

051
Balt

THE

BALTIMORE LITERARY

2314

AND

RELIGIOUS MAGAZINE,

For 1837.

CONDUCTED BY
ROBERT J. BRECKINRIDGE,
 AND
ANDREW B. CROSS.

"Beware lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ." Col. ii. 8.

VOL. III.



BALTIMORE:

**PRINTED FOR THE CONDUCTORS,
 BY MATCHETT & NEILSON.**

THE NEW YORK
PUBLIC LIBRARY
244288B
ASTOR, LENOX AND
TILDEN FOUNDATIONS
1948

INDEX TO THE VOLUME.

A.

Abduction of Eliza Burns,	345, 519, 549
Abolitionism in the feminine gender,	411
Agnus Deis,	238
Anathema, form of	524
Antichrist, the Pope	193
Antiq'ty of the religion of Protestants,	201
Assembly, Presbyterian of 1837,	281, 304
310, 312, 313, 360, 391,	454
Assurance, Christian	433
Anecdotes,	
Two little boys and their bible,	41
Settling accounts,	48
John Randolph,	ib
Indian eating a Popish God,	173
Trial of a Priest's faith,	179
Two sins for a confession,	181
Confessing to a Stump,	182
Of Napoleon,	13
Admitting Pilgrim's Pro-	
gress in Italy,	325

B.

Bellarmino quoted,	176
Bible doctrine of Slavery,	418, 476
Bishops full vs Bishops empty,	466
Body, This is my	34
Breckinridge's Discourse on the } formation and development of } the American Mind,	482
Brunswick, the Duke of—50th-reason,	35
Bulls—Pope Pius VII. vs Bible } Societies,	44, 93
Unigenitus, by Clement XI.	128
Pius VII. Excom. of Buonaparte,	185
Innocent XI. on Edict of Nantz,	233
Bishop of New York vs. free } discussion,	46
Buonaparte Excommunicated,	185
Burns Eliza, case of	345, 519, 549

C.

Calvin, Character of	107
Cardinals, Origin of	54
Duties,	55
how created,	56
purple dress of	ib
Extract from their let- } ter to Paul III. see note. }	57
Canon Laws,	
Women cannot bear witness,	33
Oaths vs. the Church are } perjuries,	33
Christians, Sufferings of Early	135, 136
Columbus, Christopher	151
Commons, a night in the House of	292
Communion in one kind,	137
Convent, Carmelite scream in	101
Confession, meaning of	180

Confession uncertainty of	180
Congregation of the Index,	240
Council, Roman, at Baltimore,	253
" of the Pope,	54

D.

Decrees of Trent on Images, Saints, } Relics,	87
" " Communion in } one kind,	132
" " Extreme unction,	50
" " Mass,	175
Deluol, Priest as a Controvertialist,	509
Destitution in Baltimore,	276
Destroying Christ in the Mass,	174
Division of the Presbyterian Church,	313
Documentary History of the Assem- bly of 1837,	312, 360, 391, 454

E.

Edict of Nantz revoked,	233
Education Society, American,	454
" in Ireland,	261
English Universities, Reform pro- } posed in	331
Enupnion,	182
Errors in Doctrine,	512
Eucharist, real presence in the	36
Exposition of Rom. IX. 1—3	529

F.

Finale of the case of Eliza Burns,	519
Fontainebleau, Palace of	565
Edict of	235
Fundamental doc. of Christianity,	448, 542

G.

Geneva,	104-5
Green, Robert A. case of	51

H.

Hale, Sir Matthew, on keeping } the Sabbath,	74
Hazard of Salvation in Church of Rome,	1
Hogan Excommunicated,	524
Holy See, Tribunals of the	121

I. J.

Idolatry, British in India,	376
Immorality of Popes,	352
Index, Congregation of	240
Prohibitory, Rules of	50
Intercession, Nature of Christ's	166
Justification, Essays on 355, 404, 514,	557

Southern Works Co 12 May 1943

K.		Prohibitory Index, Rules of - - - 40
Kerney and Gildea, Priests - - -	49	Propagandism, Catholic in the U. S. 209
L.		Protestants, Antiq'y of their religion, 201
Letters,		" unlearned, directions to 381
To W. G. Reed, Esq. - - -	97	Protestantism and Popery contrasted, 141
Irish Bps. vs. Bible societies, 141		Principal reason for depriving the } 167
Jacob Sporn to La Chaise, 201		laity of the cup, }
Mollard Lefevre, - - -	333	Præface, Real in the Eucharist, 37
Michael Crotty to Dr. Murray, - - - 326, 370, 427.		
From Dr. Junkin, - - -	447	R.
Sir M. Hale to his children, 74		Relics, - - - - - 86, 433
Pope Innocent XI. - - -	235	" Catalogue of - - - - - 89, 137
Life of Whitfield, - - - - -	26	Rivet on Antichrist, - - - - - 193
Loss of Friends, - - - - -	31	Rese Bishop, of Detroit, - - - - - 553
Literary History of the Papal } 441		Religious Excitement, - - - - - 554
controversy, }		
M.		S.
Memoranda of Foreign Travel, by		Sabbath, Sir M. Hale on - - - - - 74
Robert J. Breckinridge, 12, 58, 104		" Breaking of - - - - - 142
150, 214, 240, 322, 337, 385. (See		Sacrificing of Christ afresh; 175, 6, 7, 8,
the contents on each of these pages.		Salvation Hazardous in Ch. of Rome, 1
Memorial to the Assembly of 1837, 281		Scotland, State of Popery in - - - 543
Missionary Society, American Home 454		Sermons, by
Moral Government of God, 448, 552		Dr. Tillotson, - - - - - 1
Morality of the Romish Church, 351		Dr. Owen, - - - - - 145
Morrison, Rev. Geo. Obituary of 230		Dr. Dickey, - - - - - 291
Man, Souls of - - - - -	184	Dr. Miller, - - - - - 433
Matchett, Statement of - - - - -	549	Sins Venial, Difficulty of knowing 180
		Sol Lunar Influence, - - - - - 80
		Sulpicius Severus, quoted, - - - 136
		Synods, Four separated - - - - - 391
		" Few facts about one of them, 310
O.		T.
Oath of every Papist, - - - - -	33	Tacitus quoted, - - - - - 125
Oaths vs. the Church, Perjuries, 33		Trent, see Decrees of
P.		Tribunals of the Holy See, - - - 121
Papal Domination in Spain, - - - 409		Theban Cebeas, Picture of - - - 535
Superstition propagated by } 552		Tiernan, note of - - - - - 547
our public money, }		
Penance, - - - - -	423	U.
Plan of Union, - - - - -	390	Unigenitus, Bull - - - - - 128
Popery, Reasons for renouncing 333		Union, Plan of Abrogated, - - - 360
Pope and his Council, - - - - -	54	
Popish Mass, can a Protestant with } 171		W.
a safe conscience be present at }		Whitfield, Life of - - - - - 26
Population, Statistics of - - - - -	526	Waldenses of the Cotienn Alps, 166
Priest confounded, - - - - -	179	
Preaching of Bishop England, - - - 253		

THE
BALTIMORE LITERARY
AND
RELIGIOUS MAGAZINE

JANUARY, 1837.

No. 1. 12

THE HAZARD OF BEING SAVED IN THE CHURCH OF ROME.

A SERMON,

*By the Rev. John Tillotson, D. D. Archbishop of Canterbury, in the
17th Century.*

I. Cor. III. 15.—But he himself shall be saved yet so as by fire.

THE context is thus. (10—15. vs.) "According to the grace of God which is given unto me, as a wise master-builder, I have laid the foundation, and another buildeth thereon. But let every man take heed how he buildeth thereupon. For other foundations can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ. Now if any man build upon this foundation, gold, silver, precious stones, wood, hay, stubble. Every man's work shall be made manifest, for the day shall declare it, because it shall be revealed by fire: and the fire shall try every man's work of what sort it is. If any man's work abide, which he hath built thereupon he shall receive a reward. If any man's works shall be burned, he shall suffer loss: yet he himself shall be saved, yet so as by fire."

In these words the apostle speaks of a sort of persons, who held indeed the foundation of Christianity, but built upon it such doctrines or practices as would not bear the trial; which he expresses to us by wood, hay and stubble, which are not proof against the fire. Such a person the apostle tells us, hath brought himself into a very dangerous state, though he would not deny the possibility of his salvation, *he himself shall be saved, yet so as by fire.*

That by fire here is not meant the fire of purgatory, as some pretend (who would be glad of any shadow of a text of scripture to countenance their own dreams) I shall neither trouble you or myself to manifest; since the particle of similitude (*oos*) plainly shows that the apostle did not intend an escape out of the fire literally, but like to that which men make out of a house, or a town that is on fire. Especially as very learned persons of the church of Rome do acknowledge that purgatory cannot be concluded from this text,

may all that Estius contends for from this place is, that it cannot be concluded from hence that there is no purgatory; which we never pretended, but only that this text doth not prove it.

It is very well known that this is a proverbial phrase used not only in scripture, but in profane authors to signify a narrow escape out of a great danger. He shall be saved yet so as by fire, *dia puros*, out of the fire. Just as *dia udatos* is used, 2 Pet. III. 20, where the apostle speaking of the eight persons of Noah's who escaped the flood, *diesoothasan di udatos* they escaped out of the water. So here this phrase is to be rendered in the text, *he himself shall escape, yet so as out of the fire.* The like expression you have, Amos IV. 2. "I have plucked them as a firebrand out of the fire." And Jude 23. "Others save with fear, plucking them out of the fire." All which expressions signify the greatness of the danger, and the difficulty of escaping it: "as one who when his house at midnight is set on fire, and being suddenly waked, leapt out of his bed, and runs naked out of the doors, taking nothing that is within along with him, but employing his whole care to save his body from the flames," as Chrysostom on another occasion expresseth it. And so the Roman orator (Tully) who, it is likely did not think of purgatory) useth this phrase; *quo ex judicio, velut ex incendio, nudus effugit*, from which sentence or judgement he escaped naked as it were out of a burning. And one of the Greek orators (Aristides) tells us, that "to save a man out of the fire, was a common proverbial speech."

From the words thus explained, the observation that naturally ariseth is this: *that men may hold all the fundamentals of the Christian religion, and yet may superadd other things whereby they may greatly endanger their salvation.* What these things were which some among the Corinthians built upon the foundation of Christianity, whereby they endangered their salvation, we may probably conjecture by what the apostle reproves in this epistle, as the tolerating of incestuous marriages, communicating in idol feasts, &c. And especially by the doctrine of the false apostles, who at that time did so much disturb the peace of most Christian churches, and who are so often and so severely reflected on in this epistle. And what their doctrines was, we have an account, Acts xv. viz: That they imposed upon the gentile Christian circumcision, and the observance of the Jewish law, teaching that unless they were circumcised, and kept the law of Moses, they could not be saved. So that they not only build these doctrines upon Christianity, but they made them equal with the foundation, saying, *that unless men believed and practised such things they could not be saved.*

In speaking to this observation, I shall reduce my discourse to these two heads.

I. I shall present to you some doctrines and practices which have been built upon the foundation of Christianity, to the great hazard and danger of men's salvation. And to be plain, I mean particularly the church of Rome.

II. And I shall enquire, whether our granting a possibility of salvation (though with great hazard) to those in the communion of the Roman church, and their denying it to us, be a reasonable argument, and encouragement to any man to betake himself to that church.

And there is the more reason to consider these things, when so many seducing spirits are so active and busy to pervert men from the truth; and when we see every day so many men and their religion so easily parted. For this reason these two considerations shall be the subject of the following discourse.

I. First. We will consider some doctrines and practices which the church of Rome hath built upon the foundation of Christianity, to the great hazard and danger of men's salvation. It is not denied by the most judicious protestants, but that the church of Rome does hold all the articles of the Christian faith which are necessary to salvation. But that which we charge upon them, as a just ground of our separation, is, the imposing of new doctrines and practices upon Christians as necessary to salvation, which were never taught by our Saviour or his apostles; and which are either directly contrary to the doctrines of Christianity, or too apparently destructive of a good life. I begin,

1. With their doctrine. And because I have no mind to aggravate lesser matters, I will single out four or five points of doctrines, which they have added to the Christian religion, and which were neither taught by our Saviour, and his apostles, or owned in the first ages of Christianity. And the

First which I shall mention, and which being once admitted makes way for as many errors as they please to bring in, is the doctrine of Infallibility. And this they are very stiff and peremptory in, though they are not agreed among themselves where this infallibility is seated; whether in the pope alone, or in the council alone, or in both together, or in the diffusive doctrine of Christians. But they are sure they have it, though they know not where it is.

And is this no prejudice against it? Can any man think that this privilege was at first conferred upon the church of Rome, and that Christians in all ages did believe it, and had constant recourse to it, for determining their differences, and yet that that very church which had enjoyed and used it so long should now be at a loss where to find it? Nothing could have fallen out more luckily, than that there should be such differences among them about that which they pretend to be the only means of ending all differences.

There is not the least intimation in Scripture of this privilege conferred upon the Roman church, nor do the apostles, in all their epistles, ever so much as give the least direction to Christians to appeal to the Bishop of Rome for a determination of the many differences which even in those times happened among them. And it is strange that they should be so silent in this matter, when there were so many occasions to speak of it, if our Saviour had plainly appointed such an infallible judge of controversies for this very end to decide the differences that should appear among Christians. It is strange that the ancient fathers in their disputes with heretics should never appeal to this judge; nay, it is strange they should not constantly do it in all cases, it being so short and expedient a way for the ending of controversies. And this very consideration to a wise man is instead of a thousand arguments to satisfy him that in those times as no such things was believed in the world.

Now this doctrine of infallibility, if it be true, is of so much the more pernicious consequence to Christianity, because the conceit

of it does confirm them that think they have it in all their errors; and gives them a pretence of assuming an authority to themselves to impose their own fancies and mistakes upon the whole Christian world.

2. Their doctrines about Repentance, which consists in confessing their sins to the priest, which if it be but accomplished with any degree of contrition does upon absolution received from the priest put them into a state of salvation, though they have lived the most lewd and debauched lives that can be imagined; than which nothing can be imagined more plainly destructive of a good life. For if this be true, all the hazard that the most wicked man runs of his salvation is only the danger of so sudden a death as gives him no space for confession and absolution. A case that appears so rarely, that any man that is strongly addicted to his lusts will be content to venture his salvation upon this hazard; and all the arguments to a good life will be very insignificant to a man that hath a mind to be wicked, when remission of sins may be had on such cheap terms.

3. The doctrine of Purgatory; by which they mean an estate of temporary punishment after this life, from which men may be released and translated into heaven by the prayers of the living and the sacrifice of the mass. That this doctrine was not known in the primitive church, nor can be proved from scripture, we have the free acknowledgment of as learned and eminent men as any of that church; which is to acknowledge that it is a superstructure on the Christian religion. And though in one sense, it be indeed a building of gold and silver, upon the foundation of Christianity, considering the vast revenues which this doctrine (and that of indulgences, which depends upon it) brings into that church; yet I doubt not but in the apostle's sense, it will be found to be hay and stubble. But how groundless soever it be, it is too gainful a doctrine to be easily parted withal.

4. The doctrine of Transubstantiation. A hard word, but I would to God that were the worst of it; the thing is much more difficult. I have taken some pains to consider other religions that have been in the world, and I must freely declare, that I never yet in any of them met with any article or proposition, imposed upon the belief of men, half so unreasonable and hard to be believed as this: and yet this in the Romish church is esteemed one of the most principal articles of the Christian faith; though there is no more certain foundation for it in scripture, than for our SAVIOUR'S being substantially changed into all those things which are said of him; as that he is a rock, a vine, a door, and a hundred other things.

But this is not all. This doctrine hath not only no certain foundation in scripture, but I have a heavier charge against it, namely, that it undermines the foundation of Christianity itself. And surely nothing ought to be admitted to be a part of the Christian doctrine which destroys reason of our belief of the whole. And that this doctrine does so, will appear evidently, if we consider what was the main argument which the apostles used to convince the world of the truth of Christianity; and that was this; *that our blessed Saviour the author of this doctrine, wrought such and such miracles, and particularly that he rose again from the dead?* And this they proved because they were eye witnesses of his miracles, and had seen him

and conversed with him after he was risen from the dead. But what if their senses did deceive them in this matter? Then it cannot be denied but that the main proof of Christianity falls to the ground.

Well! we will now suppose (as the church of Rome does) transubstantiation to have been one principal part of the Christian doctrine which the apostle preached. But if this doctrine be true, then all men's senses are deceived in a plain sensible manner, wherein it is as hard for them to be deceived as in any thing in the world: for two things can hardly be imagined more different, than a little bit of wafer and the whole body of a man.

So that the apostles persuading men to believe this doctrine persuaded them not to trust their senses, and yet the argument which they used to persuade them to this was built upon the direct contrary principle, that men's senses are to be trusted. For if they be not, then notwithstanding all the evidence the apostles offered for the resurrection of our Saviour he might not be risen, and so the faith of Christians was vain. So that they represent the apostles as absurd as is possible, viz. going about to persuade men out of their senses by virtue of an argument, the whole strength whereof depends upon the certainty of sense.

And now the matter is brought to a fair issue; if the testimony of sense be to be relied upon, then transubstantiation is false; if it be not, then no man is sure that Christianity is true. For the utmost assurance that the apostles had of the truth of Christianity was the testimony of their own senses concerning our Saviour's miracles, and this testimony every man hath against transubstantiation. From whence it plainly follows, that no man, (no not the apostles themselves) had more reason to believe Christianity to be true, than every man hath to believe transubstantiation to be false. And we who did not see our Saviour's miracles (as the apostles did) and have only a credible relation of them, but do see the sacrament, have less evidence of the truth of Christianity than of the falsehood of transubstantiation.

But cannot God impose upon the senses of men, and represent things to them otherwise than they are? Yes undoubtedly. And if he hath revealed that he doth this, are we not to believe him? most certainly. But then we ought to be assured that he hath made such a revelation; which assurance no man can have, the certainty of sense being taken away.

I shall press the business a little farther, supposing the scripture to be a divine revelation, and that these words (*this is my body*) if they be in scripture, must necessarily be taken in the strict and literal sense; I ask now, what greater evidence any man has that these words (*this is my body*) are in the Bible, than every man has that the bread is not changed in the sacrament? Nay no man has so much; for we have only the evidence of our sense that these words are in the Bible, but that the bread is not changed we have the concurring testimony of several of our senses. In a word, if this be once admitted that the senses of all men are deceived in one of the most plain sensible matters that can be, there is no certain means left either to convey or prove a divine revelation to men; nor is there any way to confute the grossest impostures in the world; for if the clear evidence of all men's senses be not sufficient for this purpose, let any man, if he can, find a better or more convincing argument.

5. I will instance but in one doctrine more; and that shall be, the doctrine of deposing kings in case of heresy, and absolving their subjects from allegiance to them. And this is not a mere speculative doctrine, but hath been put in practice many a time by the bishop of Rome, as every one knows that is versed in history. For the troubles and confusions which were occasioned by this very thing make up a good part of the history, for several ages. I hope that nobody expects that I should take the pains to show that this was not the doctrine of the Saviour and his apostles, nor of the primitive Christians. The papists are many of them so far from pretending this, that in some times and places where it is not seasonable and for their purpose, we have much ado to persuade them that ever it was their doctrine. But if transubstantiation be their doctrine, this is; for they came both out of the same forge, I mean the council of Lateran under Pope Innocent the third. And if (as they tell us) transubstantiation was then established, so was this. And indeed one would think they were twins and brought forth at the same time, they are so like one another, both of them so monstrously unreasonable.

II. I come now in the second place to consider some practices of the church of Rome, which I am afraid will prove as bad as her doctrines. I shall instance in these five.

1. Their celebrating of their service in an unknown tongue. And that not only contrary to the practises of the primitive church, and to the great end and design of religious worship, which is the edification of those concerned in it, (and it is hard to imagine how men can be edified by what they do not understand) but likewise in direct contradiction to St. Paul, who hath no less than a whole chapter wherein he confutes this practice as fully, and condemns it as plainly as any thing is condemned in the whole Bible. And they that can have the face to maintain that this practice was not condemned by St. Paul, or that it was allowed and used in the first ages of Christianity, need not be ashamed to set up for the defence of any paradox in the world.

2. The communion in one kind. And that notwithstanding that even by their own acknowledgment our Saviour instituted it in both kinds, and the primitive church administered it in both kinds. This I must acknowledge is no addition to Christianity, but a sacrilegious taking away of an essential part of the sacrament. For the cup is as essential a part of the institution as the bread; and they might as well, and by the same authority, take away the one as the other, and both as well as either.

3. Their worshipping of images. Which (notwithstanding all their distinctions about it, which are no other but what the heathens used in the same case) is as point blank against the second commandment, as a deliberate and malicious killing of a man is against the sixth. But if the case be so plain, a man may think at least the teachers and guides of that church should be sensible of it. Why, they are so, and afraid the people should be so too, and therefore in the ordinary catechisms and manuals of devotion they leave out the second commandment, and divide the tenth into two to make up the number; lest if the common people should know it their consciences should start at the doing of a thing so directly contrary to the plain command of God.

4. The worshipping of the bread and wine in the eucharist, out of a false and groundless persuasion, that they are substantially changed into the body and blood of Christ. Which if it be not true, (and it hath good fortune if it be, for certainly it is one of the most incredible things in the whole world) then by the confession of several of their own learned writers, they are guilty of gross idolatry.

5. The worship and invocation of saints and angels, and particularly of the virgin Mary, which hath now for some ages been a principal part of their religion. Now a man may justly wonder that so considerable a part of religion, as they make this to be should have no manner of foundation in the scripture. Does our Saviour any where speak one word concerning the worshipping of her? Nay does he not take all occasions to restrain all extravagant apprehensions and imaginations concerning honour due to her, as foreseeing the degeneracy of the church in this thing? When he was told that his mother and brethren were without; "who (says he) are my "mother and my brethren? He that doth the will of my father, the same is my mother, and my sister, and brother." And when the woman brake forth into that rapture concerning the blessed mother of our LORD, "blessed is the womb that bare thee, and the paps that gave thee suck!" our SAVIOUR diverts to another thing, "yea rather, blessed are they that hear the word of God and keep it." Does either our SAVIOUR or his apostles, in all their particular precepts and directions concerning prayer and the manner of it, and by whom we are to address ourselves to God, give the least intimation of praying to the virgin Mary, or making use of her mediation? And can any man believe, that if this had been the practice of the church from the beginning, our SAVIOUR and his apostles would have been so silent about so considerable a part of religion; inso-much that in all the epistles of the apostles I do not remember that her name is so much as once mentioned? And yet the worship of her is at this day in the church of Rome and hath been so for several ages, a main part of their public worship, yea and of their private devotions too, in which it is usual with them to say ten ave maries for one pater noster; that is, for one prayer they make to Almighty God, they make ten addresses to the blessed virgin; for that is the proportion observed in these rosaries. He that considers this, and had never seen the Bible, would have been apt to think that there had been more said concerning her in scripture, than either concerning God, or our blessed SAVIOUR; and that the New Testament were full from one end to the other of precepts and exhortations to the worshipping of her; and yet when all is done, I challenge any man to shew me so much as one sentence in the whole Bible that sounds that way. And there is as little in the Christian writers of the first three hundred years. The truth is, this practice began to creep in among some superstitious people about the middle of the fourth century; and I remember particularly, that Epiphanius who lived about that time calls it the heresy of the women.

And thus I have given you some instance of several doctrines and practices, which the church of Rome have built upon the foundation of Christianity. Much more might have been said of them, but from what hath been said any man may easily discern, how dangerous they are to the salvation of men.

1. According to this principle it is always safest to be on the uncharitable side. And yet uncharitableness is as bad an evidence, either of a true Christian, or a true church, as a man would wish. Charity is one of the most essential marks of Christianity, and what the apostle saith of particular Christians is as true of whole Churches; "that though they have all faith, yet if they have not charity they are nothing."

I grant that no charity teacheth men to see others damned, and not tell them the danger of their condition. But it is to be considered that the damning of men is a very hard thing, and therefore whenever we do it the case must be wonderfully plain. And is it so in this matter? They of the church of Rome cannot deny but that we embrace all the doctrines of our SAVIOUR, contained in the apostles' creed and determined by the four first general councils: and yet they will not allow this and a good life to put us within a possibility of salvation, because we will not submit to all the innovations they would impose upon us. And yet I think there is scarce any doctrine or practice in difference between them and us, which some or other of their most learned writers have not acknowledged either not to be sufficiently contained in scripture, or not to have been held and practised by the primitive church; so that nothing can excuse their uncharitableness towards us. And they pay dear for the little advantage they get by this argument, for they do what in them lies to make themselves no Christians, that they may prove themselves the truer and more Christian Church; a medium which we do not desire to make use of.

2. If this argument were good, then by this trick a man may bring over all the world to agree with him in an error which any other does not account damnable, what ever it be, provided he do but damn all those that do not hold it; and there wants nothing but confidence and uncharitableness to do this. But is there any sense, that another man's boldness and want of charity should be an argument to move me to be of this opinion? I cannot illustrate this better, than by the difference between a skilful physician and a mountebank. A learned and a skilful physician is modest, and speaks justly of things: he says, that such a method of cure which he hath directed is safe, and withal, that that which the mountebank prescribes may possibly do the work, but there is great hazard and danger in it: but the mountebank, who never talks of any thing less than infallible cures, (and always the more mountebank the stronger pretence to infallibility) he is positive that that method which the physician prescribes will destroy the patient, but his receipt is infallible and never fails. Is there any reason in this case, that this man should carry it merely by his confidence? And yet if this argument be good, the safest way is to reject the physician's advice and to stick to the mountebank's. For both sides are agreed, that there is a possibility of cure in the mountebank's method, but not in the physician's; and so the whole force of the argument lies in the confidence of an ignorant man.

IV. This argument is very unfit to work upon those to whom it is propounded: for either they believe we say true in this, or not. If they think we do not, they have no reason to be moved by what we say. If they think we do, why do they not take in all that we say

in this matter? Namely, that though it be possible for some in the communion of the Roman church to be saved, yet it is very hazardous; and that they are in a safe condition already in our church. And why then should a bare possibility; accompanied with infinite and apparent hazard, be an argument to any man to run into that danger?

Lastly, this argument is very improper to be urged by those who make use of it. Half of the strength of it lies in this, that we protestants acknowledge that it is possible a papist may be saved. But why should they lay any stress upon this? What matter is it what we heretics say, who are so damnably mistaken in all other things? Methinks, if there were no other reason, yet because we say it, it should seem to them to be unlikely to be true. But I perceive when it serves for their purpose we have some little credit and authority among them.

By this time I hope every one is in some measure satisfied of the weakness of the argument, which is so transparent that no wise man can honestly use it. The truth is, it is a casual and contingent argument, and sometimes it concludes right, and oftener wrong; and therefore no prudent man can be moved by it, except only in one case, when all things are so equal on both sides that there is nothing else in the whole world to determine him; which surely can never happen in matters of religion, necessary to be believed. No man is so weak, as not to consider in the change of his religion the merits of the cause itself; as not to examine the doctrines and practices of the churches on both sides; as not to take notice of the confidence and charity of both parties, together with all other things which ought to move a conscientious and a prudent man: and if upon enquiry there appear to be a clear advantage on either side, then this argument is needless and comes too late, because the work is already done without it.

Besides, that the great hazard of salvation in the Roman church (which we declare upon account of the doctrines and practices which I have mentioned) ought to deter any man much more from that religion, than the acknowledged possibility of salvation in it ought to encourage any man to the embracing of it; never did any Christian church behold so much hay and stubble upon the foundation of Christianity, and therefore "those that are saved in it must be saved," as it were "out of the fire." And though purgatory be not meant in the text, yet it is a doctrine very well suited to their manner of building; for there is need of an *ignis purgatorius*, of a fire to try their work what it is, and to burn up their hay and stubble. And I have so much charity (and I desire always to have it) as to hope, that a great many among them who live piously, and have been almost inevitably detained in that church by the prejudice of education and an invincible ignorance, will upon a general repentance find mercy with God; and "though their works suffer loss and be burnt, yet themselves may escape, as out of the fire." But as for those who had the opportunities of coming to the knowledge of the truth, if they continue in the errors of that church, or apostatize from the truth, I think their condition so far from being safe that there must be extraordinary favourable circumstances in their case to give a man hopes of their salvation.

NOTICE.

✂ In the sermon of this month, we have omitted the conclusion because it was not necessary to the argument, and because we had not room to publish it.

✂ Our subscribers will perceive the enlargement we have made, in the quantity of matter; and the improvement in the appearance of the Magazine for this month. It may be relied on as at least a fair specimen of the numbers that shall follow during the year.

✂ The TERMS are Two Dollars and Fifty Cents per year. Each year begins with January. No subscription received for less than a year.

MEMORANDA OF FOREIGN TRAVEL,

BY RO: J. BRECKINRIDGE.

Religious establishment in Paris.—Catholic clergy.—The Concordat.—Anecdote of Napoleon.—Dress of the Priests.—Archbishopric of Paris.—Nuns.—Churches.—Notre-Dame.—A marriage.—The Choir.—Coronation of Napoleon.—Pius VII.—A funeral.—St. Gervais—Kindness of the French to the afflicted.—Pictures.—Relics.—Transubstantiation.—St. Eustache—Chapels.—Worship of the Sacred heart.—The Baptism of a child.—The Maideleine.—Miracle in marble.—Pantheon.—Mirabeau.—Names of slain in the Revolution of July. St. Genevieve commemoration of her miracles.—Her tomb and worship Masses.

THE French Charter sworn to by Louis Philip, the first on the 9th day of August, 1830, established perfect religious liberty. "Each may profess his own religion with equal liberty, and shall receive for his mode of worship, the same protection;"—are the comprehensive words of the 5th article. It was no doubt however, true in forms, that though far otherwise in fact, as the next article asserts; "that the Catholic, Apostolic, and Roman, religion is *professed* by the majority of the French." In speaking therefore of the religious establishments of Paris, it is right to give the precedence to it.

The Catholic clergy of Paris consist of one Archbishop; twelve cures in charge of the principal parish churches in the twelve anondissements, who are associated in various relations in those churches, with twenty other priests; to whom are to be added, twenty one various metropolitan officers, all priests of course, personally associated with the Archbishop; then to these seventeen others composing the chapter of Paris; and then thirty four others who are honorary Canons; besides twenty more who are professors, directors &c.

&c. and we have in the official list of the Government for 1836 one hundred and twenty five, who receive their support from the public treasury. This it must be confessed is a very small supply for a population of a million of souls; nor does it probably even approximate to the truth, merely for the city itself, excluding the neighbouring parishes. The actual number of Priests in France, is about thirty seven thousand five hundred and twenty one; and as Paris contains about a thirty fifth part of the entire population of the kingdom, it is very certain that it contains a full proportion of the priests. So that perhaps eleven or twelve hundred, would not be very far from the mark—if we estimate those who have no public charge and therefor receiving no allowance from the government are not found in its lists. This would be one priest for every thousand souls; and considering that a portion of the people are protestants, and a very great multitude infidels,—the allowance is very ample.

These priests are generally persons connected with the lowest ranks of society. They are as a body represented to be destitute of learning, and activity; which is very manifest, from the paucity and worthlessness of their literary and scientific productions, in the thirty five years which have elapsed since the Concordat between Bonaparte, and Pius VII. restored the papal church in France.—“How did you find the ceremony;” —said Bonaparte to General Delmas, as they returned to the place, after witnessing the pomp with which that famous act was inaugurated at the church of Notre Dame.—“It was a pretty capuchinade” —replied Delmas—“and lacked nothing but the million of men, who have been slain in destroying that which you have re-established.”

You occasionally meet a priest in the streets of Paris, in his official dress. It is perfectly black, except perhaps a shirt, if they wear one; and consists of an upper garment that resembles exceedingly, the old-fashioned gown of an old women. The same long, close sleeves, and tight body; the same full skirt—and long tail tucked up behind, as I have a thousand times seen labouring women hitch up theirs, when walking in the mud. Under this, is a tight pantaloon or black stocking; and over it, nearly always; a black sash of some kind, slung from one shoulder, and under the other arm. The dress is unbecoming to the last degree; and seems to have been made after the female model, only because in the Bible men were once forbidden to dress in this way. For I have had frequent occasion to observe that there is not a single distinctive feature about this extraordinary superstition, which does not seem intended to set at nought some explicit statement of the holy scriptures. In the villages, a cocked hat, or in Paris, a common one completes the equipment. Most commonly they wear when in the streets, a dress which will not allow them to be distinguished from others;—a precaution, necessary to save themselves from public ridicule. I have had repeated opportunities to see them uncovered, and have never yet seen one with the top of his head shaved. This is the more remarkable, as the Council of Trent, not only expressly commands it to be done, but is very minute in its directions about the proportions which the tonsure is to bear, to the increasing dignity and advancement of the subject. It is to be hoped that this antiquated

folly will by and by become too absurd even for superstition to endure; and that as it has been ascertained that there is no longer any piety in baldness,—the equally happy discovery to which there seems a tendency may be soon made, as it regards fantastic and ridiculous apparel.

The Bishopric of Paris is said to have been created in the middle of the third century; and the present prelate represents himself to be the hundred and eleventh, who has occupied the see. In the year 1694, the diocese was erected into an archbishopric; since which time thirteen archbishops have governed in it. Before the revolution of 1789, the clergy of Paris possessed immense endowments, and amounted, including monks and nuns to one person in sixty, in the capitol. Under the restoration, they occupied a far more important rank than at present. I have before me a list of those for this city; for 1829 similar to that given on a preceding page for 1636, and find that instead of amounting to only one hundred and twenty five persons it exceeded twelve hundred and fifty.—From the best information I can obtain, I state the number of nuns in Paris—embracing all the female professed, at seven hundred; being in a proportion of rather more than one to every two priests.

The churches of this great city are numerous and magnificent. They present however exceedingly various styles of architecture, and one may study in them, the principles of beauty and grandeur, as applied to that delightful art, by which four or five distinct and widely separated eras were respectively characterized. A more skillful hand than mine, has told us, that successive examples of ancient Gothic, are well preserved in the churches of St. Germain-des-Prés, with its simicircular arches of the tenth and eleventh centuries;—Notre Dame, having the massive castellated structure of the middle ages; the Sainte, Chapelle, which for richness and delicacy is not surpassed by any similar monument in Europe,—and which St Louis, built at an expense of nearly 3,000,000 of francs, as the depository of the *real* crown of thrones, for which he had paid Baldwin Emperor of Constantinople an immense price; St Gervais, which was finished by Louis XIII.—and is taken for a striking specimen of the beauties and defects of the style of that and the preceding ages: and St. Etienne-du-Mont, standing near to where Mercury once had a temple devoted to him, and exhibiting now in the midst of its light, bold, and singular architectural ornaments, a hardly less idolatrous worship of St. Geneieve.—The transition from the Gothic to the Greek and Roman styles, is thought to be well exhibited in the church of St. Eustache,—whose proportions are prodigious, and its external ornaments most profuse, and I thought most unsightly. Specimens of the Roman style, sustained and perfected during the reign of Louis XIV. are preserved in the churches of the Assumption and the Visitation, and in the splendid church of the Hotel-des-Invalides, near the Champ-de Mon. At the Military Hospital of Val-du-Grace in the church of the same name is a fine specimen of the lofty, and capacious style of the seventeenth century.—It was built as a sort of thank offering for the birth of Louis XIV.. whose mother having been twenty two years married without issue,—after his birth directed the erection of this superb monument

of her sterity, her vows, and her gratitude.—Our own era, dating its origin in the reign of Louis XV., or Louis XVI.—exhibiting its incomparable superiority above those already mentioned, no where, more than in this city. The Pantheon, situated in the Place St. Genevieve, on one of the highest summits embraced within the walls of Paris, is, after St. Peter's at Rome, and St. Paul's at London, (and hardly *after* the latter)—probably the noblest structure of the kind that exists. The exquisite building devoted to St. Mary Magdalene,—now nearly completed, at the end of the Rue Royale, is perfect in its proportions, and in the incomparable finish of its parts. The sum of moneys spent on these two last buildings,—are incredible. After the restoration of religion in France, a hundred and twenty millions of francs were expended by the government, in restoring the churches, from the injuries inflicted during the revolution.

I would conduct the reader to the interior of a few of these buildings, that we be instructed by the observances to which they are devoted—or perhaps by the recollections which consecrate them.—The first of them I visited was the Cathedral, of *Notre Dame*. It is situated at the upper end of the Ile de la Cite—and stands on the spot once occupied by a temple of Jupiter. As you approach its main front, you enter upon the large, open *Parvis* (or square) *de Notre Dame*: having upon your right the immense Hospital of the Hotel Dieu; on two other sides, rows of lofty irregular, and antiquated houses—and before you, this ancient edifice, built in the form of a Latin cross,—four hundred and fifteen feet long, by one hundred and fifty wide. You stand in front of one end, which presents three lofty stories; the first divided by three great pointed arches, through which the interior of the house is reached from this direction; the second profusely ornamented with carvings, and arches, and circles of massive stone work; and the third, divided into two great square towers of open work, with flat tops. You enter a vast hall, divided by rows of pillars, with an arched roof of stone, the whole length of the building, and far above your head. Around the entire compass of the house are numerous small apartments, each constituting a separate chapel, having its own altar, its peculiar pointings or statues—its appropriated worship, its particular object of invocation, and its own votaries. These are found in almost every church: I counted thirty one of them here: In some and before others, persons were engaged at their devotions. People came and went: and the area of the room towards the common entrance, was well supplied with plain rush-bottomed chairs. Upon the backs of these, some bowed themselves before a picture or altar; in others, persons more devout kneeled on one or both knees. At the same time many came and went, as mere spectators;—while not a few were engaged in the various employments, that conscience or convenience dictated the performance of in a church. Many were there, to beg the more conveniently, and more successfully; for it is surely not easy to steel the heart to objects of distress, when we are in the act of deploring our own weakness, and soliciting the fulfillment of our own desires. I believe the command of Christ, to give to them that ask of us, is more literal than this accute generation

allows; and it is besides less painful to suppose we have done a well intentioned act, to one that did not deserve it, or that even made an ill use of it,—than to pursue those investigations whose issue might exonerate us from benevolence—or to assume their general issue as true, and therefore steadily refuse all. I confess it did not awaken a pang of self-reproach, when I left the church, and found a gang of haridons in a high quarrel in the Parvis—to discover in the ring-leader an old hag, I had given two sous to, an hour before. It is her fault if she obtains by false pretences, or applies to evil objects, the trifle which it were my shame, and my woe, if I withheld, to her undoing. And oh if we could realize the just proportion between what we receive, and what we either deserve or use aright,—we should scan with a less searching eye the sins, to which want is prone, and relieve its sorrows with a more open hand.—

As we sauntered around the room, a decently dressed woman of the lower sort, came up in great anxiety to our carrier, and hastily asked a few questions; which were positively—but with some embarrassment, answered by two or three no's. "What did she want?" said I. "That I would act as a witness in a marriage ceremony"—was the reply. "Call her back, we will do it with great pleasure,"—and our party was conducted into one of the side chapels, in which all was in readiness—but at a stand for the want of the required number of witnesses. A priest stood on the step in front of the altar, dressed in white petticoats with long sleeves, and with a red coloured sort of yoke with long ends over his neck, and dropping down before. He held a small-book in his hand; and at his right side stood a lad of ten or twelve years, dressed like himself except the yoke, and holding a small whisk, with a handle about a foot long the scanty hairs in the end of which was wet with holy water. In front were the parties,—and between them a pretty little boy two or three years old. It might have been the son of a former marriage; but perhaps they should have been sooner married. One of the greatest evils society has to bear from the church of Rome, lies in her assumption of a divine right to make such children legitimate,—and the crimes that too often find an easy excuse in the tardy exercise of this strange claim. The ceremony commenced. A few questions were asked and answered: the hands of the parties united; a plate was handed to them in which two small silver coins were placed; a ring was taken from the finger of the man, and drawn on that of the woman: they both knelt down, and two men held a long piece of cloth over them so as to conceal both. This constituted their part of the ceremony. In the mean time, the priest read, ever and anon out of his little book—in a tone of voice so low as to be almost inaudible, so rapid as to be quite indistinct—and in a manner so incoherent by skipping about from passage to passage, that it was a mere impossibility to comprehend what he said. Sometimes he turned towards the altar; then again towards the people—and then towards the altar again. Several times he put his fingers to the hair of the whisk which the boy held by his side; and several times took it and made motions in the air, like a conjurer. Once he fingered the candles that sat behind him on the altar: but I did not see for what end. In the intervals a saturnine looking fellow, dressed in a

half military, half clerical costume who stood off—cried, amen. And after about thirty minutes dumb show of the kind I have described—a general movement showed that the affair was complete. If I had not known it was to be a marriage ceremony—I should have been exceedingly puzzled to tell what it was.—I should certainly never have guessed it to be a sacrament.

About one third of the church was separated from the remainder, by a screen of antique railing—behind which was the grand altar,—and around the walls, successive chappels, separated, by another circular screen of solid construction, from the area in front of the altar. The paintings in these chapels are finer than those, in the chapels, in the more exposed part of the church: and those in the choir itself are of an order still superior. There are eight of them of large proportions, representing the birth of the Virgin, by Chompagne—the visitation of the Virgin by Louvenet,—the anunciation to the Virgin, by Halle, the assumption of the Virgin, by de la Hyre—the presentation of the Virgin by Chompagne &c. &c. In the religion of the modern Romans—the name of Juno, is changed to that of Mary,—but in other respects the worship of their ancestors, is marvelously preserved.

Our guide, a respectable looking female—suddenly stopped in front of the great altar, and pointing to a spot, indicated by a large star wrought of the costly marble of which the pavement is composed; on this spot said she was Napoleon crowned Emperor of the French!—And there—and there—pointing on either side, to the two thrones that terminated the rows of richly carved stalls,—sat the venerable archbishop of Paris, then advanced to the extreme verge of life,—and his holiness Pope Pius VII. who came to Paris to consecrate the new dynasty, which had already been baptized in the blood of Europe! This imposing ceremony took place on the 2d of December, 1804. At that door entered the emperor—escorted by his enthusiastic guard—and accompanied by the unhappy Josephine. Here stood the Pope, the Cardinals, the great ecclesiasticks—the grand officers of state,—and all the elite of France—to receive him, who came to offer up the revolution, upon the altar of his own intense egotism.” “Almighty God” exclaimed the pope, as at the foot of the altar, he anointed with a triple unction the head and both the hands of Napoleon, “Thou, who didst establish Hazael, to be ruler of Syria; and Jehu, to be king of Israel—manifesting thy will to them, by the prophet Elias, thou who didst also shed the holy unction of kings, upon the head of Saul and of David—by the hands of thy prophet Samuel; bestow, by our hands, the treasures of thy grace and benediction, upon thy servant Napoleon, —who notwithstanding, our own personal unworthiness, we consecrate this day emperor in thy name!” Even in this scene, the conduct of the emperor, was perfectly characteristic. Before,—all sovereigns had been crowned. He crowned himself: taking the diadem in his hands and placing it upon his head; then placing another upon the head of Josephine.

There are few acts in the history of the human race,—more replete with overwhelming interest. My whole frame trembled with emotion,—as the actors in it lived again before me;—and my heart was wrung with anguish at the recollection of all that it crushed

and destroyed. This amazing man, had found a mighty nation torn with horrible passions, and on the brink of ruin: and he had tranquilized them—restored order and prosperity, and forced Europe, three times conquered to recognize, the revolution as a part of its existing system, Victory, peace, prosperity, had been assured to the republic, and still liberty was safe. What a moment in which to have made himself the impersonation of a glorious age! To have consecrated to history a second man, capable like Washington of forgetting himself, to secure to the world a just equality, a wise liberty, a highly developed civilization—a noble system of human happiness and greatness. The nation, adds one of their most philosophic historians—was in the hands of a great man, or of a despot. It depended on him, to preserve it free—or to enslave it. He preferred his own selfish ends. He loved himself more, than the human race.

Full of these sad thoughts, we emerged from the choir, and encountered a procession in the great area not unsuited to them. From a side chapel near to that in which we had a short time before been witnesses of what this church calls the sacrament of marriage,—then came forth a funeral procession. Here at least we are equal,—all alike nothing. And I stood reverently as they bore along their dead—respecting even the weaknesses of a sacred grief. There came first two officers, with their battoons;—then the body apparently of a man, borne by four others;—then a company of twenty or thirty other men;—and behind, the priest I had before seen marshalled by the same attendants. The hearse was set down not far from the door: the men formed two rows facing each other, before it—between which the priest passed slowly, muttering out of the same little book, the same incoherent gibberish—and in the same perfectly careless manner. As he approached the foot of the coffin, he took the same little whisk from the lad, at his elbow, and made the same motions in the air—as if scattering about holy water; and then retired. Each of the attendants, approached, and after all the company had successively made these signals, whether to heaven, to earth, to the dead, or to the spiritual world, I know not,—they took up the body,—and bore it from the church. It is one of the most extraordinary features of the papal system of worship—that its ministers profess to exercise a power over the destinies of the souls, which death itself does not weaken. And to make the folly consummate, they pretend to secure blessings in the dread and unknown future, to one man's disembodied spirit, by idolatrous worship of another man's decayed bones!

Some days after the one on which I first visited Notre Dame, I was in the neighbourhood of the Place de Greve, and came rather accidentally, upon the church of St. Gervais,—whose admirable architecture, is the more striking, as you would never expect to find such a work; in the midst of the filthy, narrow, and irregular streets which surround it. The churches of Paris are always open—always accessible to the public. I stepped into this out of a shower of rain, and select it almost at random, as one of the few, of which it is possible to make special mention. I have never been in one, in which there were not persons at worship,—persons to beg—persons at confession—officials,—and priests, There sat at the en-

trance amongst others, a man, whose statue like stillness, attracted my notice. "I am blind; and the father of a family;" was the simple announcement, in his own tongue, written on a placard, affixed to his person. There was an air of reserve, almost of dignity, in this;—coupled with a certain calm submission to inevitable destiny—and a sort of taking for granted, that the human heart was not all stone—and that the simple fact was enough. I have observed this sort of gracefulness, in the moral of things, very often amongst the French, and its effect is never lost on their quicksighted and impulsive countrymen. Indeed I have remarked as one of their most pleasing national traits, the readiness and the tenderness, with which the very humblest of the people—admit and contribute to the claims of wretchedness.—

There was a large, and very handsome man, who was attendant at the place and ready to do its honours. He commenced with great gravity, and many marks of reverence to show us the chapels—the altars, the paintings,—especially some statuary which he pronounced to be unrivalled in Paris, if not under the sun,—and some exceedingly curious painted glass in the windows, of great antiquity and beauty. We were shown a picture of God the Father; and passed on in silence. Presently another. Then one of the Holy Ghost. I said I was a Protestant—and disapproved of such attempts. His whole manner changed at once; and putting aside his saints and legends, and revolting representation of the Almighty, he took me to the opposite side of the church, and exhibited a painting by Albert Durei, which was the first of this great master I then had seen. The picture, represented in the centre the crucifixion; and in eight compartments, four on either side,—as many scenes immediately preceeding and following it. It had been painted nearly three hundred and forty years;—and yet it was as fresh, as if brought yesterday from the case. It is a most exquisite relic; and though he showed us, afterwards, a bone of St. Gervais the patron of the church,—another of St. Laurent, the patron of that quarter of Paris, and a third of St. Denis, the patron of all the clergy of the city,—all set in gold: in my poor heretical estimation, that relic of Albert Durei, were worth all the bones of saints, be they of men, pigs, or fowls, (and which they are, I am not comparative anatomist enough to decide in a satisfactory manner)—which all the superstition of earth hath heaped together. I was also allowed, as I had before been at Notre Dame, as you can be any where for a franc, to see the rich and extensive wardrobe—which most of the churches possess. The possession of relics, is not only universal, but is considered indispensable; and amongst these, there is almost universally found, a portion of the true cross. This was shown to me on the present occasion—set in the silver crucifix—in the centre of which, in the midst of a golden sun,—the consecrated wafer is borne aloft on great occasions. Or in other words, if the priests tell true—here is a little circle about as large as a dollar, in the middle of which "the soul, body, blood and divinity of Jesus Christ"—is carried, and worshipped as God—under the species of a bit of bread;—in every particle of which, he exists whole, and entire!—Think of that, a hundred millions of Gods,—as there are that many particles of the bread—in a space as large as a dollar! And these all swallowed by a priest at

one mouthful!—And is the world to be always convulsed to propagate this dogma? Is freedom, personal and national still to be cloven down before the hierarchy of a God of dough? Are our souls to be cursed, by those who avouch God's authority for all their acts—because we are unable to believe; that which contradicts all our senses,—outrages our reason—and stultifies all science—and shocks us, as at once contemptible and horrible? Thanks be to God, the day star has arisen. I write these lines freely—on the spot where kings have slaughtered their people—and subjects bathed their hands in the blood of kings, for being only suspected of doubting—what they who hold, now only whisper to each other; wherever the light of truth has reached.—

The church of St. Eustache, which is the parish church of the third arrondissement,—is after Notre-Dame, the largest in Paris. The houses which crowd it on all sides, intercept the view of its profuse and heterogeneous, exterior ornaments. Its interior consists of double aisles of immense height, whose richly decorated ceiling of vaulted stone, is supported by so many pillars, half Greek, half Gothic, as to confuse and disturb the whole. It possesses some beautiful specimens, of that rich pointed glass, which makes the windows of the ancient churches so ornamental—and gives such softness to the light, as it passes through it. I walked leisurely about the long aisles,—read the tariffs which hung on the walls of all the churches, in manuscript, indicating the rate at which certain accommodations might be enjoyed; examined the programme of masses, fates, &c. for the current week, amongst which the chief seemed to have reference to a great service and exhibition of relics of Lazarus, Mary and Martha;—and after counting the chapels, which I found to be nineteen,—commenced a somewhat particular inspection of them. Commencing on the right hand as you enter the church, the first is the *Chapelle du Calvaire*; the second the *Chapelle of St. Cecelia* in which is a picture of the saint playing on the piano forte:—the third is the *chapelle of the angel Gabriel*. I paused before examining the fourth, that several persons who were at their devotions before it might finish them undisturbed. It seemed the most resorted to of any—and on the side of it in the aisle—was a small *Chevaux de frise*, on which a number of little candles were stuck, one of which was lighted. It was the *chapelle of the sacred heart*,—the devotion rendered to which forms conspicuous a part of the idolatry of the Jesuits. As you stand before the *chapelle* there hangs facing you, a small and rather well executed painting, of a human heart, surrounded by a crown of thorns, and surmounted by a cross, reposing in a flame. Above are heads of angels, gazing upon it. and below, several figures, which are probably meant to be celestial; as they have wings, profoundly adoring it. On the heart itself was a cypher which I could but imperfectly distinguish; but which seemed like the four Hebrew letters, which compose the word *Jehovah*. At the bottom of the picture were the words, *Cor Jesu Sacratissimum miserere nobis*:—*Most sacred heart of Jesus have mercy on us!* Before this picture I beheld rational and immortal beings, rendering their worship.

