

S T A T E M E N T

OF THE TRIALS

OF

REV. ISAAC D. COLE,

BEFORE THE

CLASSIS OF PARAMUS, IN 1838 AND 1840,

FOR

CHARGES PREFERRED AGAINST HIM

BY

JACOB I. BLAUVELT.

TOGETHER

WITH SOME OF THE CIRCUMSTANCES CONNECTED THEREWITH.

NEW-YORK:

TRIBUNE PRINT, 160 NASSAU, AND 7 SPRUCE-STREETS,

J. A. FRAETAS, PRINTER.

.....

1844.

STATEMENT

OF THE TRIALS

OF

REV. ISAAC D. COLE,

BEFORE THE

CLASSIS OF PARANUS, IN 1838 AND 1840,

FOR

CHARGES PRETERRED AGAINST HIM

BY

JACOB I. BLAUVELT.

TOGETHER

WITH SOME OF THE CIRCUMSTANCES CONNECTED THEREWITH.

NEW-YORK:

TRIBUNE PRINT, 160 NASSAU, AND SPRUCE-STREETS.

J. A. FRAZER, PRINTER.

1841.

PREFACE.

In publishing this pamphlet, it is not my design to hurt the feelings or injure the character of any man, and especially any of one who loves the truth in righteousness, and is of the household of faith. All I desire to accomplish is, a statement of facts, as they have transpired in the case, with the circumstances connected therewith, so as to bring them before the Christian community, and especially before that Church and Congregation to which I have been united in the bonds of peace, love and harmony, during twenty-four years membership. In order that they who may have been deceived or led astray may have a more correct view of the case, and thus have an opportunity of forming their judgment accordingly, it is true this case has been brought before the Classis of Paramus at two different Sessions for investigation: but as they have not published their proceedings, many particulars of it, and of the circumstances connected with it, remain in obscurity: and consequently are not by the Church or the public known, or rightly understood; which I presume is one principal reason why some have censured me as to my motives in this case, as if I had acted from envy or malice, or under the influence, or advice of others. Of such charges I was innocent, and may the Lord preserve me from such motives in any case, and especially in matters of Religion; and I hope it will be remembered by all who may think it worth their time to peruse this pamphlet, that up to the time of my first interview with Mr. Cole, on the subject of his preaching so different from his usual course, we were on terms of intimacy and friendship as far as I know, and I trust, yea, I know it was from a principle of love and duty, to him as a friend, and to the truth of the Gospel, that I was constrained to call on him, without previously speaking to a single individual on the subject; and I said to him I come to see you as a friend, and you must by all means consider me as such. The nature and effect of this interview, and of those I and some of my friends subsequently had with Mr. Cole, in relation to the strange sentiments he from time to time advanced, and also what some of those sentiments were, I shall endeavour to illustrate in the following pages. It may be asked why I did not publish this three years ago, or directly after the last decision of Classis on the case? I answer, I would have done so but for the strong impression I entertained, that Mr. Cole would on some future day, from a consciousness of his being in error, retract his course and make some overtures for a reconciliation. In this I was not altogether disappointed: for on the 3d of January, 1842, I received from him a written com-

munication, stating his regret at the unhappy difference existing between us, and that if he could realize himself to be the cause, he would have no peace of conscience until he had done all in his power to effect a reconciliation: and also, that it was his sincere and ardent prayer that they might soon terminate on true Gospel principles, to the glory of God and the welfare of his Church. On the 6th of January, 1842, I answered his letter, fully approving of his proposed principles for a reconciliation, expressing strong desires that it might soon take place, and stating also, that if I could feel myself to be the cause of our difference, I should be very unhappy until I had done all in my power, consistent with truth and justice to effect a reconciliation. I requested also that he would please fairly, impartially, and prayerfully to investigate what the true causes of difference were, by whom given, and what had been done to effect a reconciliation. On the 14th day of February, 1842, I received his reply to my letter, in which he stated that he despaired of a reconciliation because we were so much at variance as to the cause of difference and the means employed for a reconciliation, and also in effect, that I did not understand the truths of the Gospel about which we differed, and had not experienced the power and sweetness of them in my own heart. This was indeed hard language from a professed friend, whose welfare I had so earnestly been seeking and at so great an expense. On the 18th of March, 1842, I answered his reply to my letter: giving a brief outline of our unhappy difference from the commencement throughout. And as Providence has given him two years (and over) to reflect upon and answer it, which he has not chosen to do, to this day, from which I conclude that he still despairs of a reconciliation, I feel bound in justice to myself, to my friends and to the cause of truth to publish these letters also.

The communications above referred to may be seen in full in the latter part of this pamphlet.—What he said in relation to the Dutch Church and its institutions, I feel also bound to publish, believing them to be founded on the Word of God, and therefore that they ought to be supported and defended. Should I in placing this pamphlet before the Christian community, realize it to have its desired effect, I shall be fully rewarded for my labor and expense. Should it on the minds of any have a contrary effect, I shall still have the consolation of feeling that in this case I have been faithful to the Church, to the truth, to my friends, and to Mr. Cole.

JACOB I. BLAUVELT.

STATEMENT.

My first suspicions of a change in the views of the Rev. I. D. Cole on the subject of religion, arose from his conduct in relation to a Social Prayer Meeting, held in the Church every Sabbath afternoon, when he was in some distant part of the Congregation, holding a Lecture. After this society had been in operation for some time, and was well attended, he published a Lecture in the Church at the usual hour of the Prayer Meeting. This however, would have been perfectly right, had he not the following Sabbath, published a lecture at the parsonage house (which is but a few rods from the church) at the same hour, and after that never published the Prayer Meeting in the Church again, which was the cause of breaking it up. Shortly after, being at his house, he intimated that our Prayer Meeting was broke up. I answered, it appears so. He said (smiling) there was not enough of the spirit amongst us to keep up a Prayer Meeting, but did not give a word of exhortation to have it renewed. Thus he broke up a Prayer Meeting, which he charged me before the Classis, to have done on another occasion but of which I was there proved to be innocent.

On the last Sabbath of 1837, while he was discoursing on the subject of the means that were employed for the salvation of sinners, he said he knew of no other, and read of no other but the preaching of the Gospel.

On the following Monday, in the course of his Lecture in the church, he said that those societies and signing of pledges which had been got up of late years, were the cause of the Lord withdrawing his spirit from the Church.

On the 28th of January 1838, he said while preaching on the offerings of Cain and Abel, that all our good works were good for nothing, and that they were not even to be

taken as an evidence that we have faith. Knowing this to be contrary to the word of God, and the standards of the Reformed Dutch Church, I considered it my duty, as a friend, to call and see him; which I did on the 8th February. I then asked him, if I had understood him right, when I understood him to say, that all our good works, were good for nothing, and that they were not even to be taken as an evidence that we have faith. He replied he had said so. I answered that I did not understand that to be in accordance with the word of God, nor with the standards of the Dutch Church; that I was opposed to good works as being meritorious in obtaining our justification before God, but believed that we were freely justified by grace through faith in Christ, without any merit of ours; that such justifying faith, was not a dead faith but a living faith, and was productive of good works; and those good works, were an evidence of such a faith. He replied that my views were right, and if his people understood it as I did he would not be under the necessity of preaching as he did; but because of the ignorance of his people, which was so astonishingly great that I could have no idea of it, he had to preach so.

This was indeed strange to me, that the people, and especially those professing godliness should be so ignorant on a point so often explained to them in the most explicit terms, by their late Pastor, the Rev Nicholas Lansing, who, although he is dead yet speaketh. I then suggested to him the propriety of making clear distinctions, as to what were good works, and what not, and to give them their proper place; and whether such a course would not have a tendency to enlighten the people, whereas in pursuing the other course it might lead to confusion, which I feared would be the case. He then asked me what were good works. I replied only those which flow from a true faith.

On the 11th of February, he preached from the words "and Abraham believed God," &c. In this discourse he manifested a great deal of excitement; urged his people to exercise a strong unwavering faith, even without evidence; said it was not right for Christians to examine themselves by signs and marks, that they had nothing to do with them, but they must act faith, and then have the consolation of it. At the close of this Sermon, (being with him alone) I asked him some explanation of what he said in relation to self-examination. He replied that he had no time, as he had to Lecture in some distant part of the Congregation that afternoon, but would call on me in the course of that week, to converse with me on the subject; which he did not do, and has not to the present day. Here I shall leave the impartial reader to judge what effect my first interview had upon my Pastor and friend.

On the 18th February he preached from the words "he that believeth on the Son of God, hath the witness in himself." In illustrating these words, he said, when I am eating I know I am eating, because I am eating, and that is an evidence that I am eating. When the stung Israelites looked at the brazen serpent, they knew they were looking at it because they were looking at it, and that was an evidence of it; and so when I have faith I know I have faith, because I have faith, and so faith is a witness to itself. On the 22d February, a day appointed by General Synod, for Prayer and Thanksgiving for the education of Students in the Seminary at New Brunswick, he said in the course of his Sermon, that he had read in some political paper, that the success of the Temperance cause would be the triumph of infidelity, and that he was of the same opinion, and moreover that it was a snare and a trap of the Devil, to lead people astray before they were aware.

On the fourth of March, he preached from the words "For when for the time ye ought to be teachers, ye have need that one teach you again, which be the first principles of the oracle of God." In this sermon, he said it was not right for Christians to determine the genuineness of their faith, by examining themselves, as to their experience and good works.

On the 8th of April, he said in the course of his Sermon, that the quality of our faith, is not to be determined by our experience and good works; and also, that we must not examine ourselves by marks and signs; we must believe.

On the evening of the 9th of April I called at the house of Mr. A. D. Vervalen, where I unexpectedly met with Mr. Cole, conversing

with Mr. Vervalen, in relation to some of the preceding sentiments advanced by him. He finally asked Mr. Vervalen, what he would have for an evidence of true and saving faith? Mr. Vervalen replied love to the Brethren is one; Mr. Cole answered, how will you know a Brother? By their fruits ye shall know them, was the reply of Mr. Vervalen; he then said it seemed that he and Mr. Vervalen, could not agree; and expressed a willingness to continue the conversation with me, I replied that I had no objections, and would commence where they broke off. I then put the question, is love to the Brethren an evidence of faith? and requested a direct answer, yes or no; his reply was, no; I then asked him if the fruits and good works flowing from a principle of living faith were not an evidence of faith? He answered no. I replied that he was most assuredly wrong, and that I hoped he might see it very soon; he answered that he had once for two years entertained such views as I held, but that he then knew nothing at all of Religion.

On the 15th of April, he preached from the words "For by thy words thou shalt be justified, and by thy words thou shalt be condemned. Then certain of the Scribes and Pharisees answered saying, Master we would see a sign from thee, but he answered and said unto them, an evil, and an adulterous generation seeketh after a sign, and there shall no sign be given it, but the sign of the Prophet Jonah." In this discourse he condemned all christian experience and good works, as to their being any evidence of faith. He said that christians must not look at present or past experience in self-examination, as an evidence of their justification; compared it to a wicked and adulterous generation, seeking after a sign; said they must act faith, that doubting was unbelief, and also to be in the horrible pit and mirey clay. From the nature and tendency of this discourse, the impartial reader may judge what effect our conversation had had upon our Pastor and friend.

On the 23rd of April, four of the members of his congregation, viz. Samuel G. Verbryck John S. Verbryck, A. D. Vervalen and myself, called on him at the parsonage house, to converse and reason with him in relation to the foregoing sentiments as advanced by him, and if possible to convince him that they were erroneous. After telling him the object of our meeting, we suggested to him that as Dr. Elting had just stopped at my house on his way to Nyack, we might (by calling there) have our conversation in his presence, and that he might perhaps give us some light on the subject. He replied that he and the Doctor were not on good terms, and there-

fore he did not wish to do so. After having some conversation with him, he expressed a willingness however to have it continued in Dr. Elting's presence. I replied that I supposed he was gone by this time; still we went over to my house, and having ascertained that he was gone, we resumed our conversation there. Now as he was opposed to all christian experience and good works as being an evidence of faith, I asked him whether if I were to tell him that I believed that the Lord Jesus Christ was the true Messiah, that I did not doubt his ability and willingness to save all that come to him believing; and that I firmly and without a doubt believed on him alone for all my salvation, and at the same time that I knew nothing at all of the depravity of my nature, my utter inability to do any thing whereby to merit my salvation; or had never felt the need of a Saviour, and cared nothing at all about experiencing those exercises; but concluded that to believe was enough for me, he then would believe I was a christian? He replied No. I then asked him whether if I had experienced the above mentioned exercises in my own breast, and believed as above expressed, if he then would believe me to be a christian? He replied Yes. I then asked him if my experience was not an evidence to me that I was a christian? He replied No, but it was to him; that is, that my experience was an evidence to him that I was a christian. I then put the question, what reason has a man to believe that he is a christian, if he has no experience, or if his experience is no evidence to him? He made no reply to my question.

On the 29th of April, he said in the course of his sermon, that our sanctification was no proof or evidence of our justification, and that would answer the question, what reason has a man to believe he is a christian if he has no experience? and that if we looked at our experience and good works as an evidence of our justification, we made improper use of it. Shortly after this, in preaching from the words "And Abraham believed God, &c." Galatians 3d, verse 6 and 7,—he said that all our good works were abhorrent and detestable in the sight of God, and not to be taken as evidences of faith, and that our whole life was faith and nothing else. We then requested a meeting of the consistory in order to lay before them our grievances, and if possible have them removed, and a reconciliation effected; and after stating to them the cause of our grievances, I put the question whether they were of the same opinion with Mr. Cole, when he said that our sanctification was no evidence of our justification? Mr. Cole replied that he hoped the consistory would not answer my question,

and as it was not denied that Mr. Cole had advanced such a sentiment, I repeated my question, and requested the brethren to answer it if they pleased—and Mr. Cole again replied, he hoped the brethren would not answer it, and they gave me no answer to the question.

On the 3d of June I again requested a meeting of the consistory, stating to them that the existing difficulties in the church had a heavy bearing upon me, and that I considered it to be of the utmost importance to the congregation (and especially to Mr. Cole) to have them rightly understood, and if possible to have them removed, and a reconciliation effected. The Consistory unanimously complied with my request, and promised to meet on the following Friday at my house for the purpose stated; but (mark) before the time this meeting was to take place, Mr. Cole informed me that the Consistory should not meet at my house as they promised. I asked the reason; he replied, because it was unconstitutional. Who was the cause, or what the motive of breaking up this meeting I shall leave the impartial reader to judge.

Shortly after advancing the sentiment that sanctification was no evidence of justification, Mr. A. D. Vervalen read to him from Scott's Commentary, that those who argued in favor of the above sentiment were directly contradicting the apostles, and therefore were most assuredly mistaken.

Shortly after this he made the following remarks from the pulpit; away with Scott, away with Henry, away with Books and men and the Bible too, as to the letter—he advised his people not to read them, and to read only the Bible, and that without note or comment. The reader will judge whether this kind of exhortation or advice from the pulpit was calculated to enlighten a people said by him to be so astonishingly ignorant?

