u>
_____, <u>A Sober Enquiry</u>	1723	
Wilson, <u>The Trust</u>	1723	
	1726	Adams, <u>Marrow Chicaning</u>
<u>The Viper Shaken Off</u>	1726	
Fraser, <u>Select Meditations</u> (ed. by James Hog)	1726	
Boston, <u>The Marrow</u> (with Notes)	1726	

Since full titles appear in the Bibliography, abbreviated titles have been used.

The (\*) indicates that the date indicated is prior to the actual publication.

## APPENDIX C

## COPY OF HOG'S LETTER TO THE SYNOD OF FIFE

(From Synod of Fife Records, 26 September, 1733)

Very Reverend Sir

My frailty in an advanced age, cannot allow my attendance upon the meeting of the Very Reverend Synod, to which otherwise my inclinations are strong. The affair concerning me hath long depended and now that I cannot reasonably expect that the thread of a weak Life shall be long extended, according to the usual dispose of Providence, I presume my R. and D. B. B. will not mistake my earnest desires, that it be issued by a decision, as it may please the Lord to guide them. I hope I shall never be left to forget the Kindness and Justice of the Very Reverend Synod with respect to the settlement of my dear Collegue with whom I sojourn and labour in an intire harmony. My Reverend and Dear Beloved Brethren have my papers and letters in retentis which have been often and long under their view. I am so conscious to my Self of great rudeness both of Speech and in knowledge, that I am afraid least, through my default, sentiments should be imputed to me, which really are not mine, and from which I am utterly averse, yet I shall be very far from blaming the Very Reverend Synod in that Event, but do wholly leave my Complaint upon my Self, and in case of failures in that kind, I lie willingly open to Instruction and Conviction. I have indeed been long in the ministry and the humbling sense of most unaccountable Sinfull weakness attending my poor labours grevieth my Heart and covereth me with many Blushes, nevertheless I can declare with the strongest and most sweet perswasion, that since the Lord vouchsafed to open my Eyes and to put me however unworthy into the Ministry, my Spirit hath through grace been whetted to a sincere and growing Edge, as against Errors and Heresies whatsoever, to the utmost of what I was taught to discern, So in apeculiar manner vs Antinomianism upon one Hand, and Pelagianism on the other, however covered and adorned; wisdom's children acquainted with these matters, could attest so much, wheresoever I have sojourned, were there access thereunto. I shall be very loathe to contest with my Superiors in accurateness and Politeness of Expression, wherein I own I am much behind, but as to my real Sentiments, I ~~and~~very Solemnly declare that the longer my poor Life is extended, I give into our excellent Standards with a hearty compliance, still upon the ascendant, the more I peruse them. This with my sincere desires of our Lord's gracious presence with and conduct to my Reverend and Dear Beloved Brethren is all at present from Very Reverend Sir yours in all dutifull observance.

James Hog

Carnock September 24th, 1733.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

PRIMARY SOURCES

## I. WORKS BY JAMES HOG

## A. PRINTED

- Hog, James, Abstract of Discourses on Psalm XLI. 4. Edinburgh: 1716. 32 pp.
- \_\_\_\_\_, Abstract of Sundry Discourses on Job XXXVI. 8, 9, 10. Edinburgh: 1714. 72. pp. [Another Edition, Aberdeen: 1778].
- \_\_\_\_\_, Abstract of Two Private Discourses on Mark IX. 23. Edinburgh: 1715. 23 pp.
- \_\_\_\_\_, A Casuistical Essay upon the Lord's Prayer (with an Appendix). Edinburgh: John Reid, Jr., 1705. 374 pp., including Appendix.
- \_\_\_\_\_, A Conference Betwixt Epaphroditus and Epaphras. Edinburgh: Brown, 1719. 40 pp.
- \_\_\_\_\_, The Controversie Concerning the Marrow of Modern Divinity, Dialogue I. 1721. 158 pp.
- \_\_\_\_\_, The Controversie Concerning the Marrow of Modern Divinity, Dialogue II. 1722. 132 pp.
- \_\_\_\_\_, The Covenants of Redemption and Grace Displayed. Edinburgh: John Moncur, 1707. 24 pp.
- \_\_\_\_\_, An Essay to Vindicate Some Scripture Truths. 1716. 32 pp.
- \_\_\_\_\_, An Explication of Passages Excepted Against in the Marrow of Modern Divinity. Edinburgh: Robert Brown, 1719. 24 pp.
- \_\_\_\_\_, A Letter Concerning the True State of the Question between the Non-Jurant and Jurant Ministers. Edinburgh: 1718. 22 pp.
- \_\_\_\_\_, A Letter to a Friend, Concerning the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. Edinburgh: James Watson, 1706. 98 pp.
- \_\_\_\_\_, A Letter to a Gentleman Concerning the Auchterairder Affair. [1717], 4 pp.
- \_\_\_\_\_, A Letter to a Gentleman Concerning the Interest of Reason in Religion. Edinburgh: 1716. 19 pp.
- \_\_\_\_\_, A Letter to a Gentleman Containing A Detecting of Errors in a Print, Intituled, The Snake in the Grass. Edinburgh: Robert Brown, 1719. 23 pp.
- \_\_\_\_\_, A Letter to a Gentleman Detecting the Gangrene of Some Errors. Edinburgh: 1716. 50 pp.