This is enough, I sighed; and turned to quit the place. At the door I met a small party bearing a very young child. They are going

to have it baptized perhaps; a ceremony I had long desired to witness; and I turned back with them. They were soon shown into the chapel, on the left side of the church, in the centre of which stood a font apparently of silver, on a pedestal about four feet high. The priest entered, appalled nearly like him I had seen at Notre-Dame, marshalled by an official, dressed in a military costume, and followed by another in deep black, of a peculiar cut, like a sort of clerical undress. Besides these three, the nurse with the infant in her arms,—the father of the child,—a girl about thirteen, and a boy of perhaps ten, formed the company in the chapel. The priest took his stand by the font, and commenced whispering out of a little book as if speaking to himself. The infant was held in the arms, opposite; and on either side of it, stood the little girl and boy to act as sponsors for the babe; the male sponsor was obliged to stand upon a high stool, upon which the father, held him—and thus fulfilled his entire part in the scene. As the door of the chapel still stood ajar, I pointed to it, and catching the eye of the attendant, made a slight bow. He returned the salutation, and I entered and took my stand by his side, within arm's reach of all the party.

I will briefly describe what I saw. But when the multitude of the absurdities is considered, and it is remembered that the words of the ceremony were in a language (Latin) which few can speak, and which was now uttered in a foreign accent,—I shall be easily excused, if I be found in error, as to points more material than the exact order of occurrence, about which indeed I cannot be positive. During much of the ceremony the priest extended his right hand, over the child; occasionally the little sponsors did the same, the assistant, gazed about, and at intervals, said amen; while the official, handed about the various utensils, cotton, little spoons, &c. &c. used on the occasion. The priest made the sign of the cross, on the forehead and breast of the child, saying at the same time, it was "to secure to it eternal life." He breathed several times in its face, saying "receive the good spirit"—with much beside; for I only give a few words of what he muttered without ceasing. Just before or just after that—he went through a process of exorcism, which was directed against an unclean spirit supposed to reside in the infant. He put his own saliva on his fingers, and transferred it, into the nostrils and ears of the little sleeping subject, using at the operation on the latter, the solemn *Ephphratta*, once pronounced by our Saviour, with the power of God; and which I shuddered to hear profaned to such mummery. He took a pinch of salt; from a silver shell, and put it into the child's mouth. He took a little gold spoonfull of oil out of a very small silver cabinet, and touched the breast and back of the neck with it; the attendant, immediately wiping it off, with a bit of cotton, with which he also carefully wiped the cabinet. At this moment, if my memory is accurate, he took up a second silver utensil, very small, and formed like a shell, and poured out a small portion of water upon the right side of the crown of the head. Two things however distracted the fixed and painful attention with which I had regarded his proceedings. The first was the multitudes of caps, being no less than four,—which were removed from the head of the infant, to expose it, for the performance of

this part of the ceremony. The second was, that the priest, in his first attempt, missed the head, and poured the water into the font; at which he uttered several ejaculations of surprise—that greatly tried the gravity of the spectators. A second attempt was more successful. After which, he gave the unction with chrisam, taken from a second compartment of the little silver cabinet. Then followed a dumb show, with a candle which he held so, as to appear as if grasped by the child, while he uttered a few sentences; in the midst of which, they gathered closer around, and concealed it for a moment from my view. Towards the end of the affair, he took up one end of the collar which depended from his neck, and held it for a moment over the person of the infant, with the side that had a cross on it upwards. He had several times before, pressed the side with the cross, on its face and person, and once took the collar off, reverently kissed the part that rested on the back of his neck, turned it inside out and put it on again. And this is Baptism? This is that simple, significant, divine right, wherein by the pouring of water on the person, we signify the outpouring of the Eternal Spirit for the cleansing of the soul of man: in which we manifest our wish to perform, on our part, the conditions and to secure the fulfilment on the part of God, of the sacred promises, of that covenant of which it is so plain a seal? No: it is a gross and degrading mummery—compounded of impiety, superstition and folly; no more like Christian baptism, than the Pope of Rome is like that blessed Lord, in whose name and stead he claims to rule,—or the apostacy in the midst of which he sits as God, is like that universal church of the redeemed in earth and heaven, of which Christ Jesus, is the only and the adorable head!

Amongst the churches of Paris, however, incomparably the most magnificent are the Madeleine, and the Pantheon; if indeed the latter should be called a church. They are neither, as yet completely finished, although the first stone of both of them, was laid in the year 1764, by Louis XV.—and with some considerable intermissions, they have been wrought on ever since.

The Madeleine, is situated on the outside of the Boulivart of the same name, immediately in front of the Rue Royale—down which it looks, to the Place de la Concorde, and across the Seine, to the Palace of the Chamber of Deputies. Originally designed for a simple parish church, for a village which is now absorbed in the city; Buonaparte changed its destination, and in 1808 pulled down most of what had been done in the preceeding forty years, and projected the present exquisite structure, as a TEMPLE TO GLORY. La Gloire, is to a true Frenchman, meat, drink, and raiment. And he who above all men, knew the depth and intensity of this national enthusiasm—knew the best how to indulge, as well as how to direct it. An inscription on the lofty front of the portico shows that this destination has also been changed; and that the place “is under the invocation of Saint Mary Magdalen.”—And as one mounts the double ascent of lofty steps,—and enjoys the luxury of a promenade on the high terraces entirely around the church; guarded by the lofty, rich, prolonged, and perfect Corinthian colonades, he is ready to confess that, that gentle and frail penitent has had no where else a shrine

so beautiful, nor votaries touched with a more devout sympathy. A most extraordinary miracle has occurred in this house. On one of the beautiful slabs of coloured marble, polished till they are as smooth as the forehead of a child, or the inside of a marine shell—which decorates the lower parts of the interior walls, was suddenly found exhibited in the stone itself, a perfect picture of a bishop, in full attire, and of the size of nature! It is shown with great reverence to all visitors; and with a little aid from the imagination, a sort of resemblance can certainly be traced. I was critical; but the guide, and the bystanders pronounced it perfect. The omen is evil then, said I; for the staff in his hand, is held up like a baton of command, and is four times too thick. It means that you are to be again subjected to the insupportable tyranny of the priests. The suggestion, seemed no way, beneficial to the miracle.

The Pantheon is at the opposite quarter of the city from the Madeleine. It is on the left side of the river, in the place of St. Genevieve, on the street and hill St. Jaquez—behind it is the College of Henry IV: below it, that of Louis XIV: the great promoters of the arts in France. This like the church last mentioned, has been subjected to several changes of destination; but since the revolution of July, has been restored to the august purpose, of commemorating the benefactors of France. On the fringe of the gigantic portico, are these striking words: *Aux grands hommes—la patrie reconnaissante*:—A grateful country—to great men! It was the National Assembly that conceived the idea—and by a decree of 1791, consecrated the magnificent church, as the sepulchre of those who shed lustre upon their country. The same decree directed this honour, to be conferred for the first time on the remains of Mirabeau,—then recently dead,—and the assembly itself ministered at his obsequies. Great, corrupt, heroic genius! Necessary to mankind,—indispensable to France—dear to liberty!—Successive generations as they cast their shadows across these long pavements, and tread amidst these vast and numberless columns—will kindle with deeper emotion, when they remember it is thy monument! And as they recall the thousand dangers, which nothing but thy dauntless courage warded off, the difficulties which thy wisdom surmounted, the triumphs which thy eloquence achieved, for young freedom—they will weep, as they may not palliate, nor hide, thy crimes!

As you enter this splendid edifice, which has the figure of a Greek cross, you find yourself in the midst of an immense area, of the same shape,—on all sides of which are rows of enormous pillars; and surmounting the whole, a dome of great proportions, mounting up to a height, far above any other in the city. I have, on a former occasion, mentioned the wide extent, and grandeur of the Panorama, presented from this pinnacle. In the great area beneath, is one of those innumerable objects, which in this capital, seem to be so skilfully arranged to breed in the people, the most profound passions of every kind. At the four points, when the lines of the great cross, which composes the building intersect each other, and which constitute the salient points of the arch of the dome—are large slabs of black marble, on which are written long rows of names in letters of gold. At the top of each tablet is this inscription in

French: "*Names of the citizens who died in defence of the laws and liberty on the 27, 28, and 29th of July, 1830.*" I counted the names—there were two hundred and eighty seven. Are thrones so easily subverted?—I read over the places of their birth; most of them were from the immediate neighbourhood of Paris; the whole from continental Europe. I looked at the ages. There was a lad of fifteen. I would make a pilgrimage to embrace his mother's knees. It was a boy of the Polytechnique school, who fell leading a desperate, assault upon the Louvre. As soon as his hardy followers saw that he must die; they bore him with loud shouts of triumph across the place Carousal, into the palace of the Thuilleries—into the great hall of state—and placed him upon the throne from which his young hand was so rudely tearing a rebel tyrant! He breathed his last upon the throne of Charlemaine!—A few names below his, was that of a man born in Holland:—and his age given at seventy four. So old, and a stranger? Then the fire of freedom, burns far, and burns long. May it catch from heart to heart, and from land to land—till every chain melts,—and every throne dissolves before it!

In the immediate neighbourhood of the Pantheon, is an extremely curious and rather mean looking old church, called St. Etienne der Mont. But as the nation seems resolved that the Pantheon shall be called St. Genevieve, and it would be out of the question that the patroness of the city should have no church devoted specifically to her worship;—this queer looking affair, is now the veritable church of that respectable shepherdess. In the state of feeling and bodily lassitude, produced on most persons, by the inspection of the Pantheon,—climbing to its top, and penetrating amongst its vaults,—there is little inclination to visit St. Genevieve, and few do it;—this perhaps accounts for the more gross forms of superstition, exhibited openly there. It is well worth looking at, however on its own accounts. The specimen of fine stained glass, in its windows are the most perfect I have seen in Paris, and far the most abundant. The interior of the church is light, rich and rather elegant—though in all respects peculiar. Some of the paintings are very curious. Amongst others I observed some commemorating notable miracles by St. Genevieve: namely the healing of Louis XIII.—the stopping of a famine—the dispensation of the army of Attila—and the cessation of a storm! Do people believe such things? Why not? In the same collection, is a picture of the crucifixion, which represents Louis XIII. and his minister Louvais, at the cross! Believe them? Why they are the most credible part of what I saw at this church.

In passing up the aisles inspecting what was to be seen—without the wearysome aid of the usual attendants—I came suddenly upon two tablets of stone set in the wall, and thickly covered with a long inscription. I was so much astonished at its purport, that "I translated, the first tablet. "The tomb which is now used" said "the inscription "is the same in which the corpse of Saint Genevieve was deposited on the 13th of January 511: and in which it rested for 120 years. Afterwards, through a search instituted by Saint "Eloi, we received the remains and ashes of the patroness of Paris. "This stone, which inclosed them, was always the object of the veneration of the faithful. Dispoiled of the ornaments with which it "had been decorated by the piety of the Cardinal de la Rouchfou-

"cold, but happily preserved in the subterranean church of the abbey; here we behold it, after our convulsions, the only monument on earth, of a saint who twice saved the capital; and who, in heaven, has not ceased to be propitious to them." There is just as much more, consisting chiefly of details, to verify the preceding statements. It were mere waste of words to say that this is all the rankest folly, and the grossest impiety—and the foulest imposition. But if you will look behind the pillar, you will see in a recess the tomb itself; surrounded by an iron railing, the spikes of which, are so adjusted as to receive a candle upon each, of the numerous points. A young female sat in a sort of stall, not far off, composedly at work; and driving a traffic in various small articles, such as medals,—images,—beads,—but above all, little dirty candles, such as were called *vot-tales*, when in my youth, we denounced them at boarding school. While I stood near, five females, and two men, came into the recess—and reverently bowing their bodies, *seemed* to worship the tomb. What they actually did worship, is best known to themselves. The men each purchased, a candle of the girl, lighted it, and stuck it on a point of the railing round the tomb. There were other candles, that had been placed by previous devotees: and the whole railing was filthy from constant use.

On the opposite side of the church hung, in a frame—was a schedule of private masses. There were seven separate foundations, of which the particulars were given. I made a memorandum of two. 1. "A Mass was established in 1826, by Monsieur le due de Gambaceres to be celebrated yearly on the 15th day of January; for the repose of his soul; for which he created an anual rent of the hundred and twenty five francs". 2 " Monsieur Mongrud formerly professor of philosophy, created in the year 1830 a temporary foundation, for 500. masses, for the repose of his soul; which will be celebrated every Monday at 10 o'clock, until the 15th of June 1839" The sum given, is left blank.—Now suppose this be all fair and true: and the matter precisely as these gentlemen supposed when they established these masses—and as their church taught them it was. How then? I say nothing, of excluding a good man from happiness after death, and consigning him from 1830 till 1839, to the horrors of Purgatory. I say nothing of its requiring a perpetual mass to get the duke out, and keep him out. I say not a word about the blasphemy of pretending to save bad men after death. Look at it in this light. This church teaches that the sacrifice of the mass, is not only a propitiary sacrifice for the living and the dead—but that it is the very identical sacrifice of Calvary. I do not argue whether it is so or not, let us say it is. There Christ is crucified, every monday morning, at ten o'clock, at St. Genevieve, and will be for three years to come, making in all 500 repetitions of the awful scene of Calvary—for the sake of one poor sinner,—who nevertheless, might be all the time in heaven! And the priests perpetrates these tremendous acts, upon a nice calculation of francs and centemes; so nice, that he tells you beforehand the day, on which he will no longer sacrifice his Saviour on this account,—as the "pieces of silver" will be then fully earned? But as M le Due's money is a perpetual grant,—these priests will undertake that the Lord of glory shall be offered up, yearly forever,

for him? I do not believe there are on earth assassins who would, sacrifice their enemies, or even dumb creatures, upon the terms and to their extent, and for the reasons on which the priests if they believe what they say they do, must consider themselves, sacrificing him whom they call the Saviour!—How tremendous are those words, “they have crucified to themselves the Son of God afresh;—and put him to an open shame?”

LIFE OF GEORGE WHITEFIELD FROM SOUTHEY'S LIFE OF WESLEY.

GEORGE WHITEFIELD was born at the Bell Inn, in the city of Gloucester at the close of the year 1714. He describes himself as froward from his mother's womb; so brutish as to hate instruction; stealing from his mother's pocket, and frequently appropriating to his own use the money that he took in the house. “If I trace myself,” he says, “from my cradle to my manhood, I can see nothing in me but a fitness to be damned; and if the Almighty had not prevented me by his grace, I had now either been sitting in darkness and in the shadow of death, or condemned, as the due reward of my crimes, to be for ever lifting up my eyes in torments.” Yet Whitefield could recollect early movings of the heart, which satisfied him in after life, that “God loved him with an everlasting love, and had separated him even from his mother's womb, for the work to which he afterwards was pleased to call him. He had a devout disposition, and a tender heart. When he was about ten years old, his mother made a second marriage; it proved an unhappy one. During the affliction to which this led, his brother used to read aloud Bishop Ken's Manual for Winchester Scholars. This book affected George Whitefield greatly; and when the corporation, at their annual visitation of St. Mary de Crypt's school, where he was educated, gave him, according to custom, money for the speeches which he was chosen to deliver, he purchased the book, and found it, he says, of great benefit to his soul.

“Whitefield's talents for elocution, which made him afterwards so great a performer in the pulpit, were at this time in some danger of receiving a theatrical direction. The boys at the grammar school were fond of acting plays; the master, seeing how their vein ran, encouraged it, and composed a dramatic piece himself; which they represented before the corporation, and in which Whitefield enacted a woman's part, and appeared in girl's clothes. The remembrance of this, he says, had often covered him with confusion of face, and he hoped it would do so even to the end of his life! Before he was fifteen, he persuaded his mother to take him from school, saying, that she could not place him at the university, and more learning would only spoil him for a tradesman. Her own circumstances indeed, were by this time so much on the decline, that his menial services were required; he began occasionally to assist her in the public house, till at length he put on his blue apron and his snuffers,* wash-

* So the word is printed in his own account of his life; it seems to mean the sleeves which are worn by cleanly men in dirty employments, and may possibly be a misprint for *sooggers*, as such sleeves are called in some parts of England.

ed mops, cleaned rooms, and became a professed and common drawer. In the little leisure which such employments allowed, this strange boy composed two or three sermons; and the romances, which had been his heart's delight, gave place for awhile to Thomas à Kempis.

"When he had been about a year in this servile occupation, the inn was made over to a married brother, and George, being accustomed to the house, continued there as an assistant; but he could not agree with his sister-in-law, and after much uneasiness gave up the situation. His mother, though her means were scanty, permitted him to have a bed upon the ground in her house, and live with her, till Providence should point out a place for him. The way was soon indicated. A servitor at Pembroke College called upon his mother, and in the course of conversation told her, that after all his college expences for that quarter were discharged, he had received a penny. She immediately cried out, this will do for my son; and turning to him said, "Will you Go to Oxford, George?" Happening to have the same friends as this young man, she waited on them without delay; they promised their interest to obtain a servitor's place in the same college, and in reliance upon this George returned to the grammar school. Here he applied closely to his books, and shaking off, by the strong effort of a religious mind, all evil and idle courses, produced, by the influence of his talents and example, some reformation among his school-fellows. He attended public service constantly, received the sacrament monthly, fasted often, and prayed often, more than twice a day in private. At the age of eighteen he was removed to Oxford; the recommendation of his friends was successful; another friend borrowed for him ten pounds, to defray the expense of entering; and with a good fortune beyond his hopes, he was admitted servitor immediately.

"Servitorships are more in the spirit of a Roman Catholic than of an English establishment. Among the Catholics, religious poverty is made respectable, because it is accounted a virtue; and humiliation is an essential part of monastic discipline. But in our state of things it cannot be wise to brand men with the mark of inferiority; the line is already broad enough. Oxford would do well, if, in this respect, it imitated Cambridge, abolished an invidious distinction of dress, and dispensed with services which, even when they are not mortifying to those who perform them, are painful to those to whom they are performed. Whitefield found the advantage of having been used to a public-house; many who could choose their servitor preferred him, because of his diligent and alert attendance; and thus, by help of the profits of the place, and some little presents made him by a kind-hearted tutor, he was enabled to live without being beholden to his relations for more than four-and-twenty pounds, in the course of three years. Little as this is, it shows, when compared with the ways and means of the elder Wesley at College, that half a century had greatly enhanced the expenses of Oxford. At first he was rendered uncomfortable by the society into which he was thrown; he had several chamber-fellows, who would fain have made him join them in their riotous mode of life; and as he could only escape from their persecutions by sitting alone in his study, he was sometimes benumbed with

cold; but when they perceived the strength as well as the singularity of his character, they suffered him to take his own way in peace.

"Before Whitefield went to Oxford, he had heard of the young men there who 'lived by rule and method,' and therefore called Methodists. They were now much talked of, and generally despised. He however, was drawn toward them by kindred feelings, defended them strenuously when he heard them reviled, and when he saw them go through a ridiculing crowd to receive the sacrament at St. Mary's was strongly inclined to follow their example. For more than a year he yearned to be acquainted with them; and it seems that the sense of his inferior condition kept him back. At length the great object of his desires was affected. A pauper had attempted suicide, and Whitefield sent a poor woman to inform Charles Wesley, that he might visit the person, and minister spiritual medicine, the messenger was charged not to say who sent her; contrary to these orders, she told, his name, and Charles Wesley, who had seen him frequently walking by himself, and heard some thing of his character, invited him to breakfast the next morning. An introduction to this little fellowship soon followed; and he also, like them, began to live by rule, and to pick up the very fragments of his time, that not a moment of it might be lost."

The following is Southey's account of Whitefield's qualifications as an orator when he first began preaching:—

"The man who produced this extraordinary effect, had many natural advantages. He was something above the middle stature, well proportioned, though at that time slender, and remarkable for a native gracefulness of manner. His complexion was very fair, his features regular, his eyes, small and lively, of a dark blue colour: in recovering from the measles, he had contracted a squint with one of them; but this peculiarity rather rendered the expression of his countenance more remarkable, than any degree lessened the effect of its uncommon sweetness. His voice excelled both in melody and compass, and its fine modulations were happily accompanied by that grace of action which he possessed in an eminent degree, and which has been said to be the chief requisite of an orator. An ignorant man described his eloquence oddly but strikingly, when he said, that Mr. Whitefield preached like a lion. So strange a comparison conveyed no unapt notion of the force, and vehemence, and passion of that oratory which awed the hearers, and made them tremble like Felix before the apostle. For believing himself to be the messenger of God, commissioned to call sinners to repentance, he spoke as one conscious of his high credentials, with authority and power; yet in all his discourses there was a fervent and melting charity—an earnestness of persuasion—an out-pouring of redundant love, partaking the virtue of that faith from which it flowed, inasmuch as it seemed to enter the heart which it pierced, and to heal it as with balm."

Of his maturer powers, he thus collects the testimony of the most unquestionable witnesses.

"Dr. Franklin has justly observed, that it would have been fortunate for his reputation if he had left no written works; his talents would then have been estimated by the effect which they are known to have produced; for, on this point, there is the evidence of witnesses whose credibility cannot be disputed. Whitefield's writings, of every kind, are certainly below mediocrity. They afford the measure

of his knowledge and of his intellect, but not of his genius as a preacher. His printed sermons, instead of being, as is usual, the most elaborate and finished discourses of their author, have indeed the disadvantage of being precisely those upon which the least care had been bestowed: This may be easily explained.

“By hearing him often,” says Franklin, ‘I came to distinguish easily between sermons newly composed, and those which he had often preached in the course of his travels. His delivery of the latter was so improved by frequent repetition, that every accent, every emphasis, every modulation of voice, was so perfectly well turned, and well placed, that, without being interested in the subject, one could not help being pleased with the discourse—a pleasure of much the same kind with that received from an excellent piece of music. This is an advantage itinerant preachers have over those who are stationary, as the latter cannot well improve their delivery of a sermon by so many rehearsals.’ It was a great advantage, but it was not the only one, nor the greatest, which he derived from repeating his discourses, and reciting instead of reading them. Had they been delivered from a written copy, one delivery would have been like the last; the paper would have operated like a spell, from which he could not depart—*invention sleeping*, while the utterance followed the eye. But when he had nothing before him except the audience whom he was addressing, the judgment and the imagination, as well as the memory, were called forth. Those parts were omitted which had been felt to come feebly from the tongue, and fall heavily upon the ear, and their place was supplied by matter newly laid in the course of his studies, or fresh from the feeling of the moment. They who lived with him could trace him in his sermons to the book which he had last been reading, or the subject which had recently taken his attention. But the salient points of his oratory were not prepared passages,—they were bursts of passions like jets from a Geyser, when the spring is in full play.

“The theatrical talent which he displayed in boyhood, manifested itself strongly in his oratory. When he was about to preach, whether it was from a pulpit, or a table in the streets, or a rising ground, he appeared with a solemnity of manner, and an anxious expression of countenance, that seemed to show how deeply he was possessed with a sense of the importance of what he was about to say. His elocution was perfect. They who heard him most frequently could not remember that he ever stumbled at a word, or hesitated for want of one. He never faltered, unless when the feeling to which he had wrought himself overcame him, and then his speech was interrupted by a flow of tears. Sometimes he would appear to lose all self-command, and weep exceedingly, and stamp loudly and passionately; and sometimes the emotion of his mind exhausted him, and the beholders felt a momentary apprehension even for his life. And, indeed, it is said, that the effect of this vehemence upon his bodily frame was tremendous; that he usually vomited after he had preached, and sometimes discharged in this manner, a considerable quantity of blood. But this was when the effort was over, and nature was left at leisure to relieve herself. While he was on duty, he controlled all sense of infirmity or pain, and made his advantage of the passion to which he had given way. ‘You blame me for weeping,’ he would say, but how can I help it, when you will not weep for your-

selves, though your immortal souls are upon the verge of destruction, and for aught I know you are hearing your last sermon, and may never more have an opportunity to have Christ offered to you!"

"Sometimes he would set before his congregation the agony of our Saviour, as though the scene was actually before them. 'Look yonder!' he would say, stretching out his hand, and pointing while he spake, 'what is it that I see? It is my agonizing Lord! Hark, hark! do you not hear?—O my Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me! nevertheless, not my will, but thine be done!'" This he introduced frequently in his sermons; and one who lived with him says, the effect was not destroyed by repetition; even to those who knew what was coming, it came as forcibly as if they had never heard it before. In this respect it was like fine stage acting; and indeed, Whitefield indulged in an histrionic manner of preaching which would have been offensive if it had not been rendered admirable by his natural gracefulness, and inimitable power. Sometimes at the close of a sermon, he would personate a judge about to perform the last awful part of his office. With his eyes full of tears, and an emotion that made his speech falter, after a pause which kept the whole audience in breathless expectation of what was to come, he would say, 'I am now going to put on my condemning cap. Sinner I must do it: I must pronounce sentence upon you!' and then in a tremendous strain of eloquence, describing the eternal punishment of the wicked, he recited the words of Christ, 'depart from me ye cursed into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels.' 'When he spoke of St. Peter, how, after the cock crew, he went out and wept bitterly, he had a fold of his gown ready, in which he hid his face.

'Perfect as it was, histrionism like this would have produced no lasting effect upon the mind, had it not been for the unaffected earnestness and the indubitable sincerity of the preacher, which equally characterized his manner, whether he rose to 'the height' of passion in his discourse, or won the attention of the motley crowd by the introduction of familiar stories, and illustrations adapted to the meanest capacity. To such digressions his disposition led him, which was naturally inclined to a comic playfulness. Minds of a certain power will sometimes express their strongest feelings with a levity at which formalists are shocked, and which dull men are wholly unable to understand. But language which, when coldly repeated, might seem to border upon irreverence and burlesque, has its effect in popular preaching, when the intention of the speaker is perfectly understood: it is suited to the great mass of the people; it is felt by them when better things would have produced no impression; and it is borne away when wiser arguments would have been forgotten. There was another and more uncommon way in which Whitefield's peculiar talent sometimes was indulged; he could direct his discourse towards an individual so skilfully, that the congregation had no suspicion of any particular purport in that part of the sermon; while the person at whom it was aimed felt it, as it was directed, in its full force. There was sometimes a degree of sportiveness almost a kin to mischief in his humour.

"Remarkable instances are related of the manner in which he impressed his hearers. A man at Exeter stood with stones in his pocket and one in his hand, ready to throw at him; but he dropped

it before the sermon was far advanced, and going up to him after the preaching was over, he said, "Sir, I came to hear you with an intention to break your head; but God through your ministry, has given me a broken heart." A ship-builder was once asked what he thought of him. 'Think!' he replied, 'I tell you, sir, every Sunday I go to my parish church, I can build a ship from stem to stern under the sermon; but, were it to save my soul, under Mr. Whitefield, I could not lay a single plank.' Hume* pronounced him the most ingenious preacher he had ever heard; and said, it was worth while to go twenty miles to hear him. But, perhaps, the greatest proof of his persuasive powers was, when he drew from Franklin's pocket the money which that clear, cool reasoner had determined not to give: it was for the orphan-house at Savannah. 'I did not,' says the American philosopher, 'disapprove of the design; but as Georgia was then destitute of materials and workmen, and it was proposed to send them from Philadelphia at a great expense, I thought it would have been better to have built the house at Philadelphia, and brought the children to it. This I advised; but he was resolute in his first project, rejected my counsel, and I therefore refused to contribute. I happened, soon after, to attend one of his sermons, in the course of which I perceived he intended to finish with a collection, and I silently resolved he should get nothing from me. I had in my pocket a handful of copper money, three or four silver dollars, and five pistoles in gold. As he proceeded I began to soften, and concluded to give the copper; another stroke of his oratory made me ashamed of that, and determined me to give the silver; and he finished so admirably, that I emptied my pocket wholly into the collector's dish, gold and all.'

THE LOSS OF FRIENDS.

"Friend after friend departs.

Who has not lost a friend?

How often have we uttered over the dear form of a beloved friend, the words of the patient, and submissive man of God, "The Lord gave, and the Lord hath taken away, blessed be the name of the Lord." He gave, he has taken away, he has done well. This we admit, yet still we say; who has not lost a friend? We may be resigned; we must submit. It is done, and who can undo? God gave, it was his gift. He might have left us without it, but *he did give*. Oh, a precious gift it was! One we could call *friend*. How sweet the

*One of his flights of oratory, not in the best taste is related on Hume's authority.—After a solemn pause Mr W. thus addressed his audience: "The attendant angel is just about to leave the threshold, and ascend to Heaven; and shall he ascend and not bear with him the news of one sinner, among all the multitude, reclaimed from the error of his ways!" To give the greater effect to this exclamation, he stamped with his foot, lifted up his hands and eyes to Heaven, and cried aloud, "Stop Gabriel! stop, Gabriel! stop, ere you enter the sacred portals, and yet carry with you the news of one sinner converted to God!" Hume said this address was accompanied with such animated, yet natural action, that it surpassed any thing he ever saw or heard in any other preacher.

sound, my friend—my dear friend—my bosom friend—my beloved friend! What a gift? It was God's gift—I might have known it—who else could have been the author of such a gift? I could not claim it. It was given—given for a limited time—I knew not how long. But did I use it well? God did me no injustice in taking it if well used, how much less if I abused it? Yes. He did perfectly right in taking it back. Yet it was a loss, and no small loss. It might not have been to my friend—it might be gain; for it is gain to die, if we die in Jesus. *It was my loss—I have lost a friend.*

But who has not lost? Friend after friend departs. What a mercy that they go one after another! Job lost all his children at one stroke, and that from God. A pestilence sometimes sweeps away whole families and neighbourhoods at once. 'Tis kindness in God to take one at a time, one after another. We think it hard to lose even one, and we mourn as they depart. God does not forbid mourning. Holy Job did pour out his complaint to his friends. "Have pity upon me, have pity upon me, O ye my friends, for the hand of God hath touched me." *We may mourn, for it is our loss.* One after another they go, their number begins to lessen; soon, very soon, *all* will be gone—not one left—no—not one. *We shall go too.* Yes,—to friends and kindred we shall soon say—*Farewell.* O! what a struggle will the last be. As one friend departed, the rest became most choice friends. So it continued, until we had to say, "I have lost my friend."

How often have I heard the widow say, "I have lost my friend, my only earthly stay. Now I am cast on this cruel and unfeeling world. Here are my children, they are fatherless; poor little things, they know not what they have lost. They had just learned to lisp the endearing name of father; but *now* he is no more. At such times we should not forget the goodness of God. I gave you a friend, he says, you loved him; this was right. But you forgot the giver. Your earthly friend is gone, but here is one in his place; a better friend. A better friend you ask? Where can there be a better found? Oh if you did but know *him*, you would find that as friends they will not bear comparison. He is not only a friend, but near as a brother; yea, "he sticketh closer than a brother." Not only a husband, but more,—The father of the fatherless. What a dear friend he must be. How sweet his name must sound. 'Tis Jesus.

That is his name;
How sweet it sounds
In a believer's ears.

A believer is only a friend of his, and Christ will be his friend. He

Soothes his sorrows,
Heals his wounds,
And dries his tears.

Oh! what a friend, when other friends depart! We may lose all others, we may follow them to the tomb and bid adieu even to their dust. But this friend never fails, he is ever near those that will own him as their friend. The very place where others fail and die, *He* gives peace and joy; yes he causes death itself to die.

Oh! have you this friend? Do you complain of loss of friends! Will you have one, you never can lose, one who will never leave, never forsake you? Then, make Jesus your friend, and you will *always* have a friend.

THE SACRED CANONS AND GENERAL COUNCILS

Obligatory on Papists.

Every thing in the way of doctrine and practice in the Roman church, is obligatory on its members in their several stations. To the bishops and priests certain duties belong, arising out of their offices. So of the people in their relation to the church.

The *first* article heading their symbol of faith is as follows:

"I. N. believe and profess, with a firm faith, *all* and *every one* of the things which are contained in the symbol of faith, which is used in the Holy Roman Church."

In the next to the last article, it is as follows:

"I also profess and *undoubtedly* receive *all* other things delivered, defined, and declared by the SACRED CANONS, and general councils, and particularly by the holy Council of Trent; and likewise I also condemn, reject, and anathematize all things contrary thereto, and all heresies whatsoever, condemned, rejected, and anathematized by the church."

The last article as follows:

"*This true Catholic faith, out of which none can be saved*, which I now freely profess, and truly hold, I. N. promise, vow, and *swear most constantly*; to hold and profess the same whole and entire, with God's assistance, to the end of my life; and to procure, as far as lies in my power, that the same shall be *held, taught, and preached* by all *who are under me, or entrusted to my care*, by virtue of my office. So help me God, and these holy gospels of God."

Follow on now my reader to the few quotations we have made from the sacred canon law, which every Romanist, freely professes, truly holds; promises, vows, and swears that he will hold until death; and remember that he declares none can be saved who disbelieve and deny such iniquitous doctrines. Has not the Lord indeed given them over to believe a lie?

CANON LAWS.

De Judiciis. Part, 2. Title v, Sect. III,
Mulier non potest Testis esse.

A Woman cannot be a Witness.

De Judiciis. Part 1. Title VI. Sect. XI.

Non Juramenta, sed perjuria potius sunt dicenda, quæ contra utilitatem Ecclesiasticam attentantur.

They are not OATHS, but PERJURIES, which are proved to be contrary to the good of the Church.

Ib. Si quis, quando juravit, habeat in mente ut veniret contra canonicas sanctiones; non juramentum, sed perjurium potius extitit; nec est aliqua ratione servandum.

If any one, when he hath sworn, believes that it will turn out to be against the Holy Canons; IT IS NOT AN OATH, but rather PERJURY; nor is it by any means to be kept.

Ib. Non juramenta, sed potius perjuria sunt dicenda, quæ contra utilitatem Ecclesiæ, et Sanctorum Patrum veniunt Instituta.

They are not to be called OATHS, but rather PERJURIES which prove contrary to the good of the Church and the instructions of the Holy Fathers.

To these quotations we may add one, from the 4th general council of Lateran, the original Latin of which will be found on page 221 of this Magazine for 1836.

If the temporal lord shall refuse to purge his land of heretics and after being excommunicated, scorns to satisfy; it being made known to the Pope, "*He shall absolve his subjects from their oaths of allegiance, and may expose his country to be seized on by Catholics, who exterminating the heretics, may keep it in the purity of the faith, &c.*"

THIS IS MY BODY.

Matt. xxvi. 26. And as they were eating, Jesus took bread, and blessed it, and brake it, and gave it to the disciples, and said, Take eat **THIS IS MY BODY.** (27.) And he took the cup and gave thanks, and gave it to them saying, Drink ye all of it, (28.) For **THIS IS MY BLOOD** of the New Testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins. (29) But I say unto you, *I will not drink henceforth, of this fruit of the vine, until that day when I drink it new with you in my Father's kingdom."*

Luke xxii. (19.) **THIS IS MY BODY**, which is given for you, this do in remembrance of me.

I. Cor. xi. 24. And when he had given thanks, he brake it and said, take eat: **THIS IS MY BODY** which is broken for you: this do in remembrance of me.

25. After the same manner also he took the cup when he had supped, saying, **THIS CUP IS THE NEW TESTAMENT** in my blood. This do ye; as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me. (26.) For as oft as *ye eat this bread and drink this cup, ye do shew forth the Lord's death till he come.*

Roman Catholics are continually harping upon the text, *This is my body, &c.* declaring that it means, that *the wafer* which they offer up in the mass, is *the real body, blood, soul and divinity of our Saviour.* That any of them do really believe it, we have always questioned. That the passages do not prove it, taken in connection with those in the vi. ch. of John, no one who will read them will believe. But why use the expression in relation to the body, and not to the blood. If "**THIS IS MY BODY,**" is literal, **the other also; THIS (wine) IS MY BLOOD. THIS CUP, IS THE NEW TESTAMENT.** But perhaps they hold it so, as they withhold the cup, and the New Testament both from the people.

But it is to be done in memory of Christ's death, and it would appear very singular, to have the body, blood, soul and divinity, ever before us, in remembrance of itself. But it is in remembrance of one who will no more eat nor drink with us, until we surround his board in heaven.

The same mode of expression precisely will be found repeatedly in the Old Testament, for example look at the following:

The prophet *Ezekiel*, was ordered to shave the hair from his head, divide, burn, and scatter it as *an emblem* of the dealing of God with the Jews. The *emblem* or *sign* the prophet says, "THIS IS JERUSALEM," (Ez. v: 5.)

Zechariah saw in a vision a large flying roll which was a *sign* of God's judgment on the wicked, and his expression is, "THIS IS THE CURSE." (Zec. v:3. In the same chapter 8v. is an ephah, with a woman sitting in it, covered with a talent of lead and carried to be stationed in the land of Shinar, *signifying* the durable miseries of the Jews, when they should have filled up the cup of their iniquity, and of *this sign*, the prophet uses the following language, "THIS IS WICKEDNESS."

If then. "THIS IS MY BODY" is literal—The *hair* was Jerusalem—the *roll* was the curse—the woman and the Ephah,—was wickedness. It is not wonderful that priests are not willing that the people should read the Bible.

DUKE OF BRUNSWICK'S FIFTIETH REASON.

How thoroughly, and constantly the attendants on the services of the Roman church, are imposed upon by the priests, may be seen in the very reasons which are given by them to establish their faith. There is a little book in circulation among the papists, both in Great Britain and the United States, called "*Fifty Reasons for being a Roman Catholic.*" Truly there are enough of reasons, if they are good ones! This book, with these reasons is circulated by papists for the purpose of persuading Protestants to turn Papists. The reasons that induced a *duke* to turn, surely they think should be enough to turn the common people. One of his reasons, the last, and therefore we judge intended for a strong and crowning reason is as follows:

CONSIDERATION L.

"I OBSERVED how several Protestants, who had seemed for many years to be fixed in their persuasion, were converted toward the end of their days, and desired to die in the Roman Catholic faith. Now it is chiefly at the hour of death, that the soul opens its eyes into a clear prospect of things eternal. For my own part, I intend to live, as I should wish to die. And for that reason, I came to a resolution to embrace immediately the Catholic faith; because death is as certain as its hour is uncertain. Besides that, the Catholics, to whom I spoke concerning my salvation, assured me that, if I were to be damned for embracing the Catholic faith, they were ready to answer for me at the day of judgment, AND TO TAKE MY DAMNATION UPON THEMSELVES: AN ASSURANCE I COULD NEVER EXTORT FROM THE MINISTERS OF ANY SECT, IN CASE I SHOULD LIVE AND DIE IN THEIR RELIGION. From whence I inferred the Roman Catholic faith was built upon a better foundation, than any of those sects that have divided from it."

Truly now that is a reason! a *duke's* reason. Won't you be converted by it? Will you not be satisfied, when Roman Catholics,

priests, and people offer themselves to be damned, in case their religion is false? Should it be false, it must be admitted you would be damned for embracing and living under a false religion. They think so. If the Protestant religion should be false, of course we all should be damned, they being judges. But say they it is false and they have strong reasons for believing so, therefore we will all perish; yes preachers and people, every protestant.

Suppose now perchance, the Roman church should prove to be the *Anti-Christ*—the enemy of the gospel. Would her priests and people be in no danger? Would they not likely come under sentence of condemnation? But they will agree to be damned for the convert. How much good it would do either of them in case of proving false, which it is if the word of God be the standard, we cannot see. The teacher and the believer of lies, would both find that they needed stronger reasons, to save them from condemnation, than the silly ones of the duke.

He could not find a protestant minister or lay member, willing to hate God forever, to keep him among protestants. For the credit of the protestant churches, we are glad he could not find even one, who was so stupid.

For the Baltimore Literary and Religious Magazine.

REAL PRESENCE IN THE EUCHARIST.

MESSRS. EDRS.

I have recently been looking over some of your former numbers and have involuntarily been drawn to the consideration of the *real presence in the Eucharist* as maintained by the Roman Catholic church. I find their creed asserts plainly that the bread and wine used in the communion is "*the real body and blood, soul and divinity*" of our Saviour. If our Saviour in the 6th ch. of John at first avers it to be his body and blood in so many words and in the 54th verse says, "Whosoever eateth his flesh and drinketh his blood hath eternal life;" Why was it necessary for him to give an explanation of his words when the Jews murmured; and in the 63rd verse to say "It is the SPIRIT that quickeneth the FLESH PROFITETH NOTHING?"

We know Christ did not come to earth to laugh at us, and when the Jews could not understand, he kindly undertook to explain. If therefore in his explanation he says the *flesh profiteth nothing* could he have meant it *literally* when he said that they who eat his body in the flesh as it must have been, to have blood in it should live for ever?—Christianity is a spiritual matter and must be *spiritually* fed. I never heard that feeding on *meat* would make us Christians but rather to the contrary; as good eating begets evil acts, I would suppose imbibing Christ's *spirit* would sooner make us Christians than eating his *flesh*. I once heard a divine of the Roman Catholic church in his sermon assert, "that he did not know what was the nature of the body in the Eucharist, but he *supposed* it to be similar to that of Elijah in his transfiguration."

Now sir let me ask what he could know about either, unless the scriptures told him, as it necessarily must be from the New Testament if we have any knowledge on the subject.

I subsequently heard bishop England, on the 5th chapter of John. He proceeded very well until he came to the 63rd verse, when he exclaimed "Can it be supposed God Almighty intended to contradict himself?" I certainly concurred with him in the idea, that the great God could under no circumstances contradict himself. As that verse is in the Roman Catholic edition as well as the Protestant edition of the scriptures; it would have afforded me much pleasure to have heard him descant on that, as well as on the preceding verses; but as he declined, allow me to say a few words on that subject.

Our Saviour (being God as Protestants and Roman Catholics all believe) possessing the power of *omniscience*, never could contradict himself; nevertheless I presume it will be admitted that when omniscience and infinity speak to mere man, whose mind and understanding are finite, it would be a rational supposition that he could not in all instances be understood. If then, when the Jews murmured, because they could not understand and called on our Saviour for an explanation he said "it is the *spirit* that quickeneth, the *FLESH PROFITETH NOTHING*. The words I speak unto you they are *SPIRIT*." Can we possibly believe that when in the 54th verse of the 6th ch. of John he says "whoso eateth my *flesh* and drinketh my blood hath eternal life" that he *literally* meant what he said. His explanation shows he did not; for he says "the *FLESH PROFITETH NOTHING*." Our *Saviour* in course reduced himself in his expressions to the understanding of *man*. But as the eastern habit is to speak figuratively; his figures may not at all times have been understood, as would appear to have been the case in this instance: as his hearers could not readily understand him without the explanation which he gave "the *FLESH PROFITETH NOTHING*."

At the time of the last supper, Christ's body had not been broken, neither his blood spilled. How then could he have given either of the Roman Catholics, say it is a miracle? let them read their Testament and they will find that all the miracles performed by our Saviour were *VISIBLE* and so all those performed by the apostles. When the sick were made whole—the leper cured, and the dead brought to life; did not all present witness the change which took place? Is the change which *they say* takes place on blessing the bread and wine *visible*?—Why then can we suppose, or does the scripture give us any account of there being *two* kinds of miracles? And in our own days if *as was said* priest Hohenloe in Germany cured Mrs. Mattingly in Washington, in the United States, several thousand miles removed from her, even that cure was *visible*. If the prayers of the righteous avail before God, it surely will not be contended that all priests are good men. The Roman Catholic Church has its lost sheep and so have all denominations. Can the prayers of such men then effect the change? If they can, then so can those of any other *mere man*.

I am told that Christ when he said to Peter "upon this rock I will build my church and the gates of hell shall not prevail against you," transferred the power to work miracles to him, and he afterwards to

the popes, bishops and priests; and therefore we are to infer, that whether a priest be a good or a bad man the miracle is still performed. But it will be recollected that after this transfer of power to Peter *he did deny his master* and therefore the gates of hell did prevail against him. Could Peter then be the one to whom all the powers claimed by the church was transferred; surely such a rock must have rested on a sandy foundation. Did Christ who could and who did perform miracles ever deny his Father? But it may be asked what did Christ mean when he told Peter the gates of hell, alias the devil; should not prevail against him. There is one thing certain without entering into his meaning, and it is this—that if Christ had intended by so saying that *Peter was infallible* he never would have allowed the devil so to seduce him from his duty and obligation *as to deny his master*. This surely closes all argument on that subject—for as we know the fact to be so, what became of this magnificent power of infallibility in Peter?—that is easily answered; it never was given to him and his *denial* proves it.

Again, let it not be forgotten that Christ was God clothed in *human flesh*. As God, he being a spirit, had *no body*; but as man he had; that body was flesh and blood, similar to our own. Now can it be pretended that this change actually alters the wafer into *human flesh*? This surely is too preposterous.

But one is almost tempted to think the Roman Catholic Church does not believe in its own doctrine, because they give the body (or bread) alone, saying, it being flesh (*and of course human flesh*) contains the blood *in it*. Our Saviour never could have thought so, because *he gave both* bread and wine as the Protestants now do. Here is a glaring inconsistency; to believe him as he speaks and acts in one instance and not in another, on the very same occasion and in an instance too where he was not understood but where an explanation was necessary.

Was there ever an instance where a wafer after having been blessed moulded or decayed from moisture or other causes as would any other vegetable substance? Or can it be supposed that wafers thus blessed have not been lost or mislaid, and become a prey to mice or insects? This I must leave the priests to answer—but if affirmatively (and I do not desire to treat this subject irreverently either as to the Deity or disrespectfully as to our opponents) then I do think our Saviour never intended his body for *such* purposes, neither would he ever have allowed it, if this miraculous change actually had taken place.

As I said before, Christ was God, on earth, clad in human flesh, and the Roman Catholic says it (the wafer) is "the real body *soul and divinity* of Christ; the result is (and it is impossible to avoid it) that the Creator is in the Roman Catholic churches in the shape of a wafer or piece of bread and *they eat him*. The very idea is horrible: for since the ascension of Christ in the days of the apostles, he has not been *visibly* on earth, but is *spiritually*. How then can the *visible wafer* be Christ?

Is it not more rational and more consistent with the whole tenor of the scriptures to believe the sacrament is to be taken in a *spiritual*, and not a *bodily* sense?

As the change takes place at the time of the blessing, in course

after being blessed, the wine is blood, yet Christ himself says in Mathew Ch 26 and ver 29th "I will not drink hence forth of this fruit of the vine, until that day when I drink it new with you in my Father's kingdom" and be it remembered this was after the supper, and he called it "fruit of the vine" but not blood, neither, I would say, did Christ intend to convey the idea that we would drink wine or blood in his Father's kingdom, but that when they met there they would enjoy the benefits the supper was intended to commemorate. In 1st Cor. 11ch and 26th ver. the language is "drink this Cup" and this will be admitted by all to be figurative but if the change had taken place why was not "blood" used instead of Cup". In 1 Cor 10 ch. and 16 ver. the *cup and bread* are called the "*communion*" of the body and blood, why not body and blood at once, and not the communion, and in I. Cor 11ch 25 ver. Christ calls it the New Testament in my blood. A testament being something left to remain *after the death of the testator* as a memorandum of his will and desire and as Christ's *earthly body went up to heaven* he never could have meant to say he would leave a part here on earth, and when he says the act was to be done in "remembrance" of him; it at once dissipates all idea of his *bodily presence*. The Roman Catholic have their pictures and crosses to assist them in remembering those they represent; and why? because they are no longer present in the flesh. So did the Jews keep themselves in remembrance of the passover by a formal ceremony; and Christ always dealt with mankind after their own manner of action.