Being now fully satisfied that Mr. Cole (to my great grief and sorrow) was going astray from the doctrines of the Dutch Church, as contained in its standards and the word of God, I could derive little or no benefit from his preaching; yet I could not easily bring myself to leave the Congregation, where I was born and brought up, and the Church to which I had been united in the bonds of peace and love, for the term of twenty-four years, and where I trust I had experienced many a precious season, especially under the preaching of that aged and goodly servant of the Lord Jesus Christ, Rev. Nicholas Lansing.

To this congregation and to this place of worship I felt a strong attachment, and could not justify myself to leave it, until I had made use of every effort in my power to convince

Mr. Cole of his error and reclaim him. And as all the means hitherto employed, proved ineffectual, my only remedy was an appeal to Classis. Accordingly in the spring of 1838 I called an extra meeting of the Classis of Paramus, who after being convened in the Tappan Church, laid before them the causes of my grievance, which consisted principally in the preceding sentiments advanced by Mr. Cole, (except those in relation to the Temperance cause.) On which I prayed that reverend body to take such constitutional order as might restore the harmony of our congregation, and remove effectually the grounds or causes of complaint; here again (as before the consistory) Mr. Cole endeavoured to prevent an investigation of the case; but in this he failed. Classis then proceeded to appoint a committee of three, viz: Doctor Elting, Rev. J. Manly and Rev. Mr. Liddle, in order to effect a com-

promise. Said committee and some of the members of the Church, together with myself and Mr. Cole, convened at my house, and commenced on the first accusation, viz: that of his teaching that all our good works were good for nothing and not even to be taken as an evidence of faith. They reasoned with Mr. Cole in the plainest and most simple manner, in order to induce him to acknowledge that good works were an evidence of faith; but he said no, I will not call them so, and moreover, that we could do nothing there, but must go into the Church before his people. The committee then asked me if I was satisfied with Mr. Cole's explanation. I replied that I was not; and especially as this was one of the principal errors with which I charged him. The committee then reported to Classis the result of their meeting, and Classis proceeded to investigate the case.

TESTIMONY.

First Witness on behalf of the Complainant was—

Mr. A. D. Vervalen stated on the faith and credibility of a Christian, that Mr. Cole said that our good works are good for nothing; they are not to be taken as evidences of faith; he took Brother Cole to be addressing Christians, not sure whether he used these words in application or not; he does not know what words preceded or followed.

John S. Verbryck states Mr. Cole said that our good works are good for nothing, and no evidence of faith—preached on 3 Gal. 6, 7 even as Abm. &c. he said we would find on reading the 4th of Romans that Abraham simply lived by faith and not by works. Abraham did not think of works but simply faith. Our good works are good for nothing: they are abhorrent, detestable, not to be taken as evidences of faith; understood him to address Christians, made no distinction between what works were good or what were spurious.

Samuel G. Verbryck, on faith &c., heard Mr. Cole say good works were abhorrent, detestable, not to be taken as evidences of faith. Expected Mr. Cole would qualify that expres-

sion, but did not; he also said, that the fruits and good works flowing from a living faith are no evidences of faith.

Silas Miller, heard Mr. Cole say that good works were not to be taken as evidences of faith; thinks he was addressing Christians; he says that good works flow from faith and love.

2nd item—Same Witness—Says that Mr. Cole preached that neither present nor past experience, nor good works were to be taken as evidences of faith.

2nd, 3d and 4th items.—Mr. A. D. Vervalen,—Can't say that every word he has noted in his paper, are the precise words; when some Christians began to doubt, and fear as to their interest in the Saviour, they would examine into their past experience and good works, and if they believed they were of a right nature, would look upon them as an evidence of faith; this he said was wrong, it had nothing to do with it—they must act faith; the quality of our faith is not to be determined by our experience and good works; we are not to look at our experience and good works as evidences of our faith. After being asked by Mr. J. I. Blauvelt what

reason has a man to believe he is a Christian if he has no experience ; he read from an author or made the remark, that Sanctification is no evidence of Justification, that will answer the question what reason has a man to believe he is a Christian if he has no experience.

5th Item—Mr. Verbryck—States that on the application of a Sermon preached Phil. 4, 13 “I can do all things &c.” Mr. Cole said, if we look to good works or former experience to give evidences of faith, it is wrong, we must examine the principal rule and end of our actions, because faith is to be distinguished from all graces for faith is a witness for itself as I said some time ago, and that the quality of our faith is not to be determined by our experience and good works ; to look for marks and evidences is directly contrary to God’s word, and do not trouble yourselves because you have not some good marks, look to Christ, we do not want to look for evidences we don’t want them.

John I. Blauvelt.—States that he heard Mr. Cole say, that Sanctification was no proof of Justification, and this will answer the question what proof we had we were justified if we had no experience.

Eleazer Lord 6—That Mr. Cole said that there was great danger in trusting to signs and evidences, and external conduct as evidences of faith ; he condemned the practice of looking at good works and Christian experience as evidences of faith : has been much edified by Mr. Cole’s preaching except on this point its tendency is injurious to sound good works this preaching has a tendency to make people settle down in the belief that their faith is right without looking at experience or good works ; heard Mr. J. I. Blauvelt say that this action against Mr. Cole was from the purest motives, and not from any unpleasant feelings.

Harman Hoffman—States that he heard Mr. Cole say that good works, and present and past experience are not evidences of faith and at a meeting of the Consistory to his house understood him to say Sanctification is no evidence of justification ; he said that justification and Sanctification are inseparably connected ; said in his preaching afterwards that marks which we had in ourselves, are no evidence of faith, understood him to mean by these marks Christian experience.

6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13th Items—A. D. Vervalen—that Mr. Cole said in a conversation in his house, that in answer to a question from Mr. J. I. Blauvelt whether love to the Brethren is not an evidence of faith, he is positive Mr. Cole answered no ; the apostle he says was speaking of passing from death unto life and there was nothing of faith in it,

Mr. Cole said he was speaking about regeneration ; Mr. J. I. Blauvelt asked the question whether the apostle might not as well have said we know we have faith because we love the Brethren as to say we know we have passed from death unto life because we love the Brethren ; no particular reply was made that witness recollects.

Same witness on 7th Item.—He said that doubts and fears were so many sins against God ; he said in preaching, we must try our love by our love, he was then addressing christians he thinks ; witness considers doubting the ability of the Saviour and willingness to save is unbelief, but to doubt whether a person has an interest in the Saviour is doubting.

John S. Verbryck.—Recollects that Mr. Cole said that doubting is unbelief, and is to be considered as the horrible pit and miry clay.

Mr. Miller.—Says, to the best of my recollection he said away with Scott and Henry and with the bible, except as to the letter of it. Complainant’s evidence rested for the present.

FOR DEFENCE.

James P. Blauvelt.—Understood Mr. Cole all along to mean that good works were not to be relied on as grounds of acceptation with God, he has told us we must not look into past experience and settle down there.

Abraham Acker.—Says we must not depend on our good works as evidences of grace nor settle down on them, but we could not forget them ; did not hear him preach lightly of present or past experience as no use to christians, understood him to mean that they should not trust to anything but Jesus Christ ; said we should not settle on Commentators, but read them with care ; preached on great necessity of vital union with the Saviour ; by words horrible pit and miry clay he meant to awaken the people to fly to Christ.

T. Blauvelt.—If works flow from a true and living faith they are evidences of faith ; makes a plain distinction between a true and false faith ; could not suppose Mr. Cole meant to tell his people to throw away good works.

Garrett Acker.—Says that good works were proper in their place ; preached on vital union to Christ, and faith working by love ; says that the fruits of faith as an evidence of faith has been more stirred during the last three months than formerly, that we should not settle on books for a foundation, that the inward life of a christian will be manifested outwardly : that good works were good in their proper place.

Cornelius J. Smith.—Has taken no notes, but has a general recollection of Mr. Cole's sermons, heard him always put works in their proper place; impossible for christians to live without works; as water would flow from a living fountain; has been more edified and built up for the last three months than formerly in his faith; people generally with whom he has conversed expressed themselves in like manner, they long for the return of the sabbath to hear Mr. Cole again.

1st Item.—*A. D. Vervalen*, cross examined—Said that Mr. Cole used the expression, 'our good works,' and believed him to be addressing Christians.

John S. Verbryck—has heard Mr. Cole say, that good works are good for nothing, and no evidence of faith; he said, that our good works (preached on 3d chap. of Galatians) were good for nothing, abhorrent, detestable, and not evidences of faith. On reading 4th chap. of Romans, we would find that Abraham lived by faith, and not by works, and did not think of works, but faith. He understood him as addressing Christians. He made no distinction between a true faith and a spurious one—spiritual good works and mere morality.

Cross-examined.—The point on which he was speaking was concerning the faith of Abraham, if he recollects right, on the doctrine of justification—text: "Even as Abraham believed God, it was, &c." and the duty would be to show how we are accepted before God. Don't recollect how the text was divided—was trying to make Paul say what he could not believe he did say; that is, Mr. Cole said that Paul would say, I think nothing of alms-giving, good works, brotherly love, and charity. He spoke of it after he got home, and noted it down at the time. Circumcision was a good work, good for nothing in point of merit. He is positive that Mr. Cole used the expression referred to above. He thinks that what was said was spoken in the application of the sermon. It is his custom to take notes in the Church.—He has only once heard Mr. Cole since last winter say—that a true faith would bring forth good works. Said nothing of it at the time when he was preaching.

Samuel G. Verbryck.—Cross-examined.—Thinks that the expressions referred to were spoken since last New-Year. He does not think that Mr. Cole generally preaches against good works, but does not hold them up as an evidence of faith. He found that a number had observed this peculiarity in Mr. Cole's preaching; they tried to come to an understanding; he held up a good faith as producing good works, but did not consider such good works as any evidence of faith to

those in darkness and trouble. It appeared to him that Mr. Cole went around a little and did not treat of good works as formerly.

Silas Miller.—He can't say he has heard Mr. Cole preach directly against good works, but did not hold them up as an evidence of faith; has heard him preach that good works are the fruits of faith; he does not think that Mr. Cole has particularly held up good works; but thinks he has labored hard to show they are not evidences. He has heard him say that good works were infallibly produced by a true and living faith; his discourses were principally about faith as an evidence in itself; he does not recollect that Mr. Cole distinguished between a true living faith and a spurious one; he has felt as though Mr. Cole's preaching was calculated to make a lazy congregation; he preached on the text—trust in the Lord, and showed that good works would flow from a lively faith, but no evidence of faith; that these variations in Mr. Cole's preaching he considers as different from what was preached formerly; he has heard some of the neighbors express their dissatisfaction.

2d point.—That neither present nor past experience is to be taken as an evidence of faith nor to be brought in self-examination; that believers look with gratitude to past experience; he has heard him preach that a Soul under conviction will flee to various support, but finding them unavailing, will flee to Christ, his preaching has been to look at the internal acting of faith, but not at good works, and past experience as evidences of faith, that he has preached up the duty of self-examination according to the order of the Communion form.

2nd, 3d and 6th points.—*A. D. Vervalen*—CROSS EXAMINED—ON EXPERIENCE IN AND SELF-EXAMINATION.—has not heard Mr. Cole preach that a man could be a Christian without experience, has heard him say in conversation, that sanctification was not an evidence of Justification, that he requested the Consistory not to answer the question whether they upheld him in this doctrine, he has not heard Mr. Cole give one exhortation to repentance, since last January, has heard him say, or read from an author from the pulpit, that Sanctification is no evidence of Justification.

J. S. Verbryck—Cross-examined. In regard to the Sermon preached from Phillipians, he does not remember the particular connection; Mr. Cole told him, that waiting on the Lord, was to do nothing, he thinks he does not rightly divide the word of God.

John I. Blauvelt—Cross-Examined.—he took up the book and said that would answer the question that Sanctification is the evidence of Justification; he can agree with Mr. Cole

on Justification but not on Sanctification ; he understands Mr. Cole that we are not to look at experience in self-examination, thinks his preaching varies from his private conversation, he will not allow Sanctification to be an evidence of Justification ; he said that Mr. Cole preached up regeneration : he says that Mr. Cole has explained that good works flow from living faith ; that he afterwards explains it away, it has been his habit for months to preach that all these signs and evidences of faith are good for nothing ; these are his own words, the former part, his sermons, he would not object to ; but principally in the application, he has this impression that Mr. Cole is different in his principles from what he was before ; that he has been dissatisfied with Mr. Cole's preaching ever since he has been in Tappan, in plain words he must say that he never thought much of Mr. Cole's preaching ; that there was no prejudice on his mind ; he did not like him formerly, because he preached up good works too much in that connection, he now made no distinction between true and saving faith and a spurious one ; that Mr. Cole, has habitually from sabbath to sabbath, preached that if a man was vitally united to Christ, he would risk his life ; has heard him preach that all right experience leads the soul out of himself to Christ ; that he made no distinction between spiritually good works, and such as are of a worldly character ; that Mr. Cole has distinguished between true and imaginary experience, and has used the word imaginary very often ; that he has labored to guard his people against building on a false foundation, and resting in false signs and evidences.

Eleazer Lord. — Cross-examined. — He thinks there is great danger of men deceiving themselves by trusting to an imaginary experience and external works ; but that scriptural good works were the surest evidence of a gracious state ; he meant to say, that the tendency of Mr. Cole's preaching on this subject was unfavorable to good works ; that a person who considered good works as no evidence of a gracious state, would not be as careful to perform good works, as one who believes that they were the surest evidence that a renewed heart is necessary to the performance of acceptable works ; he does not remember that Mr. Cole has given exhortations to repentance within four or five months ; he thinks that the distinction between scriptural good works and works which do not proceed from a right spirit, but are good only in respect to their end, has been noticed less, than the principle from which good works proceed ; has

heard him preach concerning a true and saving faith, but not much concerning a spurious one.

Harman Hoffman. — Cross-examined. — He understood Mr. Cole's preaching to be that good works are no evidence of faith, and that we must try our faith by our faith ; has not heard him particularly hold up a change of heart ; he has understood Mr. Cole as preaching that good works are good for nothing and as condemning those as an evidence of a gracious state.

On the remaining items.

Mr. A. D. Vervalen—cross-examined.— He understood him as saying that love to the Brethren was no evidence of faith, that Mr. Cole after that interview at Mr. A. D. Vervalen, preached different from his representation of the case at the time.

7th item. Doubting as being sinful.

Mr. A. D. Vervalen.—Said that Mr. Cole preached, that as faith is an evidence of itself, so love is an evidence of love.

John S. Verbryck—cross-examined.— Cannot specify particularly the connection of the discourse in which these words were brought in, of being in the horrible pit, &c. Expected to hear it modified, but was disappointed ; has heard Mr. Cole preach that a Soul in a doubting state should wait till the Lord should renew his faith, he has recommended him not to read commentaries ; and to read Galatians without note or comment ; has heard him preach, away with Scott, away with Henry, away with marks and evidences ; and away with the Bible at least as to the letter of it ; when he used this language he said, I advise my people ; he is satisfied that this is his language ; on the next Sabbath he said they must read their Bible, and he, Mr. Verbryck, understood what Mr. Cole had said about, away with the Bible was an unguarded expression : he would have commentaries read with care, and that scripture must be compared with scripture ; Mr. Cole said he must not believe any thing merely because he said it, if it did not accord with the Bible.