- \_\_\_\_\_, A Letter to a Gentleman in Which the Unlawfulness of Imposing Forms of Prayer Is Demonstrated. Edinburgh: John Moncur, 1710. 71 pp.
- \_\_\_\_\_, "A Letter to Mr. Gray of Glasgow Concerning the Nature of Faith". n.d. (Printed in John Brown, Gospel Truth, pp. 50-53).
- \_\_\_\_\_, A Letter to a Person Exercised to Godliness About Our Natural Enmity. Edinburgh: 1714. 48 pp.
- \_\_\_\_\_, A Letter to a Private Christian, Wherein It Is Demonstrated That the Believer's Receiving the Law as the Law of Christ Is the Only Effectual Method for Attaining Gospel Holiness and Escaping Antinomianism. [1720]. 16 pp.
- \_\_\_\_\_, A Letter Wherein The Scriptural Grounds and Warrants for the Reformation of Churches by Way of Covenant Are Considered. Edinburgh: 1727. 16 pp.
- \_\_\_\_\_, Editor, The Marrow of Modern Divinity, Part I. Scottish Edition, Preface by James Hog. Edinburgh: John Mosman and William Brown, 1718. 274 pp.
- \_\_\_\_\_, Memoirs of the Public Life of Mr. James Hogg. Ed. by Archibald Bruce. 1798. 142 pp.
- \_\_\_\_\_, Notes About Saving Illumination. Edinburgh: John Moncur, 1708. 56 pp. [Another edition, Aberdeen, 1778].
- \_\_\_\_\_, Notes About the Spirit's Operations. Edinburgh: John Moncur, 1709. Part I, 127 pp. Part II. 56 pp.
- \_\_\_\_\_, Otia Christiana. Edinburgh: James Watson, 1708. 220 pp. [Another Edition, Aberdeen: J. Chalmers, 1776].
- \_\_\_\_\_, and Bathgate, James, Reasons Humbly Offered to the Presbytery of Dunfermline for not Observing the Day of Thanksgiving. [1724]. 16 pp.
- \_\_\_\_\_, Remarks Concerning the Rooting, Growth, and Ripeness of A Work of Grace in the Soul. Edinburgh: Andrew Anderson, 1715. 38 pp.
- \_\_\_\_\_, Remarks Concerning the Spirit's Operation. Edinburgh: Andrew Anderson, 1701. 126 pp.
- \_\_\_\_\_, Remarks Upon the Review of a Conference betwixt Epaphroditus and Epaphras. Edinburgh: Robert Brown, 1719. 16 pp.
- \_\_\_\_\_, The Right of Church Members to Chuse Their Own Overseers. Edinburgh: 1717. 19 pp.
- \_\_\_\_\_, Editor, Some Choice Sentences and Practices of Emelia Geddie. Edinburgh: T. Lumisden and J. Robertson, 1741. 51 pp. [Earlier edition not in National Library or New College Library. Another edition, Edinburgh: Alexander Robertson, 1795].



- \_\_\_\_\_, Some Few of Many Passages, Collected from the Marrow of Modern Divinity, for Clearing It from the Charge of Antinomian Licentiousness. [1720?]. 4 pp.
- \_\_\_\_\_, Some Missives Detecting and Refuting Deism. Edinburgh: John Mosman, William Brown, and James M'Euen, 1718. 130 pp. (Including a Supplement.)
- \_\_\_\_\_, Some Proposals for Peace and Harmony. Edinburgh: John Reid, 1718. 24 pp.
- \_\_\_\_\_, Some Remarks About Submission to the Sovereign Disposal of the God of the Spirits of All Flesh. Edinburgh: 1709. 23 pp.
- \_\_\_\_\_, Some Select Notes Detecting a Covered Mixture of the Covenant of Works and of Grace. Edinburgh: James Watson, 1706. 32 pp. [Another Edition, Edinburgh: John Mackie, 1718.]
- \_\_\_\_\_, Three Missives Wherein the Author's Grounds for Remaining in Communion with the Church of Scotland Are Stated. Edinburgh: 1717. 64 pp. [First 'Missive' republished, Edinburgh, 1893.]
- \_\_\_\_\_, Two Letters Concerning Professor Campbell's Divinity. Edinburgh: 1731. 65 pp.
- \_\_\_\_\_, A Vindication of the Doctrine of Grace from the Charge of Antinomianism. Edinburgh: Robert Brown, 1718. 24 pp.

## B. IN MANUSCRIPT

- Hog, James, "Annotations on Thomas Gilbert's Guilt and Pardon of Sin." In New College Library, Edinburgh. (Press Mark U. S. II. 1. 24.) 98 pp.
- \_\_\_\_\_, "Answers to Some Queries Concerning the Covenants of Redemption and Grace." In New College Library. (Press Mark U. S. II. 1-21, pp. 43-79.)
- \_\_\_\_\_, "Concerning Returns of Prayer." New College Library. (Press Mark U. S. II. 1. 24.) 27 pp.
- \_\_\_\_\_, and others, "Copy of A Declaration to Dunfermline Presbytery Anent Subscribing the Confession of Faith." New College Library. (Press Mark U. S. II. 1-21.)
- \_\_\_\_\_, "Journal". Written between November 19, 1694 and October 9, 1695. New College Library. (Press Mark U. S. II. 4. 7.) 47 pp., appended to a fragment of Hog's Memorial.

\_\_\_\_\_, "Letter Anent Conduct of the Synod of Fife, April, 1722." New College Library. (Press Mark U. S. II. 1-21, pp. 37-43.)