It is a known fact to all acquainted with the Hebrew language, that it affords no word signifying "representation," and when our Saviour says, "I am the true vine, you are the branches"—"I am the shepherd and you are the sheep"—"I am the door, and any one who enters through me," &c. what did he mean but that he "*represented*" those things; so also when he says, "this is my body," he not only meant it *represented* him, but in so many words said, "*the flesh profiteth nothing*;" did he then in the words of Bishop England mean to contradict himself; or to explain;—and so also in I. Cor. x: 4. St. Paul speaks of Christ being a *rock*, and that it followed the Israelites, and "*they drank of that rock which followed them*;" and in Genesis xli: 26. Joseph expounding Pharaoh's dream to him, says, "the seven kine are seven years, and the seven good ears of corn are seven years." What did he mean, or how could any human being understand him otherwise than that they respectively REPRESENTED those things.

Now sir, if the Pope, council and holy fathers can better explain to us than our Saviour and his Apostles what our Saviour meant, I cannot object to it, but must first be satisfied that the same unanimity of opinion, practice and doctrine exists or ever did exist among them which characterised our Saviour and his apostles

If the Pope is the regular successor of our Saviour then he should be in every instance a good Christian; but if they have been, they must be more than mortal and history does not do them justice.

The Pope and Council do not concur unanimously in all things pertaining to doctrine as *did Christ and his Apostles*, and although the majority in a Roman Council may prevail, can we believe in a doctrine of Christianity, promulgated by a MAJORITY of *fallible* be-

ings. It is the best rule we have to control us in *earthly* measures, but how often do we find their decision erroneous. Shall we therefore rather take the Bible of infallibility for our guide or the explanation of SUCH MEN and *blindly believe and obey*. Let us do rather as Christ directed" in John 5ch 39th ver.—"Search the scriptures for in them ye think ye have eternal life and *they are they which testify of me*". This text being both in the Roman Catholic and Protestant Bible, it may become a matter of propriety for the Roman Catholic to decide whether they will rely on the scriptures or on decrees of popes and councils. B. C.

RULES OF THE PROHIBITORY INDEX.

For prohibiting the reading of such authors as the Pope disapproves.

THE church of Rome, has one great centre and head, from which emanates all laws, rules and directions, for the vast body of people, scattered in different nations, under that name. These laws, rules &c. are obligatory on them by an oath which they have taken, to believe and obey them. This oath is considered so important, that every oath taken in opposition to it, is *perjury in the eyes of the church*. This one fact, will exhibit to us, what a power and force the head of this system who is at Rome has upon all his subjects. The effect naturally expected, may be seen in noticing but the course which they pursue, in their intercourse with their Protestant neighbours; still more plainly may it be seen in the things which they seek. They are under oath bound to do nothing, which the church forbids. The church forbids the use of the scriptures in the vulgar tongue,—hence they cannot consistently read them. She forbids the reading of any work unless approved by the inquisitors, Archbishop &c;—hence every man must go to them, enquire of them, and secure permission before he reads any work.

Booksellers are not to have any books for sale without the approbation of the archbishops. What a delightful time it would be, if *the archbishop* would search all the book stores, and order all the books he disapproved of to be burned. This surely he would be required to do, if circumstances would allow.

Printers as will be seen below in rule 10, sect. 5, are to have spies in their offices, who shall pry into things that they are doing that they may enable the inquisitors of heretical pravity effectually to complete their work.

Below we print the rules for prohibiting books, as issued under Pope Pius V. by order of the Council of Trent. They are a complete system prepared to tyrannize over the mind of man, to prohibit him, from seeing, hearing, or knowing any thing but what his Roman confessor will teach him. Oh! What would man and the world be if such men were permitted to rule in their wickedness and tyranny! The cells of their Cathedrals would be filled with men of piety and learning; waiting the holy acts of the holy inquisition. Here is the work of these holy inquisitors,—hunting out, those that read contrary to the index.

Violation of these rules demands punishment. Could Huss and Jerome of Prague speak, they would tell us the meaning of that punishment that will fall upon those who write and publish contrary to the Index; and Galileo would tell what befalls those who dare investigate beyond the knowledge of the holy church.

The Latin original of these rules will be found in the introduction to the index of books. The edition which we use, and in which they are found, is that printed at Rome in 1819, with additions up to 1827. In some future No. we shall give a more particular account of the indexes, and a specimen of the books there enrolled as prohibited.

Rules of the Index, issued by order of the Holy Council of Trent.

"1. All books condemned by the supreme pontiffs, or general councils, before the year 1515, and not comprised in the present Index, are nevertheless, to be considered as condemned.

"2. The books of heresiarchs, whether of those who broached or disseminated their heresies prior to the year above mentioned, or of those who have been, or are, the heads or leaders of heretics, as Luther, Zuingle, Calvin, Bathshasar Pacimontanus, Swenchfeld, and other similar ones, are altogether forbidden, whatever may be their names, titles, or subjects.

"The books of other heretics, which treat professedly upon religion, are totally condemned.

"But those which do not treat upon religion are allowed to be read, after being examined and approved by Catholic divines, by order of the bishops and inquisitors.

"Those Catholic books also are permitted to be read, which have been composed by authors who have afterwards fallen into heresy, or who, after their fall, have returned into the bosom of the church, provided they have been approved by the theological faculty of some Catholic university, or by the general inquisition.

"3. Translations of ecclesiastical writers, which have been hitherto published by condemned authors, are permitted to be read, if they contain nothing contrary to sound doctrine.

"Translations of the Old Testament may also be allowed, but only to learned and pious men, at the discretion of the bishop; PROVIDED

they use them merely as elucidations of the vulgate version, in order to understand the Holy Scriptures, and not as the sacred text itself.

"But translations of the New Testament made by authors of the first class of this Index, are allowed to no one, since little advantage, but much danger, generally arises from reading them.

"If notes accompany the versions which are allowed to be read, or are joined to the vulgate edition, they may be permitted to be read by the same persons as the versions, after the suspected places have been expunged by the theological faculty of some Catholic university, or by the general inquisitor.

"On the same conditions also, pious and learned men may be permitted to have what is called Vatablus's Bible, or any part of it.

"But the preface and prolegomena of the Bible published by Isidorus Clarus are, however suspected: and the text of his editions is not to be considered as the text of the vulgate edition.

"4 Inasmuch as it is manifest from experience, that if the Holy Bible, translated into the vulgar tongue, be indiscriminately allowed to every one, the temerity of men will cause more evil than good to arise from it, it is, on this point, referred to the judgment of the bishops, or inquisitors, who may, by the advice of the priests or confessor, permit the reading of the Bible translated into the vulgar tongue by Catholic authors, to those persons whose faith and piety, they apprehend, will be augmented, and not

injured by it; *and this permission they must have in writing.*

"But if any one shall have the presumption to read or possess it without such written permission, he shall not receive absolution until he have first delivered up such Bible to the ordinary.

"Booksellers, however, who shall sell, or otherwise dispose of Bibles in the vulgar tongue, to any person not having such permission, shall forfeit the value of the Books, to be applied by the bishop to some pious use; and be subject by the bishop to such other penalties as the bishop shall judge proper, according to the quality of the offence.

"But regulars shall neither read nor purchase such Bibles without a special license from their superiors.

"5. Books of which heretics are the editors, but which contain little or nothing of their-own, being mere compilations from others, as lexicons concordances, apophthegms, similes, indexes, and others of a similar kind, may be allowed by the bishops and inquisitors, after having made, with the advice of Catholic divines, such corrections and emendations as may be deemed requisite.

"6. Books of controversy betwixt the Catholics and heretics of the present time, written in the vulgar tongue, are not to be indiscriminately allowed, but are to be subject to the same regulations as Bibles in the vulgar tongue.

"As to those works in the vulgar tongue, which treat of morality, contemplation, confession, and similar subjects, and which contain nothing contrary to sound doctrine, there is no reason why they should be prohibited; the same may be said also of sermons in the vulgar tongue, designed for the people.

"If in any kingdom or province, any books have been hitherto prohibited, as containing things not proper to be read, without selection, by all sorts of persons, they may be allowed by the bishop and inquisitor, after having corrected them, if written by Catholic authors.

"7. Books professedly treating of lascivious or obscene subjects, or narrating, or teaching them, are ut-

terly prohibited, since, not only faith but morals, which are readily corrupted by the perusal of them, are to be attended to; and those who possess them shall be severely punished by the bishop.

"But the works of antiquity, written by the heathens, are permitted to be read, because of the elegance and propriety of the language; though on no account shall they be suffered to be read by young persons.

"8. Books, the principal subject of which is good, but in which some things are occasionally introduced tending to heresy and impiety, divination or superstition, may be allowed, after they have been corrected by Catholic divines, by the authority of the general inquisition.

"The same judgment is also formed of prefaces, summaries, or notes, taken from the condemned authors, and inserted in the works of authors not condemned; but such works must not be printed in future, until they have been amended.

"9. All books and writings of geomancy, hydromancy, aeromancy, pyromancy, onomancy, chiromancy, and necromancy; or which treat of sorceries, poisons, auguries, auspices, or magical incantations, are utterly rejected.

"The bishops shall also diligently guard against any persons reading or keeping any books, treatises, or indexes, which treat of judicial astrology, or contain presumptuous predictions of the events of future contingencies, and fortuitous occurrences, or of those actions which depend upon the will of man.

But such opinions and observations of natural things as are written in aid of navigation, agriculture, and medicine, are permitted.

"10. In the printing of books or other writings, the rules shall be observed, which were ordained in the 10th session of the council of Lateran, under Leo X.

"Therefore, if any book is to be printed in the city of Rome it shall first be examined by the Pope's Vicar and the master of the sacred palace, or other persons chosen by our most holy father for that purpose.

"In other places, the examination of any book or manuscript intended to be printed shall be referred to the bishop, or some skillful person whom he shall nominate, and the inquisitor of heretical pravity of the city or diocese in which the impression is executed, who shall gratuitously and without delay affix their approbation to the work in their own handwriting, subject, nevertheless, to the pains and censures contained in the said decree; this law and condition being added, that an authentic copy of the book to be printed, signed by the author himself, shall remain in the hands of the examiner.

"But it is the judgment of the fathers of the present deputation, that those persons who publish works in manuscript, before they have been examined and approved, should be subject to the same penalties as those who print them; and that those who read or possess them should be considered as the authors, if the real authors of such writings do not avow themselves.

"The approbation given in writing shall be placed at the head of the books, whether printed or in manuscript, that they may appear to be duly authorised; and this examination and approbation, &c. shall be granted gratuitously.

"Moreover, in every city and diocese, the house or places where the art of printing is exercised, and also the shops of booksellers, SHALL BE FREQUENTLY VISITED BY PERSONS DEPUTED FOR THAT PURPOSE BY THE BISHOP OR HIS VICAR, CONJOINTLY WITH THE INQUISITOR OF HERETICAL PRAVITY, SO THAT NOTHING THAT IS PROHIBITED MAY BE PRINTED, KEPT, OR SOLD.

"Booksellers of every description shall keep in their libraries a catalogue of the books which they have on sale, signed by the said deputies; nor shall they keep or sell, nor in any way dispose of any other books, without permission from the deputies, under pain of forfeiting the books, and being liable to such other penalties as shall be judged proper by the bishop or inquisitor, who shall also punish the buyers, readers, or printers of such works.

"If any person import foreign books into any city, they shall be obliged to announce them to the deputies; or if this kind of merchandize be exposed to sale in any public place, the public officers of the place shall signify to the said deputies, that such books have been brought; but no one shall presume to give to read, or lend, or sell, any book which he or any other person has brought into the city, until he has shown it to the deputies and obtained their permission, unless it be a work well known to be universally allowed.

"Heirs and testamentary executors shall make no use of the books of the deceased, nor in any way transfer them to others, until they have presented a catalogue of them to the deputies, and obtained their licence.

"But in all cases of refusal, they shall be subject to the confiscation of the books, or the infliction of such other punishment as the bishop or inquisitor shall deem proper, according to the contumacy or quality of the delinquent.

"With regard to those books which the fathers of the present deputation shall examine, or correct, or deliver to be corrected, or permit to be reprinted on certain conditions, booksellers and others shall be bound to observe whatever is ordained respecting them.

"The bishops and general inquisitors shall, nevertheless, be at liberty, according to the power they possess, to prohibit such books as may seem to be permitted by these rules, if they deem it necessary for the good of the kingdom, or province, or diocese.

Let the secretary of these fathers, according to the command of our holy father, transmit to the notary of the general inquisitor, the names of the books that have been corrected, as well as of the persons to whom the fathers have granted the power of examination.

"Finally, it is enjoined on all the faithful, that no one presume to keep or read any books contrary to these rules, or prohibited by this Index.

But if any one keep or read any

books composed by heretics, or the writings of any author suspected of heresy or false doctrine, he shall instantly incur the sentence of excommunication.

"Those who read or keep works terdicted on another account, besides the mortal sin committed, shall be severely punished at the will of the bishops."

BULL OF POPE PIUS VII. AGAINST
BIBLE SOCIETIES.

If opposition to the *words of the living God*, be opposition to God himself, there is a very simple exposition of that passage "*WHO OPPOSETH, and exalleth himself* above all that is called God, &c. (2. Thes. II. 4.) Surely there cannot be greater evidence of hostility—of opposition to the Lord, than the published opinions of Pius VII. in which he says "*he is shocked at the crafty device, by which the very foundations of religion are undermined*"—"a pestilence" "a defilement of the faith, imminently dangerous to souls"—"*impious machinations*"—"a nefarious scheme of wickedness"—"*tares which the adversary has sown.*" These are the epithets applied by the pope, the holy head of the only holy church, to the circulation of the word of God. He is shocked at the audacity and wickedness of men, who are engaged in spreading the Word of Life, and he charges upon his Bishops (who are bound on oath to obey him) that they perform whatever they can, *by power, counsel, or authority*, to oppose the same. They in so doing are fighting the battles of the Lord, and he assures them that *he has conferred in council* with Cardinals &c. and deliberated upon the measures to put a stop to it, &c.

Read this Bull and when you are done, answer the question, Who is it that opposeth and exalleth himself, &c.?

Translation of the Bull against Bible Societies, issued June 29th, 1816, by POPE PIUS VII. to the Archbishop of Gnesn, Primate of Poland.

PIUS P. P. VII.

VENERABLE BROTHER.

Health and apostical benediction.

In our last letter to you we promised, very soon, to return an answer to yours; in which you have appealed to this Holy See, in the name of the other Bishops of Poland, respecting what are called *Bible Societies*, and have earnestly inquired of us what you ought to do in this affair. We long since, indeed, wished to comply with your request; but an incredible variety of weighty concerns have so pressed upon us on every side, that, till this day, we could not yield to your solicitation.

We have been truly shocked at this most crafty device, by which the very foundations of religion are undermined; and, having, because of the great importance of the subject, conferred in Council with our venerable brethren, the Cardinals of the Holy Roman Church, we have with the utmost care and attention, deliberated upon the measures proper to be adopted by our Pontifical authority, in order to remedy and abolish this pestilence as far as possible. In the mean time, we heartily congratulate you, venerable brother; and we commend you again and again in the Lord, as it is fit we should, upon the singular zeal you have displayed under circumstances so dangerous to Christianity, in having denounced to the Apostolic See, *this defilement of the faith, so imminently dangerous to souls.* And although we perceive that it is not at all necessary to excite him to activity who is making haste, since of your own accord you have already shown an ardent desire to detect and overthrow the *impious machinations of these innovators; yet, in conformity with our office, we again and again exhort*

you, that whatever you can achieve by power, provide for by counsel, or effect by authority, you will daily execute with the utmost earnestness, placing yourself as a wall for the House of Israel.

With this view we issue the present Brief, viz. that we may convey to you a signal testimony of our approbation of your excellent conduct, and also may endeavour therein still more and more to excite your pastoral solicitude and diligence. For the general good imperiously requires you to combine all your means and energies to frustrate the plans which are prepared by its enemies for the destruction of our most holy religion: whence it becomes an Episcopal duty, that you first of all expose the wickedness of this nefarious scheme, as you have already done so admirably, to the view of the faithful, and openly publish the same, according to the rules prescribed by the Church, with all the erudition and wisdom which you possess; namely, 'that the Bible printed by Heretics is to be numbered among other prohibited books, conformably to the Rules of the Index, (§No. 2 and 3.) for it is evident from experience, that the Holy Scriptures, when circulated in the vulgar tongue, have, through the temerity of men, produced more harm than benefit.' (Rule IV.) And this is the more to be dreaded in times so depraved, when our holy religion is assailed from every quarter with great cunning and effort, and the most grievous wounds are inflicted on the Church. It is, therefore, necessary to adhere to the salutary decree of the Congregation of the Index (June 18th 1757,) that no versions of the Bible in the vulgar* tongue be permitted, except such as are approved by the Apostolic See, or published with an-

notations extracted from the writing of holy fathers of the Church.

We confidently hope that, in these turbulent circumstances, the Poles will give the clearest proofs of their attachment to the religion of their ancestors; and, by your care, as well as that of the other Prelates of this kingdom, whom on account of the stand they have wonderfully made for the depository of the faith we congratulate in the Lord, trusting that they all may very abundantly justify the opinion we have entertained of them.

It is moreover necessary that you should transmit to us, as soon as possible, the Bible which JACOB WITK published in the Polish language with a commentary, as well as a copy of the edition of it lately put forth without those annotations, taken from the writings of the holy fathers of our Church, or other learned Catholics, with your opinion upon it; that thus, from collating them together, it may be ascertained, after mature investigation, that certain errors lie insidiously concealed therein, and that we may pronounce our judgment on this affair for the preservation of the true faith.

Continue, therefore, venerable brother, to pursue this truly pious course upon which you have entered: viz. diligently to fight the battles of the Lord for the sound doctrine, and warn the people intrusted to your care, that they fall not into the snares which are prepared for their everlasting ruin. The Church demands this from you, as well as from the other Bishops, whom our rescript equally concerns; and we most anxiously expect it, that the deep sorrow we feel on account of this new species of tares which an adversary has so abundantly sown, may, by this cheering hope, be somewhat alleviated: and, we always very heartily invoke the choicest blessings upon yourself and your fellow Bishops, for the good of the Lord's flock, which we impart to you and them by our Apostolic benediction.

Given at Rome, at St. Mary the Greater, June 29, 1816, the 17th year of our Pontificate.

PIUS P. P. VII.

*It will be seen that no Bible in the vulgar tongue is permitted, unless it has annotations approved by the church, which will act as an antidote to the pure word of God. They cannot trust God's own word to the people; it will ruin them!

† JOHN BISHOP OF NEW YORK.

Lord of the conscience, and the intellect of his people.

Will not every young man, who has been educated in the Catholic church in this country swell with indignation when he reads the Letter of the Bishop of New York. "The freedom of speech and the press, by the constitution of the U. S. is guaranteed to every man in the land. A few young men in the city of New York, presuming upon this, had formed themselves into a society for the promotion of religious knowledge; upon which the Bishop comes out, denouncing it is dangerous, *as prohibited by him*, and censures the Editor of the diary for commending it. He denies them the privilege of reading any thing but what he approves, carrying out the rules of the Index, and at the same time commending to their notice, if they wish to read, the Jesuitical works of *Milner and Bossuet*.

Let it no longer be said; Rome does not hate light, that she loves free discussion.

NEW YORK CATHOLIC SOCIETY.

To the Editor of the Truth Teller.

NEW YORK, Oct. 3, 1836.

Having read, to my great surprise, in the Catholic Diary of last Saturday, a notice of a society, calling itself the New York Catholic Society, for the promotion of religious knowledge, of the existence of which I was ignorant, with an Editorial article encouraging and drawing public attention to such a society. Whether application has been made to you to publish the same, or wisely you decline publishing it—I consider it my duty to request you to publish the following copy of my letter to the Editor of that paper, in order to obviate as soon as possible, the mischief

which such a Society, if countenanced, might produce. You know my opposition to controversial disputes on religion, particularly in debating Societies, or newspapers. Sherlock, if I remember well, has with some propriety observed that no man is *reasoned out of his religion*; there are, no doubt, some exceptions, but they are only in favor of simplicity, good sense, purity of morals, and above all fervent prayers. Generally speaking, those controversial disputes are only calculated to create ill will among citizens, filled with contrary prejudices,—enough has been said and written to convince a sincere enquirer after truth.

To the Ed. of the Catholic Dairy.

In the Catholic Dairy of Saturday last, October 1st, I find a notice from you, of a society *calling itself*, the New York Catholic Society, for the promotion of religious knowledge. Of the existence of that Society, I was utterly ignorant, and feel surprised that you, who ought to know better, would think of encouraging and drawing public attention to such a Society, without first ascertaining the sentiments of your Ordinary on so important a subject. The Church wisely ordains that nothing of the nature of this Society can be established without the approbation of the Bishop of the Diocese, where it is meant to introduce it, and that permitted, it should be governed by such rules and regulations as to him may seem proper, for it obviously partakes of the nature of a Theological School,—Far be it from me to impede the progress of religious knowledge; nothing could be more dear to my heart than to encourage whatever contributes effectually to its promotion; but placed as I am, as a sentinel over the sacred ark of religion, it is my imperative duty to prevent it from being touched by profane or unpractised hands.

So far from viewing this Society in the light you see it, it is my decided conviction that it ought not to be sanctioned by me; how can it be supposed that young men, whose education is chiefly mercantile of

mechanical, can come with sufficient preparation to the discussion of a question that requires vast erudition with a degree of research, which they cannot possess; you cannot be ignorant of the severe mental discipline to which students are subjected in our Theological Seminaries, before they are allowed to commence the study of theology. You know also, that this study is regulated by experienced and able professors, that young men are not allowed to grope their way with only their own feeble light, through the dark mazes of deceitful cavil and infidel sophistry.

The members of this society, who thirst so much for religious knowledge, can read our elementary works and also, the masterly productions of Milner, Fletcher, Bossuet's history of the Variations, lately printed, and others, where they are sure to find the tenets of our faith explained with a precision and elegance that cannot fail to satisfy the sincere inquirer after truth. The precision of ideas, and elegance of expression in the imparting of religious knowledge, their preamble sets forth to be the main objects of this Society, and it covers the desire and intention of acquiring that species of tact and dexterity in theological debate, which would enable them to follow into the arena the fanatics of the day. All this I must condemn as well as the publication of crude essays of tyros among us. Let us dispute less and practise more.

The Church in the most positive manner prohibits all laymen from entering into *dispute* on points of religion with sectarians, "inhibemus," says Pope Alexander IV., "ne sin quam Laicæ Personæ liceat publice vel privatim de fide Catholica disputare; qui vere contrafecerit, Excommunicationis laqueo innodetur;" had you recollected this sentence, I am sure you would be far from calling on the Catholic young men of this city, to become members of a debating society on religious subjects, open to so many serious objections.

†JOHN, Bishop of N. York.

THE TWO LITTLE BOYS AND THEIR BIBLE.

We have often heard, and read of the two little boys mentioned in the following letter, addressed to the Editor of the London Evangelical Magazine in the month of December 1819; but have never seen the particulars as they are here recorded by the individual who had gathered them. It is such a delightful exhibition of *the value* of sabbath school instructions, and of that blessed book which God has given us for the rule of our lives; such a comment upon the reading of the scriptures in the vulgar tongue, (the authority of the Pope and the Catholic church to the contrary, notwithstanding) that we cannot refrain from giving it a place in our columns.

"The circumstance to which I allude is introduced to our notice in the following words: 'About three weeks ago, two little boys, decently clothed—the eldest appearing about thirteen, and the youngest eleven, called at the lodging house for vagrants in this town, (Warrington,) for a night's lodging: the Keeper of the House (very properly) took them to the Vagrant Office to be examined; and, if proper objects, to be relieved. The account they gave of themselves was extremely affecting; and no doubt was entertained of its truth. It appeared, that but a few weeks had elapsed since these poor little wanderers had resided with their parents in London. The typhus fever, however, in one day, carried off both father and mother, leaving them orphans, in a wide world, without a home and without friends! Immediately after the last mournful tribute had been paid to their parents' memory, having an uncle in Liverpool—poor and destitute as they were, they resolved to go and throw themselves upon his protection. Tired therefore and faint,

they arrived in this town on their way. Two bundles contained their little all. In the youngest boy's was found, neatly covered and carefully preserved, a *Bible*. The keeper of the lodging-house, addressing the little boy, said, 'you have neither money nor meat, will you sell me this Bible? I will give you five shillings for it.' 'No!' exclaimed he, (the tears rolling down his youthful cheeks) 'I'll *starve* first.' He then said, 'There are plenty of books to be bought besides this: why do you love the Bible so much?' He replied, 'No book has stood my friend so much as my Bible.' 'Why, what has your Bible done for you?' said he. He answered, '*when I was a little boy, about seven years of age, I became a Sunday Scholar, in London, through the kind attention of my master, I soon learnt to read my Bible:—this Bible, young as I was, shewed me that I was a sinner, and a great one too; it also pointed me to a Saviour, and I thank God that I have found mercy at the hands of Christ, and am not ashamed to confess him before the world.*' To try him still further, six shillings was then offered him for his Bible. 'No,' said he, 'for it has been my support all the way from London: hungry and weary, often have I sat down by the way side to read my Bible, and have found refreshment from it. Thus did he experience the consolations of the Psalmist, when he said, 'In the multitude of the sorrows that I had in my heart, thy comforts have refreshed my soul.' He was then asked. 'What will you do when you get to Liverpool, should your uncle refuse to take you in? His reply may excite a blush in many established Christians. 'My Bible, tells me,' said he, 'When my father and mother forsake me, then the LORD will take me up.' The man could go no further, tears choked his utterance, and they both wept together. They had, in their pockets, tickets, as reward for their good conduct, from the school to which they belonged, and thankfulness and humility were visible in all their deportment. At night these

two little orphans, bending their knees by the side of their bed, committed themselves to the care of their Heavenly Father—to him whose ears are ever open to the prayers of the poor destitute; and to him who has said, 'Call upon me in the day of trouble: I will deliver thee, and thou shalt glorify me.' The next morning these refreshed little wanderers arose early, addressed themselves to their journey, and set out for the town of Liverpool; and may HE who hears the ravens when they cry, hear and answer their petitions guide them through time, and bless them in eternity."

SETTLING ACCOUNTS.

When a minister of the gospel was spending a few weeks in Edinburgh, there came, on business, to the house where he was, a man of the world. He was introduced to the minister in the following manner: "This is an acquaintance of mine and I am sorry to add, though young and healthy, never attends public worship;" "I am almost tempted to hope that you are bearing false witness, against your neighbor;" replied the minister. "By no means," said the man, "for I always spend my Sunday in settling accounts. The minister replied, "you will find sir, that *the day of judgment will be spent in the same manner.*"

JOHN RANDOLPH'S MOTHER.

The late John Randolph. some years before his death wrote to a friend about as follows: "I used to be called a Frenchman, because I took the French side in politics; and though this was unjust, yet the truth is, I should have been a French atheist, if it had not been for *one recollection*, and that was the memory of the time when my departed mother used to take my little hands in hers, and cause me on my knees to say, "*Our Father which art in heaven.*"

THE
BALTIMORE LITERARY
AND
RELIGIOUS MAGAZINE

FEBRUARY, 1837.

No. 2.

THE INHUMANITY OF PRIESTS

GILDEA of *St. Mary's Church*, and KERNEY of *St. Patrick's Church (Fell's Point.)*

THESE two priests, with every papist are sworn to believe and hold the doctrines and decrees of the Council of Trent. Some of them are as follows:

"This true Catholic Faith out of which none can be saved." See Creed.

In the seventh session of the Council of Trent, in the decree respecting *Sacraments in general*, are the following canons.

Canon 8. "Whosoever shall affirm that grace is not conferred by these sacraments of the new law, *by their own power*, but that faith in the divine promise is all that is necessary to obtain grace; let him be accursed."

Canon 9. "Whoever shall affirm that a character, that is, a certain spiritual and indelible mark, is not impressed on the soul by the three sacraments of baptism, confirmation and orders; for which reason they cannot be repeated: let him be accursed."

Canon 11. "Whosoever shall affirm that when ministers perform and confer a sacrament, it is not necessary that they should have an intention to do what the church does: let him be accursed."

(8. "Si quis dixerit, per ipsa novæ legis Sacramenta ex opere operato non conferri gratiam, sed solam fidem divinæ promissionis ad gratiam consequendam sufficere; anathema sit.

9. Si quis dixerit in tribus Sacramentis, Baptismo scilicet, Confirmatione, et Ordine, non imprimi characterem in anima, hoc est, signum quoddam spirituale, et indelebile, undè ea iterari non possunt; anathema sit.

11. Si quis dixerit, in ministris, dum Sacramenta conficiunt, et conferunt, non requiri intentionem saltem faciendi quod facit Ecclesia; anathema sit.")

The catechism published in this city contains the following. Page 142—3. "Representing as he does, in the discharge of his sacred functions, not his own, but THE PERSON OF CHRIST, the minister of the sacraments, be he good or bad, VALIDLY CONSECRATES AND CONFERS THE SACRAMENTS, provided he make use of the matter and

form instituted by Christ, and also observed in the Catholic church, and intends to do what the church does in their administration."

SACRAMENT OF ORDERS. XXIII. Sess. 1 ch.

"The power was given (to the Priesthood) to consecrate, offer, and minister his (Christ's) body and blood, and also to *remit and retain sins.*" See *Latin decrees.*

On page 283 of the Catechism, it is stated that the priests are the representatives of God upon earth, and have the power of remitting sins"

On page 242, we read thus. "The power with which the priests of the new law are invested is not simply to declare that sins are forgiven, but as the minister of God *really to absolve from sin.*"

SACRAMENT OF EXTREME UNCTION.—XIV. Sess. 2 ch.

The effect of this sacrament: "For this power (of the sacrament) is the grace of the Holy Spirit; WHOSE UNCTION CLEANSSES AWAY SINS, IF ANY REMAIN TO BE EXPIATED, EVEN THE LAST TRACES OF SIN; and relieves and confirms the soul of the sick man, exciting in him strong confidence of the divine mercy; by which strengthened, he bears far better the inconveniences and pains of his disorder, resists more easily the temptations of the devil, who does as it were, lie in wait at his heels; and SOMETIMES OBTAINS THE RESTORATION OF HIS BODILY HEALTH, IF THE SAME SHALL FURTHER THE SALVATION OF HIS SOUL."

"The grace of this sacrament remits sins, especially lighter offences, or as they are commonly called venial sins. Its primary object is not to remit mortal sins. For this the sacrament of penance was instituted, as was that of baptism for the remission of original sin." Catechism, p. 280.

THE TIME THIS SACRAMENT IS TO BE GIVEN.

Sess. xiv. ch. 3. The council also declares that this unction is to be applied to the sick, and especially to those who lie in so dangerous a state, as in all appearance to be appointed to death, whence it is called 'the sacrament of the dying.'

Catechism, page 280.—"The administration of this sacrament, therefore is committed to priests" "In this, as in the others, it is also to be distinctly recollected, that the priest is the representative of Jesus Christ and his church." And on page 278,

"Extreme unction is to be administered to those only whose malady is such as to excite apprehensions of approaching dissolution. It is, however, a very grievous sin to defer the holy unction until all hope of recovery now lost, life begins to ebb, and the sick person is fast verging into insensibility."—"Extreme unction, then, CAN BE ADMINISTERED ONLY TO THE SICK, and not to persons in health, although engaged in any thing however dangerous, such as a perilous voyage, or the fatal dangers of battle. It cannot be administered even to persons condemned to death, and already ordered for execution."

Canon 2. "Whoever shall affirm, that the sacred unction of the sick does not confer grace, NOR FORGIVE SIN, NOR RELIEVE THE SICK: but that its power has ceased, as if the gift of healing existed only in past ages: let him be accursed."

The reader will at once perceive, that we have given, without comment the doctrine of the Roman Catholic church, as stated by themselves in their most accredited, and standard works. The

quotations from the Catechism are from the edition published in this city, at the Cathedral. The Latin of those from the decrees of the Council of Trent, is given below, that they may be compared, excepting where the same sentiment is directly expressed in the Catechism.

It will be perceived on reading the above: that the papists believe, "that there is no salvation out of the church of Rome;"—that the priest in the celebration of a sacrament, does BY THE MERE FACT OF HIS PERFORMING IT with a right intention, impress a character, or spiritual and indelible mark upon the individual for whose benefit it is done; that a priest can REMIT, RETAIN, and REALLY ABSOLVE FROM SIN; and that the sacrament of extreme unction administered to a sick man, cleanses away sins if any remain to be expiated, even the last traces; and whoever denies that it does not confer grace, nor forgive sins, nor relieve the sick; LET HIM BE ACCURSED (anathema.) "This sacrament cannot be administered to a person condemned to death and ordered to be executed." See above.

We have been thus particular in bringing forward the power of the priest, that the way may be prepared for the following statement of facts, and for our comments thereon.

"Departed this life, on Thursday the 12th of January, after a long and lingering illness, ROBERT A. GREEN, in the 24th year of his age." One of this young man's parents was a Catholic, perhaps both—he was married by the priest,* before which could be done, he confessed as was necessary to the performance of the ceremony. During the sickness which terminated in his death, and but a few days, before he died, he or some of his family sent for a priest, another went for the second. They both came, but instead of ministering to the soul of the dying man, and endeavouring to bring before his mind the great, and important concerns, of that immortal spirit, which was just on the borders of the eternal world—instead of giving to the man, that consolation in the hour of death, which the priests of the church of Rome profess to be able to give them;—instead of administering that sacrament, which they profess to believe remits, all the remaining traces of sin, and prepares the soul for death,—they refused doing any thing for him, unless he would renounce the ODD FELLOWS.

In passing we may remark, that the society of ODD FELLOWS, were contributing regularly, Three Dollars per week, during his protracted sickness for the support of himself and family, and that his funeral expenses were paid by them. We know nothing of this association, but what is here stated, and that the same rule applies to all their sick members.

THE PRIESTS, were Rev. JOHN GILDEA, of St. Mary's Church and Rev. NICHOLAS KERNEY, of St. Patrick's Church, Fell's Point.

I. Each of these priests claims, the power of retaining and remitting sins: They believe, (or else they deny the doctrines which they have sworn they believe, and will diligently teach) that if they have the intention when they administer these sacraments, that they will effectually, and that from the mere performance, produce a

* We have since learned by Mr. Kerney.

spiritual impression. They believe that the power of life and death, or in other words (the consequence follows) that they can save or damn men, that by their ceremonies they can rescue a man from hell, and give him a place in heaven; that they can bind a man's sins upon him, and send him down under their load to writhe amid the torments of hell forever!! What else can their interdicts and bans of excommunication mean? What do they mean by excluding a man from the pretended benefits of their church, and cursing him *by refusing him a burial in their consecrated ground!*

One of the iniquitous usurpations of the papacy, is the power of making every thing holy, and then refusing it unless the individual will assent to their directions. But the day is breaking, and throwing light upon this subject. People even under the dominion of the priest, are beginning to believe and sometimes to act upon the principle, that a man's bones will rest as quietly and safely in ground that has not been sprinkled with holy water or blessed by the priest.

II. It will at once be acceded to by every Roman Catholic, that if the priest has the power, or believes that he has, to relieve a sick man,—to take away his sins,—prepare him for death,—and then after death, by the sacrifice of the Mass to deliver him from Purgatory;—that it will not only be his bounden duty, but that he should by the mere impulse of human kindness, be led *at once* to administer each, any or all of the sacraments, without compensation, and without delay. The neglect, much less the refusal to perform the office required should mark him, as one who had trifled with a man's soul. Such would be the conclusion in the case of a negligent physician of the body.

Priests claiming the above powers, and charging upon themselves the duties growing out of them, have a ready admission at such times to their sick and dying. Did Mess. GILDEA or KERNEY visit this man? Did they offer to administer the sacraments of extreme unction? Did he refuse to let them administer it? One or the other was true. But a day before the man died, we heard that *the priests had refused to do any thing for him; unless he would renounce the Odd Fellows.* The man, and his friends thought this could do him no good. And it does not appear, what effect this could have upon their not performing the ceremony.

Now, *no man, unless he is insane and continues such, or a malefactor who has been condemned to die by the hands of the executioner, is excluded from the benefit of the Sacrament of Extreme Unction, and may be buried in holy ground.* Why then, we ask was the privilege refused to this man? Why was nothing done for him? Is there any reason that can be given, other, than that he would not renounce the Odd Fellows? If there be any reason for their conduct, or we have drawn false conclusions from the facts. Messrs. KERNEY and GILDEA, shall have the use of our columns to correct, and point out our errors.

III. Should it prove true, as we have every reason to believe, we beg our readers, the friends of the deceased, the public to look at it. Here are two men, who profess to have the power of opening or shutting heaven, against their fellow men; who profess to believe that the soul of man, will spend an eternity in happiness, or misery;

who profess, and positively swear that they believe themselves appointed by God to act in this matter; and who are bound to teach their people that they must believe in them, under penalty of damnation, and yet refuse to save a man from perishing.

In the present case which we have before us, we have the exhibition of a spirit of cruelty and vengeance, that would have graced the papacy, in the days, when, the fire, the faggot, and all the untold cruelties of the inquisition, would have been the portion of the individual who should even dare to think contrary to the priest. Here we have no public wreaking of vengeance upon the transgressor, as in papal countries, but it is the same spirit. Look at it. It is not merely a sentence of excommunication or an interdict, during which all the privileges of the church were prohibited, and the burying of the dead in holy ground, forbidden. They have gone farther. Believing that they had power over him, to save him by THE MERE PERFORMANCE of the sacrament—yet, they refused. They would do nothing for him—they would not let him be buried in holy ground. Why? He died out of the church! Did he not send for the priest? Was he not received into it by baptism?—then at his marriage did he not renew his membership? and here again on his death bed, was not the priest sent for? Whose fault, (and there were two priests at his house) was it that he did not die in the church and partake of its benefits? Oh!—not the Priests.—*He was an Odd Fellow.* Surely every Catholic that is an Odd Fellow, and every Odd Fellow, who may wish to be buried in holy ground or be saved by the priests had better see about it in time!

The treatment of *Mr. Green*, was cruel, to say the least. In the last hours of life; when a man is just about to separate from the wife of his choice, the child that God had given them,—from the friends of his youth, and his rising manhood,—at such a time to be treated even with indifference, betrays a want of those feelings that adorn a man. But to be refused by those, who profess to believe that they, and *they only can help them*—is indeed, inhuman. To be treated *then*, as those who are insane, or condemned criminals, is indeed an aggravation of their cruelty.

When these two men, pass up, and down, through the eastern sections of the city, and over Fell's Point, endeavouring to make converts to their system of superstition, we would bear a caution to the desired convert. Beware of the dying hour and the proffered hope!

Once more, and we are done. These are the professed followers, and they declare themselves the only ministers of Jesus Christ; But here we have another, added to the innumerable instances, of conduct and practice any thing else than becoming his servants. *Jesus*, "came to bind up the broken hearted,"—"to heal the sick,"—"to comfort the mourning,"—"to give himself a ransom for sinners," These priests demand, the *veneration due to Jesus Christ himself*—but *he* said "that he came to *seek*, and to *save that which was lost*." He feels for us. He hears our prayers, and he will do, what no priest can; "go with us through the dark valley of the shadow of death," and we need "fear no evil."—Psalms xxvii. 4.

From the Catholic Almanac of 1837, we take the following account of the *Pope and his Council*, and the number of the Cardinals.

CHAPTER I.

The Pope and his Council.

The reigning *Pope Gregory XVI.*, (Maurus Capellari), was born at Belluno in the Venetian States, on the 18th of September, 1765. In his youth he entered the *Benedictine Order* of the Camalduli, and for many years was professor of belles-letters, history, philosophy and divinity. He was appointed Procurator General of his Order, and Superior of the Convent founded at Rome by Pope St. Gregory. Pius VII. knowing his merit, named him examiner of all the elected bishops, and consultor of many of the *Congregations*, particularly those of Propaganda and Ecclesiastical Affairs. He manifested in his several stations vast erudition, excellent judgment, discretionary prudence, and solid piety. Leo XII. trusted to him many important commissions, among which was that of reorganizing the schools of the Roman State. He reserved him *in petto** in the conclave of the 21st of March, 1825, to be a cardinal, and declared him such on the 13th of March, 1826. He was made Cardinal-Priest with the title of St. Callixtus, and Prefect of the Propaganda, a trust of great importance and extensive privileges, which he discharged with diligence and ability. He was *elected Pope* on the 2nd of Feb. 1831, was consecrated bishop, and inaugurated as Sovereign Pontiff on the 6th of the same month. (*U. S. Cath. Miscel.* Vol. x. p. 335.

The Council of the Pope is the Sacred College of Cardinals, which, according to a Bull of Sixtus V. dated December 3d, 1586, consists of seventy members, who are distributed into three classes; six Cardinal *Bishops*, fifty Cardinal *Priests*, and fourteen Cardinal *Deacons*.

The title of Cardinal was originally given to clergymen who were attached to particular churches in the capacity of Curates. They were distinguished by this name from other clergymen who had no determinate place for the exercise of their functions, but officiated in different churches according to the order of their ecclesiastical superior. The appellation of Cardinal (which is derived from the Latin word *Cardo*, a hinge), signified that their locality was fixed, that like a door resting upon its hinges, the respective stations to which they had been appointed depended on them for the benefit of religion. The same word was sometimes employed for the sake of distinction among bishops and deacons. By a cardinal bishop was understood a prelate who was charged with the government of a special district. Cardinal deacons were those who were appointed to serve minor churches, called *diaconia* and *oratories*. Historians do not agree upon the precise period at which this title was first introduced. Some contend that it was used as early as the year 150, while others date its commencement from the close of the third century. It is certain however, as Fleury observes, that this mode of expression was very common under the pontificate of St. Gregory the Great, and in general acceptance throughout the

* This term signifies that the Pope apprises the Sacred College of certain appointments he has made to the Cardinalship, but, for sufficient reasons does not yet publish the names of those promoted.

Latin Church. In the course of time it was applied particularly to clergymen who resided in cities, and at a still later period it became obsolete except in the Church of Rome where the primitive usages of Christianity are adhered to with peculiar veneration. The Cardinals of Rome, from the office which they exercised of aiding the Sovereign Pontiff in the government of the Universal Church, soon became more elevated in dignity than bishops themselves. The Episcopal Order is, doubtless, far more eminent than that of the priesthood; but the distinguished rank of a Cardinal is estimated not from the grade of the sacred order with which he is invested, but from the extensive powers he enjoys, as member of the Apostolic See and counsellor and elector of the pope. Thus Eugenius IV. in his letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury, in the year 1410, after mentioning the several prerogatives of the Cardinals, concludes that their dignity arising from the vast jurisdiction which they exercise, surpasses that of patriarchs and other bishops, whose authority is confined within the limits of their respective territories. *They did not however, acquire this precedence until the commencement of the 12th century.* At first, the cardinals of Rome consisted only of priests and deacons, but subsequently the bishops of the neighbouring cities were decorated with the title and ranked among the counsellors and assistants of the Pope. They were called *Suburban* bishops, and were formerly seven in number, viz. those of Ostia, Porto; Alba, Palestrina, Sabina, Frascati and St. Rufina, but this last See having been coupled with that of Porto, the number of Cardinal bishops was reduced to six. That of Cardinal priests and Cardinal deacons has often varied. Upon the death of Clement VI., in 1352, it was resolved by the Sacred College, that it should not exceed twenty; Paul IV. limited it to forty; afterwards Sixtus V. carried the number up to seventy, a regulation which has been uniformly adopted by his successors. Each Cardinal is required to be in the holy order which he represents; unless he be dispensed by the S. Pontiff from the observance of the law which obliges him to receive the holy order befitting his rank, within twelve months from the date of his appointment, under pain of rendering his nomination void. It generally happens, however, that most of the Cardinal Deacons, in the order of bishop or priest.

Cardinals are created only by the Pope, who convenes his Council for this purpose and confers the dignity with their advice and approbation.—Their duties consists in aiding the Sovereign Pontiff in the management of ecclesiastical affairs, in governing the Church, when deprived of its Chief Pastor, and in electing another to fill the vacant See. Hence they are selected by his Holiness among those clergymen who are most conspicuous for their learning, piety and other estimable qualifications. "It is the peculiar honor of this illustrious body," says de Joux, in his *Lettres sur l'Italie*, "to be formed of men, distinguished by their talents, genius and virtue, without any regard to national considerations or to circumstances of birth or fortune. We are not surprised, therefore, to find that even the first princes of Europe have aspired to the dignity of Cardinal." "Whatever might be the merits of the talents of any other body of

^aFrom their own mouths, it will be seen that their pretensions, were not accorded to until the dark ages drew on.—[E.]

men in the universe," says Dr. England "I could have no hesitation for an instant, to place this assembly by its side, and, whether upon the ground of capacity, of experience, of information, of industry, or of virtue, or of all united, to claim a favourable award from every impartial and capable judge."

"Not one of its members has been raised to the Cardinalate, merely because of his family greatness; he has uniformly decorated that, at least by his virtues. In this body are found the protectors of science, the patrons of the arts, the promoters of piety, the founders of colleges, of hospitals, and of those other institutions which alleviate the distress and promote the happiness of man. The constitution of the body exhibits the sources from which is drawn the mass of excellence which it contains. *If there be something of aristocracy in its composition, it is, perhaps, that species of which even a republic might to some extent approve.* No one is admitted by descent or hereditary claim; if dignity is conferred, it is only upon the individual, and for his personal merits. It is open for the son of the peasant equally as for the son of the prince. If the Dorias, the Pamphillis, the Justinianis, the Matteis; and such like be found upon the list, the Micaras, the Salas and others, raised by their own merits from the humblest ranks, are also high upon it. If the antiquarian, the painter, the poet, or the sculptor, were asked who are their best protectors, they will tell you, Fesch, Galeffi and Weld: the philosopher will claim Zurla. The memoirs of the venerable Pacca, will exhibit the tact of the statesman, the erudition of the scholar, the sufferings of the martyr, and the fidelity of patriotic heroism, Lambruschini and Spinola stand deservedly respected for their correct diplomacy. Bernetti is looked upon as worthy of the mantle of Gonsalvi, which has fallen upon his shoulders. Pedicini and Odescalchi are the enlightened patrons and patterns of elevated piety and regularity of discipline."

"The **USUAL DRESS** ^b of the **CARDINALS** in the Papal chapel, is a **red cassock** with a cincture of the same colour, having tassels of

b. Bellarmine, and Baronius, with nearly all the inferior authorities in defence of the church of Rome, in hope of getting some proof for Peter's being at Rome, are strongly in favour of that text. 1. Peter v. 13, being interpreted Rome instead of Babylon. Much good, may it do them, as to all the proof they can bring out of it.—Rome is seated on SEVEN HILLS, and in the Revelation of John, xvii. ch. *Babylon the great* is said to be seated on a *beast*, which has *seven heads*, which *seven heads* are *seven mountains* on which the woman sitteth.

We here print a few passages of scripture, describing as we think the seat of the Beast and the costume of the Cardinals, and we beseech of the reader, just to compare it, with those passages in this account, printed in Italics, where *red—purple—and scarlet*, occurs.

The Woman. Rev. xvii. ch. 3 v. "And I saw a woman, sit upon a *scarlet coloured beast*, full of names of blasphemy, *having seven heads*, and ten horns."

The Beast's heads v. 9. "The *seven heads*, are *seven mountains*, on which the woman sitteth."

Who is this woman? v. 18. "And the woman which thou sawest is that great city, which reigneth over the kings of the earth."

Her name. V. 5. "And upon her forehead was a name written, MYSTERY, BABYLON THE GREAT, THE MOTHER OF HARLOTS, AND ABOMINATIONS OF THE EARTH."

Her character. V. 6. And I saw the woman, drunken with the blood of the saints and with the blood of the martyrs of Jesus."

Her dress. Ch. xvii. v. 4 "And the woman was arrayed in purple and scarlet colour, and decked with gold and precious stones and pearls, &c."