Silas Miller—cross-examined.—He thought Mr. Cole was addressing those who are looking at those marks, signs and evidences on which they rest their hope ; evidence arrested.

Mr. Cole's evidence cross-examined.

J. P. Blauvelt.—Has heard Mr. Cole preach that we must not rest in experience and settle down there, he understood him as speaking on the subject of an acceptance with God ; has been absent some few Sabbaths and does not recollect hearing Mr. Cole say that experience is no evidence of faith, he thinks that Mr. Cole's preaching has had a tendency to excite him to greater vigilance and activity in

the Christian life, that he was formerly more confused by a mixture of works and faith, but has lately been much more pleased and edified.

Abm. Ackerson—cross-examined.—That Mr. Cole preaches up the importance of good works in almost every sermon; that Mr. Cole's preaching has revived him to activity in the Christian life that good works are an evidence of faith.

In cross-examining this witness, I asked him if Mr. Cole preached that good works were an evidence of faith, he answered that Mr. Cole said that good works were no evidence of saving grace, Mr. Cole replied that Mr. Acker was a Dutchman and did not understand my question, I repeated the question in as plain a manner as could be done, and Mr. Acker's reply was as before not recorded.

T. Blauvelt—cross-examined.—Has heard him make distinction between a true and spurious faith; has heard him say that good works are an evidence of faith, if they flow from a true and living faith; is not positive whether in the pulpit or in private conversation; has never heard him say, that Sanctification is not an evidence of Justification, has been much edified by Mr. Cole's preaching, that he recommends good works; has heard him recommend to them not to believe any thing because he said it, but to search the Scriptures; it encouraged him more to search and examine himself, and to greater diligence in the Christian life.

Garret Eckerson—cross-examined.—Has not heard Mr. Cole say that good works are not an evidence of faith; attendance and attention to word, better than usual; warns the unconverted more than in former times; thinks whole preaching adapted to every class of persons; Christian experience and good works not to be looked at in self-examination.

Witness explains; true Christian experience may be looked at as evidence.

Cornelius J. Smith—cross-examined.—thinks that now there is a real revival in this Church under Mr. Cole's preaching.

In answer to this, I will only say, may the Lord preserve his Church, from such revivals.

Evidence was arrested on consent of parties.

I do hereby certify that this is a true copy of the testimony produced in the case of J. I. Blauvelt and the Rev. I. D. Cole before the Classis of Paramus at an extra session, held in the Tappan Church, July 3d. 1838.

C. S. HAGEMAN—*Stated Clerk.*

Given Feb. 26th, 1844, Nyack.

The testimony being closed on both sides, I endeavored to sum it up; after which Mr. Cole spoke in his defence, in the course of which, he said, that if he had made the expression that good works were abhorrent and detestable in the sight of God, (and he believed he must have said so because it was proved against him by credible witnesses.) He must have been much excited for he was not in the habit of making use of such expressions: that he was extremely sorry for it and would for the future guard against it: and moreover that he believed good works to be an evidence of faith, and, sanctification to be an evidence of justification, and that he would for the future preach those doctrines so plain that they could not be misunderstood. With these confessions, acknowledgments and promises, I and my friends were satisfied: and in consideration of them I freely gave him my hand and heart, for I did not wish to see him censured, neither did I seek his ruin (as some said) but his welfare; nor was I contending for victory but for the truth.

The consideration that a reconciliation had now been effected, which I and my friends had so long and earnestly sought, was indeed cause of rejoicing to us. But I soon had reason to fear that his confessions, acknowledgments and promises before Classis had been made only to escape their reproof or censure: for I very soon perceived his preaching to be of the same nature as before, though in a more obscure way at first: but I had partly made up my mind to make no public complaint of it, and see what the consequence would be.

On the 2nd of June, 1839, he preached from the words—"Teach me to do thy will for thou art my God." He said the will of the Lord could not be known; the Psalmist was sensible of this, which caused him to make the petition: and if he could regenerate one soul by making exhortations he would do it, but he could not; but the spirit must and would do it. Here I would remark that although it is not in the power of any man to regenerate another, yet it is the duty of every Minister of the Gospel to exhort sinners to repentance and faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, and Christians to live a holy and godly life.

On June 9th, he preached from the words—"And wisdom and knowledge shall be the stability of thy times and strength of Salvation; the fear of the Lord is his treasure." He said it was the wisdom of Christians

when in darkness and trials to sit still and do nothing at all, until the Lord removed the cloud and caused the sun of Righteousness to shine upon them with healing in his wings, and then go on again : and also, that he had heard Ministers exhort sinners to repentance, and apparently with great earnestness, and with threatnings, telling them if they did not repent they would be damned, but all this he said was of no use. The Lord would by his spirit in his own time and way regenerate all those who were from all eternity elected in the everlasting covenant of grace.

On the 4th of August, he preached from 122d Psalm, 8th verse,—“For my brethren and companion’s sake, I will now say, peace be within thee.” In the application he said we must examine whether we had the peace spoken of in the text, and in such examination we must not look into ourselves, we must look at Christ and nothing else whatever : that some Christians when in doubts and fears would examine themselves to find something within to comfort them ; this he said was wrong, they must look at Christ, that it was presumption to look at our experience and good works and take comfort from them. Here I would ask whether if Christians experience the spirit to bear witness with theirs, that they are born of God, that is not great cause of comfort to them ?

On the 11th of August he preached from the words.—“And prosperity within thy palaces” In this sermon he said that when a soul was brought into covenant union with the Lord Jesus Christ, Zion prospered ; and also, that covenant union with the Lord Jesus Christ was the principal means used for the prosperity of Zion. He said we must examine ourselves whether our souls prospered ; and in this we must not look into ourselves, our experience and good works, nor any thing else whatever, but to Christ. On the first Sabbath after the last meeting of the Classis of Paramus, at Nyack, he preached from the 25th Psalm, 10th verse. In this sermon he said, what is there in all the Ecclesiastical judicatures of the Dutch Church, but trouble and contention ? no brotherly love no harmony : and what are all her (benevolent) institutions ? they are not warranted by the Word of God ; there is not a single stipulation to be found in the covenant authorizing those institutions.

Here I beg leave to remark, that about this time, Mr. Cole had attending upon his ministry a number of the members of a society by him denominated Antinomians, to one of whom he addressed a letter some time previous to his advancing the foregoing sentiments. I shall give a few extracts of

the said letter in his own words. 1st “I need not say, that Mr. Palmer (who was one of the Ministers of this society) is an Antinomian, his discourse shewed that sufficiently. You have now my views of Mr. Palmer’s discourse.” 2d “We may have a presumtuious confidence which does not arise from real evidence of grace in the heart, and this presumption I have observed, invariably accompanies Antinomians.” 3d “And now I sincerely tell you, that you are on Antinomian grounds and that you are encouraged in it by a few Antinomian Companions and Preachers.” I beg leave further to remark, that the persons composing this society, were at that time violently opposed to Mr. Cole’s preaching, and so remained, until he found out this new mode of preaching, which they said was, because he had received new light, and then pronounced him a true gospel preacher. This circumstance alone evidently shews a change in the views of Mr. Cole.

On the 27th of October, he preached from Solomon’s Songs, 5, and first 8 verses. “In his Sermon, he said, it was the special duty of Ministers of the Gospel, to edify and build up the body of Christ, and the same food that would nourish and build up the Christian, would bring in those that were yet standing without. On the 8th of December, he preached from Acts, 17th chapter, verses 11 and 12. In this Sermon he said, there was no similarity, in the whole Protestant Church at the present day, to what it was in the days of the Apostles, and that it needed a reformation now as much as in the days of Luther. He said also in one of his Sermons that the elect were justified and sanctified from all eternity ; said he would illustrate it in the following manner, viz : supposing a debtor become insolvent, and his creditors to seize him and confine him in prison, a friend steps forward and pays the debt, the creditor is satisfied, but the friend chooses to leave the debtor confined, until he pleases to set him free so his debt is paid, but he does not know it, so the elect sinner is justified and sanctified from all eternity, (although yet a slave to sin and Satan in this world) but does not know it, until it please the Lord, by his spirit, to bring him to Christ, and set him free. This illustration he acknowledged before Classis, was precisely as he spoke it from the pulpit ; but the charge that he taught that the elect were justified and sanctified from all eternity he denied. Now, I would ask the candid reader, where is the necessity of such an illustration if the above sentiment had not been expressed, and does it not go to prove the fact that he did so express it ; he said also in one of his Sermons, (holding up the

Bible in his hands) *that book* is not the word of God, it is paper and ink, bound up into a book, but is not the word of God, but the spirit *that is it*. He said also in relation to the Classis of Paramus, a short time previous to our difficulties, that there were but two Ministers in said Classis (besides himself) that would come out for the truth if contended for; namely, Mr. Christie and Mr. Wiggins; I made no reply, but thought it a very strange expression; a few days previous to our first trial, he called on me, and referring to the above expression, and what I recollected of it, I replied that he said as above stated, &c. Mr. A. D. Vervalen being present also replied, that he had made the same expression to him or words to that effect. Mr. Cole then replied, that the other members were good men, but added, that it was one thing to be a good man, and another to come out for the truth.

On the first sabbath in January 1840, the Rev. John S. Ebeaugh (who was about that time, in the bounds of Mr. Cole's Congregation, endeavouring to dispose of a book: called Heavenly Incense, by him translated, and compiled chiefly from the works of Zollickoffer, highly recommended by the Rev. Thomas Dewitt, William C. Brownly, John Knox, William R. Bogardus, and others) preached for him, and also assisted him, in dispensing the Communion of the Lord's Supper; and on the evening of the same day, lectured at the Parsonage House, from the words, "Furthermore then we beseech you brethren, and exhort you by the Lord Jesus, that as ye have received of us, how ye ought to walk and to please God, so ye may abound more and more." Both these discourses were edifying, and suitable on the occasion, and gave general satisfaction to the people. In the latter he reminded christians of the precious season, and privilege they had enjoyed on that day, and the obligations they were under, to shew true thankfulness; with suitable instructions as to how they ought to abound more and more, in all holiness of heart, and life, and exhorting the unregenerate to repentance and faith in the Lord Jesus Christ. At the close of this discourse, Mr. Ebeaugh was requested by a friend of Mr. Cole, to lecture at his house, which he did on the following Wednesday Evening, from the 19th Psalm, verse 7, 8, 9 and 10, "The law of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul," &c. This was also an experimental and practical discourse, and as far as I know, pleasing to the greatest part of the audience. After the service was closed, a friend of Mr. Cole remarked to me, that if that was not good preaching he knew nothing about it—but mark what follows:—

On the next ensuing sabbath Mr. Cole publicly assailed the doctrine advanced by Mr. Ebeaugh in his last preceding discourse, and compared him to a wolf in sheep's clothing, at which the congregation were greatly surprised, and many of them much grieved.—In relation to the book offered by Mr. Ebeaugh, he said that two dollars (which was the price of it) was a very high price for it.

He cautioned his people if they read it to do it very carefully, as it contained matter that might lead them astray; that there were two or three sermons in it, and, referring to one of them he said it was a great learned piece, but there was nothing of the Gospel in it. In all this he did not mention the name of Mr. Ebeaugh, but no one present did or could deny, but he was pointed at; Mr. Ebeaugh was an entire stranger to me, but believing his character and standing as a Minister of the Gospel to be good, I thought it no more than justly due to him and to the cause of truth to add to my list of accusations the foregoing sentiments, expressed by Mr. Cole, in relation to his character and doctrine and his book also, recommended as it was: not with a view to fight his battles (as some have said) but to bring his discourses before the Classis, in order to give them an opportunity to see what kind of doctrine Mr. Cole had assailed. But the Classis gave it the go-by as they called it and would take no further notice of it. On the first Sabbath in March 1840, the Rev. J. Demarest preached for Mr. Cole, from the words—"But whoso looketh into the perfect law of liberty and continueth therein he being not a forgetful hearer, but a doer of the work—this man shall be blessed in his deed." This was also a good discourse, with suitable exhortations and admonitions, materially differing from the course pursued by Mr. Cole. After Mr. Demarest closed his discourse Mr. Cole followed up the sermon, quoted the text "For I through the law &c." In commenting on these words he said, the Christian had nothing to do with the law: he did not explain how the Christian was dead to the law; it appeared as though he was laboring to overthrow what Mr. Demarest had advanced. On the 8th of March, 1840, he preached from the words "Obey them that have the rule over you &c." (here let me remark that many in the congregation were dissatisfied on account of his not exhorting the unregenerate to repentance and faith, nor the christian to maintain good works, of which dissatisfaction he was well aware.) In this sermon he said (and with a great deal of excitement,) to say that I do not preach to the sinner, would be ridiculous,

it would be idle to say so, and it is for want of light that any say so; I do preach to the sinner—I am a sinner—and you are all sinners, and I preach to you all, and the same food the christian has the sinner wants.—Now I ask the reader does a corpse want nourishment? of course not, for it is dead; so the unregenerate sinner being spiritually dead, does not want the food or spiritual nourishment of the christian; it is true he stands in perishing need of it, but does not want or desire it, and has no relish for it, until he is made truly sensible of his need of it. Now as I considered the foregoing sentiments advanced by Mr. Cole since (as well as before) his solemn pledge made before Classis in 1838, to be unscriptural and not in accordance with the standards of the Reformed Dutch Church, and as I did not wish to leave the Congregation, and could not conceive it to be my duty under existing circumstances (although several of the members has already left, some to form a new Congregation at Piermont, and some, most part of the time, attending the Presbyterian Church at Blauveltville.) I was again constrained, from a sense of duty, to speak once more to the Consistory on the subject. Accordingly, at the close of the last mentioned sermon, being with them alone, I addressed them thus, Brethren is this the doctrine of the Dutch Church, to give the same food to all, and make no distinction, and as I received no answer I replied to my own question, by saying, that it was not dividing the word of truth aright, and giving to each his portion in due season, as the Apostles taught: I requested them by all means to consider me as their very friend, and that of the Congregation, and that in speaking to them on this all-important subject, I was in earnest, that it grieved me to the very heart, to hear (from our own Pulpit) the Dutch Church, and her institutions, so disregarded, and her Doctrines so misconstrued and corrupted, that I could hardly bear it any longer, and as I did not wish to leave them I asked if nothing could be done to remove my grievance. One of the Elders (Mr. James P. Blauvelt) replied by asking me, if I thought Mr. Cole to be in error (I replied yes) and further, if I was not put up by some one or another, to do this in order to make trouble, which might tend to their benefit? I replied no sir, but that I did it from the purest motives, and the most honest intentions to promote the welfare of the Congregation; I was then asked by the same Elder, if I would once more converse with Mr. Cole on the subject? I replied it would be a gratification to me, to do it in the presence of his Consistory and one or two other persons; this was agreed

to by the Consistory, and accordingly they appointed a meeting at the Parsonage House, on the following Friday afternoon for the purpose above stated, and if possible to effect a reconciliation, which I have no doubt was (at that time) purely the object of the Consistory; but mark what follows, as I called at the Parsonage House (with two of the members of the Church, according to agreement) and was entering the Hall, I was met by an Elder, who requested my two friends not to come in, they asked the reason, and were answered by the same Elder, that it was unconstitutional, of course they went back, and I was conducted to the room where the Consistory were convened, and was then, by them requested to sit down and write my accusations against Mr. Cole. At this I was surprised, and replied, Brethren, I have not come here to day for such a purpose, but have come to converse before you with Mr. Cole, as was previously agreed upon, in order to effect a reconciliation.—Where is he? they replied he was not at home, and they then urged me strongly to write my accusations immediately, I replied that I could not do it then, as it required some time, but would (if they requested to have them) prepare and give them to the Consistory on the following Friday afternoon to which they finally agreed; accordingly on the 28th day of March, 1840, I laid before them my list of accusations, of which the following is a copy.