\_\_\_\_\_, "Letters Concerning the Conditionality of the Covenant of Grace." Written between December 13, 1712(sic) and January 19, 1711. Letters 41-56. New College Library. (Press Mark U. S. II. 1. 24.) 29 pp.

\_\_\_\_\_, "Letters from Mr. Jas. Hogg to His Friends at Edinburgh." Letters to an Edinburgh Society. Three sets of Letters in New College Library. (Press Mark U. S. II. 5. 6.)

Set 1. 30 Letters written 1730-1731 (last letter dated February 19, 1731) on doubt, unbelief and faith. 130 pp.

Set 2. Letter Nos. 4-14 (written between July 28, 1731 and December 25, 1731); 17, 18 (January 25, 1732); and four other letters (various dates). Mostly on faith.

Set 3. 15 Letters written between January 25, 1732 and June 30, 1732, concerning Man in his corrupt natural state and the means of recovering him from unbelief to faith.

\_\_\_\_\_, "Letter to Mistris Shiell of Edinburgh." A Letter of Sympathy. In National Library of Scotland. Dated December 2, 1723. [This letter was published by D. C. A. Agnew, Theology of Consolation, pp. 295-96.]

\_\_\_\_\_, "Letters to Robert Wodrow", or "Wodrow Manuscript Correspondence". In National Library of Scotland. Letters as follows:

- Vol. II. No. 97. December 22, 1709. Anent notes on "Returns of Prayer."
- II. 100. March 15, 1710. Anent Hog's writings and reply to Wodrow's comments.
- II. 107. July 15, 1710. Enclosing "Returns of Prayer."
- II. 108. June 10, 1710. Concerning "Returns of Prayer."
- II. 109. October 4, 1710. Concerning the above.
- XIX. 4. August 24, 1711. Anent the Queen's appointing fasts and thanksgivings.
- XIX. 110. July 27, 1713. Anent doubt and faith.
- XIX. 24. October 15, 1714. Queries anent the Abjuration Oath, reproduced in Wodrow, Correspondence I. 647-48.
- XIX. 25. October 15, 1714. Anent Hog's prints on "Natural Enmity" and "On Mark IV. 26, 27, 28."
- XIX. 26. January 1, 1715. Anent the Abjuration, replying to Wodrow's comments, and concerning John Simson.
- XIX. 27. February 4, 1715. Anent the oath and Simson.
- XIX. 30-31. March 30, 1715. Anent the "History of the Sufferings of the Church", and Professor Simson.
- XIX. 45. May 10, 1717. Anent Hog's "Essay on Separation."
- XIX. 53. March 12, 1718. Anent Wodrow's share in the expense of printing the "Missives against Separatists."

- XIX. 60. June 9, 1718. Anent a work against Deists.  
 XIX. 61. July 4, 1718. Anent John Hepburn.  
 XXX. 1. March 23, 1720. Anent Thomas Hog and Js. Fraser.  
 XXX. 15. No date. A letter concerning prayer.  
 XXXIX. 32. Several letters of Hog to Simson and Simson to Hog, 1714-15, on "Sinning in Hell." 35pp. 52pp. 4pp.

\_\_\_\_\_, "Testamentary Memorial of Mr. James Hog." In the National Library of Scotland. Eleven chapters, 701 pp. [Another copy, minus the last chapter (which was torn out and published as Memoirs of the Public Life of Mr. James Hogg, by Archibald Bruce, in 1798) is in New College Library, Press Mark U. S. II. 5-7. Another memorial by Hog, covering the same material, is partially preserved in New College Library, Press Mark U. S. II. 4. 7.]

## II. OTHER PRIMARY SOURCES

### A. PRINTED

Abstract of Difficulties Occuring to a Reader of Simpson's Printed Answers to Webster's Libel. n. d. 8 pp.

Acts of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, 1638-1842. Church Law Society Edition. Edinburgh: Edinburgh Printing and Publishing Company, 1843. 1208 pp.

[Adams, James], The Cromwelian Ghost Conjured. Edinburgh; 1720. 88 pp.

\_\_\_\_\_, Marrow Chicaning Displayed. 1726. 46 pp.

\_\_\_\_\_, The Snake in the Grass. Edinburgh: 1719. 47 pp.

Advertisement, Concerning a Short Abstract taken from Simson's Printed Account of the Process. [1716] 1 page.

Allan, James of Rothes, A Letter to the Moderator of the Next General Assembly. 1707. 56 pp.

Anderson, John, "The History of the Introducing of the Usage of the Lord's Prayer in Dumbarton". In Transactions of the Scottish Ecclesiological Society, I(1903), pp. 159-185.

An Answer to a Paper Entitled Abstract of Difficulties Occurring to a Reader of Professor Simpson's Printed Answers. Edinburgh: William Adams Junior, 1717. 24 pp.

Associate Presbytery, Act Concerning the Doctrine of Grace. Glasgow: John Bryce, 1766. Introduction viii; 88 pp.