The cost of this dress—mourning at her overthrow by those from whom it was purchased, at her inability to buy; &c. Ch. xviii. 11, 12, 13 verses.

gold red stockings, a rochet* over which they commonly wear a *cappa* or ample cloak, with a large tippet of white ermine, which hangs over the shoulders and chest. The ermine is laid aside in the summer season. On their heads they wear small red *calottes*, and sometimes square red caps. In times of penance and mourning, the red robes are changed for others of a violet colour, and on two or three particular days the rose colour is used. On solemn occasions, when the Pope officiates, or when there is a grand procession, they all wear red shoes, and mitres of white damask silk; the Cardinal bishops wear copes; the Cardinal priests, chasubles, and the Cardinal deacons, dalmatics of the colour suited to the solemnity; but on days of penance, the deacons wear chasubles.— Their dress of state, when not engaged in sacred functions, is the cassock, the rochet, over which is worn a *manteletta* or shortcloak; through which they put their arms, and a *mozetta* or tippet with a small hood, over which the Cardinal bishops exhibit the chain of the pectoral cross, but not the cross itself. When in full jurisdiction, that is, in the churches of their titles (each Cardinal is titular of some church in Rome), or during the vacancy of the Holy See, the *manteletta* is always laid aside. Cardinals promoted from any of the religious orders, preserve in their robes the peculiarity of colour belonging to that association, and never use silk.† But all wear the red hat and cap, the first of which was introduced by Innocent VI. in 1245, as emblematical of the obligation they were under of shedding their blood, if necessary, for the honour of God and the welfare of religion. The red cap was instituted by Paul II., to distinguish the Cardinals from other prelates on occasions when the hat was not used.

“If the splendor and richness of the Cardinals’ appearance in public be great, numbers of them have inherited the means by which that exhibition is sustained, and refuse to accept from the public purse, the allowance which is appropriated for its support; others would, in any state of society, have by their merits obtained a similar rank; others in the midst of this external show follow in their private life, the poverty and mortification, which they vowed as members of the strictest orders of religion; and if they ride in splendid carriages in Rome, for the purpose of conforming to the etiquette which is so essential, they have traversed Italy on foot, with

Their lamentation. V. 16. “Alas, alas, that great city, that was clothed in fine linen, and purple, and scarlet, and decked with gold and precious stones and pearls.” Read on in this chapter her terrible overthrow and the rejoicing, over it, of the holy apostles and prophets. 20 v. [Ed.]

*A rochet is a surplice with narrow sleeves, such as is worn by bishops.

†Dr. England’s *Ceremonies of Holy Week, in the Papal Chapel.*

c See Letter to Pope Paul III. in vol. I of *Preservatives against popery.*

“Nay, in this city Whores walk about as if they were Goodly Matrons; or they ride upon Mules, and are at noon-day followed up and down by men of the best account in the families of Cardinals and Clergymen. We see no such degeneracy in any other city, but in this, which is to be an example to all others. These Whores live in splendid houses: ’tis a filthy abuse, and ought to be remedied!” This extract from the address of four cardinals and five Bishops to Paul III. (who died 1555.) on the necessity for a Reformation, must strike any one as leaning very pointedly, on the practice of these Cardinals, as given by one who as report says, is looking forward to a seat among them. [Ed.]

only their breviaries in their hands, making its churches resound with the eloquence which converted the sinner and encouraged the saints."⁶

In viewing this finished character and the numberless others that might be adduced, we are forced to acknowledge that the SCARLET ROBES OF A CARDINAL are something more than outward show.* We cannot but believe that they are the expression of great excellence as well as the insignia of eminent rank; and that minds so pure, so gifted, so cultivated as to have merited this high distinction, will honour it by the faithful discharge of the important obligations which it imposes.

CHAPTER II.

This chapter gives us the Names and Number of Cardinals, &c We shall omit the Names, giving only the Numbers, and the countries from which they have been called.

Romans,	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	11
Of the Papal Dominions,	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	23
Neopolitans,	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4
Sicilian,	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
French,	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3
Corsican,	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
Sardinians,	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2
Genoese.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6
Spaniards,	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3
Portuguese,	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
Austrian,	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
Milanese,	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
Venitians,	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2
Maltese,	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
English,	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
Creations	{	Of Pius VII.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	15
		Of Leo XII.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	17
		Of Pius VIII.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3
		Of Gregory XVI.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	26
Places reserved or vacant,	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9	
Total,	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	79

(To be continued.)

MEMORANDA OF FOREIGN TRAVEL,

BY RO: J. BRECKINRIDGE.

Canton Freybourg.—*Wolf the Missionary.*—*Guyeres.*—*Temperance.*—*Frutigen.*—*Pilgrims.*—*City of Freybourg, and its great suspension bridge.*—*The Peasantry.*—*Goitres.*—*Roman Antiquities.*—*Canton Vaud.*—*Persecution and Revival in it.*—*Momiers.*—*Dr. Malan of Geneva.*—*Felix Neff.*—*Political State of the Canton.*—*Lake Lemon.*—*Beautiful Scenery.*—*Lausanne.*—*Gibbon's House.*—*Change in Society.*—*The Cathedral.*—*Pope Felix V.*—*The Prince*

*U. S. Miscel vol. XIII. p. 164. †Sec Note b. page. 56.

of Hesse.—The Manners of the Great.—Use of German Princes.—Revolution in Vaud.—The shore of Lake Lemon.—Vintage—Use of wine.—Lake Craft.—Coppet.—Madame De Stael.—Pistolozzi.—The residence of Lord Byron.—Ferneŷ—Voltaire, estimate of him.

THE Canton Freyburg (or Friburg as it is often spelt) is ranked amongst the large Cantons of Switzerland. It is situated towards the western side of the confederation; and contained in 1831, a population of 87,000 souls,—of whom, only seven or eight thousand residing in the district of Morat (or Murten)—are reformed. It is decidedly a Catholic Canton; and contains not only establishments of Jesuits, but several extensive ones of the austere and un-social Carthusians,—who seem to place the chief good, in silence, naked feet, and dirty clothes. Since the late revolution in this Canton, a degree of religious liberty, not enjoyed in the Catholic Cantons generally has been allowed; though even here, it is rather a shy toleration, than any real freedom. In this Canton, the French language, in a miserable patois, is spoken, as extensively almost as the German: but this is the limit, to which that language has yet penetrated the country, in the use of the people at large.

There are several of these establishments of the professed that deserve particular notice on one account or other; and I regretted my inability to visit them. The hermitage of *Sainte Madalienne*, a league from Freybourg, is said to be cut entirely out of the rock; although the whole establishment is four hundred feet long, and its clock tower eighty feet high. It is the establishment of Trappists at *Valsainte*, nine leagues off, in the direction of Bulle and Cresny, which possess most interest. It is the chief place of this singular fraternity; and was for some time the residence of the missionary Wolf. This extraordinary man was born in Bavaria, of Jewish parents, his father being a man of consequence, amongst his people and a Rabbi. At the age of sixteen years he was baptized, by a priest at Prague, in Bohemia, and became a papist. After some time he went to Rome, and spent two years in the college of the Propaganda—pursuing his studies. He was dismissed from that institution, and found his way to Switzerland; and finally into the convent of Trappist Monks at Valsainte. Here he remained, until he became disgusted beyond farther endurance with the deceit and imposture of his companions; and at this critical juncture of his destiny met with an English traveller, at whose suggestion he visited England. He there found friends,—under whose advice he spent two years at Oxford University. His subsequent history is known,—as well as his extraordinary efforts and sacrifices in the cause of Christ and his brethren: efforts and sacrifices, attended by some eccentricities and errors, which however they are to be regretted,—have perhaps too seriously weakened the sympathy of the Christian world in his behalf.

The road from Berne to Freyburg, and thence to Lausanne in the Canton Vaud,—over a distance of eighteen Swiss leagues—passes through a beautiful and well cultivated region,—composed of a constant succession of hills and valleys,—across which the route generally lies. To the right the Java range of mountains which skirt France and Switzerland, gradually rise from a distant dim line,

along the horizon; to bold and rocky promontaries, which seem much nearer than they really are. On the left the mountains of the ancient country of Gruyeres, famous on many accounts, and not amongst the least for their cheese—and the sweet and stirring music of their cow-herds;—form a kind of low scene, over which the stupendous alps, lift up their heads, crowned with a diadem of pure, brilliant and everlasting snow. The Counts of Gruyeres, lost these rich hill sides, in a singular way. Having become greatly involved by their extravagance—the evidences of their liability passed into the hands of the Bernes and Fribourgers; who eventually took the country for the debt. By a strange chain of circumstances, the people of an entire district were eaten and drunken, from subjects of a petty prince, into republicans; and that without any intervention of their own. I am not able to say what influence, this singular lesson, on the fruits of extravagance, had in producing the edict, by which from the year 1735, to this time the sale of spirituous liquors, has been prohibited in these mountains. It is said that, the consumption of coffee, is greater here, in proportion to the number and wealth of the people, than in any part of the world. This may be attributed to the disuse of ardent spirits. Or probably to the general habits of luxury and prodigality, for which the wealthier people amongst them, are said to be famous. These qualities are however so far from being common to their neighbours—that the people of the valley of Frutigen, are reported to have abstained from eating meat for seven years—that by a rigid parsimony they might hoard the sum demanded by the barons of Thure, as the price of their exemption from all imports. The Swiss of another generation, would have redeemed their liberties, with a different metal. And yet perhaps, these simple peasants made the wiser as well as the surer purchase. The shedding of human blood, should be the utmost remedy; and that only a joint intolerable wrong. Even amongst the wisest of the heathen it was a principle of morals, as well as a policy—that the sword was only, *ultima ratio*, the very last alternative. And even in this dire extremity, its use is qualified by a most instructive limitation. *Ultima ratio regum. Kings*—not mankind at large, but the rulers of the world, have been the great slaughter mongers of it.—

At the village of Schmitten between Berne and Freybourg, we had occasion to stop for a few moments, and were overtaken by a company of pilgrims, who were returning from Eiusièdlen in the Canton Schurgts, where they had made a pilgrimage to the Benedictine abbey, where a wooden image of *Notre-dame des Ermites*, (our lady of the Hermits) presented by the princess Hildegarde to the founder of the abbey, attracts yearly crowds of pilgrims. This company consisted of thirteen persons, of humble appearance; of whom three were females, and one a boy;—the remaining nine being young and athletic men. They declined all conversation, except the shortest, and simplest answers to such questions as seemed to them worthy of a response. Amongst those not answered was that designed to ascertain their place of abode; and I can therefore form no idea of the distance they had gone, to worship a stock: which has become doubly sacred since it escaped the fury with which the French soldiers in 1798 visited some other objects about the Abbaye. They were now nearly a hundred miles from

the place of pilgrimage, on their return home. And although their progress was necessarily slow—seeing that some or all of them, stopped to perform an act of worship in every church and chapel,—and before every cross and station mark, they encountered; yet they seemed weary and harrassed with the length of their way. For the rest, they were ragged, filthy, and haggard to a pitiable degree; and presented a spectacle, well calculated to humble our hearts in the view of what human nature is, and to fill them with sorrow at the proof of what it may be made.

The city of Freybourg is one of the prettiest in Switzerland,—though one of the least frequented by travellers. The road leading through it, is not quite so level as that by Morat; and all sorts of excuses are made by owners and drivers of post horses, to prevent persons from taking route by it. I resolved to see it; and was doubly fixed in that purpose on finding that it lay precisely in my way,—from which I must turn aside to avoid it. Its situation is exceedingly romantic,—the country around it beautiful—the public edifices well worthy of inspection—and its institutions curious, and antique. There are few places in Switzerland, where I should suppose, a traveller would pass a short time most pleasantly.—It possesses one monument of taste and enterprize,—I might almost say magnificence—which surpasses any thing of the kind, perhaps in the world. The town is situated on the south bank of the river Savine,—whose cliffs are abrupt and high. Above these cliffs and receding a little more from the stream are still higher elevations; upon the sloping face of one of which the little city stands, with white houses, and ancient walls; which cross the river and encompass a part of the town built on the margin of the water on the north side of the Savine. The work of which I have spoken, is a superb suspension bridge, thrown across the river from the tops of the cliffs—and hanging in the air without apparent support, 900 feet long, and 140 feet above the bed of the river—with a breadth of perhaps 60 feet. At each end, on the cliff is an arch of considerable height, through which the way passes. Over these are drawn two cords of a diameter of six inches, which are composed of fine wires, tightly bound together. The ends of these large cords, passed over the tops of the arches, are fastened into the cliffs, on each side of the river,—at a distance of perhaps a hundred feet from the arches, and nearly on a level with their basis. This fastening, and the fulcrum afforded by the tops of the arches, form the entire support of the bridge. The great cords pass across the river—swagging in such a way—as to touch the cone of the bridge about the centre; the bridge itself being slightly arched. The timbers of the bridge are fastened to the great cords, by vertical cords of one inch diameter, made precisely like the great one, and occurring at intervals of a few feet. It has been in use for about two years;—and the heaviest burdens, in all sorts of vehicles carried over it. Its balance is so perfect, that it trembles, at the tread of a single passenger. I was not able to learn the name of the architect; and got for answer “Oh! he is some Frenchman; I believe from Lyons.” It is a work full of genius and science; in which the simple and beautiful structure, is surpassed only by the hardy and grand conception.—I saw various advertisements, of the first scheme of the seventh class, of the lotteries, by the proceeds of which this noble work is to be paid for:

and I bewailed the sad necessity by which ignorance and vice seem doomed to obscure all that is greatest, and degrade all that is most useful amongst men.

The village of Payerne (called in German Peterlingen)—although within four or five leagues of the town of Freybourg, is situated in the Canton Vaud. It is seated in the midst of rich and highly cultivated fields, lately stripped when I saw them of crops of peas, tobacco and hemp, and looking more like the best portions of our middle and western states, than any part of Switzerland I had seen.

We tarried an hour in the place, for our driver to rest his horses—during which, I had an opportunity of seeing a large collection of the people from the vicinage, at their weekly market. I observed here, very strikingly several peculiarities of the dress of the men of the middle and poorer classes, which are in a considerable degree common to the other cantons. Very few wear woollen clothes;—and the hemp and cotton fabrics which poorly supply their place in a climate so damp and cold, are thin and coarse. But even these garments never fit the person. Short in the arms, short in the legs—narrow in the back—the short tails sticking fantastically out, or lapping over each other, with every other possible defect of cut and make; the whole effect, is such, that the wearer looks uncomfortable and ludicrous. This thing is nearly universal, and is I think a principal reason why the peasants of the country are always considered ugly. Their wives and sisters may treat them thus through incapacity; and indeed their hands seem fully as familiar with the hoe and plough, as with the distaff and needle. But a very slight glance at the females of this region, is enough to make one suspect that a ~~secret~~ purpose, lurks at the bottom of their terrible handy work for the other sex. They are not perhaps to be thought hard of for desiring their husbands to look somewhat like themselves; and of all the female sex I had then ever seen, these impressed me with the most disgust. To say nothing of any thing else, three women out of every four had goitre, of the most terrible dimensions: and I am rather inclined to believe, that if a strict scrutiny were allowed, a large part of the remainder, would be found to have small ones. I had observed a few persons, before with this revolting disease; which had from the first exclusively offended my sight, on account perhaps of its great rarity in America. But to be thrown, in an instant, amongst five hundred women—nearly all of whom were deformed in the throat,—and very many to a degree scarcely admitting of belief, shocked me beyond expression. There is no feeling more spontaneous in the breast of civilized and enlightened men, than tenderness and veneration, towards all that is called woman. The debt of gratitude to our mothers which nothing can repay,—heightened by the recollection of the tears we have wrung from their sacred eyes,—serves to give to every aged woman a title to our reverence. The inexpressible tenderness of a father's heart overflows towards every bright look of maiden beauty that recalls the name of daughter; and there is not a step of sedate and matron-like dignity and grace, that does not fill the memory, the imagination and the heart, with that form which is the centre of every blessed picture of life. How much of its sweetness, yea how much of its dignity and virtue, does life owe, to these hallowed relationships! For my part, I felt as if a

calamity had overtaken me; when I found myself irresistibly repelled, from the indulgence of such kindly feelings towards such multitudes, by what could only be called a misfortune: and my heart upbraided me for a fastidiousness of taste, as insuperable as it is, perhaps indefensible. It would break my heart to dwell amongst such sights.

The village of Milden still nearer to Lausanne, is not perhaps worthy of special mention on its own account; and I shall remember it principally as the spot, where I saw a block of defaced stone, a few feet high, and of about half the width of its height—covered with characters, which the “tooth of time”—has in a great degree consumed. But that stone, has the same simplicity and beauty of figure which every where distinguished the Roman altar; and it tells more eloquently, in its disfigured solitude, the tale of ruin, which it alone is left to record—than words could repeat. It is the only relic of what was once Minidunum: all that abides to connect the idle loungee through the crooked streets, with heroic generations, that have been dust, for so many centuries. They who say they have deciphered the inscription make it announce that Quintus Ælius, priest of Augustus, had erected at his own expense, this altar, to Jupiter Optimus Maximus, and to Juno Regina,—and that he had given three quarters of a million of Sesteres (about \$20,000) to the city of Minidunum, for the construction of a gymnasium: upon condition that, if the money were not applied to this use, it should appertain as a legacy to the city of Aventicum.—I am solaced to believe, that this is the real import of the inscription. Religion is the first necessity of man; learning his chiefest accomplishment; enlarged and wise benevolence his highest excellence. It is touching to behold this memorial of the indwelling power of what pertains to every generation. Surviving all that was peculiar to the most majestic of them all. It pertains to nature,—and therefore it meet, that its memorials should live when all others die. The brook which murmurs past these walls—the mountain which frowns on them from afar, abide in their separate, and changeless beauty and grandeur—just as when Minidunum and Aventicum, and Quintus Ælius and the wise Augustus, lived to gaze upon them. And so they will abide, when other ages in distant posterity, retain of us, less traces it may be, than this little stone. But in those most distant ages, as in these passing now, and in those buried in an unknown antiquity; the royal structure of man will stand changeless as the universe around him. How it rejoices the heart, to know that with the blessing of God, the very essence of things, involves the necessity, that sustained efforts to do man good, are obliged to succeed. For they are based in necessities and impulses, stronger than all that is within and without united; and so enduring that we can be ruined only by their misdirection. Man will have a God. Will the Christians give him his? Man will submit himself to be taught by those wiser than he. Will the enlightened give him truth? Man's gifts are lavished evermore, where his affections cleave. Will the wise present him with objects worthy of a magnificent charity?

The Canton Vaud is one of the most considerable in the Helvetic confederation both in population and territorial extent; that is to say, if such a word, can be used of a little state; containing only 180,000 people. Of these not above four thousand are called Catholics; the

remainder not only professing the protestant religion—but there is great reason to believe engaging as evangelical ministration of the word of life to a greater proportionate extent than any other part of the continent of Europe.

It is known to the religious world, that the Christians of this canton have during the present generation suffered a most rigorous oppression—I should perhaps call it—from their brethren, professing the same faith with themselves. This state of things lasted six or eight years, during which, persons were exiled, imprisoned, fined and prohibited from assembling for worship; and otherwise vexed and premised, by the authority of the laws, and under the procurement of the public authorities and protestant pastors;—avowedly because they professed doctrines and pursued a course of life and worship, which need be no further explained to an American reader, than to say they were such as *all* the Christians of that country aim at. Happily, this folly and wickedness defeated its own ends: or rather God made the wrath of man praise him, and graciously restrained the remainder thereof. For the last four or five years unlimited freedom of worship has been enjoyed; and at this time, there are above a hundred pastors in the Canton Vaud, who receive the truth in the love of it, and preach it faithfully and zealously to the people. “It is a blessed Canton,”—said one of the most active and enlightened Christians of Switzerland to me,—one not himself a citizen of Vaud.

The state of things which preceded and ushered in this revival of religion throughout the Canton Vaud, as well as in other parts of Switzerland, and indeed in most countries of Europe, was extremely curious and interesting. I mention this canton only, at the present time. I asked Dr. Malan at Geneva, what was a *Momier*. I had heard the word used, in every sense, good and bad; and although I understood in general that a religious sect was designated by it, I was somewhat confused by various imports. “Ah!” said the venerable man, “you speak to the king of the *Momiers*—to the first perhaps who was branded with the name.”—He then proceeded to inform me in reply to anxious questions shortly of his conversion—the privation of his appointment of instructor of youth in Geneva on that account—his lack of permission to preach—the contempt of his brethren—and the scorn of his fellow citizens. In this contingency, his habit was to preach, as he could in the adjoining villages of France which are near enough for persons from Geneva to attend. The same malice which oppressed him at home; followed to revile him, in the regions round about. To ridicule him, it was advertised that the *great Momier*—would exhibit, at such and such times and places; the word answering precisely to a noun personal made out of our word *mummery*. At first he was not aware that he was meant; but supposed that as the habits of the places and time encouraged sabbath day exhibitions of all kinds,—it was a real juggler who had availed himself of the crowd and would actually exhibit his mountebank tricks. “When I found out the truth” said he, with his dark eyes beaming light—“I was full of joy. Then I knew this was a great thing. I did not see it so plain before. They had given it a name; it is a great work; they have so treated great works before: I saw that God intended great things!”—The event

the single hearted Christian. And amidst the trials and sorrows of an apostleship full of many that wound the spirit and break the heart; God has permitted his servant to see the truth of that in which he trusted. It is a great work. Who shall say, how much greater it is destined to become.

Amongst the early converts, either through the direct agency of Dr. Malan or perhaps through the same instrumentality, to which his own conversion may be attributed—was Felix Neff. "The most gifted man, both in body and mind, I ever knew, was Felix Neff." These words were spoken to me, by professor Gaufern of Geneva. Neff was a soldier in the garrison of Geneva;—was converted—became a minister of Jesus Christ—and was perhaps more directly successful and more wonderfully blessed in his labours, than any man of this extraordinary age. It was through his instrumentality that the revival amongst the pastors in the canton Vaud commenced; and that at a time when he was but imperfectly educated, and not licensed to preach. He went on foot, from one parish to another, over the canton—visiting the pastors. To these he preached; not directly but with a pathos, subtility—and demonstration, which characterised the man, and marked him, as a chief captain in the army of the Lord. His instructions to the pastors (what a phrase have I used—what a lesson is contained in it—a discharged soldier teach pastors religion!) His instructions—for they were truly such—were confined exclusively to the narration of what he had seen, heard and witnessed. He asked leave to tell what God had done for his soul. The pastor listened, in the retirement of his study:—and the truth slew him! He wished to make known what he had witnessed, of the work of the Lord on the heart of such, or such a one. The pastor heard—and the scales fell from his eyes. It was as the water of Marah, with the bitterness of sin gushing from the head of the fountain. And the servant of the Lord cast in of the tree of life eternal, and the sweetness of heaven revisited the stream. Will it be credited, that I searched every book store in Geneva for some monument of Felix Neff and found none? Can it be believed that in the two principal book stores of the place, I was told in both instances by the masters of the shops—that they had never before heard of the man!

I should not omit to state, that this canton has taken the lead in support of popular sentiments, and just and liberal views in Switzerland, for some years past. Indeed the toleration of piety dates from the revolution in Vaud following that of July in France: while on the other hand the Christians of the canton, have with equal fervency espoused the cause of freedom. It is surely true that the Christian religion, is perfectly compatible with the existence of all kinds of social systems, not sinful in themselves, and that chiefly because, it has nothing to do with any sort of system—except to teach all men to do perfectly all their duties. But it is just as true, that the principles of Christianity are principles of justice, to all—mercy to the unfortunate, and humility before God; and that its spirit, is as widely different from that of most of the existing institutions of the world—as selfishness, cruelty and oppression—are removed from the principles already stated. Let us therefore rejoice doubly in such manifestations as these. True religion is at

length permitted to compensate mankind for the horrors which false religion has perpetrated against them. They who love freedom more than they love virtue—alas! too great a portion of our kind, will learn that true religion is the twin sister of well regulated freedom. And false religion—welded to the worst corruption of thrones—to the severest oppressions of the privileged orders—to all the wrongs of the poor—and all the sufferings of the miserable—must perish before the united force of temporal and eternal interests—the combined energy of heaven and earth.

As the evening began to draw around us—we approached Lausanne. Behold Mount Blanc, said the Voituriers, stopping his horses, upon the summit of a hill. Not long afterwards—he paused again, saying Lac Lemon, and indicating with his hand the sheet of still water, stretched like a beautiful bow begins at the feet of surrounding mountains. The largest and loveliest of the Swiss lakes—the loftiest, and most majestic of all the mountains in the northern hemisphere, greeted us, for the first time almost at the same moment. A wide and varied landscape, such as the world has few like, is before and around the traveller as he descends by this route into the delicious valley of the Lemon. To the right are the steep and naked ridges of the Juva,—around whose base the lake seems drawn from you in the most graceful air. Between the bare mountain and the smiling waters, a belt of verdure rich as one can imagine, full of vines, and grain and fruit trees—and the habitations of man, stretches entirely to Geneva. To the left, and in front across the lake, the dark looking hills of the neighbouring cantons and of Chablais in Savoy—are the first steps of the eternal Alps; which far off, seem to lean upon the sky. Above them all far to the right, towers the triple head of Mount Blanc, ruling in cold and silent grandeur the frozen world around him. Lausanne, elevated upon several hills considerably above the lake—but still more below the level of the country behind it,—is seated upon the outer edge of the lake; and while it forms a striking object in the general picture—furnishes from its various promenades the most delightful views of the other parts of it.

This city is the capital of the Canton, and one of the largest and most pleasant in Switzerland. It is furnished with the apparatus of Chateau, Cathedral, Terrace, Fountain &c. which belong, as appears, by indispensable necessity, to all continental cities, of any pretension. The still more important accompaniments, of libraries, colleges, museums, hospitals &c. are also found here, on the same scale of liberal and wise provision which distinguishes almost all the Cantons. Its advantages, its pleasures, its climate, its beauties, and perhaps more than either, its liberal and generous policy towards strangers—have made the Canton Vaud, and especially the town of Lausanne, a place of great resort for various classes of them. Men of letters, men of reduced circumstances, men suspected, men oppressed; at Lausanne there are generally to be found, under these and various other classes, persons of most countries of Europe. The costume, language and features of them all, may be seen and heard in the dark and steep streets; and combine with the picturesque appearance of the place itself, to make its impression very striking. Amongst the curiosities of the place, strangers are shown

the library of the Spaniard Benial de Quiros, added to that of the city near a century ago; and the house in which Gibbon wrote his great work, on the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire. The latter is a plain stone building, rather low, situated in the rear of the church of St. Francis, near to an ancient building which once appertained to a convent of Franciscan Friars—but is now more usefully employed as the kitchen of a hospital. It is at present owned and occupied by a *momier!*—a believer in that religion, which Gibbon ridiculed;—a worshipper of that Saviour whose disciples, the philosophic historian—falsified the truth of history, and perverted the principles of philosophy, that he might traduce. Great as this change is, it happily indicates one somewhat resembling it, commensurate with the whole face of the Christian world. There are probably few who read the works of Gibbon who do not consider his attacks on the Christian religion, as decided stains upon them. But in his own generation perhaps an equally great proportion of the same class of persons, cherished them as capital excellencies; while he himself regarded them as furnishing one of the best evidences of the depth of his learning, and the greatness of his capacity. A great cycle in human thought has been accomplished. We have passed through an era in which every thing was dissolved, and the sharp ingredients which were thrown into the mass, were necessary to disengage the foreign and hurtful materials, and then subside with the impurities which generations of sin and error had accumulated. We have returned to a posture more elevated than any occupied by man since the days of the apostles. We are better off than after the revival of letters. For knowledge is more diffused and religion more general. We are happier in our position, than they were who saw the best days, which the reformation ushered in. For now we stand upon the ruins of all those opinions, of which reformers only scaled the ramparts. Or more strictly speaking, the events which date in the world since the American revolution, and in Europe since that of France of 1789—have produced upon all human interests precisely the effects, which the reformation did in regard to religion. Right ideas have the mastery: it is power, brute force alone that holds society in check. The heart of the world is accessible at every pore—to the naked, simple, glorious, power of divine truth. The time for the life from the dead is come, for the world. If the church of Christ be faithful,—a career of blessedness is before her—of which all past generations have seen but the twilight.

The Cathedral at Lausanne, which is regarded as one of the finest Gothic edifices in Europe,—was once considered also peculiarly sacred. It was consecrated by one pope, and the remains of another, still repose in one of its aisles. The first was Gregory X. the other Felix V. The latter deserves the admiration of posterity, for an act of rare and noble self-denial—which is perfectly unique in the history of the papacy. The council of Basle had deposed the reigning pope and elected the Count of Savoy—who took the title of Felix V. That the Council had ample power to do both these acts, had been expressly settled, as of faith, by the Council of Constance. But the reigning pope and his faction, choose to regard their interests as more infallibly revealed—than the will of God could be to

a general council; although they held as of faith, that such a council, spake as with the voice of God. But they evaded this conclusion by denying that the Council of Basle, was holy general or œcumenical: a denial which robs them of the countenance of the most respectable assembly of papal divines that ever met. Felix V.—after accepting the triple crown, and waiting several years, without violence or bitterness, to see if the Ultramontaine party would submit to the voice of the Council and the general wish of the papal church:—found himself reduced to the necessity of taking up arms to subdue the anti-pope—creating a permanent schism by tolerating him longer,—or abdicating the tiara. With the spirit of a benevolent man, and a wise prince—may we not hope also of an humble Christian, he chose the last alternative and resigned the papacy, in this Cathedral in the year 1449. I trod upon his ashes, with profound reverence; and looked upon his defaced monument, with a feeling of kindly remembrance, strongly contrasting with the coldness, perhaps contempt, with which I regarded the pompous titles of the dead barons, and the carved marble of the nameless prelates around him. His successors in the county of Savoy, are at the present moment kings of Sardinia: and it is not improbable they may yet rule over all northern Italy. The reigning pontiff, and all who have preceded him for nearly four centuries, are the successors of the anti-pope, condemned and justly deposed by the Council of Basle; which had every mark by which the papists themselves define, a general council, in a greater degree than most of those they regard as such;—and this additionally that it composed, as they say, the great Hussite schism. Either a general council is not infallible,—or the popes for four centuries have had only an anti-papal, instead of an apostolical succession—or the Council of Basle was an erroneous and schismatical assembly instigated by the devil. If this last alternative be admitted—no human ingenuity can prescribe rules by which a true general council can be distinguished from a false one: and therefore the faith of Rome is built on the sand. If either of the two former suppositions be true—Rome can have no faith at all. But one of the three is obliged to be true—as the three cover every possible supposition in the case.—

There was a curious point in the manners of the great, accidentally exhibited to me in great nakedness, at Lausanne. Though grown familiar with the appearance of soldiers, I thought there were rather more than the usual portion lounging before, and about the galleries of the hotel at which I stopped. On asking what it meant, I was told, they belonged to the household of the prince of Hesse Cassel, who was then a lodger in the hotel. Further enquiries revealed the fact that his highness, (whether royal or merely serene, I am not able to say,) had a family with him,—that is a lady, perhaps several, and children. Another step in the investigation brought out the admission that the family, although *really* his, was not his *real* family. That is, his highness was publicly travelling up and down Europe, with his mistress and her offspring. I thank God, that our republican ideas are yet sufficiently in accordance with virtue and public decency, to save us from such open manifestations of debauchery. But we should judge the prince of Hesse Cassel, *harshly* if we supposed he was at all sensible of the nature of the

outrage he was committing. The number of rulers in Europe, whether great or small who have illegitimate families—is generally equal to the entire actual number; and this revolting truth has existed so long, that more than half the hereditary aristocracy of all Europe, is justly entitled to the boy Sinister—the badge of bastardy—upon their proud escutcheons. Even those royal races which are extinct in the legitimate lines—survive in those which are otherwise. The present royal family of England, has but three feeble remnants of the large family of George III. to nourish legitimate rulers, for the British realm, in the next generation. But in the other sort—the numbers are not so easily computed. The present “most religious king”—William IV. the head of the United Church of England and Ireland—has around him a large family of the late unhappy actress, Mrs. Jourdon, whom he is so benevolent, as to treat as if they were his own,—and to allow, in the use of the name Flitz Clarence, his own ducal appellation. These young gentlemen and ladies, are the attendants of royalty—the friends—equals—portions of nobles, prelates—magnets of England. It might almost be supposed, that something of this sort, was meant in England, when they spake of a man's *being well born*.

These little German princess, are not however to be underrated. They play a most important part in the affairs of Europe. For though their territories be often too small for an ancient park;—and their cities not so large as we could build up in America in half a year; yet this is all the better. The more they can be multiplied the better for Europe—for the world—for posterity.—There are certain parts of the earth which seem peculiarly adapted to the growth of certain creatures. The Roman emperors sent to one province for the brains of the peacocks, and to another for the tongues of nightingales,—for their costly repasts. Lybia, in all ages, is the land of the lion;—Arabia of the horse. Germany produces queens! These little nests of princes,—are the common resort of the failing royalty of Europe. And when one wants a queen he goes thither, almost by instinct.

The Canton Vaud appertained for a long time to the county of Savoy. Conquered afterwards by the republic of Berne, in a war undertaken to assist their allies of Geneva; it remained until the close of the last century subject to that Canton. As one of the consequences perhaps of the French revolution, it revolted from Berne; and when the great powers of Europe were resettling its states after the fall of Napoleon in 1814, this Canton, was placed, in the Helvetic confederation, on its present footing. It is said that the personal influence of General de la Harpe—who was a native of Vaud, and had been attached to the person of the emperor Alexander in his youth was the great obstacle of the reunion of the two cantons at that period. It has no doubt been better for both, that the intrigues alleged to have been entered into by Berne to obtain the reannexion of Vaud—were not successful.

The distance from Lausanne to Geneva—is about forty English miles. The road passes along the shores of the lake—through a region of great fertility and beauty—sustaining a dense population and cultivated to a high degree. The vallages have an ancient and rather sombre appearance;—and the chateaus are hid away in the

midst of groves of walnut and pear trees. The valley is filled with vines, which were still covered with their delicious fruit—though it was the end of the first week in October. I had seen no vines since we left the shores of lake Zug—and not many since we had turned our backs on the Rhine. It surprised me to find so many and so extensive vineyards, such large vines, and such abundant vintage; and especially, to see the white grape, which is generally considered less hardy than the purple—predominating every where. During my stay at Geneva I had an opportunity to witness the whole process of the vintage in this part of Switzerland; and will in a few words describe it.—On both sides of the lake the white grape is preferred—and considered more suitable to the climate, than any coloured grape. It ripens a week or ten days sooner: and on the south side of the lake, as the frosts are earlier, the vintage is commenced sooner than on the north. It is apparent from these several facts, that from the commencement of the vintage of the white grape on the south side of the lake, to the close of that of the red grape on the north side, several weeks must elapse. Much also depends on the season. But in general the two last weeks of October, are considered the period of the vintage. The labourers at this season, are paid about eighteen cents a day of our money, to the females (who compose the larger portion of them)—and twenty five or thirty cents to men. They are also fed in a plain way; and permitted to sleep in barns, and garrets, where they exist. These labourers, for the region around Geneva, meet in a sort of market, every Sabbath morning in that city, and are there hired for a period of one week or less—at a time. The process of gathering the grapes, and making the wine then commences. The bunches of grapes are picked and put into small wooden vessels; which as fast as they are filled, are emptied into a larger, and very curious funnel shaped tub, which they use all over Europe to carry liquids in, upon their backs, with the small end downwards. This is filled with bunches of grapes; and as they are thrown in, a man mashes them with a sort of pestle—pretty much as hommony is beaten. He then carries them to the wine press—which is generally erected in the same building where the wine is stored.—The grapes are poured from the tub upon the press;—and after they have been pressed to apparent dryness—the pumice is cut up, and placed in hogsheads with water. This after soaking is fit for vinegar—for distillation into brandy, or for an inferior kind of wine,—usually given to servants. The juice of the grape, is not even strained; but thick, and far more dirty, than our sweet cider—it is taken from the press, and thrown into hogsheads, which I should imagine contain several hundreds of gallons each. This finishes the process. The wine ferments clear, and in three months is fit for use; being much improved, of course by age. But it is neither, racked off—nor adulterated—nor mixed.—it is the simple juice of the grape—and is so used by the grower, or so passes into the hands of the wine merchant. What befalls so much of it as the wine dealer handles, is best known to the trade. But in Europe at least I presume its extreme cheapness, insures it against any adulteration except that arising from the addition of water, or inferior qualities of wine. As a drink it is in universal use. At every table d'Hôte, in the hotels, one bottle at least is set by every plate—and

sometimes two,—one of white the other of red wine. At the *coffee*, they give you what they call, *dejeuner a la fourchette* (literally, *breakfast with a fork*, a meal to which we have nothing answering)—for a frank or a frank and a half—always throwing in a bottle of wine. And this is bona-fide expected to be used: for what a European does not eat, he often carries off in his pocket. At least you will generally see this done, with the sugar left after taking coffee. The wine is generally sour—and as a beverage not much superior to the common cider of America. It is sufficiently strong to produce intoxication;—and the observant traveller will very soon see reason enough to discredit the common but extremely erroneous notion—that drunkenness is rare in those countries that produce wine.

The lake of Geneva—or Lemon,—like several of the smaller ones of Switzerland, is furnished with two or three comfortable steam boats,—which during the greater part of the year make daily voyages around it.—It also possesses some water craft of a different kind, and of a very beautiful construction and equipage. Small vessels, with narrow keels or slope bows and sterns—rigged with a false deck extending over the gunwails, so as to carry considerable stuff. They are furnished with one or two masts;—ordinarily with two, which are short, and composed of a single piece. To each of these is rigged a single spar considerably longer than the mast itself; so attached, that it can work up and down the mast;—and so balanced, that it can play on its own axis, both vertically and horizontally. These spars support, each a single sail—long, narrow, sharp, and triangular: and they usually lay across the masts, at a pretty sharp angle: either both on one side—or with their upper points turned out on opposite sides, like the tail of a swallow.—They are graceful and beautiful—and as far as my knowledge extends, are confined to lake Lemon, and the Mediterranean sea: at least I have seen such no where else. And I recall with a pleasant association the ancient village of Nyon, on the shores of the former, where I saw them first—and the romantic city of Nice on the banks of the latter, from the terrace of whose sea wall, I saw her little harbour hid behind marble bulwarks crowded with them. It is sweet to chain the memory to what we shall see no more—by bands ever so capricious—so that they bring back to us scenes, which we looked upon, when our hearts were at ease.

At a short distance from Geneva you pass through the village of Coppet—where Madame de Stael, long resided. Here she produced some of her most extraordinary works; which are certainly the most profound that any female has ever written—and which are neglected to a degree as unaccountable—as they were perhaps once overrated. Here she gathered around her in an honourable and elegant retirement, many of the first spirits of the age; who from time to time, resorted to her abode and refreshed themselves with her converse. A very curious anecdote is told of one of these assemblages. Benjamin Constant Schlegel, and other equally distinguished persons, were staying at Coppet, along with Pestalozzi, whom they had in vain endeavoured to draw into a discussion, on the subject of education—and to obtain an exposition of his peculiar system.—He evaded all discussion—refused all debate—escaped every snare laid

by his hostess and her guests to entrap him into a full disclosure of his ideas,—before an audience, whom he perhaps feared—or perhaps despaired of. They at length organized a plot against him; and by preconcert, one afternoon, the whole array of genius at Coppet insensibly gathered round him, and hemmed him, completely in. Then commenced the attack. One demanded his ideas on such a point; another required an answer to this objection; and all had somewhat that required explanation and defence. Pentolozzi, as usual attempted a retreat; but arms and legs and chairs surrounded him on all sides. The attack was renewed: and for a moment the old man seemed in despair. But finally summoning all his resolution, he charged upon the phalanx—and leaping over the top of one of the party—rushed out of the circle leaving it convulsed with laughter.

Almost opposite to Coppet, on the other shore of the lake, and in full view is the house where Lord Byron resided—and in which he wrote the third canto of *Child Harold*,—the *Manfred*, and the *Prisoner of Chillon*. The scene of the last named poem is laid at the chateau of that name, on the shore near the upper end of this lake; and the principal incidents are true. They belong to the life, sufferings and heroic efforts of Francis Bonnivoid, the defender of the liberty of Geneva—who languished six years chained to a rock in the dungeons of Chillon. Byron was attended during his residence here, by the poet Shelley, and the novelist Monk Lewis. I think none of the party, produced any kind impression on the Genevese. The house he occupied, is a plain stone edifice, on the lake shore, just above Coligny—and was vacant when I saw it. I had gone into the country for another purpose; and finding myself at the gate—walked in for a moment, upon the gloomy stone terrace. I take Byron to have been one of the most extraordinary combinations, that has had the human shape. His poetic genius was in modern times, altogether unparalleled. And yet his heart was cold, stern and bitter,—and his spirit caustic and capricious, to a degree that would seem incompatible, with a strong perception of what is beautiful and lovely, and wholly inconsistent with the fervid control of the imagination. It proves that intense passion and profound thought—have no necessary connexion with those qualities to which men have delighted to unite them;—nay more, that naked and alone they may triumph in regions appropriated to them, only when guided and sustained, by more refined and tender impulses.

On the same side of the lake as Coppet, but nearer to Geneva, is the village of Ferney, the residence, and I believe the domain of Voltaire; who made the acquisition of it in 1759—and lived in the chateau, if it deserve the name, till his death in 1775. The village is in the French territory; but being only five or six miles from Geneva—and the road from thence delightful,—it may be regarded, so far as travellers are interested in it, as an appurtenance of that city. Voltaire once said in derision of the Genevese, that if he shook his wig, he could powder the whole republic. At present, I believe few persons find their way to his mansion, except those attracted to Geneva, by its own objects of interests—so derided by the literary leviathan, in the height of his glory. Count Bude of a Genevese family and a protestant, is the owner of Ferney;—and

another house still nearer Geneva once occupied by Voltaire, is at present not only owned and occupied by a Momier,—but I was told; a part of it, was appropriated to the purposes of a magazine for Bibles and religious tracts. The succession to Voltaire seems even more extraordinary than that to Gibbon.

I visited Ferney, and found the whole matter a very paltry affair. The house is a comfortable and rather large country house; the grounds, pretty—not more hardly to much. The boasted church, which Voltaire built, and inscribed on the front—*Deo erexit Voltaire*,—I found full of wood—and going to decay. It was a very small and mean structure at its best days. The great objects of interest, are his private apartments—which are said to be preserved in the same state in which he left them. These are particularly mean. They consist of an outer hall—an interior saloon of a circular shape, behind it—and a small bed room on the left of it. Every thing here fills one with surprise—when it is remembered that this is the most secret place, of a man of wealth and inconceivable vanity and pretension,—at the very period when he was the intimate correspondent of sovereigns—and the most distinguished philosopher of the world.—It is a little miserable hole—adorned with some bad pictures—and a number of small, and wretched engravings. Amongst these were heads of distinguished persons of all countries; about half of the whole being Americans and English. I observed those of Washington—Franklin—Newton—Milton,—those also of Leibnitz—D'Alembert—Diderot—Helvetius—Racine—Cornelle; a portrait of the empress Catherine, and one of Frederick the Great; and to my utter amazement, a print of Clement XIV. Voltaire did indeed effect universality on all subjects;—to know and to be every thing—was the ruling conceit of a soul—consumed with low and evil passions. But that he whose strongest wish was expressed in the anxious desire “to see the last Jesuit strangled in the bowels of the last Molinist,”—and who continually sought to have it believed that it was not religion but superstition which he warred against,—and the papal system, as the concentration of folly and imposture;—that this same man, should hang up amongst his special favourites, the head of the reigning pontiff—who was the common father of Jesuit and Molinist—and the very centre of all that Voltaire considered ridiculous and unprincipled, in religion,—was an exhibition, for which I was not prepared.

No man ever exerted so great influence as this—who fell so speedily into so great contempt. With great activity of spirit—unbounded vivacity, and wit—and much that cannot be denied was real genius,—he possessed also an exceedingly wide range of superficial knowledge. With a laboriousness and flexibility never surpassed,—he wrote through nearly a century, with his eyes fixed on two grand objects;—the greatness of Voltaire,—and the littleness of all things else! See the issue. No one believes he was learned—few give him credit for poetic powers even of the second order,—all admit that his historical statements are unworthy of the least credit—no one claims for him any respect as a great thinker—and even his works rich in the happiness of expression are rejected by reason of their irreverence and obscenity!—A century of great and successful effort—terminates in half a century in an issue like this!

As I looked upon the fragments which excited these thoughts, how strongly did the divine assurance come to me,—*no weapon formed against Zion shall prosper.* Behold the proof!

SIR MATTHEW HALE'S DIRECTIONS

To his children on the keeping of the Lord's day.

LORD Chief Justice Hale, whose letter of advice to his children, we publish, on the duty of keeping the Sabbath, was one of the most upright, and honest men, in the discharge of the duties of his profession, that ever lived. Baxter, says, "he would have lost all that he had in the world, rather than do an unjust act." In the duties of his office he regarded no man; in private life he was an exceedingly humble man; in his studies diligent and laborious, studying for many years sixteen hours a day; in the public duties of religion and the service of God regular and punctual, so much so that for thirty six years he never once failed going to the house of God, on the Sabbath; with all his law studies he was a most diligent student of the Bible; in the performance of his private devotions he was punctual and regular until his last sickness, and then when he was unable to move himself he would have his servants carry him into his chamber on a chair. He was born 1st of November, 1609, died 1765.

LETTER.

Children,

WHEN I last lodged in this place, on my journey up to London, I sent you from hence divers instructions concerning your speech, and how you should manage it, and required you to take copies of it. I forgot to enquire of you, whether you had taken copies of it, but I hope you have; and I do again require of you to be careful in observing those and my former directions given to you, some in writing, and many more by word of mouth. I have been careful that my example might be a visible direction to you; but if that hath been defective, or not so full and clear a pattern for your imitation; especially in respect of my different condition from yours, yet I am certain that these rules and directions which I have at several times given you both in writing, and by word of mouth, have been sound, and wholesome, and seasonable; and therefore I do expect that you should remember and practise them; and though your young years cannot yet perchance, see the reason and use of them, yet assure yourselves time and experience will make you know the benefit of them. In advice given to young people, it fares with them as it does with young children that are taught to read, or with young school-boys that learn their grammar rules; they learn their letters, and then they learn to spell a syllable, and then they learn to put together several syllables to make up a word; or they learn to decline a noun, or to form a verb; and all this while they understand not to what end all this trouble is, or what it means. But when they come to be able to read English or to make a piece of Latin, or construe a Latin author, then they find all these rudiments were very necessary, and to very good purpose; for by this means they come to understand what others have written, and to know what they knew and wrote, and thereby improve their own knowledge and understanding. Just so it is with young people, in respect of counsel and instruction,

when the father, or the minister, or some wise and understanding man doth sometimes admonish, sometimes chide and reprove, sometimes instruct, they are apt to wonder why so much ado, and what they mean, and it is troublesome and tedious, and seems impertinent; and they are ready to say within themselves, that the time were better spent in riding, and hunting, or merriment, or gaming; but when they come to riper years, then they begin to find that those instructions of the ancients are of excellent use to manage the conversation, and to direct the actions, and to avoid inconveniences and mischiefs and miscarriages, to which they are subject without the help of these counsels. And therefore it hath been my practice to give you line, upon line, and precept upon precept, to enable you to steer and order your course of life through an evil and dangerous world; and to require you to be *frequent in reading the scriptures* with due observation and understanding, which will make you wise for this life, and that which is to come.

I am now come well to Farrington, from whence I wrote to you my former instructions concerning your words and speech; and I now intend to write something to you of another subject, viz. Your *observation of the Lord's day*, commonly called *Sunday*, and this I do for these reasons.

1. Because it hath pleased God to cast my lot so, that I am to rest at this place upon that day; and the consideration of that duty therefore, is proper for me and for you; it is *opus diei in die suo*, the work fit and proper for the day!

2. Because I have, by long and sound *experience*, found that the due observance of this day, and of the duties of it, has been of singular comfort and advantage to me; and I doubt not but it will prove so to you. God Almighty is the Lord of our time, and *lends it to us*; and as it is but just we should consecrate this part of that time to him, so I have found by a strict and diligent observation, that a due observation of the duty of this day hath ever had joined to it a blessing upon the rest of my time; and the week that hath been so begun, hath been blessed and prosperous to me: and, on the other side, when I have been negligent of the duties of this day, the rest of the week has been unsuccessful and unhappy to my own secular employments; so that I could easily make an estimate of my successes in my own secular employments the week following, by the manner of my passing this day; and this I do not write lightly or inconsiderately, but upon a long and sound observation and experience.

3. Because I find in the world much *looseness and apostacy* from *this duty*. People begin to be cold and careless in it, allowing themselves sports and recreations, and secular employments in it, without any necessity, which is a sad spectacle, and an ill presage. It concerns me, therefore (that am your father) as much as I may, to rescue you from that sin which the example of others, and the inclination and inconsiderateness of youth are otherwise apt to lead you into.

I shall therefore set down unto you particularly (and not in generals only) these things: 1. What is the reason and ground of your observation of this day. 2. What things ought not to be done upon this day, which possibly may be lawful upon another day. 3. What things may be done upon this day. 4. What things are either fit or necessary to be done in order to the sanctification of this day.

1. Touching the first of these, viz. *the reason of the observation and sanctification of this day*; and the reasons are these:

1. It is a *moral duty*, that since the glorious God gives me my time, I should consecrate and set apart some portion of that time in a special manner to his service.