To the Consistory of the Reformed Dutch Church, at Tappan.

DEAR BRETHREN.—It is with regret that the undersigned finds himself in duty bound to call your attention to an unpleasant subject, which he hoped had been adjusted in a manner as to be buried by the concessions made by our pastor, Rev. I. D. Cole, before the Classis of Paramus, and his solemn pledge to preach the whole system of doctrine and practice as taught in the standards of our church, but inasmuch as our said pastor has violated said pledges, and pursues the same mode of exhibiting doctrines of the character complained of in the memorial laid before the Classis at its meeting in Tappan, in 1838,—I find myself imperiously called upon to lay my grievances before you, in order that your interference may be brought to bear upon the subject and our church may again be nourished and fed by the pure milk and meat of the word of God to which we were accustomed during the long period of the ministry of our much loved pastor, the Rev. N. Lansing.

The specifications we would adduce to you are the following:—

1st. That our pastor, Rev. I. D. Cole has violated his pledge made in the presence of the Classis at its meeting in Tappan, in 1838.

2d. That said Rev. I. D. Cole has withheld much of the council of God as to practical part of the gospel system as exhibited in the standards of our Reformed Dutch Church.

3d. That our pastor, Rev. I. D. Cole has publicly assailed the character of the ecclesiastical and benevolent institutions of the Reformed Dutch Church.

4th. June 2, 1839, he preached from 143 Psalm, 10, "Teach me to do thy will, for thou art my God," He said the will of the Lord could not be known, the psalmist was sensible of this, and this caused him to make the petition; said if he could regenerate one soul by making exhortations he would do it, but he could not, the spirit must and would do it.

5th. June 9, he preached from Isaiah 33, 6, he said it was the wisdom of christians when in darkness and trials to sit still and do nothing, until the Lord removed the cloud and caused the sun of righteousness to shine upon them with healing on his wings, and then go on again; said he had heard ministers exhort sinners to repentance, and apparently with great earnest, and with threatening too, telling them if they did not repent they would be damned; but all this he said was of no use, the Lord would by his spirit in his own time and way regenerate those who were from all eternity elected in the everlasting covenant of grace.

6th. August 4, he preached from 122 Psalm, 8, in the application he said we must examine whether we had this peace spoken of in the text, and in this examination we must not look into ourselves, we must look at Christ and nothing else whatever; said some christians when in doubts and fears would examine themselves if they could find something within to comfort them; said this was wrong, they must look at Christ; said this might by some be called presumption, but it was not, but it was presumption to look at your experience, duties, and good works, and to take comfort from them.

7th. August, he preached from 122 Psalm, 7, "And prosperity within thy palaces"; he said Covenant Union with the Lord Jesus Christ was the principal means used for the prosperity of Zion, for every thing else flowed from this union, he said we must examine ourselves whether our Souls prospered and in this we must not look into ourselves, our experience, and good works, nor any thing else whatever but to Christ.

8th. On the first sabbath after the last meeting of Classis at Nyack, he preached from 25 Psalm, 10 verse, he said what is there in all the ecclesiastical judicatures of the Dutch Church, but trouble and contention, no Brotherly love, no harmony, and what are all her institutions, they are not warranted by the word of God, there is not a single stipulation to be found in the covenant authorising those institutions.

9th. Oct. 27, he preached from Solomon's Songs, 5, first 8 verses, in this sermon he said it was the special duty of ministers of the gospel to edify and build up the body of Christ, and the same food that would nourish and build up the christian would bring in those that were yet standing without.

10th. December 8th, he preached from 17 of Acts, 11. 12. in this Sermon he said there was no similarity in the whole Protestant Church at the present day, to what it was in the days of the Apostles, and that it needed now a reformation as much as in the days of Luther.

11th. March 8, 1840, he preached from the words, "obey them that have the rule over you &c.," in this Sermon he said, to say that I do not preach to the Sinner would be ridiculous, it would be idle to say so, and it is for want of light that any should say so, I do preach to the Sinner, I am a Sinner, you are all Sinners, and I preach to you all, and the same food that the Christian has the Sinner wants.

12th. He said in one of his Sermons some time last fall, that the elect were justified and sanctified from all eternity, said he would illustrate it in this way, supposing a debtor to become insolvent, his creditors to seize him and confine him in prison, a friend steps forward and pays the debt, the creditor is satisfied, but the friend chooses to leave the debtor confined until he pleases to set him free, so his debt is paid but he does not know it; so the elect sinner is justified and sanctified from all eternity (although yet a slave to sin and satan in this world) but does not know it until it please the Lord by his spirit to bring him to Christ and set him free.

13th. March 22nd, he preached from John's gospel 17. 19. "And for their sakes I sanctify myself" in this sermon he said there was legal sanctification enough in the world, plenty of it, but gospel sanctification was very little understood, it was a very deep mystery, it commenced from all eternity and was carried through time unto perfection in glory.

14th. That he publicly assailed the doctrine of a minister in the Reformed Dutch Church from the pulpit in the Tappan Church, the Sabbath after having availed himself of

his services to aid him in preaching, and assisting him to dispense the communion of the Lord's Supper on the first Sabbath in January, 1840, to the great grievance of God's people.

15th. That the said Rev. I. D. Cole has also assailed a standard work on practical piety, published by a Minister of the Reformed Dutch Church* which said attack was made from the pulpit in the Tappan Church, on the second Sabbath in January, 1840, notwithstanding said work is most strongly recommended by the unanimous resolutions of the Synod of the German Reformed Church, and also a number of the most distinguished Ministers of the Reformed Dutch Church.

The above I present as specimens of his departure from the principles as taught by the standards of our Church, and for which I feel myself to be agrieved.

JACOB I. BLAUVELT.

March 28th, 1840.

I then offered to give testimony in support of the charges which they refused to hear, and requested me and my witnesses to withdraw: and on the same day delivered to me a copy of their decision on the subject, which is in the following manner and form:

At a meeting of the Consistory of the Reformed Dutch Church of Tappan, held at the Parsonage, March 28th, 1840, the following members were present, viz:

Rev. ISAAC D. COLE, *President*.

Elders.

ABRAHAM ECKERSON,
JAMES P. BLAUVELT,
WANDLE VAN ANTWERP,
SAMUEL HARING.

Deacons.

JACOB RIKER,
JAMES J. DEMAREST,
JOHN I. BLAUVELT,
JOHN V. B. JOHNSON.

The Meeting was opened with prayer by the President.

Jacob I Blauvelt appeared with two witnesses—Tunis I. Blauvelt and Paul Poulison, and presented the following charges against the Rev. I. D. Cole. (*See copy of charges.*)

Mr. Blauvelt and his witnesses having departed, the Consistory carefully deliberated on all the charges separately, and are unanimously of the belief that whatsoever is con-

tained in the above charges of an exceptionable nature, is not founded in truth, but is a misrepresentation of the words and sentiments of the Rev. I. D. Cole, as held forth by him in his sermons; and we moreover are satisfied that his preaching is not only doctrinal, but also of an experimental and practical nature, according to the excellent standards of the Reformed Dutch Church. We therefore consider it our duty to take no further notice of the charges contained in the above document.

ABRAHAM ECKERSON,
WANDLE VAN ANTWERP,
SAMUEL HARING,
JAMES P. BLAUVELT, } *Elders.*

JOHN T. BLAUVELT,
JOHN V. B. JOHNSON,
JACOB RIKER,
JAMES J. DEMAREST, } *Deacons.*

Now I ask the reader to reflect for a few moments upon the conduct and management of Mr. Cole in relation to the meetings of his Consistory in this case. First, I refer you to the question I put to them in relation to sanctification being no evidence of justification, and why he requested them not to answer it—the reason is plain. He very well knew that if they answered it correctly it would be in direct opposition to what he expressed from the pulpit. Now look at the two last preceding meetings at the Parsonage House;—and in relation to the first, should he not (at least) have remained at home, and met me before the Consistory, as a man and a christian, and made use of every argument in his power, in order to remove the unhappy difference existing between us, and if possible effect a reconciliation? This, indeed, would have manifested something of the spirit of the meek and lowly. But instead of this he left home, and went to the house of an elderly brother who, (while he was there) asked him if he had not to be at home at that time, on account of a meeting of his Consistory there? He replied that he had nothing to do with that meeting. But when the Consistory met a week after to receive my accusations, he was at home and had something to do with that meeting; for he was then willing to have the case investigated and deliberated on; and why? because he was now presiding Judge of a Court in his own case; and the said Court would not allow me to be present during the investigation, in order to have an opportunity to speak or give testimony in support of my accusations, which of course gave him a better opportunity to manage his own case successfully. For I have been credibly in-

* German Reformed Church.

formed that he wrote the copy containing their deliberations and decision on the case, which was only copied off by one of their number. Now, reader, look at this. Was there not a plan laid by some one to get my accusations before the Consistory; and in this unfair and unconstitutional manner to acquit Mr. Cole, not only, but also to justify him in his mode of preaching; and moreover to say that my accusations were not founded in truth, on the presumption that it would put an end to the matter at once. But from such a decision I was bound to appeal to Classis, and for the following reasons:

To the Consistory of the Reformed Dutch Church, at Tappan.

DEAR BRETHREN.

The undersigned a member in full Communion of said Church, at Tappan, respectfully and solemnly appeals from the acts and proceedings of your Ecclesiastical body, at a meeting held at the parsonage on the 28th of March, in the present year of our Lord eighteen hundred and forty, as the same appertained to the charges I then preferred against our Pastor Rev. I. D. Cole, for the following reasons.

1st. Because the undersigned verily believes said charges founded in truth.

2nd. Because the said Rev. I. D. Cole made a solemn pledge before the Classis of Paramus, at its meeting in Tappan, in 1838, to preach the doctrine, that good works and sanctification, were an evidence of justification, which said pledge he has violated.

3rd. Because there is in said charges, no misrepresentation of the words and sentiments of the Rev. I. D. Cole, as held forth by him in his Sermons, referred to in said charges.

4th. Because the undersigned, appellant believes the interest of truth and righteousness required of the Consistory, a careful examination, accompanied by taking of testimony in the case.

5th. Because the undersigned believes the case should at least have been kindly referred by the Consistory, for trial of Rev. I. D. Cole, by the Classis of Paramus.

For the above reasons, the subscriber appeals as aforesaid, to the next stated meeting of the Classis of Paramus, to be held at Pascack, on the 14th of April, in the year of our Lord eighteen hundred and forty. Given

under my hand this fourth day of April, 1840.

JACOB I. BLAUVELT.

This appeal I filed before the Classis of Paramus, when in session at Pascack, on the 14th of April, 1840. When Mr. Cole presented the paper containing the accusations brought against him before his Consistory, and their decision on them, which was by Classis considered not to be in constitutional order,—but agreed that if both parties were willing to let the case come before them by consent, it would be in order, to which both parties assented. Classis then appointed an extra session, to meet on the 28th of April, 1840, in the Tappan Church, to investigate the case. But before I give a particular account of the trial, and what occurred during its progress, I shall give one more of the sentiments advanced by Mr. Cole previous thereto; it was on the last sabbath previous to the trial, when he preached from the words—"Good and upright is the Lord, therefore will he teach sinners in the way." In this sermon he addressed the unregenerate in these words:—Have you ever felt a desire to be led in the ways of the Lord, or to be taught in the ways of the Lord? If you have not, then why should you pray for it? This sentiment was not in my list of accusations as it was advanced after I filed them, but I charged him with it before the Classis. He replied that there was not a man in the church who heard him say so. I answered that he did say so. He made no reply.

Now I shall endeavor to give an account of the trial, and what occurred during its progress. The documents in the case being read, both as to the acts of the Consistory, and the reasons of appeal, a motion was made to commit them to a committee, which was lost. Here let me remark that Mr. Cole, as on former occasions, endeavored to prevent an investigation of the case. First, by pleading that I brought the accusations out of passion, and improper motives, when at the same time he must have known, that it was done at the request of his own Consistory, from whose decision I was bound in justice to myself, and to the cause of truth, to appeal. The yeas and nays were called for, and the question, was decided in the negative. His next plea to prevent an investigation was, that the manner and form in which the appeal was presented, was unconstitutional: as this was by the chair (Rev. E. Wiggins) decided in the affirmative, the Classis referred to the mutual agreement made between the parties when the appeal was presented before them

at Pascack, viz: "The parties in the case, Rev. I. D. Cole President of Consistory, and Jacob I. Blauvelt, mutually agreed to wave any objection that might be raised on such informality, and that the case be now regularly and constitutionally before the classis, and in accordance with such arrangement resolved to meet at Tappan for the purpose of testing said case, on Tuesday, April 28th, at 10 o'clock A. M." Here let me remark, that while I was attempting to reply to Mr. Cole's first plea, viz: my motives in this case, I was publicly told by a member of Classis, (a Minister) that I had no right to say a word on the subject, as I was no member of Classis; and also that I had no right to bring accusations against a Minister, if his Consistory were satisfied, and that there was a conspiracy against Mr. Cole, and I was at the head of it, pointing to me, and saying is he a Christian? Let me also remark, that Mr. Cole charged before Classis, that I had in a prayer meeting at the house of Mr. W. Van Antwerp an Elder, by giving out the 143 Psalm to be sung, and also in the prayer that I made, pointed at him which he said was the cause of breaking it up. But I proved my innocence, by having the said Psalm read, and by the testimony of said Elder. How Mr. Cole could have such views in relation to my feelings towards him, I am at a loss to understand, unless he measured them by his own towards me; for he was evidently from time to time (since my first interview with him,) pointing at me from the pulpit, and not only that, but in visiting his Congregation from house to house, he passed and repassed my house and did not call in at all; and that contrary to the advice of his Consistory, and while I was a regular attendant upon his ministry; but these things I considered to be small, and as far as I was concerned, did not move me, for they were nothing in comparison with what I was contending for.

Afternoon Session.

Classis assembled at the hour appointed after the recess. Opened with prayer.

Rev. Mr. Elting was called on as a witness to prove the second point of the appeal.

When Mr. Cole summed up his case, he made some elucidations and explanations, very satisfactory to my mind, throwing light upon several points. He retracted somethings particularly that good works were good for nothing, abominable and abhorrent. He did not know that he had made these expres-

sions. He must have been much excited if he had. He was not in the habit of being much excited, and if he had made them, he retracted and abhorred the idea of making them. Then he pledged himself on these points, viz: that sanctification is an evidence of justification—and that good works were an evidence of saving faith, he would in future express himself so plain, that no person who had taken exception to his phraseology, could misunderstand him."