- \_\_\_\_\_, Act, Declaration and Testimony For the Doctrine, Worship, Discipline and Government of the Church of Scotland. [Known as The Judicial Testimony.] Edinburgh: Printed for James Jaffray, 1737. 152 pp.
- [Bannantine, James], An Essay Upon Gospel and Legal Preaching. Edinburgh: James Davidson, 1723. 142 pp. [Also, James Ballantine].
- Baxter, Richard, Aphorismes of Justification. The Hague: Abraham Brown, 1655. 334 pp., including Appendix.
- Boston, Thomas, A General Account of My Life. G. D. Low, Editor. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1908. 381 pp.
- \_\_\_\_\_, Queries to the Friendly Adviser. 1722. 36 pp.
- Bourignon, Antonia, The Light of the World. London: Christian de Cort, 1696. 593 pp.
- \_\_\_\_\_, The Renovation of the Gospel Spirit. London: 1707. 446 pp.
- Brown, John of Haddington, Editor, The Christian, The Student, The Pastor. Edinburgh: Gavin Alston, 1781. 295 pp.
- Burnet, Bishop Gilbert, History of His Own Time. 2nd. Ed. Vol. 4. Oxford: The University Press, 1833.
- [Calder, Robert], An Answer to Mr. James Hog at Carnock. Edinburgh: 1710. 95 pp. [Last page completed in manuscript in National Library copy.]
- Calvin, John, Institutes of the Christian Religion. Translated by John Allen, 8th American Edition, Revised. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1949. Two Vols.
- Campbell, Archibald, A Discourse Proving That the Apostles Were no Enthusiasts. London: Printed for A. Millar, 1730. Preface xxiv; 79 pp.
- Campbell, Sir Hugh, A Collection of Letters. Edinburgh: Andrew Symson, 1709. 169 pp.
- \_\_\_\_\_, An Essay on the Lord's Prayer. Edinburgh: Andrew Symson, 1704. 76 pp.
- Carstares, William, State Papers and Letters Addressed to William Carstares. Ed. by Joseph M'Cormick. London: Printed for W. Strahan and T. Cadell, 1774. 800 pp.
- [Clarkson, Andrew], Plain Reasons for Presbyterians Dissenting. 1731. 280 pp.

A Collection of Confessions of Faith. William Dunlop, Editor.  
Two Volumes. Edinburgh: James Watson, 1719, 1722.  
Vol. I, Preface clxii pp.

A Collection of Prophetical Warnings of the Eternal Spirit.  
London: 1708. 174 pp.

The Confession of Faith (With supplementary section containing "The Practical Use of Saving Knowledge" and "A Brief Summary of Christian Doctrine"). Fifth Ed. London: Printed for James MacEuen, 1717. 400 pp.

Currie, John, An Essay on Separation. Edinburgh: T. Lumisden and J. Robertson, 1738. 224 pp.

\_\_\_\_\_, The Search. Edinburgh: 1734. 233 pp.

\_\_\_\_\_, A Vindication of the Real Reformation-Principles Concerning Separation. Edinburgh: A. Alison, 1740. 360 pp.

D'Espagne, [Jean], The Use of the Lord's Prayer Vindicated and Asserted. [Tr. by Sir Hugh Campbell of Calder?],  
Edinburgh: Andrew Symson, 1702. 48 pp.

Dutton, Thomas, and others, Warnings of the Eternal Spirit to the City of Edinburgh. London: 1710. 179 pp.

Erskine, John, Journal of the Hon. John Erskine of Carnock, 1683-1687. Edinburgh: Printed for the Scottish History Society, 1893. 259 pp.

Erskine, Ralph, Faith No Fancy (with an Appendix). Edinburgh: Printed for William Gray, 1745. 40 pp.

\_\_\_\_\_, The Poetical Works of the Reverend and Learned Ralph Erskine. Aberdeen: George and Robert King, 1858. 664 pp.

F., E., [Fisher, Edward], The Marrow of Modern Divinity. Ninth Edition, corrected, with Preface by James Hog. Edinburgh: Printed by John Mosman and William Brown, 1718. 274 pp.

\_\_\_\_\_, The Marrow of Modern Divinity. Part I, Twelfth Edition, corrected, with notes by Philalethes Irenaeus [Thomas Boston]. 1726. 384 pp.

\_\_\_\_\_, The Second Part of The Marrow of Modern Divinity. With a Preface and an Appendix [by John Williamson]. 1722. Preface xvi; 176 pp.

Fraser, James, Memoirs. Edinburgh: The Religious Tract and Book Society, 1889.

- \_\_\_\_\_, Some Choice Select Meditations. [Ed. by James Hog].  
Edinburgh: 1726. 64 pp.
- \_\_\_\_\_, A Treatise Concerning Justifying or Saving Faith. [Ed.  
and with Preface by James Hog?] Edinburgh: James Mosman,  
1722. ix; 281 pp.
- Free Thoughts on the Case of the Presbytery of Dunfermline. 1733.  
8 pp.
- A Friendly Advice for Preserving the Purity of Doctrine and Peace  
of the Church. Edinburgh: J. Mosman, 1722. 134 pp.
- [Garden, George], An Apology for M. Antonia Bourignon. London:  
Printed for D. Brown, 1699. 444 pp.
- Gilbert, Thomas, A Learned and Accurate Discourse Concerning The  
Guilt and Pardon of Sin. Edinburgh: William Brown and  
John Mosman, 1717. 28 pp.
- Glass, John, A Narrative of the Rise and Progress of the  
Controversy about the National Covenants. Edinburgh: 1728. 226 pp.
- [Graham, James], The Famous Tryal of the late Reverend and  
Learned Mr. James Grame. London: J. Bettenham, 1719. 182 pp.
- Hadow, James, The Antinomianism of the Marrow of Modern Divinity  
Detected. Edinburgh: John Mosman, 1721. Prefaces xiv, xvi; 172 pp.
- \_\_\_\_\_, A Review of a Conference betwixt Epaphroditus and  
Epaphras. Edinburgh: John Mosman, 1719. 67 pp.
- \_\_\_\_\_, The Record of God and Duty of Faith. Edinburgh:  
John Mosman, 1719. 39 pp.
- Halyburton, Thomas, Memoirs. Edinburgh: Andrew Anderson, 1714.  
288 pp.
- \_\_\_\_\_, Natural Religion Insufficient; and Reveal'd Necessary.  
Edinburgh: Andrew Anderson, 1714. Preface by James Hog.  
Part I, 232 pp.; Part II, 104 pp.
- Hamilton, Alexander, A Short Catechism Concerning the Three Special  
Divine Covenants, and Two Gospel Sacraments. Edinburgh:  
John Moncur, 1714. Preface, 41 pp.; 50 pp.
- Hepburn, John, The Last Testimony of the Reverend, Pious and  
Painful Mr. John Hepburn. 1723. 24 pp.
- Historical Manuscripts Commission: Laing Manuscripts. Ed. by Rev.  
Henry Paton. "Minutes of Conference with the Cameronians".  
Vol. II (London: 1925), pp. 101-109.