2. And because the glorious God *best knows what portion of time is fit* to be peculiarly dedicated to his service, that so the morality of that time might be determined unto some certainty, he hath, by his express precept given to his ancient people the *Jews*, limited one day of seven to be that special portion of time, which he would have peculiarly dedicated to his service, and so to include, and transfer into it the morality of that duty.

3. This seventh portion of time, under the old law given to the *Jews*, was determined by the precept and command of God, in the fourth command, and likewise by his own example confined to the seventh day, from the seventh day from the creation, upon which the Lord rested from the works of creation.

4. But our Saviour Christ, who is the son of God, blessed forever, and is Lord of the Sabbath, fulfilling the work of our redemption by his *resurrection* upon the first day of the week, and by his *mission of the Holy Ghost* miraculously the first day of the week, and by the *secret message of the Spirit* to the apostles and primitive church, hath translated the observation of the seventh day of the week to the first day of the week, which is our Christian Sabbath; that, as our Christian baptism succeeds the sacrament of circumcision, and as our Christian *pascha*, the sacrament of the Eucharist, succeeded the Jewish passover, so our Christian Sabbath, the first day of the week, succeeds the Sabbath of the seventh day of the week; and morality which was by Almighty God, under that covenant confined to the seventh day, is, by the example of Christ and his apostles, to us gentiles, transferred to the first day of the week; and that which would have been morally a violation of the morality of the fourth command under the Jewish Sabbath, is a violation of the same fourth command, if done upon the Christian Sabbath; though the strictness and severity enjoined to the Jews be not altogether the same that is now required of Christians. And thus you have the reason of the obligation upon us Christians to observe the first day of the week, because by more than a human institution, the morality of the fourth command is transferred to the first day of the week, being our Christian Sabbath; and so the fourth command is not abrogated, but only the day changed; and the morality of that command only translated not annulled.

II. Concerning the second. It is certain that *what is unlawful to be done* upon another day, is much more unlawful upon this; as excess and intemperance, and the like sinful and unlawful actions. But further, there are many things that may be lawfully done on another day, which may not lawfully be done upon this: and many things that are not only lawful upon another day, but also fit and decent; which are yet unfit to be done on this day. Upon other days we may and must employ ourselves in our secular and ordinary callings; we may use bodily exercises and recreations, as bowling, shooting, hunting, and divers other recreation; we may study human learning; but I hold these to be not only unfit, but unlawful to be used upon this day, and therefore remember it. Moderate walking may thus far be used, so far only as it enableth to the more cheerful and lively

performance of the duties of this day; and therefore I allow you to walk soberly about half an hour after dinner to digest your meat, that you be not drowsy, nor indisposed in the religious duties of the day. Merry, but harmless talking, or talking about sports or worldly business, may be used another day, but not upon this. Feastings may be sometimes seasonably used upon other days, but are not fit upon this day. *Let only such provision be made upon this day* as may be necessary for feeding the family and the poor; and therefore I hold that curiosities, baking of meats,* and superfluous provisions upon this day, are to be avoided, as being an unnecessary breaking of the rest of this day, and unbecoming the solemnity of it.

III. *What things may be done* this day, is a question of a greater latitude; because circumstances are many that do much diversify the actions of men, and many times render them lawful or unlawful, according to those varieties of circumstances. Therefore I shall shortly set down those things that do not of themselves directly tend to the sanctification of this day, that yet may, and sometimes must be done upon this day; for there were many things that were strictly enjoined to the Jews in their observation of the sabbath, which were ceremonial and concerned only that state, and do not oblige under the gospel, as the dressing of meat on this day was prohibited to them, but not to us; and many more things they did forbear and count unlawful, which in truth were not only not forbidden, but enjoined and commanded, for which our Lord reproves the Pharisees, who accounted it a breach of the sabbath to heal the sick, or to pluck the ears of corn for the necessary relief of hunger. Therefore,

1. *Works of absolute necessity* for man or beast, may be done upon the Lord's day. And those I call works of necessity, which cannot be done before, or after, without apparent danger. As, for instance stopping of the breach of a sea wall; supporting a house that, upon a sudden tempest of casualty, is ready to fall; pulling out an ox or other beast fallen into a ditch; preventing a trespass, that by a sudden accident may be occasioned to my corn or my neighbour's; setting of a broken bone; physic to remove an incumbent, or imminent disease, or pain; milking of cows; feeding of cattle; and many more instances of that kind. But yet therein great weariness and integrity must be used; for otherwise men, under pretence of necessity, will take the liberty to do what they please. Therefore take these cautions concerning necessity,

1. That is not a necessity that excuses a work upon this day, which might have been reasonably foreseen and done before the day; as, for instance, a man hath a necessity to dress meat for his family, which he might have provided on the Saturday, and neglected it; this necessity will not justify men in sending two or three miles to buy meat on the Lord's day.

2. That is not a necessity which may be forborne to be done without any absolute destruction or loss of the thing until the morrow. If a rick of hay be on fire, I may endeavour to quench it on the Lord's day; but if my corn be cut, and lying upon the ground on the Saturday, though the weather be rainy, or inclining to wet, I may not make it into cocks, or fetch it home on the Lord's day;

* The word "meats" which now refers almost exclusively to flesh, is used in the Bible and in old English writers including food of all kinds. Ed.

because possibly Almighty God may send fair weather to morrow. And therefore in my forbearance, I do two duties under one, viz. observe his law, and rest upon his providence.—Men make necessities many times to serve their ease, and sloth, and fancies, when in truth there is none, but the business may be deferred without any danger. If we would be faithful in our obedience to God, we should find many pretended necessities to vanish into mere imaginations.

3. *Works of charity.* Relief of the poor; administering physic upon an apparent necessity; visiting or comforting the afflicted; admonishing the disorderly; persuading peace between neighbours offended; and endeavouring to compose differences which require not much examination, or cannot be deferred without an apparent danger of greater mischief. These are not only permitted, but commendable, nay commanded upon this day. But if the business require examination, or may be deferred till to-morrow, then it is best to defer such examinations and treaties between offended parties till another day; because they will take away too much of the little precious portion of time of this day, and may be as well done to-morrow.

4. As for the fourth, what is proper, fit, or necessary to be done, in order to the sanctification of this day, I will set down particularly; for generals seldom produce any great effect, because every man is apt to construe them according to his own mind and liking.

1. I would not have you meddle with any recreations, pastimes, or ordinary work of your calling from *Saturday night*, at eight of the clock, till *Monday morning*. For though I am not apt to think that *Saturday night* is part of the Sabbath, yet it is fit then to prepare the heart for it.

2. Rise at least three hours before morning sermon; and when you have made yourself fully ready, and washed, and fitted yourself for the solemnity of the day, read two chapters in the Bible, and then go solemnly to your *private prayer*, and desire of God his grace to enable you to sanctify his day; and after your private prayer, read another chapter, and let your reading be with attention, observation, and uncovered head.

3. When you are in the *public worship and service* of God, be *uncovered* all the while of reading, praying, or preaching; and if the weather be too cold wear a satin cap.

4. Kneel upon your knees at prayer; stand up at the reading of the Psalms, and the first and second lessons, and the epistle and gospel, the hymns and creeds; so you shall avoid offence, and give the same honour to every part of the holy scripture: but stand not up at reading of any apocryphal book, if any happens to be read.

5. Sit at the sermon, and be very attentive at your prayers, and in your hearing. I commend your *writing* the sermon, especially till you are one or two and twenty years old, because young minds are apt to wander; and writing the sermon fixeth them, and maketh them more attentive.

6. When the minister readeth any of the Psalms or lessons,* turn to them in your Bible, and go along with him; it will fasten your attention, and prevent wandering thoughts.

* It will be seen by the reader that he was an attendant on the Episcopal church, and that his directions refer to the order of its service. Ed.

7. Be very attentive and serious *at church*; use no laughing, or gazing about, nor whispering, unless it be to ask those by you something of the sermon that you slipped in writing.

8. *Sing* the singing Psalms with the rest of the congregation.

9. *After sermon*, eat moderately at *dinner*, rather sparingly than plentifully upon this day, that you may be fit for the afternoon's exercise, without drowsiness or dullness.

10. Walk half an hour *after dinner* in the garden to digest your meat, then go to your chamber and peruse your notes, or recollect what you remember of the sermon until it be church time.

11. If you are well, be sure to go to church morning and afternoon, and be there before the minister begins, and stay till he has ended; and all the while you are at church, carry yourself gravely, soberly and reverently.

12. *After evening sermon*, go to your chamber and read a chapter in the Bible; then examine what you have written, or recollect what you have heard; and if the sermon be not repeated in your father's house, but be repeated in the minister's house, go to the minister's house to the repetition of the sermon.

13. In all your speeches or actions of *this day*, let there be no lightness nor vanity; use no running or leaping, or playing, or wrestling: use no jesting, or telling of tales, or foolish stories; nor talk about worldly business; but let your actions and speech be such as the day is; serious and sacred, tending to learn, or instruct in the great business of your knowledge of God, and his will, and your duty.

14. *After supper*, and prayers ended in my family, every one of you going to bed kneel down upon your knees, and desire of God his pardon, for what you have done amiss this day, and his blessing upon what you have heard, and his acceptance of what you have endeavoured in his service.

15. Perform all this cheerfully, and uprightly, and honestly, and count it not a burden to you; for assure yourselves you shall find a blessing from God in so doing. And remember it is your father that tells you so, and that loves you and will not deceive you: and (which is more than that) remember that the eternal God hath promised, "If thou turn away thy foot from the Sabbath, from doing thy pleasure on my holy day, and call the Sabbath a delight, the holy of the Lord, honourable, and shalt honour him, not doing thy own ways; nor finding thine own pleasure, nor speaking thine own words; then shalt thou delight thyself in the Lord; and I will cause thee to ride upon the high places of the earth, and feed thee with the heritage of Jacob thy father; for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it."

And thus I have written to you of the observation of the Lord's day; wherein though I have omitted many things that might have been fit to be inserted, yet you must consider that I had but a small portion of time allotted to me to write while I lay at an inn, and upon that day wherein I have performed those duties which I now enjoin you. Let the original be laid up safely for your brother R. and every one of you take copies of it, that you may thereby remember the counsel of

October 20, 1662.

YOUR LOVING FATHER.

SOL-LUNAR INFLUENCE.

By *Maxwell McDowell, M. D. of Baltimore.*

Medical philosophers in exercising their laudable zeal, for the purpose of investigating the causes of fever, have not confined their researches to the *speck*, in creation, which we inhabit.—They have made speculative excursions to other orbs in our solar system in search of causes for the purpose of enabling them to explain the origin and progress of fever.—The central, or governing orb, of our solar system and that secondary planet which performs the office of a satellite, to the globe which forms our habitation, have been principally examined, by the cultivators of medical science, in their endeavours to investigate these causes.—SOL-LUNAR influence, has been considered by many medical authors, as having a considerable agency in the production of fever. Let us take a view of the evidence which has been produced in support of this pathological doctrine. Sol-Lunar influence in fevers, is a doctrine in medical science of great antiquity. Like many other doctrines, which had claimed the particular attention of medical philosophers, it had been permitted long to remain in a state of undisturbed repose. Towards the close of the last century an attempt was made, to revive this doctrine, by Dr. Balfour, in a work which he has entitled “A Treatise on Sol-Lunar influence in fevers.” The doctor addressed a circular letter to several physicians as well as to sundry persons who were not of the medical profession. I shall not deem it necessary to make any apology for giving the sentiments of the doctor’s correspondents, in their own language; in as much as I wish the reader to judge for himself, whether I do justice in my animadversions. “I really do not recollect,” says a correspondent of the Doctor’s “whether the two attacks of fever which I had at Dacca happened at the full or change of the moon. From cotemporary circumstances, I think the first happened about the 10th of January, 1790, and the second about the 15th of October, of the same year. Indeed the truth of lunar influence in fevers was so strongly impressed, on my mind, that I looked upon the attack happening at either the full or change of the moon, more especially in that part of the world, as a matter of certainty.—I was unpardonably negligent in not informing you that, during my residence at Berampere, in 1791 and 1792, I was three times attacked with an intermitting fever, which invariably came on about the full moon. The surgeon who attended me during my last illness, doctor Spotswood advised me to take two or three doses of bark for some days preceding and following the full and new moon. I accordingly did so for some months, and have not since had any return of the complaint. Since my arrival at this place, I had a fever which I attributed to having wontonly exposed myself to the sun in the month of April, when engaged in superintending some public works which captain McKenzie had entrusted to my care. It did not appear however that the moon had any influence on this fever; and I had great reason to think, that it was infectious, as Mrs. Black, was soon after my recovery, attacked with a fever of a similar nature, accompanied with the same symptoms. A woman also who was giving suck to an infant in our house, and several other of my

servants were attacked with fevers, all of which were accompanied with similar symptoms. I am the more inclined to think that lunar influence had not any effect on this fever, as several revolutions of the moon have occurred since that period, and no person has experienced a relapse.

It appears to me, though conscious how ill qualified I am to give an opinion on the subject, that the influence of the moon in fevers is more particularly applicable to those which are contracted in the eastern parts of Bengal, or in the countries much covered with wood, &c."

Now, admitting that the author of the passage which we have just quoted was in every respect well qualified for philosophic investigation, and took an unbiassed view of passing events; yet his communication, on the subject to Dr. Balfour is not calculated to support the doctrine of Sol-Lunar influence in fevers. For, although in one part of the passage quoted, the author says "Indeed the truth of lunar influence in fevers was so strongly impressed on my mind, that I looked upon the attacks happening at either the full or change of the moon, more especially in that part of the world; as a matter of certainty," yet in the concluding part of the same passage, the correspondent says, "that the influence of the moon in fevers is more particularly applicable to those which are contracted in the eastern parts of Bengal, or in countries much covered with wood, &c." We consider it altogether repugnant to the principles of sound philosophy to admit that the moon's influence, in fevers, is confined to particular districts of our earth. Any influence that the moon possesses over the globe which we inhabit, or the animals and vegetables which occupy its surface must be uniformly exercised, varying in *degree* only according to the relative position of that planet with respect to our earth. To admit a contrary doctrine, would be to ascribe to the moon a power which inanimate matter cannot possess, viz: a power of acting or not acting, and a power of selecting the particular object upon which its influence is to be exercised. Such an opinion would not merit a serious refutation.

"I had frequent attacks," says another of Dr. Balfour's correspondents, "of the fever when with the battalion at Midnapore and am of opinion they were in general greatly influenced by the full and change of the moon; and have observed as well as I can now recollect, that the fits more commonly came on between eight in the morning and two in the afternoon. I am also of opinion, from experience, that a change of air frequently prevented a return of the fever at the time it was expected."

Now, what support can this doctrine derive from the foregoing observations! The writer informs us that his attacks of fever "were in general greatly influenced by the full and change of the moon"—but afterwards tells us, "from experience, that a change of air frequently prevented a return of the fever at the time it was expected." Here we observe a violation of the correct rules of philosophising. When this correspondent of Dr. Balfour found that in a particular atmosphere he was attacked by fever, and "that a change of air frequently prevented a return of the fever at the time it was expected"—he might, we think, have saved himself the trouble of an excursion to the moon in search of the cause which produced his

fever. The cause which gave origin to his fever as well as that which, by a change of air, prevented its return, could not have been removed more than a few feet from the surface of the ground on which he walked.

Another correspondent of Dr. Balfour says that he had not "for a long time entertained any doubts of the existence of the general law, and of its influence being manifested in fevers, particularly by the tendency to relapse at the full and change. The precaution which this suggests" he "found of great consequence in practice, viz; of recurring to remedies at these periods, even after they were left off in the intervals, and continuing them in this manner until strength was completely established." He says further, that "It is very common to meet with patients, convalescent from intermittents, who probably never read a medical book, and are therefore not influenced in favour of any particular theory, sufficiently convinced from their own experience, i. e., sufferings, of the necessity of attending to the above precaution, and of carefully avoiding all irregularities at these periods."

This correspondent also says that "Its being a matter of common observation amongst such, is no small proof of this influence prevailing in a remarkable degree in Bengal." He thinks "also every practitioner in this country must have remarked, that medicines are much more liable to fail in the effects expected from them at those times than in the intervals, i. e. that there is often a difficulty in interrupting the succession of paroxysms during the spring, and that frequently it cannot be done completely till they are over, when a continuation of the same remedies soon completes the cure." We cannot admit the sentiments just quoted as philosophic evidence, of the existence of Sol-Lunar influence in fevers, notwithstanding the writer states that "Its being a matter of common observation among such is no small proof of this influence prevailing in a remarkable degree in Bengal." We know that it is a matter of common observation, and *belief*, among a certain portion of mankind that the influence of the moon, on our earth, is such as to render it necessary to observe particular signs of the moon, as they are called in some almanacs, in the raising of garden vegetables and yet we are fully convinced from *experiment* that the common observation of such persons is an absurdity, and has not the shadow of truth for its foundation. The house which I occupied, the five years immediately preceding my removal from York Pa. to this city, stood upon a lot of ground of considerable size. A part of the ground I appropriated to the purpose of raising culinary vegetables. A larger portion of the lot was covered with grass. One half the lot was sold to a blacksmith whose shop occupied the front part of his ground. An imaginary line divided the garden, as well as grass plat, of my neighbour from mine. The whole portion of ground which my neighbour and I used as a garden had been cultivated, for that purpose, by the original owner of the lot. The soil, therefore, which my neighbour and I occupied, as a garden, must have been upon a complete equality, as to its constituent parts, as well as fertility. My neighbour, an honest industrious mechanic, was a firm believer in the doctrine of lunar-influence to the widest extent of its operations. Considering this a

fair opportunity of testing the doctrine, I obtained from him a statement of the *unfavourable* periods of the moon, for planting garden seeds. I was very particular, therefore, in committing seeds to the ground at a time when according to the doctrine under consideration, the moon had decided that my labour would be in vain. My neighbour, however, was obliged to acknowledge, for ocular demonstration would not permit him to do otherwise, that my garden produced *radishes, beets, parsnips, &c.* as abundant in quantity, and as perfect in quality as any of those esculent vegetables which grew in his garden.

It is also a matter of common observation and belief among a portion of mankind that it is necessary to spread manure upon the ground in a particular sign of the moon, in order to obtain its fertilizing influence. I also tested this doctrine after having obtained, from my neighbour, a statement of the *unfavourable* time of the moon for spreading manure upon the ground. I was very particular therefore, in having manure spread upon my grass plat at a time when according to the doctrine of lunar-influence, neither the grass nor soil would receive any benefit from it. My neighbour and I had frequent opportunities of comparing our grass plats with each other. He candidly acknowledged that my crop of grass was as luxuriant as that which he raised.*

It is a matter of common observation and *belief* among a certain portion of mankind that it is necessary to cut timber, which is intended for any useful purpose in machinery, during a certain sign of the February moon, in order that the materials of which the machine is constructed may possess durability and be free from the destructive operation of worms. York has long been celebrated for the excellent quality of the wagons that it produced. For a considerable time after I became a resident of that town I was at a loss to know how a market was obtained for the immense number of wagons which were manufactured there. Upon enquiry I ascertained that farmers, often came a great distance to obtain a York wagon. The excellent quality of the wagon, was in a great degree, attributed to the circumstance that the wood, of which it was composed, was cut in the *right sign of the February moon*, for there is a *wrong sign of the February moon*, for cutting timber for useful mechanical purposes, in the opinion of those who believe in lunar-influence. I was always disposed to smile at the doctrine whenever it was mentioned to me. But when I found that not only the respectable mechanics of the place, were firm believers in the doctrine, but that other persons, of a high order of intellect and of considerable scientific attainments, professed to believe it also, and warmly advocated it, I considered it worth while to submit the matter to the test of *experiment*. For this purpose I called upon a respectable carpenter to be informed on the subject of the *favourable* and *unfavourable* signs of the February moon for cutting timber. The information which I obtained I reduced to writing for my guid-

* The doctrine here opposed by the author is one in which we have had but little faith, and yet there are cases that go far to prove that the moon does exert an influence upon the earth. For example: a board laid flat upon the earth at that season of the moon, called the dark, will in the course of a short time sink in the ground, while the same board laid upon the earth a foot distant during the light of the moon, will remain on the top.—Ed.

ance. I was not restricted to any particular species of timber. I made choice of the species commonly denominated white oak, and hickory. When the *favourable* sign of the February moon arrived, I repaired to the forest and procured two samples of each of those species of timber, which I carefully labelled. When the *unfavourable* sign of the February moon arrived, I again visited the forest and obtained two samples of each of the same species of timber which I also carefully labelled. When I was preparing to leave York, for this city, I boxed up my *moonstruck* samples of timber, and brought them with me in order that I might have an opportunity of seeing the unequivocal evidence which the steady hand of time would exhibit on the occasion. After keeping my samples of timber, a sufficient length of time I examined them, and unfortunately for the doctrine of lunar-influence, some of them which the moon, according to the doctrine, had *protected* against the destructive operations of worms, were literally *riddled* by those animals, whilst other samples which the moon had given up to the worms were not *touched* by them at all. Thus we see that the *common belief*, of any portion of mankind, in any particular doctrine cannot be admitted as philosophical *evidence of the truth* of that doctrine.

That there is a particular time to cut timber, when it will be more durable, I have no doubt. For a knowledge of that time, however, we must consult the *economy of vegetation*. The moon has no more to do with it, than "the man in the moon," in my opinion.—

A medical correspondent of Dr. Balfour informs the Dr. that he considers sol-lunar influence to be "a truth so well established, and of so much importance in medicine, that" he gives his "testimony with great confidence and satisfaction." He also informs Dr. Balfour that about thirteen years previous to the date of his letter he had lived with his "friend Dr. Campbell, then surgeon general, resident in India, for many years, and employed in a very extensive and successful practice; and that he was a firm believer in sol-lunar influence, and attended to it in his practice. In short, that the operation of this law is confirmed by observations in every quarter of Bengal." I am entirely unacquainted with the character of the writer, but am disposed to consider it of the first order in point of intellect and respectability; but what does the evidence contained in the communication amount to with regard to the doctrine of sol-lunar influence in fevers. In my opinion, it is nothing else than what the schoolmen denominate a "*petitio principii*" a begging of the question, and not that kind of evidence which ought to be produced for the establishment and support of a philosophical doctrine.

The writer commences his communication by saying that sol-lunar influence appears to him to be a truth "well established," and then proceeds to state the circumstances which have confirmed him in the belief, of this pathological doctrine, which are the frequent relapses, after the first attacks of remitting and intermitting fevers, that he says he knew from observation, as well as from the testimony of others, were "constantly connected with the full and change of the moon." Now it would have been more satisfactory if this correspondent of Dr. Balfour had detailed the circumstances with *minuteness*, which support his opinion, that relapses of remitting and intermitting fevers are "constantly connected with the full and

change of the moon."—Science indeed demanded such a detail when an important doctrine was the subject of investigation.

This correspondent also informs Dr. Balfour that his friend Dr. Daniel Campbell was a "firm believer in sol-lunar influence." We certainly intend no disparagement to the character of Dr. Campbell; but we cannot admit his firm belief in sol-lunar influence as sufficient evidence to prove the reality of that doctrine. Were this kind of evidence to be admitted as valid, in support of doctrines, we could be at no loss to find the "firm belief" of very respectable men in support of very absurd doctrines.

We might furnish the reader with extracts from the communications of many medical correspondents of Dr. Balfour; but as they are in substance, similar to that which we have already quoted, we deem it unnecessary. Upon a view, therefore, of the evidence furnished to Dr. Balfour, by his numerous correspondents, we consider it altogether insufficient to establish his favourite doctrines. We think, therefore, that the Dr. has entirely failed in his endeavours to establish the doctrine of sol-lunar influence, in fevers.

The doctrine of sol-lunar influence, in fevers, could not escape the notice of the active intellect of the celebrated Dr. Darwin.—Accordingly in his *Zoonomia* he says "as far as I have been able to observe the periods of inflammatory diseases, observe the solar day; as the gout and rheumatism have their greatest quiescence about noon and midnight, and their exacerbations some hours after; as they have more frequently their immediate cause from cold air, inanition, or fatigue, than from the effects of lunations; whilst the cold fits of hysteric patients, and those in nervous fevers, more frequently occur twice a day, later by near half an hour each time, according to the lunar day; whilst some fits of intermittents, which are undisturbed by medicine, return at regular solar periods, and others at lunar ones; which may probably be owing to the difference of the periods of those external circumstances of cold, inanition, or lunation which immediately caused them." Such are the sentiments expressed by Dr. Darwin upon the subject of sol-lunar influence, and we confess that we are entirely unable to discover in them any decisive evidence in support of that doctrine. Supposition, conjecture and probability are the amount of the evidence which they afford.

But it is not only in a pathological point of view that medical authors are disposed to consider lunar-influence, for they view the *physiology* of the human system as subject to the powers of that secondary planet of our solar system. Now, we know that many substances, different kinds of aliment for example, which are necessary to aid the animal body in the performance of its *physiological* actions, also become the cause of *pathological* actions in the human system. But alimental matters act in this two-fold manner according to their quantity and quality, in different conditions of the system. Can it be supposed that the moon's influence varies in quantity and quality with respect to its actions on the human system?

Doctor Jackson after acknowledging that in the writings of medical authors on the subject of lunar-influence in fevers there is not "any thing accurate and precise enough to enable us to form an

opinion," undertakes to communicate his own observations upon the subject, which he flatters himself, are "less ambiguous." The Doctor's observations were made in the island of Jamaica, and in the southern states of our continent during the war which eventuated in the independence of America. In Jamaica Dr. Jackson informs us that he provided himself "with the almanac of the year 1776, and marked in the blank leaf of it, the precise date of attack of all the fevers which came under his care." "In looking over these memoranda at the end of the year," says the Dr. "I found I had put down thirty cases of proper remitting fever, the invasion of twenty eight, of which was on one or other of the seven days immediately preceding new or full moon; that is in the second and last quarters." We cannot admit that the sentence just quoted contains any thing precise on the subject of lunar-influence in fevers. *Fourteen days* of a lunation are allowing a considerable latitude of time for the moon to influence fevers; so much so that we cannot avoid concluding that if the intelligent Jackson had confined his attention, on these fourteen days, to the causes which existed on the surface of the earth, and its surrounding atmosphere which were under his view, he might have accounted for his cases of fever without requiring any assistance from the moon. In the observations made by Dr. Jackson, in the southern part of the United States, he informs us that "the approach to new and full moon never failed, even in this climate, to increase the number of the sick; yet it deserves to be remarked, that this increase was always smaller in proportion, in that part of the battalion, which lay contiguous to the swamp, where the disease was highly epidemic, than in the other extremity of the encampment, where it prevailed in a less degree." There is certainly nothing explicit in the sentence just quoted in support of the doctrine. Local causes will sufficiently account for the difference in the increase of cases, in the different parts of Dr. Jackson's battalion, independent of any supposed agency from the moon. We are decidedly of opinion that the doctrine of sol-lunar influence has not been established, to the extent that has been contended for, by its advocates.

SAINTS—RELICS—IMAGES.

Every part of the system of Popery, bears upon its front the marks of honour, given to every other but unto the one living and true God; and of all sorts of mediators, but that "*one Mediator between God and man, the man Christ Jesus.*" (1 Tim. ii: 5.)

How any man in his senses, can read the decree of the Council of Trent which follows, (which every Roman Catholic has sworn to believe and hold) and not be entirely convinced, that this system is an idolatrous system, we cannot understand. It is not a question whether priests and people are men to be respected in their opinions. It is a question, whether this system is that which God has appointed in his word, and through which he will be worshipped. That it is not the religion of the Bible, we have the best evidence, in the care and zeal manifested by the priests to keep their people from

reading that blessed book, and the virulent opposition of the Pope to every effort making to spread abroad the word of life, as will be seen in his bulls; that the system is not that through which God will be worshipped, is settled as clearly, when we see that it is not worship given to God, but a system that gives to *images, relics, and dead men*, good or imaginary as it may happen, that honour and worship which should be given to God. It will be seen on reading this decree, that bishops, are to examine and decide when *NEW RELICS, are to be received*, and put on the list of Gods, and these are to be honored under the penalty of the curse of the holy church.

This worship is not that of single individuals; it is not the opinion of a single, or of many of the Roman divines; it is the declared doctrine of the Roman Catholic church, congregated at Trent, and received over the whole world, wherever there is a bishop, priest, or member of that system, Go to any Roman Catholic church, and behold the images, the painted saints, the holy relics, and you will at once see, that it is carried out to the very letter. From whence all these relics come we know not; and it would puzzle any of their bishops, or priests to answer.

DECREE OF THE COUNCIL OF TRENT ON SAINTS, IMAGES, RELICS.

"The holy council commands all bishops, and others who have the care and charge of teaching, that according to the practice of the Catholic and apostolic church, received from the first beginning of the Christian religion, the consent of venerable fathers, and the decrees of holy councils, *they labour with diligent assiduity to instruct the faithful concerning the invocation and intercession of the saints, THE HONOUR DUE TO RELICS, and the lawful use of images;* teaching them that the saints, who reign together with Christ, offer their prayers to God for men—that it is a good and useful thing suppliantly to invoke them, and to flee to their prayers, help, and assistance, because of the benefits bestowed by God through his Son Jesus Christ our Lord, who is our only Redeemer and Saviour; and that those are men of impious sentiments who deny that the saints, who enjoy eternal happiness in heaven, are to be invoked—or who affirm that they do not pray for men, or that to beseech them to pray for us is idolatry, or that it is contrary to the word of God, and opposed to the honour of Jesus Christ, the one Mediator between God and men, or that it is foolish to supplicate, verbally or mentally, those who reign in heaven."

"*Let them teach also, that the holy bodies of holy martyrs and others living with Christ, whose bodies were living members of Christ and temples of the Holy Spirit, and will be by him raised to eternal life and glorified, are to be venerated by the faithful, since by them God bestows many benefits upon men.* So that they are to be wholly condemned, as the church has long before condemned them, and now repeats the sentence, *who affirm that veneration and honour are not due to the relics of the saints* or that it is a useless thing that the faithful should honour these and other sacred monuments, and that the memorials of the saints are in vain frequented, to obtain their help and assistance."

"Moreover, let them teach that *the images of Christ, of the Virgin, Mother of God, and of other saints, are to be had and retained, es-*

pecially in churches, and due honour and veneration rendered to them. Not that it is believed that any divinity or power resides in them, on account of which they are to be worshipped, or that any benefit is to be sought from them, or any confidence placed in images, as was formerly by the gentiles, who fixed their hope in idols. But the honour with which they are regarded is referred to those who are represented by them; so that we adore Christ, and venerate the saints, whose likenesses these images bear, when we kiss them, and uncover our heads in their presence, and prostrate ourselves. All which has been sanctioned by the decrees of councils against the impugnors of images, especially the second council of Nice."

"Let the bishops teach further, that by the records of the mysteries of our redemption, *expressed in pictures or other similitudes*, men are instructed and confirmed in those articles of faith which are especially to be remembered and cherished; and that great advantages are derived from all sacred images, not only because the people are thus reminded of the benefits and gifts which are bestowed upon them by Christ; but also because the divine miracles performed by the saints, and their salutary examples, are thus placed before the eyes of the faithful, that they may give thanks to God for them, order their lives and manners in imitation of the saints, and be excited to adore and love God, and cultivate piety. Whoever shall teach or think in opposition to these decrees, let him be accursed."

"But if any abuses have crept into these sacred and salutary observances, the holy council earnestly desires that they may be altogether abolished, so that no images may be set up calculated to lead the ignorant into false doctrine or dangerous error. And since the histories and narratives of sacred scripture are sometimes represented in painting or sculpture, for the benefit of the unlearned multitude, let men be taught, that when the Deity is thus represented, it is not to be supposed that the same can be seen by our bodily eyes, or that a likeness of God can be given in colour or figure. Moreover, let all superstition in the invocation of saints, the veneration of relics, and the sacred use of images, be taken away; let all base gain be abolished; and lastly, let all indecency be avoided, so that images be neither painted nor adorned in a lascivious manner, nor the commemoration of the saints or visits to relics be abused by men to gluttony and drunkenness; as though the festal days appointed in honour of the saints were to be spent in licentiousness and luxury. Finally, let all diligent caution be observed in these respects by the bishop, that nothing be done tending to disorder, impropriety or tumult, and no profane or unseemly exhibitions be allowed; for holiness becometh the house of God. And that these things may be faithfully observed, the holy council decrees that it shall not be lawful for any one to fix or cause to be fixed a new image in any place or church, however exempt from ordinary jurisdiction, unless the same be approved by the bishop, *nor are any new miracles to be admitted, or any NEW RELICS to be received, but with the recognition and approbation of the bishop, who, having received information respecting the same, and taken the advice of divines and other pious men, will do whatever shall be judged consonant to truth and piety.* But if any doubt or difficulty occurs in abolish-

ing abuses, or any unusually important question arises, let the bishop wait for the opinion of his metropolitan and the neighbouring bishops, assembled in provincial council; yet so as that nothing new or hitherto unused in the church be decreed, without the cognizance of the most holy Roman pontiff."

Translation of the decree of the XXV. Session of the Council of Trent.—See the original in the decrees of that Council.

The above decree speaks the doctrine of the church, on the worship of *saints, images, and relics*. Can any human being pretend that this is the doctrine of the Bible? And who in the least degree acquainted with history does not know, that the ingenuity of man has been put to the utmost stretch to prepare images, and that the graves of men and beasts have been ransacked for bones, to be set apart by the bishops for holy relics? All catholic countries present a picture of superstition on this subject that is heart sickening.

In the year 1752. a young Englishman spending a short time in Rome, found the following list of Relics set out for Sale at auction, on the 1st of June 1753. Having procured a list he sent it to England where it was published the same year. It is a comment on the Decree, on Relics, &c.

A CATALOGUE

Of the most sacred and eminently venerable Relics of the Holy Roman Church, collected by the pious care of their Holinesses the Popes, the most august Emperors, Kings, and Princes, Pontentates, and Prelates, of the Christian World, and several of them brought to Rome by the vast care and expense of the most Reverend Fathers the Jesuits. All which are now to be disposed of by Auction, for the general Benefit and Emolument of the Christian World, at the Church of St. Peter's, at Rome, on the 1st of June, 1753, from Eleven in the Morning, till Four in the Afternoon, and continue till all are sold.

N. B The whole of these said most proper Vouchers, and Certificates of Verification, and his Holiness's Bull for their being true authentic Originals, may be viewed and examined (but not handled) at the Church of St. Peter's aforesaid,

12

by all Ambassadors, Prelates, and Persons of Quality, and proper Credit, Condition, and Character till the Day of Sale.

"Lot 1. The ark of the covenant; the cross of the good thief; both somewhat worm-eaten.

2. Judas's lanthorn, a little scorched; the dice the soldiers played with when they cast lots on our Saviour's garment; from Umbriatico, in Calabria.

3. The tail of Balaam's ass, that spoke when she saw the angel.

4. St. Joseph's axe, saw, and hammer, and a few nails he had not driven: a little rust-eaten.

5. St. Christopher's stone-boat, and St. Anthony's mill-stone, on which he sailed to Muscovy.

6. The loaves of bread turned into stone by St. Boniface, on a soldier's denying him a piece of one of them when he was starving; for which he suffered martyrdom as a sorcerer.

7. Our blessed Saviour's teeth, hair, and præputium (*emptum Charovii;*) another præputium, (*emptum Aquisgrani;*) brought thither by an angel from Jerusalem—N. B. In all such cases of duplicates, equally well vouched and verified, it is left to the faith of the buyer which deserves the preference.

8. Several drops of Christ's blood on different occasions; as his circumcision, bearing his cross, and crucifixion,—purchased at a vast price, and

brought by the Fathers, the Jesuits, from Rochelle: several small phials of it from Mantua; larger vessels of it from St. Eustachius's, in this city of Rome; mixed with water as it came from his side, from St John Lateran in this city.

9. His cradle and manger, very much decayed.— Ditto, a pailful of the water of Jordan, where he was baptised, fresh and clear to this day (*emptum Cassini.*)

10. The water-pots of the marriage of Cana in Galilee.—N. B. These are not the pots shown at Pisa, Cluniaci, and Andegavi, but the true original ones.

11. Crumbs of the bread that fed the five thousand: *Romæ ad Mariæ Novæ.*

12. A bough of the tree carried by Christ entering Jerusalem in triumph, the leaves almost fresh still from Spain, *ad Salvatoris.*

13. The table on which Christ ate the last supper, a little decayed: at Rome, St. John Lateran.

14. Some of the bread which he then broke: from Spain, *ad Salvatoris.*

15. The cup he then drank out of and gave to his disciples: *ad Mariæ Insulanæ*, near Lyons.

16. The sacrament of his body and blood, from Brussels.

17. The towel with which he wiped his disciples' feet, very rotten: Rome.

18. Part of the money paid Judas Malchus's lanthorn, some of the panes cracked, and the door quite decayed: from St. Denis.

The following most holy and precious relics were brought to Rome, by the blessed Father Francis Visconti, by order of the Pope, from Aquisgranum, or Aken:

19. Part of the wood of the cross, a little decayed; and a nail of the same.

20. Some of the manna in the wilderness; and of the blossoms of Aaron's rod.

21. Part of the sudarium, of the reed, and sponge of our Saviour.

22. A girdle of our Saviour's, and another of the Virgin's, little worn.

23. The cord with which Christ was bound at his passion, very fresh.

24. Some of the hair of St. John Baptist. A ring of the chain of St. Peter.

25. Some of the blood of St. Stephen; and the oil of St. Catherine.

26. The arm of St. Simeon, ill kept. The image of the blessed Virgin, drawn by St. Luke; the features all visible.

27. The relics of St. Spes, or St. Hope. Some of the hair of the blessed Virgin.

28. One of her combs, brought originally from Besancon in Burgundy; and twelve combs of the twelve apostles, all very little used: originally from Lyons.

29. The *indusium*, or shift, of the blessed Virgin, when our Saviour was born.

30. The swathes in which our Saviour was wrapped the night of his nativity.

31. The holy linen-cloth upon which St. John Baptist was beheaded; wants new hemming and darning.

32. The cloth with which our Saviour was covered when he hung on the cross.

33. The brains of St. Peter, from Geneva—*Nota.* These are the individual brains which that arch-heretic Calvin declared were a mere pumice-stone, sinning against God, the holy apostle, and his own soul.

The following most venerable relics were bought at, and brought from, Prague, to this city, by the reverend Father Priuli, Jesuit, commissioned and authorized by the pope:

34. The head and arm of the blessed Longinus. Some relics of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob.

35. The arm and some part of the body of Lazarus; ill kept, and smells.

36. Two pieces of two girdles of the blessed Virgin.

37. A part of the body of St. Mark; and a part of his Gospel, of his own hand-writing, almost legible.

38. A piece of St. John the Evangelist's coat. A piece of the staff of St. Peter; and another piece of the staff of St. Paul.

39. A part of St. Peter's chain.

40. A finger of St. Ana.

41. A part of the blessed Virgin's veil, as good as new.

42. The head of St. Luke.

N. B.—It is true there is also another in this Catalogue; but both are so amply verified,—nay, avouched by daily miracles,—that his holiness leaves it undecided. Betwixt the buyer and seller be it.

43. Some of the relics of St. Catherine of Alexandria.

44. The head and finger of St. Stephen: it is supposed to be his middle finger, but that is doubtful.

Here endeth the collection of relics from Prague.

45. The staff delivered by our Lord to St. Patrick, and with which he drove all the venomous creatures out of Ireland.

46. Eight Veronicas, or holy handkerchiefs, of our Lord's: one from Turin; another from St. John de Lateran; and a third from St. Peter's, in this city; another from Cadion, in Perigort; a fifth from Besancon; another from Compeigne; a seventh from Milan; and another from Aix-la-Chapelle.

N. B. It is as impossible as unjust to decide which has the best title to be the real one, since they have all been received from age to age by the faithful; but, as that of Cadion hath fourteen bulls in its favour, and the rest but one or two, (though that of Turin produceth four in its behalf,) we leave it undecided. 'This we do the rather, as the prayers and devotions of the pious have probably sanctified them all equally; and, moreover, it is possible that they have been miraculously multiplied by the goodness of God, for the support and aid of the faithful, as the loaves and the fishes were to the hungry Jews.

47. The most holy fore finger of John the Baptist, with which he pointed to Christ: brought from Jerusalem to Malta, by the brothers of St. John's Hospital, and since to this city.

48. The holy Sindon, or linen in which Christ's body was buried: from Turin.

49. The dish in which Christ ate the paschal lamb, made all of one emerald: from Genoa.

50. A nail of our Saviour's cross: fixed formerly on the church-roof of Milan, and since brought hither.

51. Another: being one of those which the Empress Helena ordered to be wrought up into the cheek of a bride for the Emperor Constantine; and a third, which was thrown into the Adriatic sea in a vast storm, to appease it, as it actually did: taken up since in a fisherman's net, and brought to this city;

52. The stone upon which Abramam offered to sacrifice his son; and another stone, on which our Lord was placed when he was presented in the temple.

53. The top of the lance with which Christ's side was pierced.

54. The smoch of St. Prisca, in which she was martyred 1700 years ago: something decayed.

55. A thorn of that crown of thorns which was put on our Saviour's head.

56. The head of the woman of Samaria, who was converted by our Saviour: decayed, but plainly a head still.

57. The arm of St. Ann, mother of the blessed Virgin; and the chain of St. Paul.

58. *Scala Sancta*; or the twenty eight steps of white marble on which Christ was led up in his passion to Pilate's house, and on which visibly appear the marks of his blood: sent by Helena, from Jerusalem, to the Emperor Constantine.

59. A picture of our Lord, said to be begun by St. Luke, but finished by an angel: or, as others say, St. Luke prepared to draw it, but falling to his prayers to God that he might draw his Son aright, when he arose, he found the picture finished.

60. The holy crib of our Saviour: very old and tender.

Here follows some most venerable relics, brought hither from Venice by the aforesaid Father Francis Visconti.

61. A thorn of the crown of thorns a finger of St. Mary Magdalen.

62. A piece of St. John Baptist's skull; a tooth of St. Mark, a little rotten; also one of his fingers, and his ring with a stone in it.

63. A piece of St. John Baptist's habit; some of the Virgin's hair.

64. The sword of St. Peter, very rusty and old.

65. A piece of Christ's white robe, when he was set at nought by Herod.

66. One of the stones with which St. Stephen was stoned.

67. Some of St. Joseph's breath, which an angel enclosed in a phial, as he was cleaving wood violently; which was so long adored in France, and since brought to Venice, and from Venice to this city.

68. The head of St. Dennis; which he carried two miles, after it was cut off, under his arm, from Montmartre to St. Dennis.

69. The rock which Moses struck in the wilderness, with the three holes in it, of the diameter of a goose-quill, out of which the water issued for the six-hundred thousand Israelites and their cattle.

Here endeth the list of the relics from Venice.

70. A piece of the rope Judas hanged himself with: from Amras, near Inspruck.

71. Part of the crown of thorns, from Paris; several single thorns, from different places,—Compostella, Toulouse, and this city; to be sold separately.

72. The reed given our Lord for a sceptre: Rome, St. John Lateran.

73. His holy cross: a great part of it from Jerusalem; more of it from Constantinople; more from Paris.

74. Several nails belonging to it; two from Rome, two from Venice, one from Colen, two from Paris, one from Sienna, one from Naples, one from St. Dennis, one from the Carmelites at Paris.

—N. B. We say in this, as aforesaid, which are the right nails? He only knows whose body they pierced; but the vouchers and certificates for all are to be seen, proved, and examined: let the purchasers determine according to the truth.

75. The title fastened to the cross, fair and legible, and thought to be St. Peter's hand writing: from Toulouse.

76. The sponge that was dipped in vinegar, and given to our Lord: Rome. Another, from Cassini,

77. The point of the lance,—three of them: one originally of Rome, another from Paris, a third from Xaintonge; all properly vouched and evidenced. The church herein decides nothing, but modestly saith, *Caveat Emptor*.

78. The footsteps which our Lord left in the rock on his ascension; Rome.

79. The marks of his seat made in the rock by his resting: from Rheims.

80. Four crucifixes, whose beards grow regularly; seven that have spoke on several occasions; ten more that wept often, and bitterly on Good Fridays, and on the success of heretics in their wars with Catholics.

81. Five others that have stirred and moved on different accidents, four of them equal to any in the Christian church; six more that have groaned, smiled, and nodded,—all vouched authentically, very little inferior to the former, except the freshest being the last made.

82. Another crucifix, which, having had his leg broke by accident, stunk so grievously that all the people in the church were obliged to hold their noses, till, proper remedies being applied, the bone knit again; though the place where the broken parts joined is still visibly thicker and larger, and that leg near two inches shorter than the other.

83. Another crucifix from Trent, under which the synod was sworn and promulgated, and which bowed its head to testify the approbation which it gave to the learned decrees of that holy assembly.—N. B. As no man could ever tell what this Crucifix was made of, so it is much doubted by the faithful if ever it were made by hands: it worketh unheard-of miracles.

84. Another Crucifix, from St. Dominic the Greater in Naples, which spoke one day to St. Thomas Aquinas, "Thou hast well written of me, Thomas."

85. Another, from the church of the Benedictines in Naples, which held twice two long conversations with his holy vicegerent, Pope Pius V. of blessed memory; and another of St. Mary of the Carmelites, of the

same city, which bowed its head at the sight of a cannon-bullet, which was shot at him in 1439, (when Don Pedro of Arragon besieged that city) and only struck off the crown.—
N. B. To cover his head, being very bald, there is a peruke of the hair of the Virgin fitted to it.

86. An image of Christ, made by himself, and sent to King Abgarus from St. Silvester: in the Field of Mars in this city.

87. Another, made by angels: from the chapel of the Sancta Sanctorum, in this city; and a crucifix, which was begun to be painted by Nicodemus, but finished by angels: from the cathedral of St. Martin, at Lucca.

N. B. All these Crucifixes have wrought great miracles within these fifty or sixty years.

(To be continued)

ANOTHER BULL OF POPE PIUS VII. AGAINST BIBLE SOCIETIES.

“Out of thine own mouth will I judge thee,” was the language of our blessed Saviour to the wicked servant. Luke xix 22. So in our judging of the church of Rome, we take not the opinions of the members or even of Bishops among the Roman Catholics as the ground of our judgment; but the supreme Head of the church who claims to be Judge in all controversies. Hear the words that came out of his mouth, in the bull which follows.

I. He complains that he is worn down with poignant and bitter grief, at hearing of the *dispersion of the Bible in the native tongue of the people.*

II. It appears that this Archbishop has been so unmindful of his duty as to aid in its circulation, at this he is surprised, reminding him of the rule, that he had violated, “*That the Holy Bible in the Vulgar tongue permitted every where, more injury than benefit would arise.*”

III. No edition of the Bible is allowed by the Decree of the Council of Trent but the *Vulgate Edition*, (in Latin,) rejecting all others except with notes.

IV. *Heresy* is the result of reading the Bible, in the Language which we are able to understand!!

V. He laments that even their learned men, have failed in interpreting the Scripture. Alas! When the infallible Bishops and Popes have failed, we had better try ourselves.

VI. Compare this Sophistical argument of Antichrist, with the word of God: Psalm cxix. 130. “*The entrance of thy words giveth light; it giveth understanding to the simple.*” and the command of Jesus Christ, John v. 39. “*Search the scriptures, &c.*” Ps. xix. 7. 2 Tim. iii. 15—17.

VII. Here he refers to the Bulls of other Popes on the Subject, in which they teach *that if the Scriptures were unreservedly laid open to all, they would be despised and disregarded.* See Ps. cxix. 87—104. where studying the word of God begets love to it. “O how I love thy law.”

The next point which the Bp. ought to have understood, was the Bull Unigenitus, and this we shall publish in part in our next No. In it the giving of the Bible to all is prohibited and the author of an edition of the New Testament though a catholic, condemned for teaching that it was proper to read it.

VIII. TRADITION, which the council of Trent, *receives and venerates with equally the same pious affection*

and reverence, that she has for the Holy Scriptures, he had omitted in his rescript of the Decree.

In the remaining sections he accuses him of garbling the Letter of Pius VI; blames him for his conduct, as that which would be culpable in a private member, much more in him; as being contrary to his oath; and urges him to lie to the people, telling them that he did not mean what he had said; but only in accordance with the rules of the Church. Let it speak for itself.

POPE PIUS VII.

To our Venerable Brother Stanislaus, Archbishop of Mohileff.

VENERABLE BROTHER,

Health and Apostolic Benediction.

1. WE are worn down with poignant and bitter grief at hearing of the pernicious design, not very long ago entered upon, by which the most holy books of the Bible are every where dispersed in the several vernacular tongues, and published, contrary to the most wholesome Rules of the Church, with new translations, and these craftily perverted into bad meanings. For we have perceived, from one of those versions which has been brought to us, that it tends to destroy the sanctity of purer doctrine; so that the faithful may easily drink deadly poison, from those fountains whence they ought to draw the waters of salutary wisdom.