Rev. J. M. Manly's testimony not recorded.

Rev. P. I. Quick.—"Had not charged his memory particularly—his impression was this, Mr. Cole in relation to those two points, said he was not conscious of having promulgated such expressions from the pulpit, but as this had been proved against him by credible witnesses, he supposed he must have said those words, and for the future would try to explain himself in such a way that he cannot be misunderstood."

The Elder Peter Smith, was chosen Assistant Clerk.

Mr. Hoffman.—When Mr. Cole had summed up his cause, he said that he was sorry that the congregation had misunderstood him, and he would endeavor hereafter to preach so plain that they would understand him different. He has not understood him since to preach up good works as an evidence of justification. I have not heard exhortations given to repentance. I have not heard him warn sinners. On self-examination he has heard him say, look out of yourselves to Christ, not look at your experience or good works.

Mr. Vervalen.—"He said that if he had made such expressions as were testified by credible witnesses, he was sorry he had made them and would be careful hereafter to preach them so plainly that none could misunderstand them. He did not preach up good works as an evidence of faith. He has not urged the duty of good works."

Mr. Miller.—"His general way in self-examination, was to urge us to look out of ourselves to Christ. He has not urged the duty of good works—good works were not an evidence of faith, but infallible fruits of faith. He holds up a complete Saviour, but not as a pattern of holiness for a Christian to imitate.

Paul Poulis.—"On self-examination his general direction is not to look to ourselves—our experience—good works, but only to Christ. He does not preach up the duty of good works. He has said that outward sins would not shake us "unless we indulge in unbelief."

9th Article. Heard him say the same food the Christian enjoyed the sinner wanted. The Gospel alone was sufficient. He noticed there was some alteration in his preaching.

Mr. Vervalen.—Heard him say that preaching the Law was leading sinners down to Hell.

Mr. Miller.—"Heard him say the same food of Christians was suitable for sinners."

Mr. Seaman.—In regard to eternal justification and sanctification, he does not know that he particularly heard these words, that we were justified and sanctified, but did not know it until it pleased the Saviour to reveal himself to us. The illustration Mr Cole acknowledged to be correct.

Mr. Miller does not recollect this language as used by Mr. Cole.

Mr. Blauvelt.—Has heard Mr. Cole say that the elect were justified and sanctified from all eternity.

Dr. Dewitt.—On the sermon preached at New Brunswick, preaching respected the mystical Church—felt that there was restraint in his preaching to sinners; after hearing the sermon read by Mr. Cole, I asked Dr. Dewitt if it was the same as Mr. Cole preached it at New Brunswick; he replied that it had been altered, as also Dr. Elting testified, neither of which is recorded.

Classis assembled again in the morning at the hour appointed. The President being absent, the Rev. W. R. Bogardus was chosen President, pro. tem. The meeting was opened with prayer.

Rev. James Demarest.—In violation of the pledge, he preached here first sabbath in March; Mr. Cole followed up the sermon with some remarks, quoted the text—"For I through the Law &c." Witness preached from the text—"Whoso looketh into the perfect law of liberty &c." Mr. Cole in commenting on the above text, said the christian had nothing to do with the law. He did not explain how the christian was dead to the law; it seemed to witness that there was rather a deficiency through error. He had some conversation with Mr. Cole on the 1st March, whether good works was an evidence of faith. He did not say whether they were or not; then he asked him whether good works were not really an evidence of faith? He said that works (whether good or bad, witness could not understand) were thought more of than they were worth.

3d Specification.—I do not remember the precise words he used in regard to the Benevolent Institutions of the Church—he spoke particularly against the abuses of these in-

stitutions; but from the general tenor of his remarks and language gathered the idiea that he was averse to them.

Rev. John S. Ebeaugh.—On 17th December, while coming from Mr. Perry's, he asked concerning the piety of certain individuals of Nyack. Mr. E. said that he was greatly satisfied with the piety of a member of that family whom he met in the prayer meeting. Mr. C. said that his good works were no evidence of his faith and piety.

Silas Miller.—3d specification.—No collections have been taken up for the benevolent institutions of the Dutch Church for two years past. He states that he was absent one-third or one-quarter of the time, and that a collection might possibly have been taken up in his absence.

Mr. Seaman.—Has not heard of a collection being taken up for two years or over;—most generally attends church.

8th Specification.—*John I. Blauvelt.*—Stated he had heard Mr. Cole say that there was strife and contention in the Ecclesiastical Judicatures of the Dutch Church, no brotherly love and harmony. He said that the benevolent institutions were unwarranted by the word of God, and that there was nothing in the covenant concerning them, and that there were some words between them concerning them, that he had forgotten, and does not remember the connexion with the point in hand—but recollects that they were these, "that there were no stipulations in the covenant concerning them."

Mr. Demott.—11th Specification.—He asked Mr. Cole if on a certain sabbath he had not preached that the same preaching that a christian needed ought to be preached to the sinner. Answered yes. Said there was no use to preach terrors alone, that terror could not convert the sinner—that something more was wanted.

John S. Verbryck.—Understands in the summing up of Mr. Cole that he made certain concessions that on former occasions he would not make. He conceded that sanctification is an evidence of justification, and that good works were an evidence of faith, and also promised hereafter to make them so plain that they should not be misunderstood. He had a conversation with Mr. Cole. Mr. C. asked him to give a statement of his belief. He did so, and Mr. C. remarked he did not see any reason why he was arraigned before Classis on a former occasion, as our belief was the same—on the doctrine of justification by faith.—He told him that from the first to the last sermon he had not differed on that point—but if they went further they would differ. He asked if he did not believe

that faith was sanctification. Answered not. Witness hoped that Mr. C. would not say that justification was sanctification.—Answered, certainly that it was the ground of it.

Here I rested my case with the understanding that one more witness might be examined. This was an important witness, but he was placed in such a delicate situation that I thought it prudent at (his earnest and repeated requests) not to call him up.

Testimony in behalf of the Defence.

One of the Elders was now called as a witness, to which (though it does not appear on the record) I objected—for he had sat in judgment on the case, as did all the members of the Consistory with Mr. Cole, and consequently they were parties in the case. But this objection was overruled by the President and they were admitted, against which Dr. Elting protested.

James P. Blauvelt.—There was evidence brought against Mr. Cole that he had said that good works were abominable, detestable, good for nothing—but Mr. C. said, if he had said so, he regrets it and is sorry for it.—Mr. Cole said he did not recollect, but witness recollects it. He preached from the text “The Lord had respect to the offering of Abel &c.” at the time witness heard the above expressions. In winding up his discourse, Mr. C. asked why the Lord had respect to Abel and his offering; answered because he had faith as the apostle tells us in the Hebrews, “By Faith &c.” Then he told his hearers that Cain performed a work too, as well as Abel—but such good works were abhorrent, detestable, and good for nothing—does not recollect how many witnesses heard it.

As to the pledge—that if he had been misunderstood, he would endeavor in the future to make it so plain that he should not be misunderstood. He does not recollect that in any one instance Mr. Cole has violated this pledge; witness does not recollect that Mr. C. omits any part of the standards in his preaching; witness stated in regard to self examination, that Mr. Cole advised his hearers to look out of themselves to Christ for the granting of these graces, but to ourselves for the possession of them. We must look out of ourselves for an acceptance with God.—Witness has been absent some sabbaths and had not heard him preach in that connexion specified in preaching from these words—“Peace be within thy walls;” he does not know that in his district there is any dissat-

isfaction, but has heard there is one man is not altogether satisfied; has a prayer meeting in his neighbourhood and has had for several years—Mr. Cole has encouraged it. He often tells us to let our light so shine &c. Has often heard him speak of good works, viz.—humility, prayer, faith, and hope.—He frequently urges the duty of a holy walk and conversation.

In relation to the Ecclesiastical Judicatures of the Dutch Church: does not know whether he spoke of the Dutch Church or others. He said there was trouble and contention, among them. He heard speak of the general assembly that they were divided. Recollects the Sermon from this text, Hebrews 13. 17. “For they watch for your souls as they &c.” He recollects this language used by Mr. Cole that the same food that the Christian had, the sinner wanted, or something like that; but whether it was in connexion with this Sermon or not, does not recollect.—He has frequently heard him qualify remarks in this language, “by the divine blessing” but does not know that he did at this time. He preaches particularly to sinners; Mr. C. in preaching to sinners, said, that if it were possible he would take them in his arms and bring them to the Saviour; but he could not and asked if they were sensible that they were sinners, and entreated them to come to Christ. “Seek and ye shall find, &c.”—Witness thinks that one who comes from time to time, habitually from proper motives could not say that he did not preach to sinners.

11th Specification Witness recollects at a meeting of Consistory, that I. D. Blauvelt asked brethren can you stand this any longer, I cannot; they asked him why he was dissatisfied, he answered because Mr. C. kept back much of the council of God; then they asked him if he believed Mr. Cole in error? he answered in part. *Mr. Abraham Acker.*—Witness does not think Mr. C. has violated his pledge on Justification and Sanctification: he preached plainly, exhorts his people to good works, Christian covenant and prayer, not only on communion occasions, but all other times; family visitation performed six weeks ago, had a particular talk with the members of the family, and in one occupied nearly two hours, and in others according to the size of family, in addressing them from the oldest to the youngest; heard of no complaint in the whole district. Has not heard him preach against the institutions of the Dutch Church, but the movements of the Church at large. Has not heard him preach Eternal Justification and Sanctification of the elect. It can't be said that Mr. C. does not preach to sinners.

Jacob B. Wood.—Heard Mr. C. lecture some months ago; it was a discourse with which he was much delighted; from this text Mr. Cole quoted this passage, "This is the will of God, &c." He said that faith in the heart would lead to all practical duties and was the spring from which all Christian graces would flow. He conceived that this discourse agreed with the standards, &c., was calculated to edify—and made this remark to his family, that there was much instruction and consolation. He heard him speak of Sabbath Schools; said he thought in the city, it was a good thing, but in the country preferred seeing the children himself.

Mr. Van Antwerp.—Does not know any thing about the pledge; does not know that Mr. C. preaches contrary to the standards and doctrines of our Church; visited the Congregation about a fortnight ago; found dissatisfaction with only one person; cant recollect what it was about; heard Mr. Poulis say, that he could not understand him; Mr. Cole wished to see him to satisfy him. Says that a prayer meeting was held in his neighbourhood, and Mr. Cole encouraged it; has generally encouraged prayer meetings. Mr. J. I. Blauvelt took part in the prayer meeting; was not positive whether he referred particularly to Mr. Cole; does not think there was any thing improper in the prayer; cant say that Mr. Blauvelt broke up the prayer meeting.

Did not recollect that Mr. C. had used the language contained in the 5th specification with regard to electing sinners to repentance.

Mr. Samuel Haring.—We visited the congregation 3 weeks ago; number of families about 35; a goodly number of pious people among them; the whole with the exception of one, who was not a member, perfectly satisfied with Mr. Cole's preaching; understands Mr. Cole to preach according to the standard of our Church; exhorts sinners to the duties incumbent upon them; he preaches faithfully to the unconverted; does not understand Mr. Cole to preach against the institutions of the Dutch Church. In cross-examining this witness, I asked him if he knew of his own knowledge that Mr. Cole preached according to the standards of the Dutch Church? He replied, Yes. I then asked him what the standards of the Dutch Church were? He replied he did not know. I then asked him to give me one single point of the doctrines of the Dutch Church? He gave me no answer—but the President replied in these words, viz. *I shall have to stick up my horn—no more questions.* This cross-examination is not recorded.

John V. B. Johnson.—Mr. Cole does not preach contrary to the doctrines and practice of our church. Faithfully instructs christians in their duties according to the word of God and the standards of our Church;—preaches faithfully to the unconverted, warning sinners of their danger, and pointing them to their only remedy; never heard him preach against the Ecclesiastical Judicatures of the Church; *remembers* one time when he spoke against some of the movements of the church at the present day, particularly of the Presbyterian Church. On self-examination—what knowledge we have of the covenant of works, and of our own sin and misery, and how we are brought out into the liberty of God's dear children. (Mr. Cole spoke of the want of brotherly love among some of the ecclesiastical judicatures of the church; witness the Presbyterian Church in her last General Assembly; not in the habit of such preaching, he only spoke of it in one discourse; I suppose Mr. C. had no reference to the Classis of Paramus, at Nyack; encourages prayer meetings.

James P. Smith.—Said he was a member of the Presbyterian Church of Greenbush; attends nearly half of the time here; his preaching accords with the standards of the Dutch Church; heard Mr. Cole instruct christians according to the word of God; very free and earnest in exhorting to all christian duties calculated to awake and interest the unconverted, and bring them to a knowledge of salvation; never heard him preach against the institutions of the Dutch Church; not his habit to preach about things of this kind; supposes from the manner and matter of his preaching that he has an earnest desire to build up the church in faith and holiness, and to awaken sinners and bring them to a knowledge of the Saviour; his manner not offensive but highly satisfactory; in self-examination, (says we) must look within; always very plain and satisfactory to his mind; believes it to be the duty of ministers to address the unconverted and urge them to repentance, showing what repentance is; considers it the minister's duty, and considers Mr. C. so to do, more or less in every sermon he hears him preach; heard him frequently from the Heidelberg Catechism; preaches in accordance with the letter and spirit of the Catechism.

Cornelius J. Smith.—Said he preached according to the standards of our Church—preached plain on christian duties, much to his satisfaction, according to the word of God and the Heidleberg Catechism, and by comparing scripture with scripture in every sermon he preaches; follows him by referring to his bible; thinks it to be the duty of

ministers directly to address the unconverted; thinks Mr. C. does that, *points* them to Christ as the only Saviour; Mr. Cole addresses sinners as such, not as the elect;—at no time has heard him preach against the institutions of the Reformed Dutch Church; heard him speak of some of the movements of the Church, particularly the Presbyterian Church in her late General Assembly; it is not Mr. Cole's habit to preach on these subjects.

Mr. Lippincott.—In relation to a sermon in the city, was received with general approbation both by Pastor and people.

Rev. P. I. Quick.—Testified, he thinks it was last fall Mr. C. preached from the text, Psalms, "O Lord I am thy servant &c." accorded with my views of scriptural truth, and with the views of his people who-soever he had heard speak on the subjects: thought there was a manifest improvement in explaining particular points which were somewhat obscure.

Rev. P. Allen.—Testified to a sermon Mr. C. had preached last February, before the Bible Society; it agreed with his views, was edifying and well adapted to promote the object in view; he thinks Mr. C. is a member of the Bible Society; he did not go there to preach, but spoke with a few moment's reflection.

C. I. Blauvelt.—He was very well satisfied; he thought it much to the purpose; spake of it to his family in that way at Clarkstown; very satisfactory to his mind at the time; so it appeared to his neighbors with whom he conversed about it.

Tunis I. Blauvelt.—He does not know that Mr. Cole has violated his pledge; thinks he has preached the doctrine of the Church regularly and plainly according to his judgment.