- [Honyman, Andrew], Bourignonism Displayed. Aberdeen: John Forbes, 1710. 134 pp.
- An Humble Address to the Reverend and Honourable General Assembly Anent Catching of Foxes. [A Poem] Printed by Margaret Reid. n. d. 1 page.
- Lacy, John, Editor, A Cry from the Desert. Second Edition. London: Printed for B. Bragg, 1707. Preface, xxiv; 114 pp.
- A Letter to the Author of the Antinomianism of the Marrow of Modern Divinity Detected. Edinburgh: 1722. 7 pp.
- Leydekker, Melchior, A Copy of a Letter from Mr. Melch. Leideker to R. Mr. Ja. Hog, Concerning the R. M. Jo. Simson. [May 18, 1717.] 1 page.
- Luther, Martin, A Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians. New Translation by Theodore Graebner, Third Edition. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House. n. d. 252 pp.
- Mackenzie, Margaret and Cuninghame, James, Warnings of the Eternal Spirit to the City of Edinburgh. London: 1710. 39 pp.
- M'Claren, John, The New Scheme of Doctrine Contained in the Answers of Mr. John Simson. Edinburgh: John Reid, 1717. 457 pp.
- Marshall, Walter, The Gospel Mystery of Sanctification. London: 1714. 368 pp.
- Melanchthon, Philip, The Loci Communes of Philip Melanchthon. Tr. by Charles L. Hill. Boston: Meador Publishing Co., 1944. 274 pp.
- Memorial for the Members to be Chosen to Represent This Church at the Ensuing General Assembly, Humbly Offered by an Elder of the Church of Scotland. n. d. 8 pp.
- [Mitchell, Gavin], Humble Pleadings for the Good Old Way. 1713. 311 pp.
- [Murray, Archibald], The State of the Parish of Kinross. [1729?]. 16 pp.
- News from Bathgate: A Poem [on Patronage]. n. d. 70 pp.
- Nimmo, James, Narrative of Mr. James Nimmo. Ed. by W. G. Scott-Moncrieff. Edinburgh: Printed for the Scottish History Society, 1889. 112 pp.
- Plain Reasons Against the Adding of Mr. Dunlop's Preface unto the Westminster Confession of Faith, 1719. 1722. 20 pp.

- [Pollock, John], An Answer to the First Part of Humble Pleadings.  
Dumfries: Robert Rae, 1717. 75 pp.
- Principal Acts of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, 1708. (Unprinted Acts). Edinburgh: George Mosman, 1708.
- Principal Acts of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, 1714, 1716, 1717, 1720, 1722. (Unprinted Acts). Edinburgh: Andrew Anderson, 1714, 1716, 1717, 1720, 1722.
- The Protestation of Several Ministers of the Gospel Given in to the General Assembly met at Edinburgh, May 1722. 1722. 16 pp.
- Protesters Vindicated. 1716. 264 pp.
- Queries, Agreed unto by the Commission of the General Assembly; And Put to These Ministers who Gave in a Representation and Petition, Together with the Answers to the said Queries. 1722. 120 pp.
- Queries to the Scots Innovators in Divine Service and Particularly to the Liturgical Party in the Shire of Angus. 1712. 32 pp.
- The Register of the Actings and Proceedings of the General Assembly 1692. Ed. by Principal Robert Lee. Edinburgh: Neill and Co., 1852. 37 pp.
- Remarks Upon the Answers of the Brethren to the Queries. Edinburgh: 1722. 91 pp.
- The Representation and Petition of Several Ministers of the Gospel, to the General Assembly, Met at Edinburgh, May 1721. Edinburgh: 1721. 32 pp.
- [Riccartoun, Robert], The Politick Disputant. Edinburgh: 1722. 80 pp.
- \_\_\_\_\_, A Review of an Essay upon Gospel and Legal Preaching.  
Edinburgh: James M'Euen, 1723. 128 pp.
- \_\_\_\_\_, A Sober Enquiry. 1723. Preface, xv; 446 pp.
- Ross, [Katharine], Memoirs or Spiritual Exercises of Mistress Ross.  
(Prefatory letter by James Hog). Edinburgh: 1735. 88 pp.
- Rule, Gilbert, The Good Old Way Defended. Edinburgh: Andrew Anderson, 1697. 316 pp.
- Shields, Michael, Faithful Contendings Displayed. Glasgow: John Bryce, 1780. Preface, xxiv; 530 pp.
- Simson, John, Libel against Mr. John Simson; Mr. Simson's Speech to the Presbytery of Glasgow; Mr. Simson's Answers. (Publication of the official papers of the First Simson Case). [1715?] 288 pp.