2. But we were still more deeply grieved, when we read certain letters signed with the name of You, our Brother; wherein You authorized and exhorted the people committed to your care, to procure for themselves modern versions of the Bible, or willingly to accept them when offered, and carefully and attentively to peruse them! Nothing certainly could more aggravate our grief than to behold You, who were placed to point out the ways of righteousness, become a stone of stumbling. For You ought carefully to have kept in view, what our Predecessors have always prescribed;

namely, That if the Holy Bible in the vulgar tongue were permitted every where, without discrimination, more injury than benefit would thence arise.

3. Further, the Roman Church receiving only the *Vulgate Edition*, by the well-known Decree of the Council of Trent, rejects the version in other languages, and allows only those which are published with notes properly selected from the writings of the Fathers and Catholic Doctors; lest so great a treasure should be subject to the corruptions of novelties, and in order that the Church, scattered over the whole world, might be of one lip and of the same speech. Truly, when we perceive in a vernacular tongue very frequent changes, variations, and alterations, proceeding from the immoderate licentiousness of biblical versions, that immutability would be destroyed; nay, the divine testimonies, and even the faith itself would be shaken, especially since, from the signification of one syllable the truth of a dogma may some times be ascertained.

4. Wherefore, by this means, Heretics have been accustomed to bring forward their corrupt and most destructive machinations; in order that they might insidiously obtrude each their own errors, dressed up in the more holy garb of the Divine word, by publishing the Bible in the vulgar tongues, (though concerning the wonderful variety and discrepancy of these they mutually accuse and cavil at each other.) 'For Heresies arise only,' saith St. AUGUSTINE, when the excellent Scriptures are not well understood; and what in them is ill understood, is nevertheless rashly and boldly asserted.'

5. But, if We lament that men, the most renowned for piety and wisdom, have often failed in interpreting Scripture; what may not be feared, if the Scriptures, translated into every vulgar tongue, are given to be freely read by the ignorant common people, who usually judge not from any preference, but from a sort of temerity? 'Is it so,' exclaims St. AUGUSTINE properly, 'that you, un-
tinctured by any poetical skill, do not venture to open TERENCE with-

out a master: but you rush without a guide upon the Holy Books, and wish to give an opinion upon them without the assistance of an instructor.

6. Wherefore, our Ancestor **INNOCENT III.** in his celebrated epistle to the faithful of the Church of Metz, most wisely commanded these things. The hidden Mysteries of the faith are not every where to be laid open to all people; since they cannot every where be understood by all men, but by those only who can comprehend them with a faithful mind. On which account the Apostle says, (1 Cor. iii. 2,) to you who are the more ignorant, as it were babes in Christ, I gave milk to drink, not food, for strong meat belongeth to the elder. As he himself said to others: We speak wisdom among the perfect; but among you I determined to know nothing but Jesus Christ, and him crucified. For so great is the depth of the Divine Scriptures, that not only the simple and illiterate, but even the prudent and learned, are incompetent fully to discover their meaning. On which account the Scripture affirms: Because many who have diligently searched have failed. Whence it was rightly ordained of old in the divine law. (Exod. xix. 12,) that the beast which shall touch the mountain should be stoned; lest truly any simple and unlearned person should presume to reach after the height of Sacred Scripture, or even proclaim it to others: for it is written, Mind not high things. Therefore the Apostle commands; Not to be more wise than is becoming, but to be wise soberly.

7. Yet, not only the letter of **INNOCENT III.** just quoted, but also the Bulls of **PIUS IV.**, **CLEMENT VIII.**, and **BENEDICT XIV.**, are very well known; in which they fore-warned us, lest, if the Scripture was unreservedly laid open at all, it would perhaps be despised and disregarded or being improperly understood, by persons of low capacities it would lead them into error. But You, our Brother, may know plainly what is the opinion of the Church concerning the reading and interpretation of the Scripture, from the famous *Bull*

UNIGENITUS by another of our Predecessors, **CLEMENT XI**; wherein are expressly refuted those opinions which asserted, That it is useful and necessary at all times, in all places, and for all descriptions of persons to know the mysteries of the Scripture, the reading of which was intended to be for all,—That it is pernicious to keep it back from Christian people,—Yea, that the mouth of Christ was closed against the faithful, when the New Testament was taken out of their hands.

8. But what caused even still greater grief, is this; that You have gone so far as, when transcribing the decree of the Council of Trent concerning the Canon of Scripture, that You omit those things respecting Traditions, which are sanctioned by the same context. For, when these Holy Fathers openly declare, That the Word of God is contained not merely in the written books, but also in the most indubitable Traditions of the Church, in things pertaining to faith, as well as to morals; which, as proceeding either from the mouth of Christ, or dictated by the Holy Spirit, and preserved by continued succession in the Catholic Church, this most Holy Synod receives and venerates with equality pious affection and reverence.

9. You, Venerable Brother, have not feared entirely to garble this passage, with the same artifice with which we observe You have quoted the Letter of **PIUS VI.** our Predecessor, to **MARTINI**, Archbishop of **FLORENCE**! For, when that most wise Pontiff, for this very reason commends a version of the Holy Scriptures, made by that Prelate, because he had abundantly enriched it by expositions drawn from tradition; accurately and religiously observing the Rule prescribed by the Sacred Congregation of the Index and by the Roman Pontiffs; You have suppressed the part of that letter, in which these things are related: and thus, not only have you excited the strongest suspicion of your judgment on this subject, but also, by not fully quoting both the context of the Holy Synod and that of our aforesaid Predecessor, You have given an oc-

cession to others to err, in an affair of so great importance.

10. For what else, Venerable Brother, can these mutilations mean, but that either You thought not rightly concerning the most holy Traditions of the Church, or that these passages were expunged by You for the purpose of favouring the machinations of Innovators, which certainly tend to deceive the faith of the readers, and to make even the common people themselves read with an unsuspecting mind those versions which, as we showed above, must to them be much more injurious than profitable.

11. Moreover, if this would by no means be lawful for any Catholic person, what shall we say of a Holy Prelate of the Church, whom Pastoral Dignity has constituted the guardian of the faith and doctrine committed to him; and who is strictly bound by the force and obligation of the oath he has taken, both strenuously and diligently to remove from the people dangers of erring, and to observe and maintain the laws and regulations of the Church?

12. You see therefore, Venerable Brother, what ought to be Our mode of acting toward You, if we felt disposed to enforce the severity of the Canon Laws! 'For,' said St. THOMAS OF CANTERBURY, 'he, who does not come forward to remove what ought to be corrected, gives his sanction to error; nor is he free from suspicion of a secret confederacy, who evidently neglects to oppose mischief.'

13. But We, for the love we bear You, insist only upon that thing, from which, since it must be enjoined upon You by divine authority, we cannot refrain; namely, that You would take away the scandal, which by this mode of acting You have occasioned. Hence we most earnestly exhort You, our Brother, and beseech You by the bowels of our Lord Jesus Christ, that You will strive to repair, by a due and speedy amendment, all those things which You have improperly taught or done concerning the new versions of the Bible.

14. And I wish, Venerable Brother,

emulating the example, of illustrious men, which procured for them such honour, that you would consider how You might reprobate these your deeds by a solemn and formal retraction! We cannot however, avoid exhorting You, and by virtue of Holy obedience we even command You, to do at least what is necessary for preserving the purity of doctrine and the integrity of the faith. namely that in a fresh letter addressed to the people, containing the whole contents both of the decree of the Council of Treat, and of the letter of PIUS VI. on this subject, You should sincerely and plainly teach, that the Christian Truth and doctrine, as well dogmatical as moral, are contained, not in the Scriptures only, but also in the Traditions of the Catholic Church; and that it belongs to the Church herself alone to interpret each of them.

15. Moreover, You should declare; that You did not intend to recommend those versions of the Sacred Books, in the vulgar tongues, which were not exactly conformable to the Rules prescribed by the Canons and Apostolic Institutions: lastly, You should make known and likewise declare, that, in advising and recommending the perusal of these divine Scriptures, You had not respect to all the Faithful indiscriminately, but only to Ecclesiastical persons, or at most to those Laymen who in the judgment of their Pastors were sufficiently instructed.

16. If You shall truly perform all these things, as we trust in the Lord You will, and which we promise Ourselves most certainly from your prudent and tractable disposition, You will afford great consolation to our mind and also to the Church Universal.

Filled with this hope, we permanently impart to You Venerable Brother, and the flock committed to your care, the Apostolic Benediction.

Given at Rome, at St. Mary the Greater, on the third day of September, 1816; the seventeenth Year of our Pontificate.

POPE PIUS VII.

THE
BALTIMORE LITERARY
AND
RELIGIOUS MAGAZINE.

MARCH, 1837.

No. 3.

A LETTER

TO WILLIAM GEORGE READ Esq.
MEMBER OF THE BALTIMORE BAR,

On part of his testimony given before the committee, at Annapolis.

ON issuing the February number of this magazine, a friend handed us the testimony, given by you at Annapolis before the committee of the Legislature for indemnifying those whose property had been injured by the mob, in August 1836, in which the following passages are found:

Cross-questions by Mr. Johnson.

Fourth. "Have you any recollection of a conversation between yourself and Dr. Bond on the occasion of your declining the use of Fire-arms on the Saturday evening when Mr. Glenn's house was destroyed, in relation to the propriety of using arms in such an emergency, and particularly in reference to a possible attack on the Roman Catholic Convent in Baltimore? If you have, state what the conversation was?"

Fifth. "What induced Dr. Bond to refer to a possible attack on the Baltimore Convent? Was there about this time, or at any time, and when, any reason to suppose that the destruction of that institution was contemplated by any portion of the people of Baltimore?"

Answer to 4th interrogatory.

"I remember Dr. Bond's saying to me at the time, as I think, of my resignation. 'Mr. Reed one word turns this mob on the Convent.' I replied 'then I die on the steps.' He rejoined 'what's the use of dying on the steps?' Being further asked whether he added 'you had better die here,' I answer, I have no recollection of those words, though it is very possible he may have used them. And in regard to my 'conscientious scruples' about using arms mentioned by Dr. Bond, it was not my intention, in any thing of that kind which I have said to him, to convey the idea that I thought it unjustifiable to employ them in all cases, but that I could not conscientiously use them, in the circumstances then existing, as understood by myself at the time when it became necessary to sanction the arming that post or resign the command."

Answer to 5th. interrogatory.

"I suppose Dr. Bond's remark was predicated on the circumstances, that a FANATICAL PAPER, edited in Baltimore, had been used for

about 18 months, to excite the Prejudices of the protestant part of the community, against the members of the Catholic Church, and in particular that a number published in the spring. preceding (the May number I believe) teeming with obscenity and calumny, had, in a manner, pointed the fury of the populace against the Convent. This appears to me to be part of a system of persecution against the Catholics of this country, which commenced immediately after certain attacks upon their religion, in the Senate of the United States; and which speedily eventuated in the conflagration of the Convent in Charlestown, Massachusetts. I have to state, that the Catholics of Baltimore hope not it without a single act of irritation, which, by inviting to violence, might jeopard the public peace, or deprive themselves of a title to the sympathies of their separated brethren. I believe they owe their security to the 'vis inertiae'—the indifference—of a large portion of the community; to the good feelings of others who know the groundlessness of the charges made against their faith and practices; and also to the certainty that their institutions and churches could not be demolished but after a bloody victory.'

From the professed policy of the Priests of this city, the impression has often been attempted to be made, that all of you were indifferent to any thing said about the system, to which you have become a convert. We have much evidence to the contrary, and in your testimony we have additional confirmation. This testimony was published several months back, but was never seen by us until the time mentioned above. This will account for its not being noticed before.

We have now entered on the third month of the third year of this Magazine and have not yet seen a Priest, or Layman in this city, who would shew his face in defence of the holy mother church. True 'tis said, our publication was too ridiculous, and nonsensical for sage priests to notice!—and yet, sage priests, will privately make their comments and advise their hearers, and Lawyers, will denounce it before the committee, as *fanatical*,—as *exciting the prejudices of the Protestant community against the members of the Catholic Church*—as *persecuting the Catholics*—as *bringing groundless charges against their institutions*, which might tend to demolish them, but which would not be done without a *bloody victory*—and "you say" the May No. of 1835, *teeming with obscenity and calumny*, had in a manner pointed the fury of the populace against the convent.

These are charges made before that committee and spread out to the public in the published testimony, which shew, that there is *one man at least and he a lawyer*—who has been made to feel some little by this *fanatical* publication. There were reasons why you sir, should have known something of its character; and when you were singling out one No. if you had also called attention to the *March No.* of the same year, the reader would have known why your memory retained such accurate knowledge of what had appeared in the work. But to the charges brought by you against it:

1. The publication you say is *fanatical*. Thus you feel that there is truth in some of the charges we have made. It was fanatical, to publish the part you had in the preparation of the will, which was forged by Priest Smith. It was fanatical, to attempt an exposure of the doings of your Priesthood. You ought to have been a little better trained, by your Priests, and you would then have known

that fanatic is not the term by which every thing is put down and a man treated as infamous among Roman Catholics. The very children in the Popish schools, could have told you, that we were *Heretics*. Then you would have been able to testify that there had been an *Heretical paper*, which had dared under the very eyes of the Archbishop, the Impisitor of heretical pravity, to call in question the dogmas, and expose the practice of the priesthood! Had the scene been changed only from the committee at Annapolis, to the examining committee of Bishops, and they in Spain, we had long since been dressed up and published as Heretics (fanatics) who were to celebrate an *auto da fe*. But we are in a land, the liberties of which have been purchased by the blood of those men, whose fathers escaped from the papal fury in the mother countries; and in that land we shall speak that which we do think amenable to the laws of the land, and not to the judgment of papists, be they priests or laymen.

2. The fanaticism of it consists in exciting the prejudices of the Protestant part of the community, against their Catholic brethren. Did you forget when you made this assertion, that the priests had taught you that *all Protestants were heretics, who had deserted from your church and were still under her power, are to be judged by her, their opinions condemned, they punished, and that your Bishops had sworn themselves to the pope, to persecute and oppose them as far as lay in their power.*—If you had only recollected your doctrine, you would not certainly have stood up before a committee who were part Protestant and talk about exciting the prejudices of Protestants. But so it is. You swear you will do what your church teaches, that what she does is right; and *she says you must persecute, destroy, put down Protestants whenever you can.* Now we wish to lift our voice against such treatment. We say to our Protestant brethren beware of this system of iniquity, which under the guise of religion teaches these things, and you charge us when we so do, with an attempt to excite the prejudices of "Protestant brethren." But we are *heretics*—how then *brethren*? You have denounced as accursed of God and man—now call us brethren! How is this? What treatment did Protestants ever get from your church such as to call for sympathy from them? Is it the excommunication, the cursing and the brutal butchering of every one that they could thus act out their, sympathy upon? Is this the sympathy we are now to expect? If so, we are ready to continue the alarm, "beware of those who lie in wait to deceive, and destroy." We are ready to awaken all the prejudice we can against this system in the hands of the priests and those who obey their directions,

Can it be that you are ignorant of the constant addresses made to the prejudices of the popish community at the cathedral and other chapels. Are you so ignorant of what you hear from week to week, as not to know that we are always treated as heretics, and as those that will be damned? Are you unacquainted with one of the plainest doctrines in your catechisms and creed, which declares that there is no salvation out of your church? If so, you surely ought to be a little more careful in your denunciations.

3. This is part of a system of persecution, you think? Now sir will you answer us when we ask you what you mean by this term? Do you mean that it is the intention of Protestants to deprive Roman Catholics of their rights as citizens? If so, we deny

the charge. If you mean that it is to make them odious in the eyes of their fellow men, we also deny it. But if you mean that it is persecution to publish the doctrines, the obligations of Papists, which are inconsistent with the rights and the liberties of any who are not Papists; then we plead guilty of the charge of persecution.

What is it sir that we have been publishing that has so persecuted you? Look back over the numbers that we have already published. There you will find "the creed of your church."—"whole decrees of the Council of Trent on particular doctrines"—"decrees of other councils, entire, mostly the original latin in connection"—"whole Bulls of your Popes"—"the famous Bull *cæna domini*, Latin and English,—"the oath of allegiance of your Bishops to the Pope, Latin and English"—"extracts from your Prayer Books,—the Breviary,"—"the Catholic Almanac, &c."—and in almost every case, the book, edition, and page referred to, that any one may examine them, and so quoted that they shall speak the true meaning. Will you tell me sir, what kind of persecution this is? Can you point to any such work as having received this name before? No sir—if there was shame or principle in a man; if there was not a consciousness of the truth of that published, we had soon heard of those who would come out for your defence. The history of your Priesthood and your laymen, will answer on this point in the defences in the way of civil prosecutions.

But the term persecution is odious, and when you cannot defend yourselves, cry out we are persecuted! we are an innocent, injured unoffending class of men, who would rather be slandered than make the least defence of ourselves. So be it then. Cry persecution! Oh we are persecuted!!

4. You say that Catholics have met without a single act of irritation, those charges against their faith and practices—which were known to be groundless.

On this point we are not a little surprised that *you speak thus.*—Are you ignorant of what has been published by us? Do you know these charges to be groundless? Was the case of Priest de Barthe, and his inhuman treatment of the orphan girl a groundless charge? *Was there no truth in the Forgery of the Will by Priest Roger Smith? Are you acquainted with the counsel of Smith (a Mr. Read) who confessed in open court that he had drawn up that will at the instigation of Smith?* Are you ignorant of the barefaced and high handed roguery of Smith in that case, and the silent sanction of it by the Archbishop in refusing to degrade him from his office, and the permitting of him to remain so long at the Cathedral after the act?—The account of this outrageous act was published in the March number of 1835. Was it false? Were the charges known to be groundless? Do the citizens of Baltimore—do the lawyers of the bar—the judges of our court, know these to be groundless charges? If the public are called upon to believe our statements, when given by you, as well as by Priests, they will have to know that charges are groundless, when the interests of the church are not promoted by them.

You say that the publication of these have been met without a single act of irritation on your part. Is this so? Why did not the friends of Mr. Ward, whose family had been robbed by the forged will, publish the account of it? We can answer Mr. Read.

It was through fear of their houses being torn down and their lives taken by the members of Mr. Smith's congregation, and yet this is forbearance. How wonderfully things change, when the eyes of Protestants have been a little opened. Now you are all forbearance. We are to congratulate ourselves and the Protestant community that our houses have not been torn down and our blood shed, for publishing the doctrines of your church—and the practices of your Priests! Humane men.—Innocent men!

5. But in particular the case is pointed to "the May No. 1835, teeming with obscenity and calumny, had, in a manner, pointed the fury of the populace against the convent.

If by populace here you mean the rioters, the mob, you have at least erred a little. Those that read this Magazine, so far as we know them, and those that are subscribers we can say are as respectable and worthy men as *William George Read*—they are as respectable—useful and orderly citizens as Mr. R. can produce in the circle of his knowledge. Strange persons indeed to address, to engage in rioting and plunder. Strange indeed that we should address those who have the welfare of the city and the good order of its inhabitants at heart, on the destroying of property and disturbing the peace and good order of the community. You mean I suppose sir a class of men who are known among us within a few years, of a character with the members of your church, whose conduct on the Rail Road called for the interposition of the civil authorities to keep them in order; but the laws of the land were vain, until a Priest of your church gave the law, and then your brethren, the fellow members of your holy mother church, ceased their rioting and bound themselves to Priest McElroy of Frederick not to engage again in such quarrels. We addressed no such men, we directed to our Law makers, Law executors, to our citizens, to stand up for the laws of the country. We asked of them to look at these institutions and answer if they should not be under the control of the laws of the land, which now like our mobs are subject only to the laws of the Priest. We wished to know of them and the community if it was lawful for unmarried Priests to keep Females enclosed in private jails or work houses. We called for an investigation of an occurrence that took place in that convent, when the loud piercing, imploring cries for HELP—HELP—arrested the attention of six respectable citizens* who were passing. The Archbishop was called upon

* See May No. of 1835 for the following statement.

We whose names are subscribed hereto, declare and certify, that on or about the—day of—183—about nine o'clock at night, as we were returning home from a Meeting in the Methodist Protestant church, at the corner of Pitt and Aisquith streets; and when opposite the CARMELITE CONVENT and school in Aisquith street, our attention was suddenly arrested, by a LOUD SCREAM ISSUING FROM THE UPPER STORY OF THE CONVENT. The sound was that of a FEMALE VOICE, INDICATING GREAT DISTRESS; we stopt and heard a SECOND SCREAM; AND THEN A THIRD, in quick succession, accompanied with the cry of HELP! HELP! OH! LORD! HELP! WITH THE APPEARANCE OF GREAT EFFORT. After this there was nothing more heard by us during the space of ten or fifteen minutes; we remained about that time on the pavement opposite the building from which the cries came.

When the cries were first heard, no light was visible in the fourth story, from which the cries seemed to issue. After the cries, lights appeared in the second and third stories,—seeming to pass rapidly from place to place, indicating haste and confusion. Finally all lights disappeared from the second and third stories, and the house became quiet.

No one passed along the street where we stood, while we stood there. But one of our party was a man, and he advanced in life; all the remainder of us were women. The watch was not set, as some of us heard 9 o'clock cried, before we got home.

for an explanation. Did he give one? Yet how many silly attempts at explanation have been given. Now sir, you are the man that declared your readiness "*to die on the steps of the convent.*" Was it to keep those iron bars bolted fast upon the female victims? or was it to exhibit your zeal for your new mother? We called upon you among others to investigate this matter, and we ask you sir, would it not have been as much to your credit to have inquired if it were even possible that any such things could have occurred as that stated?

Is it so that this land is the land of the free, the home and refuge of the oppressed, and shall those who have always been tyrants and oppressors in popish countries here be permitted to erect institutions which in other countries have been the seats of that oppression, and yet no law of the land protect or defend those who having been beguiled by them, are subject to their power? Are you the man that will stand up in the face of this community to defend such oppression and tyranny? What have we done sir but lift a voice against such conduct and the system which engenders such oppression? And declare to the public the evidence that we have of the unchangeableness of the papacy in corruption and oppression. Turn to that article which you have thus particularly made mention of and you find the following:—

"We call upon the community at large, to frown upon such establishments. *Let no man violate any law, even bad ones. Let the persons, property, and rights of all be held sacred. We are no Jesuits; we know that no end can justify any improper means.*—But public sentiment can and ought to be enlightened, roused, and turned with irresistible power, against these NUNNERIES. The laws ought to be so made that the poor victims may get out: they ought to be so executed, that the civil authorities should steadily, constantly, promptly interfere, to see what wrong is done, and redress it.—The rulers of these convents ought to be brought to justice for crime, just like all other criminals."

What is there in this sir that can be objected to, as improper or in any way unlawful? Is it not what every honest man would desire? and every man who remembered *the helpless, friendless condition of these females* should exert himself to have brought about.

Will you tell us what protection any of these females have? What friends have they to whom they can fly from the dominion of the Priest? what Catholic would dare receive them, especially when the Priest whom he is bound to venerate, shall say they are turning heretics? And to what Protestant family will they go for refuge? As a man, answer these questions.

Many of us have freely spoken of these things on their occurrence And now at the request of Messrs. B. & C. & M. we give this statement, which we solemnly declare to be true; and sign it with our names.

Signed

JOHN BRUSCUP,
LAVINIA BROWN,
SOPHONIA BRUSCUP,
HANNAH LEACH,
SARAH E. BAKER,
ELIZABETH POLK.

Baltimore, March 13th, 1835.

This is to certify, that John Bruscup, Hannah Leach, Sophonia Bruscup, Lavinia Brown, and Sarah E. Baker, are acceptable members, of the Methodist Protestant Church of Pitt street station.

Baltimore March 12,

Signed,

WILLIAM COLLIER, Surgt.

They are practical questions. They refer to all that is past in the history of these institutions—to the facts which are daily coming to light in this land, and proving the connection of the present with the past, and both with the oppression and tyranny of the priests. Do you then say sir we must keep quiet? Shall such things be suffered and no one cry out against them, without being called Fanatics and Persecutors?

As you have gone so far out of your way* in giving your testimony as to pass your opinions upon the character of this work and denounce it before the committee, you could but expect that you should be held responsible for those opinions.

Now let us turn the subject. You are a convert from Episcopacy to Popery, and from what we have been able to learn, you are a very honest and conscientious man in your faith and practice. Those who are educated in a system may never ask for a reason of their faith. But those who go over from Protesting against Popery, to embrace its tenets and obey its precepts ought to have some reason for their choice—we don't want *fifty*. You think us fanatics for what we have said in defence of the principles which you once held for speaking against those which you now profess. Look now at your *new faith*.

I. "THERE IS NO SALVATION FOR ANY ONE OUT OF THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH." Not even for your Protestant Brethren. This is not very liberal!

II. "It is the duty of every Romanist, regularly to confess all of his sins, mortal and venial, to the priest—be he good or bad—moral or profligate;—and he can really forgive them." This is very much like giving a man's conscience into the keeping of a Priest, to obey his dictates,—to be saved or damned, and as he chooses!

III. "You must believe in Purgatory, and that the souls of those who are there will be helped out by the prayers and ALMS of Catholics." How a soul gets out of Purgatory and when, would most likely puzzle the ingenuity of your Priests. As you have embraced this doctrine, can you afford a reason for it? *One good one will do.*

IV. "You must believe ' that the Priest can take a quantity of flour, *part* of which he will make *into bread* and *part into wafers*;—part he will eat—part he blesses, and swears it is God—nay, *the very God—the body, blood, soul and divinity of Jesus Christ our*

* On pages 53 and 54, of this testimony, we have the following question by Mrs Mc MAHON. His reason for proposing them, and the protest of Mr. Ely, on the ground of their irrelevancy

Cross interrogatory by Mr. McMahon, to Mr. Blair.

Do you know whether before or about the time of the riots in August last, there was any expectation or apprehension of an attack by a mob upon the Carmelite Convent in the city of Baltimore; and if so, whether any and what measures were taken to prevent it? Was not a general apprehension to this effect entertained?

In the month of August previously to the general riots, a gentleman belonging to the Roman Catholic Church called upon me and stated "that apprehensions were entertained for the safety of that institution; that the friends of the Church would be expected at the signal understood by them from the Cathedral bell, to repair to the institution for its defence; that in the event of such signal he requested this deponent should attend, as his official station and personal efforts to prevent the mischief might have great effect, and hoped that he would attend to that matter. The apprehension was generally entertained so far as his knowledge extends.

Mr. Ely desired his protest to be entered on the minutes of the proceedings on the putting any questions in relation to the Carmelite Institute, *because of their irrelevancy.*

Lord; who is over all God blessed forever." Every Priest does this thousands of times in the course of his life, and *every time*, creates so many Gods, whole and entire. Each of these or as many as were administered are eaten, or swallowed, whole and entire, by the faithful Catholic. Therefore *there have been and now are* (for God once existing certainly cannot be destroyed) *as many millions of Gods, as there have been consecrated wafers!!!*

This is the great corner stone of Popery, for rejecting which hundreds and thousands of men and women have been put to death, in the most barbarous and brutal manner. And now your church says we are damned, and shall be damned, if we do not believe it. *We Protestants* reject this, and before we shall embrace it, or worship such a ridiculous idol, by the grace of God we will die as did our fathers.

This is the doctrine to which you had necessarily to give your assent, before you could become a Roman Catholic. Will you point us to a doctrine maintained by any class or denomination of Protestants, equal in absurdity to this fundamental doctrine of Popery? It would be becoming in you to be scarce with the term "Fanatical," until you have cleared yourself of a doctrine which at least savours of blasphemy. Many more points might be hinted at, but the *four* mentioned are enough to exhibit the system which you have embraced, at least until you can give us your reasons for embracing them and a better defence of your charges.

MEMORANDA OF FOREIGN TRAVEL,

BY RO: J. BRECKINRIDGE.

The Canton and City of Geneva and the region round about.—Its past history, condition.—Calvin as a Reformer; as a Statesman.—His cotemporaries and successors.—The former estimation of Geneva.—The general religious declension of the last century.—That declension at Geneva.—Sketch of the National Church to its final apostacy.—Arian version of the Scriptures, and rupture with the B. & F. Bible Society.—Succession of truth even in the Church of Geneva.—The universal religious impulse of the present century.—Its origin and progress at Geneva.—Its present state.—Dr. Malan.—The Church of the Bourg de Four.—The Evangelical Society.—Colporteurage.—Efforts to preach the gospel at home and abroad.—School of Theology.—The magnitude and importance of its efforts.—State of the national Clergy and of the People.—The Grand Council of the Republic.—The Cimetiere de l'Egalite.—Monuments and Inscriptions.

THE Canton of Geneva is the smallest of all that compose the confederation, and was the last of the 22 which united itself with the others. This statement is made without reference to the rural part of the Canton of Balse, which has been separated from the City of Balse of late years, so that strictly speaking there should be considered 23 Cantons—of which the Country Canton of Basle was the last admitted. Geneva contains only four geographical square miles of territory, and is smaller than Zug, the next least by three quarters of such a mile. The population of the Canton of Geneva

is rated at 52,000; of whom 34,000 reside in the city of Geneva, which is the most populous town in the confederation, and would long ago have reached the first rank of European cities, if its people would have levelled its ramparts so as to make room for improvements and given facilities for the augmentation of their Capital. As it is, the space within the walls is completely built over with houses generally five or six stories high; the streets are narrow; the shores of the Rhone which passes through the town and those of the lake which washes its walls are encroached upon continually: and after all, considerable villages are growing up without each of the gates. The situation of the town, upon an island, and both shores of the Rhone where it issues from the western end of Lake Lemon, is extremely beautiful. The larger part of it is on the south side of the river, and as the shore is narrow on that side, and skirted by an abrupt and high hill, upon the top and sides of which the white stone houses line the steep and crooked streets—the whole has an aspect peculiar—unique. It presents from all quarters a striking object, as the traveller approaches, whether by land or water. And the whole surrounding region as seen from it, exhibits a series of landscapes, varying continually from the beautiful to the sublime as you change the point of view, and presents a panorama hardly surpassed in the world. Towards the east is the beautiful lake, lined on both sides with a girdle of life, to which the desolate mountains that rear their naked sides above it, give new loveliness. Behind the town, towards the west and south the ranges of mountains present the most superb aspects. Looking towards the south, on the left is the range of Bonneville in the distance, and next the conical mountain of Moule, between which and the Bonneville on one side, and the grand and petit Salave on the other—are wide openings on either hand, through which the great Alps, with their glaciers and citadels of rock and snow, stretch away before you, as if to the world's limits. On the right, the two chains of the Salave rise up, with a distinct and bold outline of that regular and rounded look peculiar to mountains of the second and third class;—and far above them both, the mighty figure of the glorious king of Alps—the temple Mount Blanc—heaves itself into the clouds. Turning further towards the west, the plain in which the Rhone and the Arne unite their waters—and the villages which fill the narrow landscape—and the diminished and barren Jura, pushing his rocky course far towards the north, complete the ample and various panorama. Every where in and around Geneva—the whole or some striking part of these scenes court the delighted gaze.—If I should designate one spot as peculiarly favoured with the most rich presentation of the more striking of these objects, it would be the little mound, on the Geneva side of the village of Grand Saconnex, on the great road as you go to Ferney. From this spot, in the afternoon, (when the atmosphere is always most clear)—the view of Mount Blanc is inexpressibly magnificent—and will fully compensate for the time wasted in visiting the miserable relics at Ferney.

The city of Geneva is strongly fortified after the modern fashion; and it is the only city in Switzerland which I saw thus defenced.—Many are encompassed in the ancient way, with a high and thick

wall of large stones,—overlooked by still higher towers at short intervals—and provided with covered ways, at the most important points ; a mode of defence perfectly useless in the present state of the art of war. At Geneva you meet with the deep ditches and thick angular embankments, faced with stone of modern defence, with all the mazes of outworks and inworks ;—which the mortar and bomb seem likely to render as insignificant as canon has the plain wall of the middle ages. It is not surprising that the Genevese should be suspicious of their neighbors, and profit by an experience derived from an antiquity as great as that of their city; the whole of which teaches them, that “they will take who have the power”—as well as the other part of the couplet, that “they may keep, who can.”—In truth Geneva is one of the most ancient cities of Europe north of the Alps, and has had perhaps more than its share of the troubles common to them all. It was a place of considerable importance when the Romans first penetrated into Gall ;—and being conquered by them, wore their yoke five hundred years. Early in the fifth century, the Burgundians added the city to their kingdom, and made it one of their capitals. Then came the Ostrogoths in the following century who ruled it for a short period ; and ceded it about the middle of the sixth century to the Franks who held sway over it for three hundred and fifty years. Afterwards came the domination of the Kingdom of Arles ; and then that of the second Kingdom of the Burgundians. Then followed the long and bloody feuds, between her own Barons and Bishops—in which the streets ran with native blood, in furious contests for the mastery, by, so called, christian pastors—pastors whose pious successors and brethren shudder with horror, at the bare mention of the name of Servetus. In the thirteenth century the Counts of Savoy, became powerful in the neighborhood of the city—and often cruelly oppressed it. Then came the Reformation ; and in 1535, the Republic was proclaimed in Geneva—and for eighty years, she had to sustain, new and terrible contests for her liberty and religion. In 1798 she fell into the power of the French Republic ; but in 1813 recovered her independence ; and in 1815 joined the Swiss Confederation, as the 22nd Canton. The Congress of Vienna, and the treaties of Paris and Turin, recognized this union,—augmented her little territory—and guaranteed free access to the remaining cantons, from which it is almost entirely cut off by the territories of France, and the Kingdom of Sardinia.

Such is Geneva to the eye ; such have been her sufferings and efforts in past generations. If for these she deserves our regard—what does she not demand at our hands, for the unspeakable benefits she has conferred on mankind ! How long and how multiplied has been her descent of illustrious men ! How striking and how beautiful the lesson she has given the world of social system, perfect in kind, and perfect almost in its civil results !—Here is a little community in which every man is free, and every child educated ; in which the sovereign power resides in those hands that defend the State in danger, and adorn it in peace ; where a common and diffused public spirit pervades the entire population,—and the good of each is so clearly identified with the good of all,—that in the great

policy of the state, one finds the economy, the wisdom, the consistency and settled procedure of a well regulated family. Whence came all these wonders? Who stamped this unique and extraordinary impress on a community—not in any wise specially provided to receive it?—Its list of great names, both at home and throughout the world, is as I have said full and rich;—and that too, in every department of human effort. But it was not to them all unitedly—it was not to them all in succession—so much as it was to one single capacious, glorious mind, that they and the world, are indebted—that true and undefiled religion reigned so long within and spread so widely from these walls; and that knowledge and freedom, reign so firm there to-day.—What name is known in Geneva before Calvin;—what name known in it since,—his enemies being judge, compared with his? His enemies! strange that such a man had enemies while he lived! still stranger, that three centuries of death, unattended but by blessings increasing in their copious stream upon the earth, are unable to silence ignorance or to rob malevolence of its venom. Who had his deep and various learning—and yet who equalled his meek and humble spirit? Where shall we seek a rival to his capacious genius, his profound sagacity—his searching practical wisdom;—all tempered and adorned by a modesty almost child-like, and a gentleness becoming the heart of woman! In an age too prone to vulgarity, his writings are unstained by a blot. Amongst contests, and with enemies “fierce as ten furies”—his voluminous productions will be sought in vain for a passage, tinged with bitterness. Perhaps the dedication of his Institutes to Francis I, may be considered an incomparable model of discourse, uttered by a free, and christian, but oppressed man, to a bigoted and tyrannical prince;—in which the deepest interests of sharp and existing contests, and warring parties, with a clearness, dignity and pathos, strangely in contrast with cotemporary efforts; with the addresses, for example, of Luther to Henry VIII. As elegant and as kind as Philip Melancthon—he had all the courage of Luther—united to the learning of Erasmus—the philosophical spirit of Zuinglius—the self devotion of Farel—and a piety more conspicuous in its touching consistent and enlightened fervour—than almost any thing we meet with in the records of that noble generation.—If any man could deserve—he did, to give his name, to confer his name on—not a sect or party—but on a system held by the deepest thinkers in all succeeding generations, and rejoiced in by the most devoted spirits in all christian sects. Paul, “the first great corruptor of christianity”—as Mr. Jefferson has called him: Augustin—Calvin, the mightiest disciples of Paul! the doctrines of grace, one will call them,—the evangelical christianity another—moderate Calvinism a third: the names are identical, in defiance of the hatred and ignorance of the world, and the prejudices of many real disciples of Christ. The fall and corruption of man;—the alone mode of salvation by grace through faith, in a divine Saviour crucified in the sinner’s room and stead—the indispensable and sovereign work of the Divine Spirit, in the whole of salvation, and especially in the regeneration and sanctification of the sinner’s heart, by the use of the divinely inspired word of God; the free, unmerited and eternal love of God the Father, for the people of his heritage—the

sinner for whom he gave his Son to die—and to whom the purchased Spirit is sent with power :—this is the christian system.— And where, out of the Bible, in all the lapse of eighteen centuries, will you find its illustration and defence—its statement, its demonstration, as you find them accomplished by the hand, and illustrated by the labours, and life, of John Calvin ?—

This wonderful man is known to posterity principally in two relations—which are now considered almost incompatible with each other—and which are in truth sufficiently distinct. In his chief capacity as one of the leaders of the blessed reformation of the sixteenth century,—there are few lands so dark as not to have heard of his fame. But in the capacity of an unrivalled statesman,—men know less of him. Yet he was far more decidedly the personal founder, of the liberties of Geneva—than he can be considered the father of those churches, whose polity and doctrine, he influenced, as he did all the reformed churches, in a considerable degree, and most of the sects which have arisen since, more or less—through the influence of disciples, who drank his spirit from his lips—or imbibed it from his writings. As a statesman God gave him, especially and directly to Geneva. As a religious Reformer—to the whole world. In the former capacity and the field appropriated to its exercise—his success was perfect, absolute ; and for a period of nearly three hundred years, the free institutions of that happy community have moulded its polution, and conformed its whole civil condition, into a model for the world to imitate. In the latter capacity and the vast field—no less in its compass, than the limits of the human race—which appertained to it—I have already spoken of the nature of his services to mankind.—

It would however be as unjust as it would be false, to absorb all the claims of Geneva on the gratitude of the world—still more of the church, in those even of Calvin. We know less than we should know, of his holy and honored coadjutors in the early Church of Geneva. But we know enough to bless God, that he gave to the world, Farel, and Viret and Theodore de Beza. We have preserved perhaps a less vivid sense of the merits and labours of their pious and learned successors, than is due to them and the great cause which they adorned. Still we cherish the names of Chandieu, John Deodati, Theodore Tronchin, Benedict and Francis Turretin, Benedict Pictet, Autoine Maurice, and how many others, whom I hope to meet in heaven ! Men who kept the odour of sanctity for generations, in the church of Geneva ; and filled all the churches of Europe with veneration for her name ; so that they rejoiced in her gifts communicated to them, and sent back as they had opportunity gifts in return ; receiving their pastors and disciples as precious guides,—and fleeing to her beloved walls, when overtaken themselves by the calamities inflicted on them by the enemies of God. At the Synod of Dort Deodati and Tronchin, whom I have named above, exercised perhaps, not less influence than any two members of that venerable body. At one period the christian refugees from France, Germany, Holland, Piedmont, Great Britain, Lombardy, and the cities of Lucca and Cremona in Italy, fled in such numbers to Geneva, that in a single day (15th October 1557) the government

received three hundred persons into its protection.—Who can ever forget that it was this city, which opened its gates to the unhappy Protestant exiles who escaped the massacres of Merindole and Calbrieres? Or who is not affected at the recital of the tender interest which all the churches manifested when in her turn this beloved city was environed by dangers? Insomuch that collections to the amount of a hundred thousand livres tournois were sent to Geneva, as the result of an appeal made at the suggestion of Francis Turretin;—and employed to fortify the city. “We should aid them” said the Government of Holland to the Estates of the Provinces, at this memorable period (1661) “because that city has been chosen of God as the principal abode of his Church—to make true religion abide there: because this Church is the mother of so many others; because the world hates and persecutes her, for the religion which she professes, and the Gospel of Christ which she teaches!” And while the churches of Poland, Germany, Hungary, Transylvania, Holland, Scotland and England sent succors to the city from whence they had received blessings above all price; the elite of the youth of reformed France flew to partake her dangers, led by Henry of Navarre, Sully, Du Plessis-Mornay—and their heroic compatriots! Glorious city—that deserved such regards! Alas! that she has fallen from her high estate!—Blessed churches, that responded to such calls! Quenched alas! in their own blood;—some are now without a name;—others with little more than a name to live!—

It is difficult to fix a precise date to the commencement of that period of declension in pure religion, which during the last century was observable over all the earth,—and which, especially towards its close, relapsed into almost universal infidelity or heresy. It is probable that we should rather regard these sad catastrophes, as being so far isolated in each country, as to have peculiar causes and separate dates, as well as diverse manifestations in each; agreeing only in the general fact, of forsaking God—and in the special one, of wandering far from him, in proportion, as they knew little of his truth before. The Catholics of Italy are exhibited, by all witnesses, and especially in the personal memoirs of the Bishop of Pistoia—as sunk into the lowest condition, of pollution and superstition: those of France, became a horrid model of ferocious atheism. The Episcopal church of England, became essentially heretical, taking its own articles as the rule of judgement; and while its clergy, openly exceeded the men of the world, in “sumptuous living”—they preached, when they preached at all—Arminian, Pelagian, and Arian, errors. The established church of Scotland died; and piety went out, from their midst, leaving only a barren orthodoxy, and a cold external decency of life. In the United States, we felt the same withering influences, and exhibited the same varied results. To the north—Unitarianism, grew up; while in the middle and southern states deism became the common sentiment. The previous condition of Massachusetts, made it certain, that after taking a certain march away from God she would be Socinian; while that of Virginia, after an equal march, forced her into a condition of more reasonable, but less religious skepticism. Even the mercies of God

lashed on societies in such conditions—blessed as they were in the general points—were liable to unusual perversions—differing according to the existing conditions. Thus a wide and true revival of religion in New England, ended to a lamentable degree in all sorts of metaphysical heresies—which still disturb the minds of men; while in the west, the same gifts were perverted into extravagant and unnatural systems, regarding social life, which are still exhibited amongst those called “shaking quakers.”

There is a great principle, at the base of all these varying results,—a principle universal in the providence of God, as influenced by, or influencing in return his spiritual dealings with mankind. The condition in which we are—is the uniform basis, of that which is to follow. The influences applied, of necessity produce, some result; and whether good or bad—it is a kin to the state on which they acted. The gospel itself,—either melts or hardens; and the eternity before us, will assume in its most glorious, or most aggravated aspect—no other character, to each separate spirit, than the eternal development, perhaps, of that with which it emerged from its state of trial, into eternity.

As with each separate individual, so also with communities, the beginnings are more distant, from the final result, than we commonly imagine. I suppose that the final cause, humanly speaking, of that awful state of society in France, which obscured with horror the real benefits of the first revolution,—is to be sought at least as far back as the revocation of the edict of Natz, more than a century before its eruption;—and that the brutal licentiousness of the nobles and clergy, under the regency of the Duke of Orleans,—added the finishing touch; and so prepared the people, that the actual results were inevitable, under the given state of case. So too in Great Britain; the state of the churches and people, at the darkest period of the latter part of the last century—had undoubtedly a direct relation, to the licentiousness of religious opinion fostered in the last years of the commonwealth;—and the atrocious and perfidious conduct of the parliaments and prelates of Charles II. by whom religion was hunted down, as the only crime, which could not be tolerated within the realm. The difference of the final results in the two kingdoms, is fully accounted for, by the different degrees in which they prepared for themselves wrath;—and the consequently different conditions in which they stood, when the day of wrath came to them as nations. We trust, is too much to say, we have faith to believe? that such days will return to them no more. Oh! that the world knew its day of merciful visitation; and would appropriate its blessings, before they be hid again from their eyes.

No spot of earth has exhibited more thoroughly this mournful declension of religion than the republic of Geneva; nor has any illustrated more forcibly, at the same time, the truth of the principles already stated. For although Geneva, has thoroughly shaken off the peculiar doctrines which were so long her glory; the long and blessed influence which her civil and religious institutions had exerted—put her in a condition to make her fall without commotion, without bloodshed, without the destruction of public morals; and

to preserve after it, many of those habitudes, of which the spirit and life were gone. And what was not less important—retained her in a state, easily accessible to those previous influences—which in Geneva, as throughout all Protestant Christendom, are repairing the breaches of Zion—and restoring her lost beauty. I would speak briefly, of both these events.

The church of Geneva is at once Presbyterian and national: in the latter respects it resembles all the churches of the reformation; in the former, an immense majority of them. Its confession of faith once established—was made unalterable, except by the consent of the civil as well as the ecclesiastical authorities of the Republic: in short by the will of the whole people. At the same time, perfect freedom of religion, reigned in Geneva almost from the earliest period at which any portion of mankind had emancipated themselves from the dreadful idea that the conscience can or should be coerced; a dogma ground into the very soul of society, by the church of Rome, from the first day of its existence—and which, by itself, proves that apostacy, to be the enemy of freedom, of knowledge, and of thought. All the successive changes in the institutions of Geneva, recognise these great principles; the inviolable sanctity of the faith of the national church; the unlimited freedom of all, to believe and teach as they pleased, on their own responsibility, as free citizens. In effect, the latter principle, has saved the church of Geneva—when the former proved entirely abortive. The principle of religious liberty, which tolerated all, was forced to tolerate evangelical piety, in the established church—when all the tribunals of it, persecuted and would have cast out, all who were known to practice its precepts, or rejoice in its doctrines. Another lesson, to teach those still blinded to the evils of establishments, that the kingdom of Christ, is in no sense, a kingdom of this world.

For a period of two centuries and a half, the ministers ordained in Geneva, was required to protest, and did protest, "*that they held the doctrines of the holy prophets and apostles, as they are comprised in the books of the Old and New Testaments; of which doctrine, we have a summary in our catechism.*" What was the character of that summary admits of no doubt when we say, the catechism spoken of is that of Calvin. After the church of Holland had adopted its famous articles in the Synod of Dort, a century after the church of Geneva had established its fame over Europe—the latter required from its candidates for ordination, assent to these articles also; articles which two of its own pastors, (Tronchin and Deodati, had exercised so large an influence in framing. Still later (in 1678,) the churches of Zurich and Berne, composed a *consensus*, on the doctrines of grace, against the doctrines of certain theologians of Saumur; and this formulary, was added, to the two others then existing in the church of Geneva. But in the very beginning of the next century—the *consensus* first, and afterwards the articles of the Synod of Dort, were suppressed at Geneva; leaving the simple formulary, they had used for a century before either of the others existed—not only unaltered,—but as I have said already, to this day unalterable,—except by the people and government, as well as the ecclesiasticks of Geneva. In short, the doctrines of grace, are to this hour the only lawful creed—of the established, Unitarian Church of Geneva.

How long the church retained the use of this form after its ministers no longer honestly intended what they uttered at its adoption; or how long the catechism of Calvin was actually used after its statements had ceased to be assented to,—is extremely difficult to be justly decided—and is a subject of contest amongst those most deeply interested. In this church, besides the consistory, composed of pastors and ruling elders, and answering virtually, to a presbytery; there exists, an association called “The Venerable Company of Pastors”—which is I believe peculiar to this church. It is a weekly meeting of all the pastors, in private conference, for the single purpose, of mutual counsel, examination, encouragement, or rebuke; resembling in some degree, the class meeting for private members and the process for examining character, in conference, for the preachers,—which Mr. Wesley established amongst his followers; and for which, as for some other important points of their system, they would be surprised to find, how deeply they are indebted to the Genevese reformer. This venerable company, inscribed on its register, in 1725, these portentous words: “*the protestation imposed by our laws, on ministers, with reference to the catechism of Calvin, does not require them to follow it wholly; but is simply to testify, that the substance and summary of Christian doctrine, is contained in it.*” It is worthy of all consideration, especially on the part of the christians of the United States at the present moment—that the church which introduced this gloss, upon a simple and categorical statement needed no more, and attempted no more, beyond this gloss, to become thoroughly heretical, and not only the same confession of faith, but the very form of adoption, which existed, when the same church was thoroughly evangelical.

In the year 1768, the catechism of Calvin was totally abandoned in the religious instruction of the schools, under the care of the established church. But for above fifty years before, other catechisms had been gradually supplanting it. In 1818 the Venerable Company of Pastors, forbade one of the regents of the college of Geneva, “in the most expressa terms, to teach either of the following doctrines; namely, that there is but one God, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost; that man is born in a state of sin; that he could not escape from that state, except through the new birth, effected by the Holy Spirit; that salvation is a gift, absolutely free, which God makes in his Son, to the sinners he is pleased to save; and finally, that our good works are only the evidences of our love for our saviour, and have no merit to redeem our souls.” And in 1831, the Rev. Mr. Cheniviere, professor of dogmatic theology in the school of the national church published two elaborate essays,—against the doctrine of the Trinity and that of original sin. Before this the privation of Dr. Malan as teacher of youth—and that of Mr. Gussen, as pastor of Satigny—had been undertaken, prosecuted and accomplished, by the venerable company, the consistory, and the council of state, upon pretexts at once frivolous and false—but solely for the reason that they were both, faithful and zealous ministers of the Lord Jesus Christ.