He preaches duties throughout his discourse. Does not withhold any thing of the duties of Religion. He urges, enforces, and encourages christians to a holy walk and conversation. When they meet in prayer meetings these things are talked about to edify one another; hears of no discontent; hears that his sermons are much esteemed and liked; lectures well attended. Witness thinks there has been a manifest improvement within two years past. Thinks it to be the duty of Ministers to preach to sinners, to set before them their awful danger by nature and practice. Thinks his preaching is calculated to convince the careless soul by the divine blessing, preaches the terrors of the Law, in the proper place and connexion. Witness states this has been so for him. Does not think his preaching

is calculated to give offence, but manifests great desire for the salvation of men.

Ecclesiastical Judicatures and movements of the day; does not recollect he mentioned any thing about the Dutch Church. Has not heard him preach against the Missionary or Bible Society. Has not understood him to preach against any institution. His impression is that Mr. Cole has not been unfavorable to these institutions in their proper place. Has observed that Mr. C. was more particular in some points—distinguishing between christian good works, and works of worldlings. An extract from the work of J. Bunyan—the doctrine of law and grace, page 144, 4th section, was adduced as evidence of his way of addressing souls; a Sermon was also read from the text, "But ye were as sheep," &c. Preached since the charges were filed. To this kind of testimony I objected, although I found no fault with this Sermon, and of course not with the works of Bunyan, but requested him to produce the manuscripts of the Sermons complained of, which would better prove the manner of his preaching, but not one of those in my list of accusations was produced; this objection is not recorded.

Also, he read another Sermon. "He that believeth on the Son of God hath a witness in himself." Preached before the 1st trial.

Cross examination in the case.

Mr. Elting.—cross-examined.—says that when Mr. Cole summed up his case, he made some elucidations and explanations to my mind, throwing light upon several points; he retracted some things particularly, that good works were good for nothing, abominable and horrible; he did not know that he had made these expressions; he must have been *much* excited, if he had made them; was not in the habit of being much excited in the pulpit, but if he had made them, he retracted them; then he pledged himself on these points, viz: sanctification no evidence of justification, and good works, no evidence of saving faith; that in future, he would preach so plain as not to be misunderstood.

Manly's direct testimony omitted.

Mr. Manly.—cross-examined.—Mr. Cole at first, not willing to retract, as it has been proved; I acknowledge I have made improper expressions, and regret it, and would for the future preach different; wished it to come before the Church; does not know by how many witnesses it was proved that Mr. Cole had said good works were abominable, &c.

Mr. Quick — cross-examined.—Had not charged his memory with it; Mr. Cole in summing up, in relation to those two points, viz: sanctification and justification; and inasmuch as it had been proved against him, thought he might possibly have said so, and in future would not express himself in that way.

Mr. Hoffman—cross-examined.—Has not heard Mr. C. maintain good works as an evidence of faith. Has not been in general at Church, could not answer as to the text Mr. Cole had taken; does not know much concerning the exhortation at the Lord's table; exhorts parents a little.

Mr. Vervalen.—Mr. C. says it is as natural for the Christian to perform good works as water to flow from a pitcher; does not recollect Mr. C. to mention any particular works, was a steady hearer until January 1st, 1839. Knows nothing about the Sabbath School.

Silas Miller.—Not heard Mr. Cole give any reasons why he had no collection; not present at last communion; was at Greenbush, is a member in full communion.

John I. Blauvelt.—1st Sermon preached after Classis at Nyack; did not hear any mention made of Classis at Nyack; believe he said Dutch Church; no recollection of the text; Mr. Cole ran out against Ecclesiastical Judicatures of the Church; heard no mention of the Presbyterian Church; three or four Sundays during the year past absent; recollects Mr. C. and Mr. Vervalen were talking about works and good works; the best works we did we merited Hell with them; says Mr. Vervalen do you know what good works are? asked what he went to Church for? what he prayed for and said that if these were not good works, then it was a work of the Devil; Mr. Cole don't preach the law as a schoolmaster to bring sinners to Christ.

I. Dumott, cross-examined. Entirely well satisfied with Mr. Cole's preaching; he preaches to the sinner, shewing the miserable condition and consequences of it; Mr. C. gave me satisfaction for the words "The same food or preaching was to the church and the sinner the same."

John S. Van Bryck. Does not believe that faith is sanctification, nor that hope is sanctification; has heard Mr. Cole preach of faith, hope, and love; witness added that faith, hope, and love went to make up sanctification; believes that justification is an external act.

Mr. Miller. I heard him exhort the sinner; was glad to hear Mr. C. publish a prayer meeting at——; not heard him preach a whole sermon on faith; absent one-quarter or one-third of the time; has heard

exhortation to his people to duty; has heard Mr. C. urge sinners to repentance within five or six weeks.

Mr. Poulis. Absents himself frequently; heard Mr. C. say that outward sins would not shake us, unless we indulge in unbelief; in self-examination not to look at good works, experience not to take comfort from good works; in faith there was a powerful consolation and rest, and in that way faith is an evidence of itself; has not attended the Lord's table lately. 9th Article, had no clear understanding of it; sentiments advanced, we must have an interest in Christ, before we can do any thing good.

Mr. Seaman. Does not recollect he used the word elect; has not often used the word elect.

John I. Blauvelt. The elect sinner was justified from all eternity; does not recollect the text he preached from then; does not recollect the words preceding; could not say any thing as to the communion; not attended the Lord's table for many years.

Rev. James Demarest.—Did not notice the particular words passed between them; did not hear any thing in Mr. C. that was erroneous as to good works; does not know that that was understood particularly; does not recollect any thing about Missionary Societies; not recollect that Mr. C. said any thing directly against any Society; heard nothing that was directly heretodox, only that expressions wanted more qualifying; spoke certainly about the abuses in the Societies.

John S. Ebeaugh.—Mr. C. said the S. S. had gone down in his Church; to the best of my recollection said they were institutions of men.

Cross examination on the part of the Plaintiff here rested.

FOR DEFENCE.

James P. Blauvelt.—Mr Cole was very plain in explanation; in exhortation to holiness of life; tells them without holiness they can't be saved. He exhorts them thus frequently, then Mr. Cole always qualifies his explanation to my satisfaction.

Mr. Acker.—Never heard Mr. C. say any thing against the institutions of Dutch Church; spoke of Church at large; never heard Mr. C. say that the elect were sanctified and justified from eternity; it could not be said fairly that Mr. C. does not preach to sinners; never heard Mr. C. say he was against the institutions of the Church; does not like the movements; he was for the Bible Society as hard as he could go.

Tunis J. Blauvelt. Doctrines of church plain to him; those contained in confession

of faith and Heidleburgh Catechism; observed that Mr. Cole was more plain than ever, but no difference in doctrines; had better understanding lately, than before from his preaching; has not been able to understand any difference in the standards of the Church; the means of duty; the duty to believe the Gospel, that was the way Mr. C. preached; pursues both the direct and indirect method of addressing sinners.

The above testimony is a certified copy from the Minutes.

I shall now make a few remarks in relation to the testimony adduced in this case. And first, I invite the attention of the reader to the way and manner in which some of it was taken; as, for instance, my witnesses were not allowed to state all they knew in relation to the case at one standing, but were from time to time severally ordered to stand back, and I to call another, which had a tendency to confuse both me and them. Whereas, the witnesses offered by Mr. Cole, were respectively allowed to give all their testimony at one standing, and not only so, but the Clerk wrote as Mr. Cole dictated, (for some of his witnesses) until they (the Clerk and Mr. Cole) said it was full enough, and then read it for the witness, and asked him if it was right. To this latter way of taking testimony I objected, but the President overruled the objection, and admitted the practice. (This objection is not recorded.) In the next place, I ask the reader to notice the evidence in support of the pledge made before the Classis of 1838, for which I refer him to the testimony of the following witnesses, viz: Dr. Elting, Rev. J. Manly, (although his direct testimony is not recorded) Rev. P. I. Quick, Mr. Hoffman, Mr. Vervalen, John S. Verbryck, and three of Mr. Cole's own witnesses, viz: James P. Blauvelt, Abraham Acker, and Tunis I. Blauvelt; and he will at once perceive this point clearly and fully established. Next I call the attention of the reader to the testimony in support of the violation of said pledge. But first let me remark, (and I hope it may be understood) that whatever testimony goes to prove that Mr. Cole has not preached the duty of good works, nor, that good works are an evidence of faith, or an evidence of justification; and has neither warned the sinner as such, nor exhorted him to repentance; that he has not preached the Law in its proper place, nor explained how the Christian was dead to the Law, but has said that to preach the Law, was leading sinners down to Hell, and that Christians had nothing to do with the Law, that the gospel alone was sufficient, and that outward

sins would not shake us, unless we indulge in unbelief; that the food of Christians was suitable for sinners, and that in self-exultation, we must not look at our experience or good works, as an evidence of our justification; go to show that he had violated his pledge. If in any of these points he has failed, (always making due allowance for mistakes) it is a violation of his pledge. To satisfy the reader that the above said specifications have been proved, I refer him to the testimony of the following witnesses, viz: Mr. Hoffman, Mr. Vervalen, Mr. Miller, Paul Poulis, Mr. Blauvelt, Dr. Dewitt, Rev. James Demarest, Rev. John S. Ebeaugh and John Demott. Thus you will clearly see this point also fully established.

Here let me remark, that the violation of this pledge, brought before this Classis, all the testimony on the trial in 1838, for their deliberation and decision in this case, because it was the condition on which the compromise was originally effected.

Next I ask the reader to examine the testimony in support of his not warning nor exhorting the sinner to repentance, and teaching that the same food the christian has the sinner wants, or is suitable for sinners; which, in fact, is not addressing the sinner as such; and for teaching, that preaching the Law is leading sinners down to Hell, and that he does not preach the Law as a schoolmaster, that is, to convince and condemn, which I remark, if the Apostle's words be true, viz: ("I had not known sin but by the Law, &c. Rom. 7, 7th,) is not warning the sinner as such. To satisfy the reader that the above points have been proved, I refer him to the testimony of the following witnesses, namely: Mr. Hoffman, Mr. Vervalen, John I. Blauvelt, Paul Poulis, Silas Miller, John Demott, James P. Blauvelt, and Dr. Dewitt; having established this point also.

Next, the reader will please to examine the testimony in support of his not exhorting Christians to maintain good works, for which I refer him to the testimony of the following witnesses, viz: Mr. Vervalen, Mr. Miller, and Paul Poulis, which establishes this point also fully and clearly.

I call the attention of the reader to the testimony on self-examination. (Namely: his teaching Christians not to look at their experience or good works, as an evidence of their faith or justification, but to look out of themselves to Christ;) for which I refer you to the testimony of Mr. Hoffman, Mr. Vervalen, Mr. Miller, Paul Poulis. Having clearly established this point also, I now ask the reader to notice the testimony in relation to his teaching, that the elect were

justified and sanctified from all eternity ; for which I refer you to the testimony of John I. Blauvelt, and Mr. Cole's own acknowledgment, that the illustration I gave of it before Classis, was the same as he spoke it from the pulpit. Now I ask why did Mr. Cole make such an illustration if the sentiment was not advanced, and does it not prove the fact that it was advanced, beyond a doubt?

Now I ask the reader to examine the testimony in relation to what Mr. Cole said of the Dutch Church and its institutions, and first ; Rev. James Demarest, testified that he was averse to them ; Silas Miller, stated that no collections had been taken in support of them, for two years past ; Mr. Seaman states, that none (to the best of his recollection) had been taken for two years or over ; John I. Blauvelt states, that Mr. Cole said, there was strife and contention, and no brotherly love, no harmony in her Ecclesiastical Judicatures, and that her benevolent institutions, were not warranted by the word of God ; and that he did not hear the Presbyterian Church mentioned, but the Dutch Church ; Rev. John S. Ebeaugh stated, that Mr. Cole said, that the Sabbath School had gone down in his Church, and further, that they were the institutions of men.

James P. Blauvelt states, that Mr. Cole said, there was trouble and contention among them, but does not know whether he spoke of the Dutch Church or others, which I remark is a strong circumstantial proof that he spoke of the Dutch Church ; Abraham Ack-er, states that he heard him preach against the movements of the Church at large, of course the Dutch Church is here included.—The two latter were Mr. Cole's own witnesses ; having established this point also, I shall now make a few remarks on the testimony given for the defence. And first, I shall refer to the testimony of James P. Blauvelt, where he states, that there was evidence brought against Mr. Cole, (having reference to the first trial) to show that he had said good works were abominable, detestable, good for nothing, which Mr. Cole now said he did not recollect, but witness recollects it, and that he preached from the text "The Lord had respect to the offerings of Abel &c.," at the time witness heard the above expression. Here I beg leave to say, that witness was under a mistake, for Mr. Cole preached at that time from Gal. 3, verses 6 and 7, as witness may see by referring to the testimony of John S. Verbryck on the first trial ; witness further states that Mr. Cole said, that such good works as Cain did, were abhorrent, detestable, and good for nothing. Here again I beg leave to remark, that witness was under

a mistake ; for Mr. C. said that *our good works* were good for nothing &c, and at the same time was addressing Christians ; which witness may see by referring to the testimony of J. S. Verbryck, Saml. G. Verbryck and A. D. Vervalen, on the first trial ; and by referring to his own testimony in that case, he will see that he then did not mention a word of the above testimony, which he now almost two years afterwards recollects so well ; but Mr. Cole had forgotten it ; had he but referred to the manuscript of his sermon, it might have refreshed his memory.

Witness further states, that Mr. Cole in self examination advised his hearers to look out of themselves to Christ, *for the granting of those graces*, but to themselves *for the possession of them*. Here let me refer the reader to the testimony of Harman Hoffman, Silas Miller and Paul Poulis (on the last trial) where he will find, that when Mr. Cole advised his people (in self examination) to look at Christ, he did not mention a word about *the granting of those graces* ; and also when he advised us not to look to ourselves, our experience and good works, he did not say a word about "*for the possession of them*."

I shall next refer to the testimony of Samuel Herring, who stated that he understood Mr. Cole to preach according to the standards of the Dutch Church ; I asked him, what the Standards of the Dutch Church were ? he honestly replied that he did not know ; I then asked him to give me one single point of the doctrines of the Dutch Church ; he made no reply. Now although I am willing to admit that some of Mr. Cole's witnesses testified, that they had not heard, or, that they did not know ; or, that they had not understood him to preach, contrary to the standards and doctrines of the Dutch Church, nor against her institutions ; yet this will not (be they ever so honest and upright in the matter,) disprove the testimony of those who heard him do so. Again it has been testified by some, that Mr. Cole had given a very good lecture, and preached a very good sermon in New-York City ; but I ask, will that prove that he preached no objectionable ones at Tappan ? again it was testified that he preached a good sermon at a meeting of the Bible Society some distance from home. But will this prove that he did not preach against the institutions of the Dutch Church at Tappan ? I think not, and therefore do contend that such testimony has no weight or bearing in this case at all.—Again, a sermon preached by Mr. Cole after the accusations were filed, was adduced as evidence of his way of preaching. Here permit me to ask, why Mr. Cole did not produce the identical sermons complained of in

my list of accusations, as specimens of his preaching, when I requested him to do so? and also the one he preached in the last Sabbath previous to the meeting of Classis? would not such a course have manifested some degree of honesty in the case? and might it not have had a tendency to clear up the matter at once? but neither the latter (which I also complained of before Classis) nor any of those in my list, were produced. Again, I ask why did Mr. Cole endeavor from time to time, to prevent an investigation of this case, if he was innocent? is it not a strong circumstantial proof that he is guilty? as indeed and in truth he is. After Mr. Cole had summed up, Classis proceeded to sit in judgment in the case; the following motion was then made by the Rev. P. M. Brett. *Resolved*, that the appeal of Jacob I. Blauvelt, against Rev. I. D. Cole, be not sustained; Classis then resolved to adjourn for one hour, and assembled again at the appointed time, and after taking into consideration the motion on the table, decided it in the negative (that is the appeal was sustained) upon a division of 11 to 6. The recording of the votes was called for; it was stated that some of the Elders had not understood the question.