- \_\_\_\_\_, A True and Authentick Copy of Mr. John Simson's Letters to Mr. Robert Rowen. (James Webster, Publisher) Edinburgh: John Moncur, 1716. 37 pp.
- The Sober Verity. 1722. 60 pp.
- Some Observations Upon the Answers of the Brethren to the Queries. Edinburgh: 1722. 86 pp.
- State of the Processes Depending Against Mr. John Simson. Ed. by John Dundas. Edinburgh: James Davidson and Robert Fleming, 1728. 321 pp.
- Steuart, Walder of Pardovan, Collections and Observations Concerning the Worship, Discipline, and Government of the Church of Scotland. Edinburgh: Andrew Anderson, 1709. 314 pp.
- A Testimony Against the Present Defections, Especially Against That Church-ruining Abomination of Patronages. 1730. 23 pp.
- Toland, John, Christianity Not Mysterious. London: Sam Buckley, 1696. Second Edition. 174 pp.
- [Trail, Robert], A Vindication of the Protestant Doctrine Concerning Justification. London: Printed for Dorman Newman, 1692. 42 pp.
- Videte Apologiam Nostram Contra Websterum, Or, A Letter from A Private Christian. 1722. 16 pp.
- The Viper Shaken Off Without Hurt into the Fire. Edinburgh: 1726. 8 pp.
- Webster, James, Libel Against Mr. John Simson, etc. (Publication of the official papers in the First Simson Case). [1715?] 288 pp.
- \_\_\_\_\_, A Short Abstract Taken from Mr. John Simson's Printed Account. Edinburgh: John Moncur, 1716. 13 pp.
- West, Elisabeth, Memoirs. New Edition. Edinburgh: 1807. 218 pp.
- [Williamson, John], The Scope and Substance of the Marrow of Modern Divinity. Edinburgh: 1722. 148 pp.
- [Wilson, Gabriel], A Letter to A Gentleman at Edinburgh. (Called "The London Letter") 1721 39 pp.
- \_\_\_\_\_, The Trust. Kilmarnock: Peter M'Arthur, 1781. 124 pp.
- Wodrow, Robert, Analecta. 4 Vols. Edinburgh: Printed for the Maitland Club, 1843.

\_\_\_\_\_, The Correspondence of the Rev. Robert Wodrow. Ed. by the Rev. Thomas M'Crie. 3 Vols. Edinburgh: Printed for the Wodrow Society, 1842.

\_\_\_\_\_, Early Letters of Robert Wodrow (1698-1709). Ed. by L. W. Sharp. Scottish History Society Publication, 3rd Series, Vol. XXIV. Edinburgh: T. and A. Constable Ltd., 1937.

#### B. IN MANUSCRIPT

Carnock, Session of, "Kirk Session Record". In the Register House, Edinburgh. 1699-1735, now catalogued as follows: Vol. 1(1699-1721), Vol. 2(1722-1758).

Dunfermline, Presbytery of, "Dunfermline Presbytery Records". In the Register House, Edinburgh. 1699-1735, now catalogued as follows: Vols. 3(1696-1704), 4(1704-1717), 5(1717-1729), 6(1729-1745).

Fife, Synod of, "Synod of Fife Records". In the Register House, Edinburgh. 1699-1735, now catalogued as follows: Vols. 5(1696-1705), 6(1706-1718), 7(1719-1738).

General Assembly, The Commission of The, "Papers of the Commission Relative to the Case of John Simson, 1715-1717". In the Register House, Edinburgh.

Hamilton, Presbytery of, "Hamilton Presbytery Records". In the Strong Room of the Old Parish Church, Hamilton. 1690-1697.

"Wodrow Manuscript Correspondence", or "Letters to Robert Wodrow". In the National Library. Letters as follows:

- Vol. IX. 26. February 8, 1715. James Murray of Penpoint to R. W. anent John Hepburn and James Gilchrist.
- IX. 31. February 15, 1715. James Murray to R. W. anent Hepburn, Gilchrist, and Taylor.
- IX. 31. February 15, 1715. James Murray to R. W. anent James Hog, Allan Logan, and Cuthbert.
- IX. 49. March 15, 1715. James Murray to R. W. anent Hog, Logan, and Cuthbert, their papers anent Hepburn and Murray.
- IX. 71. May 10, 1715. James Murray to R.W. enclosing papers.
- IX. 73. May 10, 1715. Copies of papers by Logan, Hog, and Cuthbert, anent James Murray and John Hepburn.
- XLIX. 41. 42. Abstract of the Synod of Fife Record anent the process against James Hog, April 5, 1722.