So complete is this revolution in the church of Geneva, that I have authority to say—there are not above two or three pastors, in all the venerable company who can be considered as decidedly

holding the doctrine of the Trinity; and not more than one, or perhaps two, who openly preach that Jesus Christ is the true God and eternal life. About the time I was at Geneva, a circumstance transpired, which presents in a strong light at once, the sad condition of the venerable company, and the difficulties with which its few pious members find themselves environed.—An Arian version of the New Testament, had not only been issued by the Bible Society, under the control of the national church; but funds put at their disposal by the British and Foreign Bible Society, to circulate, a different, and true version—were appropriated to aid the printing of the Arian version. The result was understood to be that the British and Foreign Bible Society, had broken off all connexion with the society at Geneva. And I was repeatedly assured, from unquestionable sources, that the few pastors, possessing, or inclined to orthodox sentiments, were involved in this proceeding, to the extent of connivance if not consent—to the false publication, and the faithless misapplication of funds contributed, with a very different view.

All this subject, from beginning to end, is so full of instruction to all who will regard the lesson,—and the whole case is so exactly pertinent to a great deal, that threatens, at the moment, in which I write—the beloved church in which God has cast my own lot, that I have been the more desirous to make it plain. There is however, another and more comforting part, of the story to be told,—and I proceed to it as a pleasant task.

Neither the entire church nor people of Geneva, have probably at any time forsaken the true faith. I have already spoken of Dr. Malan, and Mr. Gaussen, as having been persecuted by their brethren for confessing Jesus Christ. The last named gentleman had been for fourteen years before the attack made on him—that is since 1816, preaching the gospel, at Satigny, we have the authority of Mr. Gaussen, in a letter addressed to his flock in 1830, for saying that his immediate predecessor, at Satigny, the Rev. Mr. Cellerier, had faithfully preached to them Christ crucified for thirty years. This leaves no great space, before we ascend to Antoine Maurice—the immediate successor of Benedict Pietet, as teacher of theology in Geneva, who was himself the favorite pupil, and successor of Francis Turritine. Here, as in other churches God, has not left himself wholly without a witness in its darkest days; and here as over all the world, he has of late years made manifest his great power, in the conversion of sinners to himself.

The spiritual declension of which I have spoken, as common to all lands was in no respect more remarkable, than the successive revivals of sound doctrine and true piety which have during the current century manifested themselves with an equal universality.—It does not fall within the present design to attempt any explanation of either of these most remarkable manifestations. I speak now only of the fact, in regard to the latter, and blessed series of events. In America, and in Great Britain the actual, as compared with the comparatively recent state of christian doctrine and effort, is so striking, as to be incapable of being overlooked by the slightest observer, or the most careless reader. Though less known, and operating on a smaller scale—the same influences have been felt, in every Protestant Church in continental Europe. Even the Jews,

the Christians who profess the faith and rites of the Greek Church—many portions of the Roman Church, and all the scattered fragments, who bear the Christian name, up and down, throughout the world, have felt the indwelling power of the same, all pervading cause; and have roused themselves up, with the power of an unusual impulse, to investigate the things which belong to the peace of their souls. Nor have systems more absolutely false, retained their votaries unmoved, amidst this shaking of the nations. But all testimonies, from all lands, unite in exhibiting the entire map of human intelligence, as waked up with unprecedented alacrity to the importance of religious ideas;—and opened to the consideration of that truth for which God has, at the same moment, and so wonderfully and so variously opened ways by which it might run a free course.—The story of this strange work in most lands needs to be fully told.—And then we shall have, of Holland, Denmark, Germany, France, Switzerland and I know not what other States of Europe, accounts that will be to us, not less replete with interest, than the mighty work of personal conversion in America, and the great efforts for external good in England—are for all mankind who love the Lord.

In Geneva I have the best authority for saying, that their revival of religion was set in motion by the labours of a foreigner, and a layman. Robert Haldane of Scotland, now well known by his Commentary on the epistle to the Romans—and his severe (I do not say unjust) censures on that of Professor Stewart; found himself at Geneva somewhere about twenty years ago. He was a stranger in the country, and spoke its language so badly, as to be quite incapable of sustaining an argument in it. He drew around him, a few young persons;—he covered his table with Bibles in all languages, and his might in the scriptures, was his only weapon. He comprehended objections—which he could not answer. His reply was, a pointed and clear text of scripture, indicated both in the original tongue and the required version. The blessing of God was richly added to these apparently fruitless labours; and of the multitudes who attended on them, from time to time—many were converted to Christ—and others, perhaps already his timid followers greatly strengthened and enlarged. From this moment, the power of divine things assumed a new aspect at Geneva. And not a few of those, most owned of God as instruments of subsequent good, could trace their own system of blessings directly or remotely to this devoted foreigner.

There are at present in Geneva, three distinct, and entirely separate organizations; in which the great doctrines of the christian religion are professed, loved, and taught. I cannot speak with certainty as to the order of time in which they arose; nor is it very important. I have the impression however, that the venerable Dr. Malan, was the first who openly preached Christ, after the second Reformation in Geneva; and he has had his reward from men, in revilings, persecutions, and insults, which the lapse of time scarcely mitigates. I was assured that to the present moment, he rarely escapes some marked indignity—in word or act,—when he passes the streets of his native city. And I have reason to know that his heart is broken, under trials so long continued and so harsh;—and which he

has born with so much apparent tranquillity.—He has this at least to cheer him—that while God has made him the instrument of great good in Switzerland—he has made his name dear to thousands in other lands—and has reserved his recompense for the great day.—He is not in connexion with the National Church of Geneva; but serves a dissenting Congregation, which he has gathered himself: and occupies here, a situation, entirely resembling that occupied by the seceding Presbyterians of Scotland,—with whose principles and views I think he entirely accords.—It is rather remarkable, and I think, of questionable propriety—that with his peculiar views, he should never have attempted to gather into a sect, the various persons in surrounding regions who participated in his views. There are certainly two very different courses to be pursued on such occasions—both of which are subject to serious modifications—and in favour of both of which much may be advanced. I take the conduct of George Whitefield, and John Wesley, to be very striking illustrations of these opposite courses. And I believe, a candid and full examination of the subject, will prove that the policy of Mr. Wesley, was not only far more effectual for the spreading of a peculiar set of opinions, as the result has proved; but far better for the world at large,—and far more influential for good by its reflex influence, even upon the church to which both these great men belonged;—that the opposite, and apparently more disinterested—but really less sagacious and decided policy of Whitefield. Mr. Wesley's followers, had the advantage of an organization, which separated them to themselves—and united them firmly together; and by which their conquests were shaped as they were achieved. Mr. Whitefield, overlooked this prime necessity; and posterity has had to mourn the comparative inconsequence of his great labours, whose fruits for lack of being gathered together, and strengthened, may possibly be more diffused—but are certainly less effective.

There is however another organization at Geneva—the second of the three alluded to above, which has done what Dr. Malan, did not attempt. The church of the *Bourg de Four*, is an evangelical one, built up on the general principles of the congregational dissenters of England. It is a small body, worshipping in a little upper chamber, and served by the pious ministers: Messrs. Empeytaz, Guers; and Lhuistier. I attended one of these services, and heard a plain, and faithful exposition of a portion of Scripture from the gentleman first named: There are scattered through Switzerland and France a considerable number of small and weak churches of this kind,—who are united to each other as closely as their peculiar views permit—and who are admitted on all hands to be doing great good. Yet their views are in some respects peculiar—and their discipline not less so. They commune every sabbath day—they permit all their members to take part in the public religious instruction of the church—and they unite in the same body opinions which seem to afford constant occasion for contention in a body thus organized; as for example, in this little society, one of the ministers and part of the body, are decided anti-pedo Baptists. Their grand idea, is to found anew the apostolical order of things; and their grand means

of doing this, to limit their views exclusively, to the pages of the Bible. But it is somewhat questionable whether persons of limited information, and small attainments,—(as may be presumed to be the case with this connection—its members and ministers being for the most part, from the humbler classes of European Society in the several countries where it exists)—can be confidently relied on to extract anew, and in contempt of all external helps, the apostolic system of doctrine and order out of the Bible. Nor have we any right, as was strikingly observed to me, by Mr. Merle d' Aubigne, one of the professors in the school of the Evangelical Society,—to overlook entirely what God has taught us, by his providence and through his church for eighteen centuries. In settling the question of fact, as to what was the apostolic church—they must necessarily err, who shut their eyes, to what the true church has been, during these eighteen centuries that the Spirit has rested in her bosom; and it is instructive to observe—how uniformly they do err, who make such pretensions.

The most considerable and promising effort of the people of God at Geneva—is that making by the members of the Evangelical Society, which remains to be spoken of. This society is composed principally, if not entirely of pious members of the national church. They have not seceded from it—neither have they been cast out of it: and although the church itself is essentially unsound—its established faith is pure. They have preferred to labour for the restoration of the church—rather than to array themselves in opposition to it.—The influences which this society, (for it is obvious that in its present condition it cannot be called a church)—is exerting, extend so much beyond Geneva—that it is not of much moment to enquire, what is best, with reference to Geneva alone. But it is perhaps to be regretted, that it was not given to these estimable men, to see more clearly the evils inherent in a church establishment, and as a consequence to put their great enterprise on a footing less provisory and questionable than that, of an imperfectly organized association. For the rest, there is every thing to make glad the hearts of God's people.

This Evangelical Society, thus constituted in 1831 has for its object, as it expresses itself "to labor for the advancement of the Kingdom of God." Its work is divided into: 1st teaching theology; 2d the popular exposition of the Scriptures; 3d the distribution of them. In each of these departments God has most signally blessed their efforts.

Professor Gausson told me that, at the commencement of their labours, an individual presented himself to them, and said: "I was a Catholic, and knew not God; I have found peace in believing upon the Lord Jesus; It was his truth that set me free, and now I offer myself to you, to bear that truth to my benighted brethren."—They deliberated—and decided not to send the man; as they had no funds, no Bibles, and but scanty means of obtaining either; while more obvious necessities seemed to press them. He amongst them of most limited means—said to the committee:—"Do you suppose God would send you this man, and that he will not provide the means to work with him! Employ the man, and if at the end of

the year, you have not been provided with means for the enterprise, I will contribute them."—Behold the employment of their first *Col-porteure*! Their fifth annual report, made in June 1836—states that during the preceding year, twenty two had been employed; that they had labored in twelve of the eighty six departments of France, as well as the Canton of Geneva; and that besides the distribution of tracts and religious books,—thirty one thousand copies of the Scriptures, had been sold by the colporteurs within five years.

Under the second head of effort—it needs only be said, that the society has already caused the gospel to be widely preached in the surrounding region—especially in France, where five churches, composed almost entirely of converted papists have here already been gathered, and where whole villages seem ready to embrace the true faith, if suitable pastors could be provided for them: that it has vigorously engaged in the work of foreign missions, already embracing Africa, India, and the Canadas in the compass of their labours; and that a comfortable, and crowded church, in the heart of Geneva—(L' Oratoire)—resounds weekly with the glad tidings of salvation, preached by the founders of the society.

In the third department, their success has not been, less decided. They have already succeeded in establishing a preparatory school—and a school of theology of the first class—in all respects. The latter is furnished with five professors—of whom I have several times mentioned two: the Rev. Mr. Gaussen, who fills the chair of Dogmatic Theology,—and the Rev. Mr. Merle d' Aubigne, professor of Church History and President of the school. The former gentleman has perocps been the most prominent instrument, whom God has used in bringing about the present state of affairs; and the latter, is undoubtedly conferring on the school a high reputation, by his great work on the reformation, of which a part has been some time before the public—and commanded the admiration of the christian world.

That portion of the population of the world which speaks the French language, exclusively, or better than any other language in all quarters of it—cannot be estimated at less than fifty millions of souls. Of these only a very small part, possess the true knowledge of God: and multitudes are sunk into incredible ignorance, superstition and idolatry. I believe a slight consideration will satisfy any who are anxious to do something for this immense population, embracing in its bosom some of the most civilized, and some of the most degraded portions of mankind; that nothing better offers through which to effect it, than the Evangelical Society of Geneva. Situated in the centre of Europe; enjoying the advantages of perfect and well established civil freedom; worthy in itself of all confidence; and already organized and acting efficiently, in the various fields of Missions, Bible and Tract distribution, the training of youth for the ministry,—the preaching of the gospel, and the support of schools both preparatory and theological; it only needs the prayers and the aid of the people of God—to do a work grand in its extent, as blessed in all its parts!—A work, which as it relates to the nations speaking the French language, it has and can have few helpers and no superior; and as it relates to the evangelization of

the world besides one of which has shown itself most ready to undertake its full share—and through God's blessing, most capable of performing it.—I shall consider it, a peculiar goodness of God—if this imperfect and perhaps somewhat tedious sketch—is instrumental in turning the attention of American Christians to Geneva; that on the one hand they may be warned in their present dangers, by the past errors of their brethren, of the house of their fathers; and on the other, may rejoice in *and help* the work which the hand of the Lord is now bringing to pass.

It would give me great pain, to produce a false impression in regard to this interesting community. And I see myself liable to be misunderstood on two points; the first that some may suppose the national church to be worse than it is; the second that others may consider the people better than they are. I spent two Sabbath days in Geneva, on a part of one of which I worshipped in the ancient Cathedral of the city—the place where the wise and holy men I have so often referred to—laboured with joy and success for so long a period. It was the afternoon; and the congregation seemed but a handfull in the immense area. The pastor took for the exercise, the 1—12 verses of the V. chapter of Matthew's gospel: and to my great surprise and sincere delight, expounded and enforced the passage, with clearness, truth and fervour. I asked the person who sat next to me, to write on my card the pastor's name. He wrote M. Barde,—I was grieved to learn from every quarter there were not many ministers—and perhaps hardly another pastor (for in this church the sound and scriptural distinction between the two is still preserved)—from whom I should have heard, doctrine so decidedly evangelical—I had also the pleasure to make the acquaintance of two members of the venerable company of pastors—whose kindness deserved my thanks as much as their intelligence excited my interests. And in general, I think the lives of the members of that body, are in private blameless to a degree, not common either in most established clergy, or decided errorists.

As to the religious condition of the people at large—the most glaring and melancholy proofs abound, that it is as deplorable as can well be imagined—in a community so singularly well ordered and blessed in temporal respects. I have spoken in another place of their Sabbath day markets for the hire of labourers. The theatres of the town were opened both Sabbath nights, I was in it. The bridge which connects the island in the Rhone with the two shores of the river—in the midst of the city, passes in the rear of the various water powers which belong to the city or private persons: and in the same region are extensive mills. I crossed this bridge on the Sabbath afternoon, and found all the machines but one in full operation. The same afternoon, I encountered hundreds of persons on the Plain Palais, just outside the gate on the left bank of the Rhone—engaged in gambling, juggling, and every sort of amusement,—which the Sabbath day brings with in countries strictly Catholic. Of the population of this canton about one third are Catholics; and priests, many of whom probably belong to the neighbouring parishes of France and Savoy—are so numerous—that I never walked the streets without encountering them. The combined in-

fluence of popery and infidelity—has completely perverted the day of holy rest, into a day of riot and excess for the lower classes—and sinful and idle recreations for the rest.

During my stay in Geneva, the Grand Council met, to elect delegates to the Extraordinary Diet, called together by the Federal Directors—in consequence of the recent and outrageous conduct of the French government, and the ambassador its Duke of Monte Bello,—which I have before detailed. I was fortunate enough to get a place in the crowded gallery of the large hall in which this body met. In it resides the sovereignty of the Republic, so far as it is delegated at all. It was a strange contrast, and altogether a singular spectacle to one who had read the injurious and insolent accusations of the French authorities, against the dominant party in the confederacy,—to behold this numerous, grave and sedate tribunal. “Factionous—insensate—enemies of social order—and disturbers of the quiet of all neighbouring states:” these and similar epithets, in the opinion of the ministers of the king of the French, truly describe, the tribunal before my eyes!—I have seen both houses of the Parliament of Great Britain several times in session; I have repeatedly witnessed sessions of the most important kind, of the Senate and House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States—and of both branches of many of our state legislatures: I have been called to act on many and stirring occasions, in bodies small and great—popular, legislative, and ecclesiastical: And I am ready to say, that the conduct of this Assembly, appeared to me most eminently dignified, serious and wise. A frontier canton, surrounded by the territories of foreign, and at that moment almost hostile states; and with an absolute assurance that in the event of war they must be the first and most continual sufferers; and in the event of continued non-intercourse, the most deeply injured, of any of the cantons. Besides this, nothing could be more clear than the fact that Switzerland instead of having reason to appease France, had been throughout the injured party;—except that other fact, that Europe would force her or permit her to be forced into concessions—merely because she was free and weak! Yet in these trying circumstances—the committee entrusted with the subject,—read a report, at once clear temperate, and manly; the large assembly listened in profound silence; the few speakers briefly, firmly and temperately exhibited their views; the body unanimously agreed in the course it became them to take, and the two delegates appointed to represent Geneva in the Diet, received with seriousness in the midst of the tribunal, the oaths, and the instructions by which their country would assure at once the fact and the manner of their fidelity. The whole transactions did not exceed four hours.—And its results might be, Alas! how fearful!—Ah! my friends, it is well for us, and for the peace of the world—and perhaps for you also—that in this time of your trial, the wide sea is between your oppressors, and our generous youth.

The principal burial ground of Geneva, the *Citimeere de l'Egalite*, where rest the bones of so many illustrious dead—is near the Plain Palais of which I have already spoken, as the scene of the sabbath day sports of those—the bones of whose holy ancestors are

mouldering in sight. I asked to be shown the grave of Calvin. We know not where it is, was the reply. Beza's? Turretin's? Pictet's?—The answer was still the same. Somewhere in the large compass of the cemetery—perhaps in a particular corner of it—but where precisely no one knows,—rest the ashes—not only of these renowned men, and others like them;—but also those of many generations of Genevise—without a vestige by which it is possible to distinguish one grave from another. It is truly, as they call it the *cemetery of equality*—and they might add of oblivion too, as to the great mass of its tenants. And is not the lesson true as it is solemn? How few are there whose memory serves a few brief months or years; whose place in all hearts is not fully occupied, before the dust returns to dust again;—and whose position amongst men, seemed so important, by themselves, is filled as soon as the body fills its narrow resting place? Then why seek to perpetuate what has no real existence, and who therefore cannot abide?—And oh! why lose what may be won, on the other side of that silent abode—in vain struggles after something on this side of it which cannot be obtained?—On the other hand, the few who deserve a monument in fact need none. Or if they both deserve and win the most lasting of all, in the gratitude of the good for the blessings they have bestowed;—it is at the highest nothing to that simple sentence written over the entrance of this city of the dead. "Blessed are the dead who die in the Lord, they rest from their labours, and their works do follow them"—If the dead are indeed blessed—it is lighter than the dust of the balance, to demand what they were in life—or who forgot them when life was gone!—Beware, that the blessedness of death and the repose for which we sigh—and the sweet and rich succession of the fruits of long and unrequited toil;—all, beware of it my soul—are only "in the Lord"!

It seems to have been a universal religious principle—among these people—until very lately—to distinguish in no way the graves of their departed friends. To a great extent the effects of some such principles are still manifestly visible. The most of the recent graves have no memorial—but the little bank of earth or sod. Every thing is done neat, and evidently cared for with great particularity. A very large proportion of the monuments are those of foreigners: and few of any kind are older than forty years. Many of those of the native population, are made of the most frail materials—as if designed to be transitory. I observed several which consisted of a few lines written on a peice of paper—and hung over the grave in frames like pictures. Others though of a more permanent character, were strictly private—and necessarily confined the information conveyed in them, to a few persons. One ran thus; *Beloved thou will live forever in the hearts of thy husband and children.*" There was neither name nor date. Another had only initials and figures; "H. C. R. B. 24. 7 February 1830." A third consisted of a rough block of black marble, across the front of which a narrow line was highly polished, and, the name "*Marianne*" written in letters of gold. How plainly in the character of a people, written in these cemeteries!

Tribunals of the Holy See.

We again present to our readers, a large extract from the Catholic Almanac of 1837. It will interest the reader and exhibit the contrast, between this great spiritual Babylon and the simplicity of the Christian system. The length of the extract prohibits our making the comments upon it which we had intended. For the present we shall leave it with but a remark or two. We may recur to it again.

The whole of it is a contrast to Christianity. Much of it is taken up in undoing what God has commanded. In the 3d sec. we learn that the office of the *Sacred Penitentiary*, is where dispensations are granted for *Illegitimate Irregularities*, and absolutions for *committing homicide, &c.*

The 6th. *The datary*, dispenses from *vows* and *impediments to marriage*. Is not this the Antichrist.

The 8th reveals the office which conducts and explains the intrigues which are carried on among the different nations of Europe, *The Secretary of the cypher*.

I

THE CONSISTORY.

A meeting of the Pope and Cardinals for the transaction of business is called a consistory, and is either public or private. A public consistory, at which his Holiness presides in pontifical attire, is that to which prelates, princes, and the ambassadors of crowned heads are admitted. It is held in the large hall of the Vatican, and is convened principally, for the purpose of giving the hat to newly created Cardinals, for the reception of Foreign ministers, and legates *a latere* on returning from their embassy, and also to discuss matters relating to the canonization of Saints. The private consistory is held in a more retired apartment of the sacred palace, where only the Cardinals assemble with his Holiness, to deliberate upon civil and ecclesiastical affairs. In this assembly the Pope appoints his legates *a latere* and other officers of government, confirms the nomination of bishops, grants the *pallium*, &c. But one of the principal objects of this meeting is the creation of Cardinals, which takes place in the following manner. The Pontiff makes known to the Sacred College the names of those whom he wishes to promote, and advises with them upon the subject. If they assent, a decree is drawn up to that effect, and immediately published.— Sometimes, only the number of those to be promoted is declared,

their names being concealed for special reasons, which is called reserving them *in petto*. Immediately after the promulgation of the decree, the new dignitaries, if they are at Rome, vest themselves in the *purple costume of a Cardinal*, and are conducted to the Pope, from whom they receive, on their knees, the *red cap*. In placing it on the head of each one, he says to him in Latin, *be a Cardinal*, and makes over him the sign of the cross.

If the clergyman raised to the Cardinalate, does not reside in the city of Rome, a messenger is despatched to apprise him of his appointment, after which he is permitted to wear the purple robes of a Cardinal. One of the officers of the Apostolic Chamber is selected as the bearer of the red cap, which the new Cardinal receives, after the celebration of Divine service, from one of the highest dignitaries of Church or State; but on condition that he will visit the Holy See before the expiration of a year.

The ceremony of giving the red hat takes place in a public consistory. On the morning of the appointed day, the new Cardinal, if he resides at Rome, repairs to the Vatican; if he comes from a distance, he is escorted thither from the monastery *ad portam populi*, by a solemn cavalcade of members of the Sacred College. On their arrival at the Vatican they proceed to the vestry room, whence they go in procession, two by two, the Pope in the rear with the cross borne before him, to the place of the assembly. There, after having taken their seats, his Holiness on an elevated throne, the Cardinal *Bishops* and Cardinal *Priests* on his right, the Cardinal *Deacons* on his left, and the other officers of government with the nobility and foreign ambassadors in their respective places according to rank; the new Cardinal is introduced into the consistory by two Cardinal *Deacons*, making a genuflexion at the door, midway between it and the throne, and lastly near the Pope, whose foot he kisses, and afterwards his hand and lips. He then gives the *kiss of peace* to all the Cardinals, commencing with the eldest. After this ceremony the *Te Deum* is intoned, and all repair to the *Capella Sixti*, where they stand round the altar, the new Cardinal lying prostrate before it, until the conclusion of the hymn. He then rises, and is sworn to observe the constitutions relative to his station, after which the procession returns to the hall of the consistory. The Pontiff then places on his head the red hat, saying; For the glory of Almighty God and of the Holy Apostolic See, receive this red hat, which is the peculiar badge of the Cardinal dignity, and signifies, that you should remain firm unto death and be prepared even to shed your blood in the defence of our holy faith, for the preservation of peace among Christians and the prosperity of the Holy Roman Church, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.— After this, the Pope retires to the vestry room, and the Cardinals to the *Aula Regia*, where they receive individually the salutations of the new Cardinal, and congratulate him on his promotion.

At the first private consistory subsequent to the reception of the red hat, the new Cardinals are admonished by his Holiness not to give their vote or express their opinion in the consistories or congregations they attend. This ceremony is called *closing their mouths*, and is intended to remind them of the prudence they should

observe in delivering their sentiments on the important subjects submitted to their consideration. At the second or third consistory, the Pontiff *opens their mouths*, that is, gives them permission to speak and vote in the conferences and congregations at which they may assist; after which they receive their titles which are always taken from the principal parishes or ancient churches of Rome.

Besides the public and private consistory, the Pope grants occasionally a public audience, which is attended by some of the Cardinals and all the civil officers of Rome. The object for it is to deliberate upon matters connected with the general welfare of Church and State.*

2.

VICARIATE OF ROME.

His Em. Cardinal ODESCALCHI, *Vicar General of His Holiness.*

The Vicar of the Pope exercises the same authority that the Pontiff himself enjoys as bishop of the diocese of Rome.† He takes cognizance of all civil and criminal causes arising among the clergy of this diocese; they are under his jurisdiction; he confers holy orders, consecrates churches, makes the visitation of monasteries, and performs the other functions of an ordinary. He has several assistants, a vicegerent who is a bishop *in partibus*,‡ three substitutes, a secretary, four notaries, and others, who meet once a week in his palace, where a court is held for the decision of ecclesiastical causes.

3.

THE SACRED PENITENTIARY.

Prefect, His Em. Cardinal DE GREGORIO, *Grand Penitentiary.*

The S. Penitentiary is a tribunal established to absolve penitents who have fallen into some crime, absolution from which is reserved to the Holy See, and to dispense *in foro conscientie* from all canonical impediments. Thus, dispensations from *irregularities* resulting from illegitimacy and the commission of homicide, the revalidation of marriages contracted *cum impedimento dirimente, sed occulto*, the provision of benefices simoniacally obtained, &c., come under the jurisdiction of this tribunal. The Grand Penitentiary has twelve assistants, a regent, a corrector, two consultants, who are all well versed in theology and canon law, a datary, a keeper of the seal, three secretaries and three scribes. Previously to their entrance upon duty, they bind themselves by oath to observe an inviolable secrecy in relation to all matters submitted to their inspection, and likewise not to require, or even to receive any fee for their services,

* Plettenberg, *Notitia Congreg.* &c., page 127.

† The Pope is at once Bishop of Rome, archbishop of the province of Rome, primate of Italy, patriarch of the West, and Supreme Pastor of the Universal Church.

‡ That is, of some See, in which there are few, if any Christians, and which being under the dominion of infidels, renders it easy for him to be dispensed from the law, which requires a bishop to reside in his See.

independently of their constituted salary. They assemble once a month in presence of the Grand Penitentiary, to inquire into the expediency of granting or rejecting the petitions that have been presented. When absolution or dispensation is to be given, the execution of it is committed to a prudent confessor; or to the bishop who has jurisdiction over the parties concerned; and in all cases, the clergyman to whom this trust has been confided, is bound to fulfil it himself in the confessional, after having heard the confession of the penitent. A salutary penance is always imposed on the delinquent or the party interested, because the object of this tribunal is, in showing mercy, to punish crime and prevent its commission.

4.

THE SIGNATURE OF GRACE.

Prefect, His Em. Cardinal BOTTIGLIA.

The Signature of Grace is a tribunal held twice a month for the examination and grant of petitions, which do not, of their nature, require a strictly judicial procedure, but depend on the liberality of the Sovereign Pontiff. Favours which have something very important for their object, or those which, if conferred, might be prejudicial to another party, are brought before this assembly; for instance, the grant of an appeal in a cause which, in strict conformity with the law, does not admit of appeal. The officers of this court are a Prefect, the Grand Penitentiary, the Prefect of the Signature of Justice, the Prodatary, the Vicar of the Pope and other Cardinals, twelve Prelates,* called Voters of the Signature, who act as counsellors, and seventy referendaries, whose function is to propose questions presented for consideration. The Signature of Grace is attended also by the auditor of the Chamber, the Treasurer General, an Auditor of the Rote, a Prothonotary of the *participanti*, a Clerk of the Chamber, an Abbreviator of the Park, and the Regent of the Chancery, not for the purpose of giving their vote, but of maintaining the rights of their respective offices. When a petition is granted, the Pope writes the word *fiat* at the end of it, or if he is not present, the Prefect signs it with the words *concessum in presentia Domini nostri Papæ*, which are followed by the clauses explanatory of the grant.

5.

THE SIGNATURE OF JUSTICE.

Prefect, His Em. Cardinal FALZA CAPPÀ.

This tribunal, which is held once a week, has for its object to canvass the grounds on which an appeal is made, and it has the power of referring to another court, cases from those tribunals, the

* The title of *Prelate* is given in the Court of Rome to ecclesiastics who hold an office of distinction or have the privilege of wearing the prelatial dress.

correctness of whose decisions is suspected. The officers of this assembly are a Prefect, the twelve Voters of the Signature of Grace and one hundred referendaries, seventy of whom belong also to the Signature just mentioned. The votes of the twelve Prelates in this court are decisive, while in the Signature of Grace, they are only consultatory. When an appeal is granted, some tribunal is designated or appointed, to which the cause in question is referred for a definitive sentence. Letters despatched in this court are signed by the Prefect with the word *placet*.

6

THE DATARY.

Prefect, His Em. Cardinal PACCA, *Pro Datary*.*

The Datary is a tribunal in which favours granted by the Pope are explained and despatched. The office of Datary consisted originally in merely affixing to the petition the date at which it was granted, but it has since become a trust of considerable importance and enjoys great privileges. The collation of benefices, *dispensations from impediments to marriage, from vows and irregularities, appointments to coadjutorship, &c.* belong to this tribunal. The principal officers who assist the Pro Datary in the discharge of his functions, are the Subdatary and the Clerk *per obitum*; the first of whom has the examination of all matters submitted to this court, except the provision of benefices that become vacant by the death of their incumbents, which forms the province of the second. In addition to these are two revisers, the clerk of the *little date*, the prefect *compendarum*, the clerk *de missis*, the reviewer of marriage dispensations, and twenty clerks of the register. The following is the mode of proceeding in the Datary. The petitions are, in the first place, handed in to the Prefect or one of his principal officers, who presents them for consideration at the daily meetings of the court, where, if it is not found necessary to refer them to the Signature or elsewhere for maturer deliberation, they are arranged to receive the signature of the Pontiff. If the favours requested are *ad ordinarium*, that is, do not require the signature of the Pope, they are signed by the Prefect himself with the words *concessum, &c.*—He and the Subdatary confer daily with his Holiness upon the resignations, dispensations, and other favours that are solicited.—When the Pope grants a petition he writes at the end of it *fiat ut petitur*, with the initial of his Christian name, and on the margin he writes *fiat* with the same initial. The papers are then examined by the first reviser, for the purpose of correcting any inaccuracies of expression contained in them, after which the clerk of the *little date* marks them in small characters with the time of the grant, that is, with the day and month, and the year of the pontificate of his Ho-

* The Presidency of this Tribunal was formerly entrusted to a prelate, who was called the *datary*; now that it is held by a Cardinal, he is called the *Pro Datary*, because, as de Luca observes, it is unbecoming the dignity of his station, to assume an inferior office; whence he is supposed to exercise it in place of the Datary, *pro Datario*.

liness. This being done, they are re-examined by the second reviser, and those for which a compensation is required, are marked by the Subdatary with the letter C. and handed over to the Prefect *compendarum*, whose office is to receive this compensation.* The Pro Datary then affixes the *great date*, given at Rome, &c. and the clerk *de missis*, sends them to the public or private register to be recorded. Here they are distributed by the master of the register among the inferior clerks, and when copied, they are compared with the record and transferred to the Court of Chancery where the bulls are drawn up and despatched. When a petition is once recorded it is secure: but previously to this, the Prefect has the power of modifying the grant, and even rejecting it *in toto*.

7.

THE CHANCERY.

Prefect. His Em. Cardinal *PEDICINI*, *Vice Chancellor*.

The Chancery is a tribunal which has the charge of drawing up and expediting letters of the Holy See, except those which are despatched under the seal of the *Fisherman*. The President of this body is the Vice Chancellor who has under him a great number of officers, the principal of whom are; the regent, who examines, compares and authenticates bulls;† the abbreviators of the Park,‡ who prepare the minutes from which the bulls are to be transcribed; the writers apostolic who copy these minutes on parchment; the protonotaries apostolic, called *participanti*, who are employed in drawing letters regarding patriarchal, metropolitcal and cathedral churches; and the auditor of contradictions, whose function is to hear and answer the objections made to the expedition of bulls. The Vice Chancellor is the first dignitary after his Holiness, in the Court of Rome, and has the superintendence of the Chancery, which he governs according to the regulations adopted by each Pontiff on his accession to the Papal Chair. These rules called *regula Cancellaria*, which were introduced by John XXII. in the 14th century, and afterwards enlarged by his successors, point out the mode of judicial procedure in the Roman Court and the forms to be observed in drawing up bulls and letters apostolic. The meetings of the Chancery are tri-weekly.

* We have here a long note arguing the right of the Pope to make laws, the violation of which will be sinful: and then his right claimed to dispense with the same. For this money is to be paid. Any thing in Rome, for money.

Rome is the fountain head of avarice,

And therefore all things there are at a price.

So said the writers of the 16th century. The note says it is to endow females with a competency for marriage—to relieve the wants of the poor, to aid the missions, &c.

† The office of Chancellor was formerly exercised by a Cardinal; but in the 13th century, it was conferred on several ecclesiastics who were not Cardinals, and for that reason, were called *Vice Chancellors*, a title which has continued in use to the present day.

‡ A *bull* of the Pope is a letter, to which is appended the leaden seal, having on one side the image and names of SS. Peter and Paul, and on the other, the name of the reigning Pontiff. A *brief* is a letter of a smaller form, given under the seal of the *Fisherman*.

§ They are so called from the abbreviations they use in writing, and from *Parce*, their place of Assembly.

8.

SECRETARYSHIP.

His Em. Cardinal BERNETTI, *Secretary of State.*

This officer has the management of political affairs and of the more important transactions with foreign governments. His principal assistant is the Secretary of the *cypher*, whose business is to explain the obscure characters used in writing.

His Em. Cardinal GAMBERINI, *Secretary of the Interior.*

The department of this Cardinal embraces chiefly what relates to the temporal government of the Papal States.

His Em. Cardinal DE GREGORIO, *Secretary of Briefs.*

This officer has the charge of expediting letters given in the form of briefs, after having revised them and affixed the seal of the *Fisherman*. The letters are written by a college of Secretaries who are appointed for this purpose and are twenty-four in number.

His Em. Cardinal JAMES GIUSTINIANI, *Secretary of Memorials.*

The function of this officer is to present to his Holiness, the memorials and petitions which require his examination, and to note the answer of the Pontiff, according to which the brief is to be written.

9.

THE APOSTOLIC CHAMBER.

Prefect, His Em. Cardinal GALEFFI, *Chamberlain.*

To this tribunal are referred all matters relating to the administration of the Papal revenue. It assembles twice a week, and consists of the Cardinal Chamberlain who presides over its deliberations; the Auditor who is the ordinary judge of the Roman Court, and has a very extensive authority in the administration of justice; the Governor of Rome, who takes cognizance principally of criminal causes, and has the charge of inflicting punishment on the guilty; the Treasurer General, who has the direction and management of the revenue of the Holy See; the President of the Chamber, who superintends the accounts of the fiscal department; an Attorney General, who is consulted on all matters connected with this tribunal; a Fiscal Procurator, who institutes and prosecutes financial causes in the different tribunals of the Roman Court; a Commissary, who is employed chiefly as an assistant of the Treasurer; and twelve Clerks of the Chamber, who are the Counsellors of the Chamberlain. Several of these clerks preside over various tribunals, such as regard provisions, currency, roads, &c. and the whole body forms a court of appeal, not only from these tribunals, but also

from the Treasurer's court. Among the cases that come before the Apostolic Chamber, those concerning the poor are always first in the order of discussion, and are defended gratuitously by lawyers appointed for this purpose, who are bound not to receive any compensation for their services.

10.

THE ROTA.*

The Rota is the supreme tribunal of the S. Pontiff, and takes cognizance of all ecclesiastical causes, referred to it from any part of the world, and also by way of appeal, of all beneficiary causes, throughout the papal territory, and of civil processes for upwards of five hundred crowns. The judges of this court are called Auditors of the Rota and are twelve in number, one of whom is a German, one a Frenchman, and two Spaniards, who are nominated by their respective sovereigns, three Romans, one of Bologna, one of Ferrara, one Milanese, one Venitian and one Tuscan. They are divided into classes of four each, who discharge their office in rotation. The rota is held twice a week, and its decisions suffer no appeal, though the S. Pontiff may reconsider them in the Signature of Grace, as a matter of pure favor, depending entirely on his clemency and liberality.

BULL UNIGENITUS.

In our last No. we promised, an extract from the Bull Unigenitus, issued by Clement XI. against the celebrated *Father Quesnel* of France, a learned Priest, for publishing comments or reflections upon the New Testament. One hundred propositions were extracted from it, and condemned, as heretical. The original Latin will be found in the *Magnum Bullarium*, printed at Luxemburg 1727—page 118—vol. VIII. It shall be found in English, in the English translation, published in London; 1719.

The extract which we give will be found in the second volume of the *History of the Jesuits* published London 1816—pages 462—467.

EXTRACT FROM "THE CONSTITUTION UNIGENITUS."

"CLEMENT, Bishop,

"*Servant of the servants of God, &c. &c.*

"When we first heard, to the great grief of our heart, that a certain book printed formerly in French, in several volumes, under the title of "The New Testament, in French, with Moral " Reflections upon every verse. &c. Paris, 1699;" * * * * though already

* The origin of this name is very obscure, some authors deriving it from the circular table, round which the judges are seated; others from the circumstance of performing their functions in rotation, four at a time; others again from the figure of a wheel represented in marble on the pavement of the court room in which they hold their sessions.

condemned by us, and really containing the falsehood of corrupt doctrines in many places, intermixed with Catholic truths, was, notwithstanding, still looked upon by many as free from all error, was frequently put into the hands of the faithful; * * * * we were extremely afflicted to see the flock of Christ, intrusted in our care, thus gradually led aside by these crafty seducements into the way of perdition.—And therefore, being excited thereto as well by the motions of our own pastoral care, as by the frequent complaints of those who are zealous for the *orthodox faith*, but most of all by the letters and petitions of *very many of our venerable brethren, especially of the bishops of France*, we have resolved to make use of some more effectual remedy, in order to put a stop to this spreading disease, which might otherwise in time break out into all manner of bad consequences. * * *

“We therefore judged, that we could not possibly do any thing more reasonable or safe than to lay open the fallacious doctrine of the book, not in general only, as we have hitherto done, but more distinctly and plainly, by *extracting out of it many particular propositions*; that so the noxious seeds of the tares being separated from the midst of the wheat which covered them, might be openly exposed to the sight of all the faithful in Christ.—And thus having detected, and, as it were, placed in open view, not one or two but many and *most grievous errors*, as well those formerly condemned, as those lately discovered, we trust, that, by the blessing of God, all will at length find themselves obliged to yield to the truth, now so clearly discovered and made manifest unto them.

“That this method will be of the greatest advantage to the Catholic cause; that it will contribute very much to the healing of those divisions which have risen, more especially in the flourishing kingdom of France, from the various opinions entertained by the minds of men, which seem to be still widening into more grievous ruptures: and that, lastly, it will be very useful, and in a manner necessary, to the quieting of consciences; not only the above-mentioned bishops have signified to us, but more particularly our most dear son in Christ, *his most christian majesty himself, Louis King of France*, whose extraordinary zeal in maintaining the purity of the Catholic faith, and *extirpating error*, we can never sufficiently commend,—has more than once assured us: for those reasons requesting of us, with repeated instances, truly pious, worthy of the most Christian King, and with earnest entreaties, that we would provide for the urgent necessity of souls, by passing the censure of our apostolical judgment without delay.

“Wherefore, by the blessing of God, and trusting in his heavenly assistance, we set about this beneficial work with great diligence and application, as the weightiness of the affair required; and *ordered a great many Propositions, faithfully extracted out of the forementioned book* according to the above-cited editions, and expressed both in French and Latin, *to be accurately discussed by several professors in Divinity, first in the presence of two of our venerable brethren, Cardinals of the Holy Roman Church*, and then afterwards to be weighed and examined with the utmost diligence and mature deliberation, *in our own presence and that of several other Cardinals, in*

many repeated congregations, in which each Proposition was most exactly compared with the text of the book. The Propositions are such as follow:"

[Here follow seventy-eight Propositions on various points of divinity, extracted from Father Quesnel. The seventy-ninth to the eighty-sixth Proposition, both inclusive, relate to the Holy Scriptures;] viz.

- '79. It is useful and necessary, at all times, in all places, and for all sorts of persons, to study and know the spirit, piety, and mysteries of the Holy Scripture.
- '80. The reading of the Holy Scriptures is for every body.
- '81. The sacred obscurity of the word of God is no reason for the laity to excuse themselves from reading it.
- '82. The Lord's day ought to be sanctified by Christians in reading pious books, and above all the Holy Scriptures. It is very prejudicial to endeavour to withdraw a Christian from reading them.
- '83. It is a great mistake to imagine that the knowledge of the mysteries of religion ought not to be imparted to Women by the reading of the sacred books. The abuse of the Scriptures, and the rise of heresies, have not proceeded from the simplicity of Women, but from the conceited learning of Men.
- '84. To wrest the New Testament out of the hands of Christians or to keep it closed up by taking from them the means of understanding it, is no other than to shut or close up the mouth of Christ in respect of them.
- '85. To forbid Christians the reading of the Holy Scriptures, especially of the Gospel, is to forbid the use of light to the children of light and to make them suffer a sort of excommunication.
- '86. To deprive the unlearned people of this comfort of joining their voice with the voice of the whole church, is a custom contrary to apostolical practice, and to the design of God.'

[Here follow Propositions, No. 87. to 101.]

The Pope's Bull then proceeds:

"Wherefore having heard the judgment of the aforesaid Cardinals, and other divines, exhibited to us both by word and in writing, and having in the first place implored the assistance of the Divine light, by appointing public, as well as private prayers, to that end; we do by this our Constitution, which shall be of perpetual force and obligation, declare, condemn, and reject respectively, all and every one of the Propositions before recited, as false, captious, shocking, offensive to pious ears, scandalous, pernicious, rash, injurious to the Church and her practice, contumelious, not only against the Church, but likewise against the secular powers, seditious, impious, blasphemous, suspected of heresy, and plainly savouring thereof, and likewise favouring heretics, heresies, and schism, erroneous, bordering very near upon heresy, often condemned, and, in fine, even heretical, and manifestly reviving several heresies, and chiefly those which are contained in the infamous Propositions of Jansenius, even in the very sense in which these Propositions were condemned. Commanding all the faithful in Christ, of both sexes, not to presume to hold, teach, or preach, otherwise, concerning the Propositions aforesaid, than

is contained in this our Constitution: insomuch, that whosoever shall teach, defend, or publish them, or any of them, jointly or separately or shall treat of them by way of dispute, *either publicly or privately*, unless it be to impugn them, shall, *ipso facto*, without any other declaration, incur the censures of the Church, and all the other penalties appointed by the law against such delinquents.

“However, by our condemning in express terms the aforesaid Propositions, it is by no means our intention in any manner to approve of other things contained in the same book: especially, since, in the course of our examination thereof, we found in it many other propositions very like those which have been condemned as above mentioned, nearly related to them, and tainted with the same errors; and likewise not a few, which, under a certain imaginary pretence of a persecution carried on at this time, do foment disobedience and contumacy, and recommend them under the false name of Christian patience, which therefore we thought it too tedious and not in the least necessary particularly to recite: and finally, which is yet more intolerable, because we found even the sacred text of the New Testament corrupted with damnable errors, and in many things conformable to *another French translation done at Mons, long since condemned* but disagreeing very much with, and differing from, the Vulgate edition (which has been approved in the Church by the use of so many ages, and ought to be looked upon as authentic by all the orthodox;) and besides all this, frequently wrested with the greatest perverseness to strange, foreign, and often hurtful senses.

“For which causes, we, by our apostolical authority, made known by the tenor of these presents, do again forbid, and in like manner condemn the said book, as being very artfully contrived on purpose *by good words, and fair speeches*, as the Apostle expresses it, that is, under a false appearance of godly instruction, *to deceive the hearts of the simple*; whether it bear the forementioned title or any other, wherever and in whatever other language, edition or version hitherto printed, or hereafter to be printed, (which God forbid!): as we also in like manner do prohibit and forbid all and singular books or pamphlets in defence thereof, as well written, as printed and already published, or which may perhaps be published, (which God forbid!) enjoining all and every one of the faithful not to read, transcribe, keep, or use any of the said books, under the pain of excommunication, to be incurred *ipso facto* by those who act contrary thereto.

“We require, moreover, our venerable brethren, the Patriarchs, Archbishops, Bishops, and other Ordinaries of places, and also the Inquisitors of heresy, that they restrain and coerce all those who shall contradict and rebel against this Constitution, by the censures and penalties aforesaid, and the other remedies of law and fact; and even by calling to their assistance, if there be occasion, *the secular power*.

“Let no one, therefore infringe, or audaciously oppose this our declaration, condemnation, mandate, prohibition and interdict. And if any one presume to attempt this, let him know that he will incur the indignation of Almighty God, and of his blessed Apostles, Peter and Paul. Given at Rome, at St. Mary Major's, in the year

of our Lord 1713, on the sixth of the ides of September, and in the thirteenth year of our pontificate.

“ J. CARD. Datary.

“ F. OLIVERIO.

“ Seen by the Court,

“ L. SERGARDO.

“ Registered in the Office of the Secretary of Briefs,

“ L. MARTINETTO.

“ In the year of our Lord Jesus Christ, one thousand seven hundred and thirteen, indiction the sixth; the tenth day of September, and in the thirteenth year of the pontificate of the Most Holy Father in Christ, and our Lord, CLEMENT XI. by Divine Providence Pope, the Apostolical letters aforesaid were published, by affixing them to the doors of the Church of St. John Lateran, of the Basilica of the Prince of the Apostles, of the Apostolical Chancery, and of the Court General in Monte Citorio, in the Campo di Fiori, and in the other usual and customary places, by me, Pietro Romulatio, apostolical Cursitor.

“ ANTONIO PLACENTIO,

“ Master of the Cursitors.”

COMMUNION IN BOTH KINDS.

The depriving the Laity of the cup in the Communion.

It never could be questioned by any one that reads the New Testament that, our blessed Saviour, instituted the Lord's Supper, *in both kinds*; that is; that he gave to his disciples bread, after blessing and breaking it, and then the cup which he denominates the New Testament, in his blood: So Paul in the XI. Chapter of his first epistle to the Corinthians. This is so glaring, that the church dare not say that Christ appointed it in one kind. They admit that Christ did celebrate it in the species of bread and wine, they admit that the church continued from that time to do as Christ did, until, the Roman apostacy began. Then they taught, that it was not necessary to salvation, to receive it in both kinds. In process of time THIS INSTITUTION OF CHRIST, for weighty and just reasons, WAS CHANGED, the custom of COMMUNING IN ONE KIND APPROVED, and FINALLY COMMANDED BY LAW.—Then the asserting the duty of observing it under both kinds, subjected one to the curse of the church.

This is the *Infallible church*, which has changed the command of Christ, and declares what he did enjoin to be unlawful and deserving of the curse. *Is this the church of Christ?*

Decree on communing in one kind, passed in the twenty first Session of the council of Trent (Cramp's translation.)

“Seeing that many and monstrous errors concerning the awful and most holy sacrament of the eucharist, are by the arts of the wicked spirit disseminated in different places; through which, in

some provinces; may seem to have departed from the faith and obedience of the Catholic church:—the sacred, holy, œcumenical, and general Council of Trent, lawfully assembled, &c. hath judged proper to explain in this place the doctrine of communion, in both kinds, and of children. Wherefore, all Christ's faithful are strictly enjoined, that henceforth they dare not believe, teach or preach, otherwise than is explained and defined in this decree

CHAPTER I. *That the laity and non-officiating clergy are not bound by the divine law to receive the communion in both kinds.*

“The sacred council therefore, taught by the Holy Spirit, the Spirit of wisdom and understanding, the Spirit of counsel and piety, and following the judgment and practice of the church, doth declare and teach that the laity and non-officiating clergy *are not bound by any divine precept to receive the sacrament of the eucharist in both kinds*; nor can any one who holds the true faith indulge the slightest doubt that communion in either kind is sufficient to salvation. *For although Christ the Lord did IN THE LAST SUPPER INSTITUTE this venerable sacrament of the eucharist IN THE SPECIES OF BREAD AND WINE AND THUS DELIVERED IT TO THE APOSTLES*; yet it does not thence follow that all the faithful in Christ are bound by divine statute to receive both kinds. Nor can it be fairly proved from the discourse recorded in the sixth chapter of John, that communion in both kinds is commanded by the Lord, howsoever the same may have been interpreted by various holy fathers and doctors.—For he who said, ‘Except you eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, you shall not have life in you’ (v. 54,) said also, ‘If any man eat of this bread, he shall live for ever’ (v. 52;) and he who said, ‘He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, hath everlasting life’ (v. 55,) said also, ‘The bread that I will give is my flesh for the life of the world, (v. 52;) and lastly, he who said, ‘He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, abideth in me and I in him’ (v. 57,) said nevertheless, ‘He that eateth this bread shall live for ever’ (v. 59.)