It was moved and seconded that the whole subject be laid on the table with a view to the appointment of a committee of compromise, which motion the President would not put on the ground of unconstitutionality; this last motion was not recorded, and Classis being divided, it was resolved to have a recess for half an hour; Classis assembled at the time appointed.

Whereupon it was resolved that a committee of three be appointed to draught resolutions to harmonize Classis. Messrs J. Christie, Manley, and Elder Albert Van Houton were appointed said committee; after a few minutes the committee reported the following resolutions.

Whereas Classis have with pain seen the distracted situation of the old and respectable congregation of Tappan, arising from complaints preferred by Mr. J. I. Blauvelt, implicating the soundness of the doctrine of the Pastor the Rev. I. D. Cole, and after an investigation of the case, *are fully satisfied as to the soundness* of the doctrine of Rev. I. D. Cole. *Resolved* that Mr. C. in view of this Classis, is hereby exonerated from the charge of unsoundness in doctrine; and Classis would express their satisfaction of the correctness of his views; as to the complete truth which he has made to appear in said investigation. *Resolved* 2ndly, that in view of the state of feeling *at present* existing in the Congregation and the existence of the pledge made in 1838, viz: that he would

in future present the points in question so clearly that they could not be misunderstood; that it be expected of him in future that he would comply with the just requirement of Classis and complainant in relation to this particular.

3rd. Classis advise that where he has been delinquent in the performance of duty, he would so comply with the resolutions of General Synod, as to make his attachment to the benevolent institutions of the Church manifest.

Upon this report, Classis did not act, nor do I see how they consistently could, unless it were so, as to make us both innocent and both guilty; which I presume could not well be in this case, for we differ so materially that if the one is right, the other must be wrong; in the first place the committee charge me with bringing the congregation into a distracted state, by preferring complaints against Mr. Cole for preaching unsound doctrine. In the next place they justify Mr. Cole, as to the soundness of his doctrine, and fully exonerate him; of course he is cleared and I am guilty; and in the third place they request Mr. Cole to preach the points in question (namely, the principal part of my list of accusations, which were all included in the pledge and its violation, to which they refer) so clearly that they could not be misunderstood; and also that it be expected of him that he would in future, comply with the requirements of Classis and complainant in this particular; they also requested him so to comply with the resolutions of General Synod, as to make his attachment to the institutions of the Dutch Church manifest: Now take all this together and you will perceive that it amounts in principle, to what I was contending for; here then of course Mr. Cole is guilty, and I am clear, unless it is wrong to make any complaints against a Minister of the gospel for preaching unsound doctrine.

The President continued to call for the recording of the votes on the above decision, which, not being agreed to by the Classis, he desired to resign his seat, pro. tem, which was accepted; and the Rev. W. R. Bogardus was chosen President pro. tem. Here permit me to ask why was the President so persevering in his call to have the votes recorded? did the decision meet his approbation? No. For in every division after that, he voted against the appeal; Was it because he wanted an excuse to leave the chair—first, with a view to place one there who voted in favor of the appeal; and secondly, that he might have a better opportunity to manage the case more successfully for Mr. Cole? so, (I am sorry to say) it appeared, if I may

judge from his conduct afterwards. A motion was made to lay the former motion on the table ; it was then moved that the original motion of Mr. Brett be reconsidered. A motion was then made that the several items of complaint be read, and that the votes be taken, without referring to testimony and without discussion ; (To this Dr. Elting objected, but his objection is not recorded.)—The first specification, viz ; the violation of the pledge was then taken up and decided in the affirmative, by a division of 9 to 8 ; all the rest were negatived, without reading or weighing of testimony, and without discussion. A motion was then made that a part of the preamble be stricken out from the word “adjusted ;” then a motion was made to adopt the following paper, carried unanimously. Here permit me to ask, what following paper ? where is it ? it is not recorded. A motion was then made to reconsider the first specification, after some members had left without permission, which was carried, and all the charges (as the minutes read) rejected or not sustained. To this last motion Dr. Elting objected. His objection is not recorded ; here permit me to remark, that the question on the last above-said specification was not put by the President, (at least I have not heard it, and have also been so informed) nor are the yeas and nays to be found on the minutes in relation to this last decision (as it is called on this all-important point, viz. the pledge and its violation, both of which, I so fully and substantially supported, by a number of good and respectable witnesses. Now the reader will perceive, that after obtaining two decisions in favor of my appeal, and against Mr. Cole, Classis in this (I am sorry to say) confused, disorderly, and unparliamentary manner, finally decided against the appeal, and resolved *that the President announce to Mr. Cole that he was acquitted.*

Two days after the termination of this unhappy trial, the Consistory of the Tappan Church had a meeting at the Parsonage House, in order to remove me from the office of Clerk and Chorister, and demand of me the books and papers pertaining to the Church, which were in my possession, and then to discipline me, as I was informed by an Elder of said Church. When they were in session I appeared before them and presented my resignation of both my offices, and then asked my dismissal ; telling them at the same time, that I had no confessions or acknowledgements to make, that whatever I had done (having reference to the case of Mr. Cole) I had done from the purest motives, and the most honest intentions ; that I had fully realized my obligations to discharge

this duty, and that my breast felt free and clear in this respect ; adding that now I feel myself in duty bound my brethren, to ask of you my certificate of dismissal, trying as it may be to my feelings to leave a congregation to which I have been so long united, and which I never intended to leave, until you carried me to the grave. But it must be so, and I request of you my Brethren, such a certificate as you think I deserve, or am worthy of ; I ask nothing more. Some of the members of the Consistory expressed their regret that it was so ; I answered there was none more sorry than I (meaning at the same time on account of the sentiments advanced by Mr. Cole, and his conduct in relation to them, which was the true cause of all this trouble and unhappiness) the consistory then requested me to leave the room for a few minutes, and on calling me in again informed me, they would write (and deliver to me at my house) my certificate of dismissal (which they did on the afternoon of the same day) of which the following is a copy. “This will certify that Mr. J. I. Blauvelt, and his wife Rachael Blanch, have been in full communion of the Reformed Dutch Church at Tappan for many years, and in good standing ; but for some time past they have not attended at the Lord’s table owing to circumstances which they regret and in which, according to their consciences they think they acted with sincere and upright motives, in the fear of God ; as such they are hereby at their own request dismissed for the purpose of uniting with any other sister Church, which when they shall have done, their peculiar relation to this Church shall cease. By order of the Consistory,——Isaac D. Cole, President.

After reading the above Certificate I objected to that part of it (for circumstances which I regret,) as I did not regret what I had done in the case of Mr. Cole, but was sorry that he had given me cause, (not only) but also compelled me as it were to do what I did in relation to this case. One of the Elders then pointed to that part of it (that I had acted with sincere and upright motives, in the fear of God,) and replied, that clears you ; they then requested me to come to church, and not stay away altogether ; I thanked them for their invitation, but replied that under present circumstances, I could not hear Mr. Cole in the church, nor did I believe he wanted to see me there, as he had charged me before the Classis of misbehaving myself in the church, and of breaking up prayer meetings, and bringing accusations against him, out of passion and improper motives ; I should only be a stumbling block in his way. One of the Elders replied that I was cleared of those charges ; I replied,

brethren, how is this? You all know he said so. I was answered by one of the Elders, he is but a man.

Now suffer me to make a short address to the Consistory, in relation to their doings in this case. Brethren when first I asked your interposition, I hope you will recollect, that when I asked you the question, whether you were of the same opinion with Mr. Cole, when he said that our sanctification was no evidence of our justification; that at the earnest and repeated request of Mr. Cole, you did not answer my question. And why was he so earnest in this request, but because he very well knew that if you answered it correctly it would be against him? Now my brethren do you not seriously believe that if you had on this occasion, considered Mr. Cole to be but a man, as you did when you handed to me my Certificate of Dismissal and had answered my question with the spirit and decision of christian men, that a reconciliation would have been effected, and all further controversy have ceased at once? Such indeed is my view of the case, and let me further remark, that if any of you had been placed in my situation, and I in yours, I would not have been silent on such an important question, for the greatest Dr. of Divinity in the Dutch Church; although I hope I love and respect all honest and faithful Ministers of the Gospel: "but open rebuke is better than secret love, and the fear of man bringeth a snare." Here then it is evident that through the influence of Mr. Cole you did not act.

A short time after this I again requested your interference; you complied at once, and appointed a meeting at my house, on a certain day, but before the appointed time for your meeting, Mr. Cole informed me that you would not meet as you promised. I asked the reason, he replied because it was unconstitutional. Now as this meeting was only intended to remove difficulties and effect a reconciliation, of course it was far from being unconstitutional. Here again it is evident that through the influence of Mr. Cole, you did not meet, and consequently could not act. On the 8th of March, 1840, I again asked you if nothing could be done to remove my grievance, stating that I had no desire to leave you, and could not conceive it to be my duty. You then kindly asked me if I would once more converse with Mr. Cole on the subject, I replied in the affirmative; you then appointed a meeting at the Parsonage House, for the purpose of conversing with Mr. Cole on the subject

of our difficulties, and if possible to effect a reconciliation, with which I was much gratified. But on meeting with you at the time and place appointed, I found (to my great disappointment,) that Mr. Cole was not there, and instead of conversing with him as above stated, I was (to my great surprise,) by you requested to sit down and write my accusations against him. In this my brethren I cannot believe you intended so to deceive me, and must not I ascribe it altogether to the controlling influence and management of Mr. Cole? One week after this (at your own request, or may I not rather say Mr. Cole's,) I filed before you my list of accusations, and offered testimony in support of them, which you refused to hear, and requested me and my witnesses to withdraw, and on the same day delivered to me a copy containing a decision in the case, which was as it were giving the lie to my accusations. Now my brethren look at this—Here the accused was his own witness and counsel, and also acted as presiding judge, of a court in his own ease—He had an opportunity to give any explanation he wished upon the charges brought against him, while the accuser was not allowed even to be present, nor to give testimony in the case,—Now suffer me to ask, was this constitutional?—Was it just?—Was it even decent?—Is it not a case without precedent?—Is it not evident there was a deep plan laid by some one in order to bring about such a result?—But here again my brethren, I am not willing to believe it was invented by any of you, because as often as I requested your interposition in the case, you manifested not only a willingness but a desire to do something in order to remove difficulties and effect a reconciliation; and were you not as often through the influence and management of Mr. Cole prevented from so desirable an object? Such my brethren is my view of the case, and if I err in this I hope you will correct me.

Now a word in relation to your decision on my accusations, and I am done. Brethren, I cannot express to you my feelings when first I examined it: I can only say (when I reflect upon days and years that have gone by) that it was to me as though I was wounded in the house of my friends.—But again when I consider the way and manner it was obtained, I can easily account for it, and therefore I freely forgive you, (as far as I am concerned,) for whatever you may have imprudently or in an unguarded moment done in relation to this case, from the commencement throughout.

MEMORIAL.

To the particular Synod of New-York, to be convened May —, A. D. 1841, containing the complaint of the minority of the Classis of Paramus, in the case of Rev. Isaac D. Cole, tried April 28, 29, 30, A. D. 1840, on the appeal of Jacob I. Blauvelt, from the decision of the Consistory of the Reformed Dutch Church, of Tappan.

The undersigned, memorialists, would set forth the following items of complaint.

1st. Because, in Consistory the Deacons were admitted to have a seat and voice in the case of discipline, contrary to the constitution.—See sect. 2, page 28.

2nd. Because, six members of Consistory were admitted as evidences, who had voted on the case and pronounced judgment in Consistory, contrary to usage and the constitution.—See sec. 10, page 26; and in face of the precedents of ecclesiastical, criminal, and civil courts, where a man who is a party cannot testify.

3d. Because Classis in deciding upon the merits of the case by items, suppressed all remarks, debates, and comparing and reading of testimony.

4th. Because Classis first fairly, and deliberately, *twice* decided that the first item, a charge of violating the pledge be sustained, and afterwards, when three of the members had gone home, unjustly, and rashly reversed said decision.

5th. Because the decision of the Classis upon the merits of the first item, and some others, is not according to evidence.

May 8th, A. D. 1840.

WILHELMUS ELTING, }
JOHN MANLY, } *Ministers.*
WM. R. BOGARDUS. }

PETER A. ZABRISKIE, }
E. P. MERSELIS, } *Elders.*
A. D. VERVALEN, }
HENRY CUNNINGHAM. }

This is to certify that the within is a correct copy, extracted from the minutes of Classis, in the case of Rev. I. D. Cole.

EBENEEZER WIGGINS—Stated Clerk.

The above said complaint was taken up by the Synod, and finally dismissed.

Tappan, January 3d, 1842.

DEAR SIR.

As I have been informed that in your general conversation you frequently advert to the unhappy difference between us, and that you express your regret because of them, and because you cannot attend the Church as formerly on my account.—

I would affectionately say to you that I do as sincerely regret that such difference should exist and continue. I should be very unhappy if I could realize myself to be the cause, nor could I enjoy any peace in my conscience until I had done all in my power to effect a reconciliation. Such is my feeling, and if you feel the same, I see no reason why those differences should remain a single day;—that they may be terminated speedily, and consistently with true gospel principles to the glory of God and the welfare of the Church, is the sincere and ardent prayer of your former and affectionate Pastor, who still desires your welfare, and the welfare of your family and friends, and wishes you all a happy New-Year, and that you may be happy through life, in death, and endless eternity.

ISAAC D. COLE.

Now as I conceived this letter to be very artfully drawn, in order to ascertain his motive. I thought it prudent to request him to investigate (prayerfully) that part of it which I presumed would be the point of difficulty in effecting a reconciliation, and which I did not mean to relinquish.

Tappan, Jan. 6th, 1842.

DEAR SIR,

I received your note of the 3d instant, in which you state that you was informed that in my general conversation I frequently adverted to the unhappy difference between us, and expressed my regret because of them, and that I could not worship in the church as formerly, on your account; to this I answer—that I have had several conversations on the subject since it took place, sometimes adverting to it myself, and often was led into it by others—and in some of these conversations lately had, I have said that I could worship with the people of Tappan, but under existing circumstances on your account I could not worship in the church as formerly, and that I regretted that such unhappy difference ever had existed or should exist. You also state in your letter that you sincerely regret that such unhappy difference should exist or continue, and that if you could realize yourself to be the cause you would be very unhappy until you had done all in your power to effect a reconciliation; all I can say to you at present on this point is, that you will please to give it a fair, full, and impartial, and prayerful investigation as to what the true cause of difference were, by whom given, and what has been done to effect a reconciliation. I can most truly and sincerely say, that if I could feel myself to

be the cause I should be one of the most unhappy beings now in existence, nor would I leave any thing undone that I could do consistent with truth and justice, in order to effect a reconciliation. You further state that you see no reason why those unhappy differences should remain a single day, and that it is your ardent prayer that they may be terminated speedily on principles tending to the glory of God and the welfare of his Church. To this I answer—that no better motives nor principles could be named to settle any difference which may arise between christian brethren, and especially so when it relates to the concerns of the church, and that it is my ardent desire and prayer that those unhappy differences between us may soon terminate on principles above referred to. I feel thankful for the expression of your desire for my welfare and the welfare of my family and friends, and can truly say that your kind feelings towards us are fully equalled by mine towards yourself.