SECONDARY SOURCES

## I. BOOKS

- Album Studiosorum Academiae Rheno-Traiectinae, MDCXXXVI-MDCCCLXXXVI.  
Ultraiecti: J. L. Beijers et J. Van Boekhoven, 1886.
- Agnew, D. C. A., The Theology of Consolation. Edinburgh: Ogle and Murray, 1881. 415 pp.
- Beveridge, Erskine, A Bibliography of Works Relating to Dunfermline and the West of Fife. Dunfermline: Private printing by William Clark & Son, 1901. pp. 171-174.
- Brown, John, of Whitburn, Editor, Gospel Truth Accurately Stated and Illustrated. New Edition. Glasgow: Blackie, Fullarton, & Co. 1831. 487 pp.
- Brown, P. Hume, History of Scotland. Vol. 3. Cambridge: University Press, 1911.
- Brown, Thomas, Church and State in Scotland. Third Series of Chalmers Lectures. Edinburgh: Macniven and Wallace, 1891. 244 pp.
- Campbell, A. J., Two Centuries of the Church of Scotland, 1707-1929. Paisley: Alexander Gardner, Ltd., [1930]. 317 pp.
- A Catalogue of the Graduates in the Faculties of Arts, Divinity, and Law, of the University of Edinburgh. Edinburgh: Neill and Co., 1858. 342 pp.
- Chalmers, Thomas, Memoirs. Ed. by William Hanna. Vol. 1. Edinburgh: Sutherland and Knox, 1850.
- Colquhoun, John of Leith, A View of Saving Faith. Edinburgh: Thomsons, Brothers, 1824. 408 pp.
- The Confession of Faith of The Presbyterian Church in the United States. Revised. Richmond: Presbyterian Committee of Publication. n. d. 453 pp.
- Craik, Sir Henry, A Century of Scottish History. Vol. 1. Edinburgh: William Blackwood and Sons, 1901.
- Cunningham, John, The Church History of Scotland. 2 Vols. Edinburgh: James Thin, 1882.
- Cunningham, William, Discussions on Church Principles: Popish, Erastian, and Presbyterian. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1863. 576 pp.

- Dictionary of National Biography. Ed. by Leslie Stephen and Sidney Lee. Vol. 9. London: 1908.
- Fathers of the Kirk. Ronald Selby Wright, Editor. London: Oxford University Press, 1960. 288 pp.
- F., E., [Edward Fisher], The Marrow of Modern Divinity. C. G. M'Crie, Editor. Glasgow: David Bryce and Son. 1902. Introduction xxxii; 390 pp.
- Fraser, Donald, The Life and Diary of the Reverend Ralph Erskine. Edinburgh: William Oliphant & Son, 1834. 564 pp.
- Graham, Henry Grey, The Social Life of Scotland in the Eighteenth Century. London: Adam and Charles Black, 1909. 538 pp.
- Griffiths, Olive M., Religion and Learning. Cambridge: The University Press, 1935. 202 pp.
- Halkett, Samuel and Laing, John, Dictionary of Anonymous and Pseudonymous English Literature. 7 Vols. New Edition by Dr. James Kennedy, W. A. Smith, and A. F. Johnson. Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1926.
- Henderson, G. D., The Claims of the Church of Scotland. London: Hodder and Stoughton, Ltd., [1951]. 251 pp.
- \_\_\_\_\_, Religious Life in Seventeenth Century Scotland. Cambridge: The University Press, 1937. 311 pp.
- Henderson, H. F., The Religious Controversies of Scotland. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1905. 274 pp.
- Heppe, Heinrich, Reformed Dogmatics. English translation by G. T. Thomson. London: George Allen and Unwin Ltd., 1950. 721 pp.
- Hetherington, W. M., History of the Church of Scotland. Edinburgh: John Jounstone, 1841. 804 pp.
- Keeling, S. V., Descartes. Ernest Benn Limited. London: 1934. 272 pp.
- Laing, Malcolm, The History of Scotland from the Union of the Crowns to the Union of the Kingdoms. 2nd Ed; Vol. 4. London: J. Mawman, 1804.
- Lathan, Robert, History of the Associate Reformed Synod of the South. Harrisburg, Pennsylvania: 1882. 418 pp.
- MacEwen, A. R., Antoinette Bourignon Quietist. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1910. 219 pp.

- \_\_\_\_\_, The Erskines. Edinburgh: Oliphant, Anderson, and Ferrier, [1900]. 160 pp.
- M'Ewan, John, Studies Historical, Doctrinal, and Biographical. Edinburgh: Macniven and Wallace, 1900. 353 pp.
- MacInnes, John, The Evangelical Movement in the Highlands of Scotland. Aberdeen: The University Press, 1951. 299 pp.
- Mackelvie, William, Annals and Statistics of the United Presbyterian Church. Edinburgh: Oliphant and Co., and Andrew Elliot, 1873. 708 pp.
- M'Kerrow, John, History of the Secession Church. Vol. 1. Edinburgh: William Oliphant and Son, 1839.
- Macleod, John, Scottish Theology in Relation to Church History. Edinburgh: Publications Committee of the Free Church of Scotland, 1943. 331 pp.
- McMillan, William, John Hepburn and the Hebronites. London: James Clarke & Co., Ltd., [1934]. 234 pp.
- \_\_\_\_\_, The Worship of the Scottish Reformed Church, 1550-1638. London: James Clarke & Co., Ltd., [1931]. 383 pp.
- M'Crie, C. G., The Confessions of the Church of Scotland. Edinburgh: Macniven and Wallace, 1907. 318 pp.
- \_\_\_\_\_, The Public Worship of Presbyterian Scotland. Edinburgh: William Blackwood and Sons, 1892. 465 pp.
- M'Crie, Thomas, Sketches of Scottish Church History. 2 Vols.; 4th Ed. Edinburgh: John Johnstone, [1846].
- Mathieson, William Law, Scotland and the Union. Glasgow: James Maclehose and Sons, 1905. 387 pp.
- Maxwell, W. D., A History of Worship in the Church of Scotland. London: Oxford University Press, 1955. 190 pp.
- Mechie, Stewart, The Office of Lord High Commissioner. Edinburgh: The Saint Andrew Press, 1957. 63 pp.
- Metzger, Bruce M., A Guide to the Preparation of a Thesis. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton Theological Seminary, 1950. 21 pp.
- The New Statistical Account of Scotland. Vol. 9. Edinburgh: William Blackwood and Sons, 1845.
- Rainy, Robert, Moncrieff of Tulliebole, and Innes, A. Taylor, Church and State Chiefly in Relation to Scotland. Edinburgh: Thomas Nelson & Sons, 1878. 224 pp.