JACOB I. BLAUVELT.

Mr. Cole's answer to my reply.

Tappan, Feb. 14th, 1842.

DEAR SIR,

I received your reply to my letter in due season, and should have written again before now, but our views of the cause of difference, and of the means which have been employed for a reconciliation are so much at variance, that I despair, unless the Lord is pleased to effect it by his grace, nothing is too hard for the Lord. I am fully persuaded that if you come to see those truths of the gospel aright, about which we differ, and are brought to experience the power and sweetness of them in your heart, that our unhappy differences will cease. The course which you have pursued towards me will readily be forgiven, and we will hail each other as brethren with the whole heart, and unite in singing the praises of redeeming love. That will be a happy time if it ever comes, and this is the desire and prayer of your former Pastor and friend,

ISAAC D. COLE.

Now as I had by this letter clearly ascertained what his motives were in writing the first, I thought it prudent and right to give him my views of the cause of difference and the means employed for a reconciliation so plain that he could not mistake them, of which the following is a copy:—

Orangetown, March 18, 1842.

DEAR SIR.

I received your letter of the 14th February, in which I am sorry to see that you despair of a reconciliation, on the ground that our views were so much at variance, as to the cause of difference and the means employed for a reconciliation, which you ascribe to my not understanding the truths of the gospel, nor to have experienced the power and sweetness of them in my own heart; to this I reply, in the first place, that my knowledge of the holy scriptures I must confess (with shame) is but very limited, and as to what I have (through the grace of God) experienced of the power and sweetness of the gospel, I deem unnecessary, at present, to give a particular account of, let this suffice, the Lord knoweth them that are his, and he will perfect that which concerneth them; I am however willing at any suitable time hereafter, (the Lord permitting) to give an account of the hope that is in me, and the more so, because I have been informed that you have been misconstruing my views of scripture doctrine and experimental religion. Now as to the cause of our difference, and the means employed for a reconciliation; I must once more (and I trust in faithfulness to my former Pastor) plead with you to give it a serious consideration; I therefore hope you will permit me to ask you a few questions, and give some explanations in order to throw some light on those two points. First, did you ever hear me to find fault or to complain of the doctrines you preached, previous to your advancing the sentiment, that all our good works were good for nothing, and not even to be taken as an evidence that we have faith? If you have not (which is the fact) then it is evident that your expression of the above sentiment was the first cause of our difference, for I cannot for a moment believe that it is in accordance with the word of God, nor with the standards of the Dutch Church. Now let me ask, what means did I employ to remove this difference? Did I not (but a few days after you advanced the above sentiment) call on you as a friend, and requested you by all means to consider me as such? And asked you if I had understood you right when I understood you to express the above sentiment? You replied yes, I then intimated to you, that I did not understand that to be the doctrine of the Dutch Church; that I was opposed to good works as being meritorious, but believed them to be an evidence of faith; you replied that my views were right, but that you had to preach so, (alluding to the above sentiment) on account of the ignorance of your people, which you said was so as-

tonishingly great that I could have no idea of it. I then suggested to you the propriety of making clear distinctions as to what were good works, and what not, and to give them their proper place, if such a course would not have a tendency to enlighten the people on those points, whereas the other course might lead to confusion; you then asked me what were good works? I replied only those which flow from a true faith. Now let me ask was this not a proper course on my part to remove the difference then between us, and what effect had it? Let us see; on the following sabbath you preached from the words, and "Abraham believed God &c. in this discourse (suffer me to be plain) you was evidently at times much excited, you condemned the practice in self-examination to look at experience, or signs, or marks of grace as an evidence of faith, said it had nothing to do with it; in this sentiment I also differed with you, which you no doubt knew from the nature of the conversation I had with you but a few days previous; from this sermon I could evidently learn that my honest and friendly conversation with you had not been kindly received. After the sermon (being with you alone) I asked some explanation as to the manner of self-examination? You replied that you had no time then but would call and see me in the course of the week.—Now let me ask was this not a proper course on my part to remove this difference and effect a reconciliation? What was the result?—You did not call as you promised, which of course was a refusal to give the explanation I requested, consequently no reconciliation could be effected. I ask who was the cause? After that I and A. D. Vervalen, John S. Verbryck; and S. Verbryck called on you to converse with you on the points in difference, and if possible effect a reconciliation, we labored hard to convince you of the truth and reasonableness of this doctrine to which you was so averse [namely that christian experience and good works were an evidence of faith,] but without success? Finally I asked you what reason has a man to believe he is a christian if he has no experience, or if his experience is no evidence to him? You made no reply; and our conversation ended. Let me ask,—was this not employing proper means on our part to effect a reconciliation? What was the consequence? Instead of being reconciled you was evidently much excited, and we unhappily disappointed. On the following sabbath you advanced the sentiment that our "sanctification was no proof or evidence of our justification," and added, "that would answer the question, 'what reason has a man to believe he is a christian if he has no experience.'" Here again was cause of difference, for I cannot believe such a sentiment to be in accordance with the word of God. Now you will perceive that my question was answered, and at a time, place, and manner, calculated to give offence, but (blessed be God) it had a contrary effect, for I was satisfied at the moment from what source it came, and was sorry for your sake; now as I verily believed you was going astray from the doctrines of the Dutch Church of which I so highly approved, I felt myself under obligations to do all in my power to prevent it; consequently I called a meeting of your Consistory that we might explain to them the points in difference and if possible effect a reconciliation. Was this not employing proper means to effect it?—what was the result? You would not allow them to act. If I put a question to them with regard to their views on the points in difference, you requested them not to answer it; of course no reconciliation could be effected.—I ask who was the cause? Sometime after that I again requested a meeting of your Consistory for the same purpose as before, to which they unanimously agreed.—Was not this employing proper means to effect a reconciliation? What was the result? You informed me previous to the set time for their meeting, that they should not meet as they promised. I ask who prevented them, and why was it done? Thus you will clearly see that the only remedy left me was an appeal to Classis to which (from a sense of duty) I was constrained to resort, and who at their meeting in 1838, after filing before them the causes of my grievance, appointed a committee to effect a reconciliation;—was this not employing proper means to effect it?—What was the result? You refused to acknowledge (when requested by that committee) that good works were an evidence of faith, and you said we could do nothing there but must go before the Classis, of course no reconciliation could be effected; I ask who was the cause? And when before that ecclesiastical body, why did you endeavor to prevent an investigation of the case, by pleading a nonsuit? Did you suppose that I was contending for victory and not for the truth, and that I desired your ruin and not your welfare, if so, you was most assuredly mistaken? Which I evidently proved by giving you my hand upon your making the solemn pledge before that body, the truth of which (the pledge) has been sufficiently proved before the Classis of 1840, when I hoped that our difficulties were removed and a reconciliation effected, but in this I was unhappily disappointed, for I very soon perceived that your views were the same as before, for you was from time to time advancing sentiments,

establishing principles of the same nature as before. Now let me ask, why was this pledge made? Was it to escape the reproof or censure of Classis, for the time being? And with regard to the sentiment of actual justification, and sanctification, of the elect from eternity, (pertaining, however to the same creed.) I would only ask, if you never have made the expression, where was the necessity of such an illustration, as you acknowledged before Classis of 1840, you gave it; (*see copy of charges.*) Permit me, also to ask you if you have not in some of your sermons and conversations also spoke disrespectfully of both the ecclesiastical and benevolent institutions of the Dutch Church. Finally, you advanced the sentiment, that the same food the christian has the sinner wants. Here again was cause of difference, for I cannot believe the unconvinced sinner wants the food of the christian, any more than that a corpse wants nourishment; nor is it dividing the word of truth aright, and giving to each his portion in due season, as the Apostles taught. Now sir, as I desired your welfare and that of the Church, and could not bear (even) the thought of leaving a congregation with which I had been so long united in the bonds of peace, love and harmony; and while I was residing next door to the house built for God, and in the erection of which I was so much engaged, and felt so much interested, that I was again constrained to complain to your consistory of the unhappiness your caused me in advancing sentiments so contrary (as I verily believe) to the word of God; they then asked me, if I would once more converse with you on the subject, I replied it would be a gratification for me to do it before them, but would like to have one or two of my friends present at the time, which was granted; they then at their own suggestion, appointed a meeting, to be at your house, for the purpose of removing our unhappy difference and effect a reconciliation. Let me ask, was this not employing proper means to effect it? What was the consequence? Let us see; at the appointed hour I called at your house with my two friends, they were not permitted to come in. I was admitted, and when before your Consistory, was, (to my great surprise) by them requested to sit down and write my accusations against you. I replied, brethren, I have not come here to day for this, but have come at your request, to converse before you with the dominie, where is he? he is not at home was the reply. Now let me ask, how could you leave home on that day, and tell a certain aged person you had nothing to do with that meeting? Who changed that meeting from what it was

intended, for to ask of me a written list of accusations? Why was this change? Was it to get them (the accusations) before your Consistory, and you to sit as Presiding Judge of a Court, in your own case, while I as Plaintiff, was not allowed to be present, nor even to give testimony in the case? Who was the planner of all this? I am not willing to believe it originated with your Consistory, as they evidently in the appointment of this meeting, and also on other occasions before mentioned, manifested a willingness, not only, but a desire to do something in order to remove difficulties and effect a reconciliation; and let me ask, did you not use your influence on those and some other occasions, (directly and indirectly) to prevent it. Again, how could you, in visiting your congregation from house to house, pass and repass my house (and that contrary to the advice of your Consistory) and not call in at all, while I was so near a neighbor and a regular attendant upon your Ministry; was this employing the means for a reconciliation or was it to prevent it? If so, what kind of a spirit was this? Again, before the Classis of 1840, you endeavored to prevent an investigation of the case, by pleading a nonsuit, on the ground, that I brought the charges out of passion and improper motives; how could you make such a charge against me, and also, that of breaking up prayer-meetings, while I was so much concerned, (and had been from the commencement of our difference, so earnestly engaged) and from the purest motives and the most honest intention to promote your welfare, and the welfare of the Church, for which I have sacrificed a great deal, and have lost me many friends; yet (blessed be God) I have the consolation to feel in my bosom this testimony, that I have been faithful to my friend (faithful are the wounds of a friend, but the kisses of an enemy are deceitful.) I hope therefore you will not receive this letter as coming from an enemy, but from one who desires your welfare and the welfare of the Church; and be assured Sir, that whatever it contains, is by the writer intended for your real benefit, I trust therefore, you will give it (at least) a serious consideration, as in the presence of the all-knowing, heart-searching and rein-trying God, before whom you and I must shortly appear, and O let us remember that he is perfectly acquainted with every part of this unhappy case, he knows every way and course we have taken in it, and what our motives and intentions were in so doing, which has been, and is my main support in all this trying and unhappy circumstances. Thus I have endeavored to explain and bring to your recollection some of the true and principal

causes of our difference, by whom given, and what means have been employed for a reconciliation, which I am fully persuaded if you once come to see in their true light and character, and your mind rightly exercised about them, that you will no longer misconstrue my views of scripture doctrine, nor despair of a reconciliation on the grounds above stated—that a reconciliation may be yet obtained upon true gospel principles tending to the glory of God and the welfare of his Church, is still the desire and prayer of your former chorister and friend,

JACOB I. BLAUVELT.

N. B.—Suffer me to advise you to guard against justifying yourself in the course you have taken in this case, because the final decision of the Classis was in your favor.

J. I. B.

Errata.—Page 13, 2nd column, 9 lines from the top, for Antinomians read Antinominism.

Errata.—Page 16, 2nd column, 2 lines from bottom, for Minister in the Reformed Dutch Church read Minister in *good standing* in the Reformed Dutch Church.

CONCLUSION.

It may be my duty and I trust and hope the Classis of Paramus, will allow me the privilege, to put some questions to them in relation to the course pursued by them in this case; or at least to ask the reverend members of that body, as individuals and as Ministers of the Reformed Protestant Dutch Church, whether they feel satisfied in their consciencies that they have in this case faithfully done their duty to their Lord and Master, to the churches which they are solemnly bound to watch over, to the standards of doctrine which they are as it were sworn to maintain and preserve inviolate, or to Mr. Cole and to me? Is there a single member of that Classis who is not conscious that the charges brought by me against Mr. Cole, were sustained by abundant and unexceptionable testimony? Is there one of them who is not fully satisfied that the charges were well founded, and that the doctrines complained of, as taught by Mr. Cole, were contrary to, and subversive of the standards of the Dutch Church, and the Word of God? Is there one of them who has any doubt whatever that Mr. Cole violated the pledge, he gave at the conclusion of the first trial? Is there any one of them who does not regret the course pursued by Classis? Any one who does not see that it has been productive of evil and not of good? I ask them if the most important truths of the Gospel in relation to justification, sanctification, &c., &c., have not been virtually sacrificed and soul-ruining errors virtually sustained by their anxiety to uphold and shield a member of their body; after proof, not only of his errors but of his violating his engagements to abstain from them? I ask if their course in this case has not practically and very publicly sanctioned the idea, that soul-ruining errors, however much denounced in theory, and condemned in the laity, are not to be censured or made matter of discipline in the case of a minister? And the idea that errors

in doctrine, and practice in a minister are to be overlooked, or enquired into, only for the purpose of securing him, and rebuking (and as it were driving away from the church of their fathers) those whose consciences compel them to call his conduct in question? Whether by this course the Classis have not thrown their influence as a body into the scale of antinomianism, and countenanced false doctrine in opposition to the truth? I ask them to consider whether the course pursued is not calculated to discourage and prevent any layman from any such regard, for the most precious truths of the gospel, or for his own conscience as to induce him to say or do anything more or less in case his Minister changes his views and comes out against the doctrines and institutions of the Church to reclaim him, or seek redress of the grievance from the constituted authorities of the Church; whether it does not as much as say to him keep still? be satisfied? it is not for you to complain of your Minister, whatever his errors may be you will not succeed; if you attempt you will be put down, your Minister will be upheld at any rate; I ask them whether by such a course, they do not become responsible for the evils which follow to those who are deceived and injured by the false doctrines thereby tolerated, and in a manner sanctioned? and whether true religion and spiritual prosperity in the Churches can be expected to follow such proceeding? and I ask them, whether one and all, they are not sensible, that in this case I have been unkindly, unconstitutionally, and unjustly dealt by, and injured? I ask these questions under a solemn sense of their importance, and of what is wrong and hurtful in the past; and in the hopes that the consideration of them, may prevent the like in future, and also that I may still further be clear of responsibility for the evil consequences of the course pursued.