- Reid, H. M. B., The Divinity Professors in the University of Glasgow. Glasgow: Maclehose, Jackson and Co., 1923. 368 pp.
- Scott, Hew, Fasti Ecclesiae Scoticanæ. Vol. 2, parts I and II. Edinburgh: William Paterson, 1868, 1869.
- \_\_\_\_\_, Fasti Ecclesiae Scoticanæ. Sir Francis Grant, Editor. 8 Vols. Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1920-1950.
- Select Anti-Patronage Library. Consisting Chiefly of Reprints of Scarce Pamphlets Connected with Lay-Patronage. Edinburgh: John Johnstone, 1842.
- Sinclair, Sir John, The Statistical Account of Scotland. Vol. II. Edinburgh: William Creech, 1794. (pp. 479-504).
- Smellie, Alexander, Men of the Covenant. Vol. 2. London: Andrew Melrose. 1908.
- Steven, William, History of the Scottish Church in Rotterdam. Edinburgh: Waugh and Innes, 1832. 416 pp.
- Story, Robert Herbert, William Carstares: A Character and Career of the Revolutionary Epoch. London: Macmillan and Co., 1874. 385 pp.
- Struthers, John, The History of Scotland from the Union. Vol. 1. Glasgow: Blackie, Fullarton, & Co., 1828.
- Thomson, Andrew and Struthers, Gavin, Historical Sketch of the Origin of the Secession Church and History of the Rise of the Relief Church. Edinburgh: A Fullarton and Co., 1848. 333 pp.
- Walker, James, The Theology and Theologians of Scotland. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1872. 190 pp.
- Warrack, John, Domestic Life in Scotland, 1488-1688. London: Methuen & Co., 1920. 213 pp.
- Warrick, John, The Moderators of the Church of Scotland from 1690 to 1740. Edinburgh: Oliphant, Anderson and Ferrier, 1913. 388 pp.
- Watson, John, The Scot of the Eighteenth Century. London: Hodder and Stoughton, [1907]. 345 pp.
- Watt, Hugh, Recalling the Scottish Covenants. London: Thomas Nelson and Sons, [1946]. 109 pp.
- Webster, J. M., History of Carnock. Edinburgh: William Blackwood and Sons, 1938. 363 pp.

The Westminster Directory. Ed. by Thomas Leishman. Edinburgh: William Blackwood and Sons, 1901. Introduction xliii; 205 pp.

Wiley, Basil, The Eighteenth Century Background. London: Chatto and Windus, 1940. 302 pp.

## II. ARTICLES

Beaton, Donald, "The 'Marrow of Modern Divinity' and The Marrow Controversy," Records of the Scottish Church History Society, I (1926), 112-134.

Henderson, G. D., "Arminianism in Scotland," London Quarterly and Holborn Review, CLVI (October 1932), 493-504.

\_\_\_\_\_, "The Idea of the Covenant in Scotland," The Evangelical Quarterly, XXVII (January 15, 1955), 2-14.

Hornsby, J. T., "The Case of Mr. John Glas," Records of the Scottish Church History Society, VI (1938), 115-137.

Lindsay, T. M., "The Covenant Theology," British and Foreign Evangelical Review, CIX (July 1879), 521-538.

McIntyre, D. M., "First Strictures on 'The Marrow of Modern Divinity'," The Evangelical Quarterly, X (January 15, 1938), 61-70.

M'Crie, C. G., "Studies in Scottish Ecclesiastical Biography. II. Professor Simson, the Glasgow Heresiarch," British and Foreign Evangelical Review, XXXIII (April 1884), 254-277.

\_\_\_\_\_, "Studies in Scottish Ecclesiastical Biography. III. Rev. James Hog of Carnock and Principal Hadow of St. Andrews," British and Foreign Evangelical Review, XXXIII (October 1884), 669-719.

M'Crie, Thomas, "Account of the Controversy Respecting 'The Marrow of Modern Divinity'," The Edinburgh Christian Instructor, XXX(August, October, and December, 1831) and New Series, I (February 1832), 539-551, 687-699, 811-826; 73-94.

M'Crie, Thomas, Jr., "'The Marrow' Controversy," British and Foreign Evangelical Review, II (1853), 411-440.

Mechie, Stewart, "The Marrow Controversy Reviewed," The Evangelical Quarterly, XXII (January 1950), 20-31.

Watt, Hugh, "The Influence of Martin Luther on Scottish Religion in the 18th Century," Records of the Scottish Church History Society, VI (1938), 147-160.

## III. UNPUBLISHED MATERIAL

Bruggink, D. J., "The Theology of Thomas Boston". Unpublished Thesis, University of Edinburgh, 1956.

Prince, Harold B., "A Form for Thesis Writing". Columbia Theological Seminary, Decatur, Georgia.