CHAPTER II. *Of the power of the church regarding the dispensation of the sacrament of the eucharist.*

“The council further declares, that in the dispensation of the sacraments, the church hath always possessed the power, so that their substance was preserved, of making such appointments and alterations, according to the change of things, times, and places, as it should judge would best promote the benefit of the recipients, and the veneration due to the sacraments themselves. Which indeed the apostle seems to have not obscurely intimated, when he said, ‘Let a man so account of us, as of the ministers of Christ and the dispensers of the mysteries of God.’ 1 Corinthians iv. 1. For it is sufficiently plain, that he himself used this power, not only in other respects, but also with regard to this sacrament, because, when he had given various directions respecting its use, he added, And the rest I will set in order when I come. 1 Corinthians xi. 34.,

Wherefore, though from the beginning of the Christian religion the use of both kinds was not unfrequent, yet when in process of time that practice was for weighty and just causes changed, holy mother church, recognizing her acknowledged authority in the administration of the sacraments, approved the custom of communion in one kind, and commanded it to be observed as law: to condemn or alter which, at pleasure without the authority of the church itself, is not lawful.

"CHAPTER III. *That the true sacrament, and Christ whole and entire, is received under either species.*

"Moreover the council declares that though our Redeemer, as has been before said, did in the last supper institute this sacrament in two kinds, and thus delivered it to the apostles, it must nevertheless be granted that the true sacrament and Christ, whole and entire, is received in either kind by itself; and therefore, that as far as regards the fruit of the sacrament, those who receive one kind only are not deprived of any grace that is necessary to salvation.

"CHAPTER IV. *That sacramental communion is not obligatory on children.*

"Lastly, the same holy council teaches, that the sacramental communion of the eucharist is not necessarily obligatory on children, who have not attained the use of reason. For being regenerated in the laver of baptism, and incorporated into Christ, they cannot lose the gracious state of children of God which was acquired at that time. Nevertheless antiquity is not to be condemned, on account of that practice having been formerly observed in some places. For though the holy fathers had sufficient grounds for the custom, in the then existing state of things, yet it must be without doubt believed that they did not attend to it, as necessary to salvation.

"Conon. 1. Whoever shall affirm, that all and every one of Christ's faithful are bound by divine command to receive the most holy sacrament of the eucharist in both kinds, as necessary to salvation; let him be accursed.

"2. Whoever shall affirm, that the holy Catholic church had not just grounds and reasons for restricting the laity and non-officiating clergy to communion in the species of bread only, or that she hath erred therein: let him be accursed.

"3. Whoever shall deny that Christ, whole and entire, the fountain and author of every grace, is received under the one species of bread; because, as some falsely affirm, he is not then received according to his own institution, in both kinds: let him be accursed.

"4. Whoever shall affirm, that the communion of the eucharist is necessary to children, before they reach the years of discretion: let him be accursed."

SUFFERINGS OF THE EARLY CHRISTIANS.

From Tacitus and Sulpicius Severus; and testimony of Tacitus, a heathen, to the Facts of the Gospel History.

TACITUS is familiar to every classical scholar, and to every reader of history, both as a historian, and as one who served in many stations, during the reign of the Emperor Vespasian and several of his successors. He wrote in the latter part of the first and early in the second century of the Christian era.

Sulpicius wrote in the latter part of the fourth and early in the fifth century. The first was a heathen, the latter a Christian. They individually give accounts of the great fire that took place in the city of Rome, in the 64th year of our Lord and the tenth of the reign of the emperor Nero, the celebrated persecutor of the early Christians. A large part of the city was burned. Nero undertook to rebuild it in greater splendour. When all things were done by him, that were possible to put the stigma of its burning upon the Christians as will be seen, both from Tacitus and Sulpicius, still the impression remained, that he was the cause of its destruction, as will be seen in the extracts from these two writers, for which we are indebted to *Lardner* in the 6th vol. pages 629 630 of whose works they will be found, with the original in the notes.

"But neither all human help, nor the liberality of the emperor, nor all the atonements presented to the gods availed to abate the infamy he lay under of having ordered the city to be set on fire. To suppress therefore this common rumor, Nero procured others to be accused, and inflicted exquisite punishment upon those people, who were in abhorrence for their crimes, and were commonly known by the name of Christians. They had their denomination from Christ, who in the reign of Tiberius was put to death as a criminal by the procurator Pontius Pilate. This pernicious superstition though checked for a while, broke out again, and spread, not only over Judea, the source of this evil, but reached the city also; whither flow from all quarters all things vile and shameful, and where they find shelter and encouragement. At first they only were apprehended who confessed themselves of that sect, afterwards a vast multitude, discovered by them: all which were condemned, not so much for the crime of burning the city, as for their enmity to mankind. Their executions were so contrived as to expose them to derision and contempt. *Some were covered over with the skins of wild beasts, and torn to pieces by dogs; some were crucified; others having been daubed over with combustible materials, were set up as lights in the night time, and thus burned to death.* Nero made use of his own gardens as a theatre upon this occasion, and also exhibited the diversions of the circus, sometimes standing in the crowd as a spectator, in the habit of a charioteer, at other times driving a chariot himself: till at length these men, though really criminal, and deserving exemplary punishment, began to be commiserated, as people who were destroyed, not out of a regard to the public welfare, but to gratify the cruelty of one man."

Annals of Tacitus—book XV. chap. 44.

“In the mean time, when the number of the Christians was greatly increased, there happened a fire at Rome while Nero was at Antium. Nevertheless, the general opinion of all men cast the blame of the fire upon the emperor. And it was supposed that his aim therein was that he might have the glory of raising the city again in greater splendor. Nor could he by any means suppress the common rumor that the fire was owing to his orders. He therefore endeavored to cast the reproach of it upon the Christian.—*And exquisite tortures were inflicted upon innocent men: and moreover new kinds of death were invented. Some were tied up in the skins of wild beasts, that they might be worried to death by dogs. Many were crucified. Others were burnt to death; and they were set up as lights in the night-time.* This was the beginning of the persecution of the Christians. Afterwards the profession of the Christian Religion was prohibited by law; and edicts were published that no man might be a Christian. At that time Paul and Peter were condemned to death. The former was beheaded. Peter was crucified.”

Sulpitius Severus. Sacred Hist. Book—2—chap. 41.

Tacitus is valuable, not for the accuracy of his statements on the character of the early Christians, for every Heathen and every Jew, considered the Christian as a wicked man, from the fact that he would not worship their Gods—or walk according to the law of Moses. He is valuable, as one who testifies to the facts of the New Testament History. The time when, the places where; the person or persons engaged in spreading the religion of Christ. The manner in which they were received—the increase of their numbers, and spread of their religion.

Here we have the name of Christians given them, as the followers of one Christ, or Christ. Of him, we learn that he was put to death in the reign of Tiberius, by Pontius Pilate.

His religion, which he here calls superstition, was stopped for a while, but afterwards broke out and spread, not only over Judea, but had reached even to the city of Rome.

They were numerous in this city. They were hated. They were charged with all manner of crimes. Treated as the very off-scouring and filth of the earth.

Nero pursued and persecuted them to the utmost, charging them with crimes, that he might have some ground of attack.

Looking back at these records, how should our hearts be filled with gratitude to God, that he has delivered us from this fire of Persecution; that we are privileged to worship him, and Jesus our Saviour under our own vine and fig tree with none to trouble, or make us afraid. But what diligence, zeal, and self denial for the advancement of the cause of our blessed Redeemer, should it stir up within us, when we behold what others have endured to spread abroad the knowledge of Christ—that very knowledge that has been blessed of God to the saving of our souls.

They laboured in the fire; and shall we now live and be at ease, while the cause of the Lord Jesus, is fainting and dying around us?

A CATALOGUE OF RELICS.

(Continued.)

88. Large parcels of the blessed Virgin's hair, all of one colour: from Paris and several places less known and much of it of this city.

89. Great quantities of her milk, gathered from many places; some butter and a small cheese made of it, that never decays nor corrupts: from Mexico, in America.

90. Her slipper, and one of her shoes.

—N. B. This is the original shoe, which the famous Rivet, in his Apology for the Virgin, (lib. xi. chap. 9.) was possessed of, and had the figure of it engraved, and published with license; and in the middle of the sole this is written, "The measure of the most holy foot of our Lady;" and then follows, "Pope John XXII, hath granted to those who shall thrice kiss it, and rehearse three ave marias with devotion to her blessed honour and reverence, that they shall gain seven hundred years of pardon, and be freed from many sins." The exact measure of this blessed shoe is just seven and a quarter inches.

91. Her needle, thread, and quassillum: *Halæ*. Her picture, by St. Luke: *Romæ ad Mariæ Inviolatæ*.

92. Another picture by the same hand of that holy evangelist: *Romæ ad Mariæ novæ*.

93. A third from Cambray.—N. B. Though some Catholics maintain St. Luke only painted one, yet as these are each of them unquestionably vouched, and that allowing St. Luke was a painter as well as a physician, it is but reasonable to suppose he should have painted more than one; his holiness, by the annexed bull, has thought it expedient to warrant them all for originals of the same divine pencil.

94. St. Michael's dagger and buckler: *Magni Michaelis apud Coreassanenses*.

95. St. John Baptist's face, very little the worse for the keeping: *Cambis ad Joannis Angelici*.

96. The hand, and part of his head without a face: from Malta.

97. Others, ditto: from Nemours. His brain, very well dried and preserved: *Novii Rantroviensis*.

98. His whole head: Rome, from the convent of St. Sylvester.—As to these two heads, the pious reader is referred to the foregoing apology for the two heads of St. Luke. It is true, Gregory Nazianzen has declared, that his bones were buried by the Donatists, so that nothing remained but a piece of his skull; but it is absurd to compare the authority of him, or one hundred such Fathers, with the authority of the church and her sacred traditions. At the same time, far be it from the modesty of the holy see to maintain he had two; but both are so amply vouched and verified, that it is presumptuous to decide for either. Let us say rather, with Cardinal Baronius, in the sentiments of a truly pious mind, allowing a mistake in such cases "*Quicquid sit, fides purgat facinus*." It is not the head of the saint we adore, but the faith for which he died.

99. A second fore-finger of St. John Baptist, with which he pointed at our Saviour, and said, "*Ecce agnus Dei*," &c. from Tolouse.

100. As good a one from Lyons; one from Florence,—wants the nail.

101. Another from Genoa, mightily damaged.—N. B. Though these are not maintained to be fore-fingers, yet they are indubitably the real fingers of the saint: and be they anathema and accursed who say otherwise, wounding the sides of the church, through these her blessed relics.

102. His ashes: Rome, St. John Lateran. More of them from Genoa, very safe and dry.

103. Some of the blood of our Saviour as he hung on the cross, gathered in a glove by Nicodemus; which, being thrown by him into the sea, for fear of the Jews, was cast up, after many ages, on the coast of Normandy, and found out by a duke of that country as he was hunting, by the hunted stag and dogs all kneeling quietly about it: from the Abbey du Bec, in Normandy, which the duke built for it, and where it was kept till now, and the said history recorded.

104. St. Peter and St. Paul's

bodies, mixed together: one half belonging to St. Peter's, the other half from St. Paul's, at Rome; both equally divided, weighed by Pope Sylvester.—N. B. That moiety at St. Peter's with some other precious relics, is not to be disposed of to any person whatever, but to remain to the church.

105. Both their heads, from St. John Lateran: Rome.

196. A toe, a finger, and a slipper, of St. Peter; all in good condition: Rome.

107. His episcopal chair, wants a foot; his vestments, want mending and darning greatly, but it would be dangerous, the cloth is so sadly decayed.

108. His rochet, which he always used to say mass in, and especially in this city, when he was here; much torn, and greatly damaged by time all at Rome.

109. Another chain, and another sword, of this blessed apostle when in prison: all at Rome from St. Petri ad Vincula.

Lot 110. A shoulder of St. Paul: Rome. St. Bartholomew's body. Three of them: one from Naples; another, fully as well saved, from St. Bartholomew's in this city; and a third from Toulouse, very tender, and not well dried, but plainly his own.—N. B. These different bodies are as hard to have any thing determined about them as the duplicates aforesaid. They are well vouched by ancient and unquestionable tradition, and all proper depositions and certificates; and it suits better with good faith and good manners to leave such perplexed difficulties in suspense, as the holy church and our religious ancestors have delivered them down to us, (however ambiguous and incomprehensibly obscure,) than that the temerity of these days should overturn the piety of the former. Let the buyers examine, and judge to the best of their faith and knowledge, and remember, as they are blessed who believe though they saw not, so much more blessed are they who believe piously and candidly even against that which they do see.

111. The skin which was flayed off this blessed apostle, in a sad condition, and something rotten: from Poitiers.

112. Another of them; probably from one of the aforesaid bodies, but wants the *fesses*, though better preserved by a great deal: Rome.

113. St. Matthias's head: *Romæ Petri ad Vincula*.

114. His rib, shoulder, arm, one foot, and a piece of another; all of them kept moist, and strongly scented: from Paris, Aquæ Sextiæ, and other places of equal credit.

115. Another skin of St. Bartholomew; in all human probability, flayed off one of the bodies aforesaid: from Pisa.

116. His head, and another member; but hard to say what it is, it is so much disfigured by time, and the zealous devotion of pious pilgrims and visitants: from Pisa also.

117. St. Matthew's blessed bones: Trevisis. His left arm: from Casini.

118. His right arm: *Romæ ad Marcelli*. Another arm: *Romæ ad Nicolai*.—We have said enough on these duplicates already.

119. The complete body of St. Anne, the blessed Virgin's mother: *Aptæ oppido Provincia*.

120. Another: from *Maria Insulanæ*, Lyons. Her head: Trevisis. Another.

121. Other heads: *Tureni apud Juliaccensis*, A third: *Annabergæ oppido Thuringiæ*.—We have said above what is abundantly sufficient to ease the minds of truly pious, though scrupulous, Christians, concerning these vexatious difficulties. The faithful and sincerely religious person will ask no more hereupon: and we speak not to schismatics, heretics, and unbelievers, as gangrened members cut off from the body of the holy church, to their eternal destruction.

122. St. Magdalen's body: *Vessali prope Altissiodorum*.

123. Another body of her: but, as this is not well vouched, having but twenty depositions, and those not fully confirmed by oral tradition, and the constant testimony of the church, and the devotion of her faithful sons,

we candidly and ingenuously declare our not being perfectly satisfied in this particular relic; which yet we would not cast out, lest we should scandalize the devout Catholics who have so long venerated it: *apud san. Maximinum oppido Provinciae.*

124. Her head, and the mark of the blow given her by our Lord on the cheek, when she would have touched him, as he said—*Noli me tangere*: the blow very plain still.

125. Great quantities of her hair, near twenty pounds: from many places.

—N. B. Though this quantity is large, there is nothing therein to give the least offence to the faithful: for on all dead bodies, and much more on those of the saints, the hair, even after death, grows most exuberantly, by which means, probably, these quantities have been produced.

126. The holy spousal ring, with which the blessed Virgin was espoused to Joseph; for which the Clusians and Perusians waged such war here in Italy, as history mentions: from Perugia.

127. The bodies of the three kings, or magi,—Melchior, Jaspas, and Belthazar; all perfectly fresh and fair, and good liking: from Colen, or Cologne.

128. Three other bodies of the same kings, fully as fair, and as well preserved, except the nose, the right eye, and a part of the left foot, of King Jaspas: from Milan, *ad Eustorgii*.—We shall be altogether silent on these six bodies, belonging (that is, universally agreed, by infallible tradition, to belong) to these three kings; and shall content ourselves with referring the pious reader, and especially if a purchaser, to the foregoing apologies. Blessed be the care of the Empress Helina, to whom we and the Christian church are indebted for these precious relics, by her sending them to Constantinople! and surely it is much better to have six bodies disputing for this honour than none at all.

129. The knife used at the circumcision of our Lord: from Compendium.

130. The stone on which St. Peter's cock crew, and the column which was cleft asunder from top to

bottom on the day of the passion; and the stone on which Pilate's soldiers cast lots for Christ's garment, all from St. John de Lateran in this city.

131. St. Stephen's body: from St. Stephen's at Rome. Several parcels of the bodies of the Innocents: from France, Germany, and Italy. *Testiculi eorum*: from Friburgh, in Brisgaw.

132. St. Laurence's body, from his church in this city; together with a vessel full of his broiled flesh; and another full of his fat when broiling on the fire: from the same.

133. The gridiron on which he suffered martyrdom, and the coals where with this blessed martyr was broiled to death: for the faith: from St. Eustachius's, in this city.

134. Four bodies of St. Sebastian: one from St. Laurence's in this city; another from Soissons; a third from a town near Narbonne, his native country; and the fourth from Pelignum, *apud Armoricos*.—It is not to be denied, these undistinguishable duplicates do return too frequently; but our former defences, and the confusion and too forward zeal of those darker times, must, and (if he be faithful and pious) will, content the reader and buyer. Let us only add, which is a point full of comfort, that the prayers of the church, and the devotion of her religious children, have so far consecrated the mistakes of their forefathers, that all must allow that each of these bodies have wrought most prodigious miracles, of which the proper certificates remain with each of them.

135. A head of the same glorified saint: at St. Peter's in this city.

136. Another head of his, belonging most certainly to one of the above carcasses: from Magdeburgh.

137. A third head of his, in like manner (as is to be delivered) several from another of the said bodies: procured from the Dominicans at Toulouse, who recovered it at the immense expense of a tedious law-suit.

138. Four of his arms; one from the Dominicans: Andegavi.

139. A second, from Toulouse, *ad Saturnini*.

140. A third, from the town Casse-dei, in Avernia.

141. And a fourth, from Monbrison.
142. Several of the arrows he was shot and cruelly martyred with: Lambesii, in Provincia.
143. More of them, from the Augustine friars, in Poitiers.
144. Several chests full of the eleven thousand virgins: from Colen, St. Dennis, the monastery of Marcian in Flanders, and many other places, where the bodies of those wonderful saints were dispersed.
145. The bones of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob; very sound and well kept: *Romæ, Mariæ super Minervam.*
146. One of Aaron's rods: Paris. *ad Sacri sacelli.*
147. Solomon's candlestick, from Prague. Some of the oil of the holy sepulchre's lamp, which every Easter Sunday blazes up of itself, before the eyes of the truly faithful: got from the altar of St. John.
148. The ring of St. Thomas-à-Becket, the blessed martyr, who rebelled against his prince, to serve the holy see and the cause of truth.
149. His rochet, sprinkled with his blood when murdered, so as never to be washed out.
150. His hair shirt; the same which Gononus's Chronicon assures us, the blessed Virgin sewed herself for him, and then hid it under his bed: all from the monastery of St. Martin in Artois, with an authentic catalogue of sixty-seven miracles wrought by them.
151. St. Appolonia's head and arm, one jaw, and several of her teeth: from two or three different churches in this city.
152. Her mouth, part of her jaw, and one of her blessed teeth: from Volaterræ, in Etruria.
153. Several more of her teeth, and her lower jaw: from Bononia; where they used to be solemnly venerated the 9th of February each year, by the Pope's legate, or vicelegate.
154. A part of her jaw, from Antwerp; where frequent miracles were wrought by it.
155. A part of her tooth, from Mechlin; and several whole ones, from Flanders.
156. A remarkable portion of her lower jaw, from Artois.
157. Four other teeth, a rib, another tooth, and her shoulder-blade; from Colen.
158. Another jaw, from the Carthusians: a tooth, from St. Maurice's church; and another lower jaw, from St. Alban's all in the same city.
159. Another of her teeth, and some other blessed relics of hers: from the church of St. Roch in Lisbon, and from Placentia in Spain.
160. St. Anthony's beard, from Colen; and a remarkable part of his head.
161. His tongue, blessed for ever: from Padua.—N.B. This is the same tongue which St. Bonaventure, thirty years after his death, found in his ashes, still fresh, and full of juice and blood; which, before the magistrates, he reverently took up and kissed, saying, "O blessed tongue! which always did bless God, and taught others to bless him; now it appears of what merit thou wast!" and so delivered it to them to be laid up again with his holy ashes; as the famous Mendozius tells us.
162. The hay found in the cratch where our Saviour was laid, called the holy hay: brought from Lorain.
163. Moses's horns, which he had coming down from Mount Sinai; and the tail of the ass our Saviour rode on: got from Genoa; and a pair of Joseph's breeches, very old, and much worn: from Aix.
164. The navel of Joseph: from St. Mary del Popalo, in this city.
165. The skin, or pannicle, that came out of the most holy body of the blessed Virgin with our Saviour, when he came into the world: from the church of St. Mary the Greater, in the same city.
166. The stone in which the same blessed Virgin used to wash our Saviour's linen: brought from Constantinople.
167. A tear which Christ shed over Lazarus, enclosed in a little crystal by an angel, who made a present of it to St. Mary Magdalen.
168. Another from the Benedictine's convent at Vendome, in France.—N. B. This is the very tear which the learned Père Mabilion wrote so admirable a treatise in defence of, to the honour of God and the holy Church.

**CIRCULAR LETTER FROM THE POPE
TO THE IRISH PRELATES AGAINST
BIBLE SCHOOLS.**

'Rome, Court of the Sacred Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith, September 18, 1819.

'My Lord,—The prediction of our Lord Jesus Christ, in the parable of the sower, that 'sowed good seed in his field; but while people slept, his enemy came and sowed tares upon the wheat,' Matt. xvi. 24, is to the very great injury indeed of the Catholic faith, seen verified in these our own days, particularly in Ireland: for information has reached the ears of the Sacred Congregation, that *Bible Schools*, supported by the funds of the Catholics have been established in almost every part of Ireland, in which, under the pretence of charity, the inexperienced of both sexes, but particularly peasants and paupers, are allured by the blandishments and even gifts of the masters, and infected with the fatal poison of depraved doctrines. It is further stated, that the directors of these schools are, generally speaking, Methodists, who introduce Bibles, translated into English by 'the Bible Society,' and abounding in errors, with the sole view of seducing the youth, and entirely eradicating from their minds the truths of the orthodox faith.

'Under these circumstances, your Lordship already perceives with what solicitude and attention pastors are bound to watch and carefully protect their flock from the 'snares of wolves, who came in the clothing of sheep.' If the pastors sleep, the enemy will quickly creep in by stealth and sow the tares, soon will the tares be seen growing among the wheat and choke it.

'Every possible exertion must therefore be made to keep the youth away from these destructive schools; to warn parents against suffering their children on any account whatever, to be led into error. But, for the purpose of escaping the 'snares' of the adversaries, no plan seems more appropriate than that of establishing schools, wherein salutary instructions may be imparted to

paupers and illiterate country persons.

'In the name, then, of the bowels (of the mercy) of our Lord Jesus Christ, we exhort and beseech your Lordship to guard your flock with diligence, and all due discretion, from those who are in the habit of thrusting themselves insidiously into the fold of Christ, in order thereby to lead the unwary sheep astray: and, mindful of the forewarning of Peter the Apostle, given in these words, viz. 'There shall also be lying masters among you, who shall bring in sects of perdition.' 2 Pet. ii. 8. Do you labour with all your might to keep the orthodox youth from being corrupted by them—an object which will, I hope, be easily effected by the establishing of Catholic schools throughout your diocese. And, confidently trusting, that in a matter of such vast importance, your Lordship will, with unbounded zeal, endeavour to prevent the wheat from being choked by the tares, I pray the all-good and omnipotent God to guard and preserve you safe many years. Your Lordship's most obedient humble servant.

'F. CARDINAL FONTANA, Prefect.'
'C. M. PEDICINI, Secretary.'

**PROTESTANTISM AND POPERY CON-
TRASTED.**

Is the question settled, Catholicus? Perhaps you yet doubt. Come then, sir, let me cite the *circumstances of this controversy* as proof of the native inherent liberty of Protestantism. You have had some experience here in this Protestant land, the head quarters of Protestantism, and I too have had some experience in Rome, the head quarters of Popery. Come let us compare notes. You are a Papist, you live in a Protestant community. The overwhelming majority of the millions of this nation are Protestant. You dwell in their midst unmolested, you go in and out at your pleasure, you may proselyte whom you can to your political or religious faith, (provided you touch not their civil rights,) you may establish without license your journals and publish what you will; you even find Protestant journals

free'y open for you to discuss and spread your own opinions; you write and debate what you please, (save only, be it remarked, what your own Bishops forbid,) you may even denounce the system which gives you this freedom, and throws the shield of its protection over you; yes, you may attempt to extinguish this Protestant torch of liberty, the *very light by which you write*, and no one even inquires who you are, or opposes to you any other force than the force of argument.

Now, sir, come with me to Rome. At the court of the Pope we shall be likely to know what Popery is. Let a *Protestant* attempt to do any one of these acts *there*, which, *you* may freely do *here*, and he would have leave to cross the frontier in twenty four hours; if he resides there, he dwells in the midst of spies; all his words, all his actions are watched, and faithfully reported; he feels the government all about him; false keys and domiciliary visits give the police access to his papers; examiners at the post office, to his letters; his least attempt to change the faith of a Roman, is known, reported and rebuked; and think you he could publicly or privately discuss in Rome, whether the Roman faith be favourable to liberty? Liberty! The word uttered loud in the streets, would startle the passers by as if it were a cry from the sepulchre of Brutus beneath their feet; and the dungeons of St. Angelo would prevent the indiscreet utterer of a word so antiquated, from again disturbing the nerves of his Holiness. And if he would write, how shall his opinions be made public? Through what newspaper? Two miserable censor-chained journals, starved spectres from the tomb of the Press, the *Diario di Roma*, and the *Notizie del Giorno*, each the size of a sheet of letter paper, filled with the thousand times repeated details of prosing ceremonies, the movements of his holiness, and the Cardinals, and meagre gleanings of *safe* intelligence, are all that Rome can boast; and for public discussion, Rome knows not the words, in politics or religion. True, he may discuss, but it must be a subject of such paramount importance as the rival merits of two opera

dancers, or the comparative excellence of last Sunday's bull fight, and that of the Sunday before.

[*N. Y. Journal of Commerce.*]

VALUABLE TREASURE.

"*He cannot take away the fifty chapters I have got by heart.*"—The utility of the practice pursued in Sunday Schools of requiring children to commit to memory portions of the Scriptures, is illustrated by the following anecdote, related in the *Missionary Register*.

"A little girl had committed to memory fifty chapters. It pleased God to bring her to her death-bed. Her comfort in that hour, was the reading of the Scriptures; but her parents being Roman Catholics, wished her to confess to the priest, and receive anointing from him. The priest, refused to give absolution, unless the Bible was given to him; and the mother thinking the child was lost to eternity, unless she complied with the priest's wishes entreated compliance, and the child refused. At last the poor ignorant mother took from her by force, the Bible which she had held on her little breast. The child on finding the Bible gone, simply exclaimed, "Well, I thank God, he cannot take away the fifty chapters I have got by heart!"

BREAKING THE SABBATH.

The violation of the fourth commandment, has almost invariably marked those that have been offenders against the laws of their country: In many instances Sabbath breaking is the beginning of crimes. To the many facts in proof of this, may be added one which has been given in the testimony of Reverend David Ruell, before a committee of the English house of commons, consisting of thirty members, who had been appointed to investigate, the evils resulting from its violation. Mr. Ruell, had been chaplain of the prisons in London, for twenty eight years. His testimony was. "That of 100, 000 prisoners, he did not think there was one who had not been a Sabbath breaker,—and in very many cases he had been assured that the violation of this, was the beginning of their downward course."

WHOSE SERVANTS ARE THEY?

THE Servant is expected to do his master's work, to do it first, to do it even to neglect his own. He is to do it at the time, place, and in the manner which his master orders. He is not to say it is unpleasant work, it is hard work, it is tedious work, and I cannot continue at it. With him it is not the prosperity or success of his labours, but the command of his master. Go work in my field, may be the command. There may be stones to gather—stumps to grub; both of which at first appear very unprofitable work. Surely one may say this will not bring grain into the garner: The next command may be, to break up the fallow ground. The plough and the harrow are now needed. The servant may still say, this will not bring fruit. Then it may be, go and scatter the seed. This is done, but there is no fruit. Here is a long delay before fruit, and these servants who have been employed for this early work, are not needed again until harvest. But when harvest comes they may have gone far hence. They laboured, they served, and saw nothing of all that they did. What judgment would there have been in them, if they had refused to work on this ground? What sort of servants would their master have considered them? What reward could they have expected? Reward! says one. They should have been at once dismissed. Who would employ such servants as these!

The servant is to do his master's work. He is employed by his master to do his work. He gives him wages, regularly, honestly for all his work. Is it a point that needs a moment's consideration, *who* he is to serve. What consideration does it need? The master states, he has such a piece of work to do. He wants servants to do it. Here are a number who engage, to do it. Surely then they are to *do it*; and to *serve him* in doing it. What would be thought of the servants who after engaging in this work, should spend all the time in doing their own work, minding their own business, following after their own desires? could they expect the payment which had been offered? Suppose however, they would come and say—The work did not seem to be worth spending so much time and labour upon, we tried it, and found that we could not succeed therein. Is this an excuse—Did they return to their master, and report to him what they had done, and what little prospect there was of succeeding in it? If so, what answer did he give? was it to work for yourselves, do your own business. If so then they had been excused. But in case he told them, I knew the work was difficult. I knew the opposition you would have to encounter, and I have prepared that which shall in time perfect it, and reward you for your toil. Would not this alter the ground, and call for their continuance, with patience in the work, to which he had called, to which they had assented, and which he now enjoined upon them.

A servant, who is fed, taken care of, all his wants provided for by his master, is under peculiar obligations to serve the master who provides for him. If he has been a captive, sold to him to prevent his life being taken as the penalty of crime committed by him,

he is that master's to serve with his life. If his master entrust a certain work to him, and give the promise of the means requisite for him to carry on his work, as he shall need them, his duty is plain. He is his by purchase; he is bound by his relation, in the very fact of his having bought him; he is bound from gratitude to engage in his service, and do his commands. When such a servant is commanded to go, he goes,—to come, he comes,—*do this, he doeth it.*

It is known what master we serve, by the fruits we bring forth; what service we delight in, by the diligence, zeal, and self denial we exhibit in those things in which we engage. The master to whom we most readily yield as servants, is the one whom we delight to honor, and *whose servants we are.* If a man seeks the world and follows it with greater zeal and ardour, than any thing else, he is undoubtedly serving the God of this world. If he can be more ready to engage in any work which will advance his worldly interest or pleasure, he is the servant thereof. "To whom ye yield yourselves servants to obey, *his servants ye are, to whom ye obey;* whether of sin unto death, or of obedience unto righteousness." (Rom vi: 16.)

Rom. i: 9. For God is my witness, whom *I serve* with my spirit in the gospel of his son.

Acts xxvii: 23. For there stood by me this night the angel of God, *whose I am, and whom I serve.*

John xii: 26. If any man *serve me, let him follow me:* and where I am, there shall also my servant be: if any man serve me, him will my father honour.

Col. iii: 24. Knowing that *of the Lord ye shall receive the reward of the inheritance; for ye serve the Lord Christ.*

1 Cor. x: 5. Therefore, be ye steadfast, unmoveable, *always abounding in the work of the Lord,* forasmuch as you know that your labour is not in vain in the Lord.

Ps. cxxvi: 6. He that goeth forth weeping, bearing precious seed, shall doubtless come again with rejoicing, bringing his sheaves with him.

In whose service are we engaged? Who is it that we delight to honour? Whose work are we doing? For whom are we labouring? His servants we are, whose interest we seek! **WHOSE SERVANTS ARE WE?**

Duties are ours: events are God's. This removes an infinite burden from the shoulders of a miserable, tempted, dying creature. On this consideration only, can he securely lay down his head and close his eyes.

We are too apt to forget our actual dependence on providence, circumstances of every instant. The most trivial events may determine our state in the world. Turning up one street instead of another, may bring us into company with a person whom we should not otherwise have met; and this may lead to a train of other events, which may determine the happiness or misery of our lives.

Cecil.

Errata.—In Jan'y No. page 38, 14th line from end, read, *Part I. title V. &c.*
 In February No., on page 64, at the bottom of the page. To the event (add) (has fully justified the confiding piety and far sighted sagacity) of the single hearted Christian.

THE
BALTIMORE LITERARY
AND
RELIGIOUS MAGAZINE.

APRIL, 1837.

No. 4.

THE USE OF FAITH IN A TIME OF GENERAL DECLENSION IN RELIGION.

A SERMON,

Preached by JOHN OWEN, D. D., Vice Chancellor of the University of Oxford—on May 21, 1690.

But the just shall live by faith.—HAB. II. 4.

THIS is the first time these words are mentioned in the Scripture, but they are three times quoted by the apostle Paul; he preached as it were thrice upon them. Rom. I. 17. Gal. III. 11. Heb. X. 38. For it is full of heavenly matter, and is made use of by the apostle for several purposes. I know no one text that hath been more preached upon, or more written upon by them who have treated of the life of faith; how the just live the life of justification; how they live the life of sanctification, the life of consolation; the life of peace, the life of joy, the life of obedience, &c. My design is that which falls in with the prophet in the first use of the words.

How we may live by faith, under great and woeful decays in churches, church members, professors of all sorts, and in the gradual withdrawing of God from us on that account.

I would speak unto three things:

I. That this is such a time of decay among us, among churches, church members, and professors of all sorts, and ways throughout this nation; yea, and other nations too, where there are any that fear God.

A sense of it is impressed upon the minds of all the most judicious and diligent Christians, that do abound most in self examination, or do take most notice of the ways of God. Multitudes have I heard testifying to it; complaints are received from many in this nation, and the neighbouring nations, that there is a great decay, as to the power of grace and life of faith, among all sorts of professors. And some of them will go further in their evidence, and tell us, that they find the effects of it in themselves, that they find it a matter of great difficulty, requiring great watchfulness, and great diligence in any measure to keep up themselves unto their former frames; and when they have done all, they do not attain their desire.

And to increase this evidence, we are all convinced of it, or else we are notorious hypocrites; for I know not how often I have heard it prayed over in this very place. So that there is sent forth from God a conviction upon the hearts and minds of spiritual self-examining believers, that churches, church members, professors, and themselves are under spiritual decays. This is the first evidence; and therefore, in such a season, it was the best part of the church that made that sad complaint; Isa. LXIII. 17. "O Lord, why hast thou made us to err from thy ways, and hardened our hearts from thy fear?" They were sensible, that there was a judgment of the hand of God upon them,

2. The open want of love among churches, among church members, among professors, is another evidence of decay. I will not speak of the want of love among churches, one to another. But as to love among church members, we have scarce the shadow of it remaining among us. Where men have relations, where they have acquaintances, where they have been old friends, where they agree in a humour and converse, there is an appearance of love; and where they agree in a party and faction, there is an appearance of love; *but upon the pure spiritual account of Christianity and church membership, we have, I say, scarce the shadow of it left among us.* I remember how it was with us, when it was a joy of heart to behold the face of one another, wherein there was love without dissimulation, in sincerity, love attended with pity, compassion, condescension, yea love attended with delight. But it is dead in churches, dead among professors.

3. Another evidence of this decay, is want of delight and diligence in the ordinances of gospel worship. These ordinances were wont to be a joy of heart unto all that feared God; but now there is so much deadness, coldness, and indifference, so much undervaluing of the word, selfishness, pride, and so much an apprehension that we know every thing, so little endeavour to tremble at every truth, by what means soever it be brought unto us, as gives a manifest evidence of woful decays that are fallen upon us. Dead preachers! dead hearers! all things now go down among the churches of God, and professors in these nations. And this is attended with two desperate evils; one of which I heard of but lately, but upon inquiry, I find it to be a far greater evil than I took it to be; viz. Men under an apprehension, that as they do not see others enlivened, nor quickened as they were wont to be, by the ordinances of divine worship, and finding no such thing in their own hearts; in all probability finding themselves to grow dead and useless, are fallen into an opinion, that there is an end of them, and that they ought to attend unto them no more. And this doth befall some that have long walked soberly, and with great diligence in the use of ordinances. Some in this city, and in other places, are led by foolish delusions to it, because they do not find the spirit, and life and power of the word and ordinances in themselves, and as they think in others. A godly and learned minister, that shewed me a discourse written upon this subject, in defence of ordinances, did acquaint me with so great a number falling into this abomination, that I did not think it had been possible. This is one of the evils.

The other evil that attends it is this. That this deadness and indifferency unto ordinances, and want of bringing our necks to the yoke of Christ therein, against all disputings and arguings of flesh and blood, hath taken such place among us, and proceeded so far, that all ways of reformation are useless. Men may make divisions, and do I know not what, but this I know, there is no way of obtaining any reformation, but for men to engage their hearts to return unto God, in more delight in his service than there hath been. Some utterly forsake the assemblies, some come with great indifferency; using their liberty, off and on, at their pleasure. Are not these evidences of great decays among us? To me they are. I speak not as to this congregation in particular, but as to the state of all churches, that I know or can hear of in these nations.

4. The last evidence I shall mention of these decays among us, is our worldly-mindedness, conformity to the world, and our security in it. These things have been so often spoken to you, and no reformation hath ensued, that now they are looked upon as words of course; and I am discouraged from speaking of them any more. But assure yourselves, this conformity to the world, and this security that is yet found among us, is a great evidence, that the glory of God is departing from us. Ministers preach against worldly-mindedness, security, &c., but it makes no impression upon the minds of men; for we can scarce give an instance in any, of the least reformation. These things plainly demonstrate, that we are all under great decays.

II. That this is, and ought to be: a cause of great trouble and trial unto all that are true believers. A sense of this general decay among churches, church members and professors, ought to be an exercise and concern unto our minds. If we think all is well with us, and are satisfied, while we are free from outward troubles, and not concern ourselves about our decays, I will not say we are hypocrites, but truly we are poor, low, dead, carnal, unspiritual Christians. I thought to have spoken to these three heads; to shew you,

1. How God is dishonoured by this general decay.

2. How the world is offended and scandalized at it.

3. How the ruin of churches is hastened by it, which will befall them assuredly, unless God recover us out of this bad state. But I shall waive these things and proceed.

III. I shall show you, how we may live by faith in such a season. What it is faith will do to support the soul at such a time. Suppose it be thus, and we do complain of it to one another, not knowing what the issue will be, nor what it may come unto. How shall we live by faith under this consideration? What is the work of faith in this state? If things are so, (and I wish any one could evidence they are not; but suppose for once that they are so) and our souls are burdened with an apprehension that they are so; then what will faith do to enable us to pass through this exercise, and live to God?

I shall tell you something of what I find. And if God help you not to do better things, make use of these, and improve them, that you may give glory to God, by believing under this condition also.

1. Faith will keep the soul in remembrance, notwithstanding this, that Christ hath built his church upon that, and that it shall never be

utterly prevailed against. The promise, saith faith, extends itself as well, to the inbred adversaries of our own souls, unbelief, deadness, and all these things;—as to our outward enemies; Matt. xvi. 18. "I will build my church upon this rock, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." Though we are all dead, helpless, lifeless, poor creatures; though we had retained almost nothing but outward order, and had lost the very vigour and essence of faith and obedience, yet Christ's church shall abide, and those that belong to him shall be preserved. Such and such are turned apostates, saith the apostle, 2 Tim. ii. 19. "Nevertheless the foundation of God standeth sure, having this seal, the Lord knoweth them that are his." Here is my ground of hope notwithstanding all this, though one falls often, though one decays after another, "nevertheless the foundation of God standeth sure," and it hath a seal upon it, "God knoweth who are his." Every one whom he hath effectually called, and built upon the rock Christ Jesus, shall be preserved, whatever befalls the residue of the world. To see such a confluence of all manner of dangerous evils from without, as are coming this day upon the church of God, and to see, in the meantime, so many evidences of a decaying spiritual state in believers themselves; it will put faith to exercise itself upon this promise of Christ, "I will build my church upon the rock, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." If you find your spirits at any time pressed with these things, if nothing better occurs at hand, exercise faith upon this promise of Christ, and upon the firm standing of the foundation of God, that he knoweth who are his, and will carry them through all these difficulties, and land them safe in eternity.

2. Faith will also remind the soul, that God hath yet the fulness and residue of the Spirit, and can pour it out when he pleases, to recover us from this woeful state and condition, and to renew us unto holy obedience unto himself. There are more promises of God's giving supplies of his Spirit to deliver us from inward decays, than there are for the putting forth the acts of his power, to deliver us from our outward enemies. And God is as able to do the inward work, to revive and renew a spirit of faith, love, and holiness, of meekness, humility, self-denial, and readiness for the cross; he is able, with one word and act of his grace, to renew it,—as he is able by one act of his power, to destroy all his enemies, and make them the footstool of Christ when he pleases. Live in the faith of this.

The Psalmist saith in Psal. cXLVII. 16, 17. "He sends forth his hoary frost," and the issue is, the earth is frozen; he brings a death upon it. But saith he, in Psal. civ. 30. "Thou sendest forth thy Spirit and renewest the face of the earth." In like manner there is deadness upon all churches and professors in some measure at this time; but God who hath the fulness of the Spirit, can send him forth, and renew the face of the soul; can give professors and profession another face, *not to trim and trick, as now so often is done, not so high and haughty, not so earthly and worldly, as is now so much seen, but humble, meek, holy, broken-hearted, and self-denying.* God can send forth his Spirit when he pleases, and give all our churches and professors a new face, in the verdure and flourishing of his grace in them. When God will do this I know not; but I

believe God can do this; he is able to do it, able to renew all his churches, by sending out supplies of the spirit, whose fulness is with him, to recover them in the due and appointed time; and more I believe truly, that when God hath accomplished some end upon us, and hath stained the glory of all flesh, he will renew the power and glory of religion among us again, even in this nation. I believe it truly, but not as I believe the other things I have mentioned unto you, for those I believe absolutely, namely that Christ hath built his church upon a rock, and that nothing shall ever finally prevail against it; and that God hath the fulness and the residue of the spirit to renew us again, to all the glory of profession and holy obedience. These I propose as truths that are infallible, and that will not fail you, and upon which you may venture your souls to eternity. And if your faith in these things will not give you support and comfort, I know not what will.

3. When your souls are perplexed within you about these things, your faith will say unto you, "O my soul, why art thou cast down?" Are not all these things foretold thee? 1 Tim. iv. 1. "That in the latter times some shall depart from the faith." 2 Tim. iii. 1—5. "That perilous times shall come, because men should have a form of godliness, but deny the power." Hath it not been foretold that churches shall decay, and lose their first faith and love, in examples that have been set before you? Why are you surprised? saith our Saviour. John xvi. 4. "I have told you these things, that when the time shall come, you may remember that I told you of them." I was never nearer a surprisal than by this one thing, how it could possibly be, that after so many instructions, after so many mercies, trials, fears, after so many years carrying our lives in our hands, and so many glorious deliverances, that there should yet be decays found amongst us, and such going backwards: it is a great surprisal to one that considers it aright. But seeing it is foretold that so it shall be, let us live by faith; God hath some great end to accomplish out of it, and then all will be well. "When I have accomplished my whole work upon mount Zion" saith God, "then," &c. Isa. x. 12.

4. And lastly, faith, if it be in exercise, will put every soul in whom it is upon an essential attendance unto those duties which God calls him unto in such a season. This accomplishes and completes our living by faith under such a trial as this. If faith be in us, and in exercise, it will put us upon all those duties that God requires of us in such a season.

First. It will put us upon self-examination, how far we ourselves are engaged in those decays, and have contracted the guilt of them.

Secondly. It will put us upon great mourning, by reason of God's withdrawing himself from us.

Thirdly.—It will put us upon watchfulness over ourselves, and over one another, that we be not overtaken by the means and causes of these decays.

Fourthly.—It will put us upon zeal for God and the honour of the gospel, that it may not suffer by reason of our miscarriages.

In one word, *faith will do something; but for our parts, we do little or nothing. Faith will do something, I say wherever it is, when it is stirred up to exercise.* But as to these special duties, in reference to

these decays that all professors are fallen under; O how little is it we do in any kind whatever; would we might advise with one another what to do under these decays, to further one another in recovering ourselves from them. This then is what we are called to, and is required of us, viz. *faith in the faithfulness of Christ*, who hath built his church upon a rock, that be things ever so bad, it shall not be prevailed against. *Faith in the fulness of the Spirit*, and his promise to send him to renew the face of the church. Faith in apprehending the truth of God, who hath foretold these things. And faith putting us upon those special duties, that God requires at our hands in such a season.

§ N. B. It is due to the memory of Dr. Owen, to state that this is one of a series of sermons preached on the use of faith, which were taken down in short hand by one of his hearers, and after his death written out for publication.

MEMORANDA OF FOREIGN TRAVEL,

BY RO: J. BRECKINRIDGE.

The County and City of Nice.—Beauty of the scenery.—The Mediterranean sea.—Christopher Columbus.—The number of Travellers in Europe.—The mutual effects of this intercourse.—The countries from which they come.—English Travellers.—Romish Ecclesiasticks.—their numbers, their appearance, their idleness.—Feelings and opinions of the European Papists, in regard to their ecclesiasticks.—Moral and Political Condition of the Priesthood.—Commutations in Europe since 1830.—Its present spirit.—The policy and influence of the Pope as the head of the Church and as a Temporal Monarch.—Present posture of Rome.—The absolute union of her cause with that of Despotism, in Europe.—The Encyclique of 1832.—The Abbe de la Mennais.—Cardinal Pacca.—Brief of 1833 to the Archbishop of Toulouse, the Bishop of Rennes, and the Abbe de la Mennais.—The Pope's second Encyclique of July 1834.—Bull to the Bishops of Poland.—The inevitable ruin of the Papacy.—Waldenses of the Cotienn Alps. Sketch of their history and condition.

THE County of Nice is the smallest of the States of the King of Sardinia. It is one of the least productive, and probably the wildest of all the little states, into which Italy found herself severed, after her furious, and long continued efforts for independence.—Heaps of mountains—narrow and rocky vallies—a barren and iron bound coast upon the Mediterranean;—such is this little district.—Its climate is reckoned one of the best in Europe; and one cannot fail to be struck with the favorable change not only in the productions of the soil—but in the aspect of the people, as he draws nearer to the famous Sea, whose shores have been the nurseries of the human race—and have witnessed the rise and the decay of so many empires. The town of Nice, is one of the most common resorts of travellers—especially of those who seek health.—And it has preserved even from the days of Augustus—the fame of its beauty, its salubrity, and its delicious fruits. It is small—and

for the most part irregularly built, occupying both banks of a small stream, and stretching along the margin of the sea. Its public walks are extremely noble,—the one especially which occupies the sea front, is amongst the finest in Europe.

From the little river at the west end of the town—to the harbor beyond its eastern extremity, must be more than a mile. For this whole distance an elevated battlement winds itself along the shore sometimes cut into the hills, upon the side, and at the base of which the city stands—sometimes walled up against the beating waves, along the flat beach—and for a long distance passing upon the top of a range of low shops which skirt another and lower promenade within the city. The warm light of the setting sun illuminates the city, the wide beautiful panorama around it—and the lofty mountains in the distance. On the other side is the noble bay of Nice—across it the white towers of Antibes in France—far to the opposite point the dim shadow of Corsica—and between the two the ample bosom of the sea. At your feet the waves come ceaselessly—chasing each other upon the beach.—One rolls its waters far up on the wet pebbles—or bursts them against the black cliffs; and as it retires into its secret places, to renew its strength—another comes behind it, rushing upon the same ceaseless ruin. There is a subdued and solemn murmur, like the distant hum of a multitude—that makes itself heard on the margin of the sea—coming onward with each advancing wave,—subdued in the crash with which it is dissolved against the beach—and renewed again in the silence which ensues. Thus recurring evermore, with the advancing wave,—and lost for a moment as it disappears,—it strikes the imagination like the mournful wail of some living creature. It is after such a fashion that generation follows generation—and ages chain themselves to the destinies of perishing ages that went before; their existence as it passed empty as this sound upon the face of the deep and when it is finished, leaving no trace behind, more valuable than the weed upon the sand!

At the end of this walk, is the harbor of Nice, pent in between mountains, sheltered from the sea by a wall of marble, and filled with the light, sharp rigged schallops of the Mediterranean,—manned with sailors of every race and costume, found upon its borders. It is almost impossible to realize, that these are the instruments with which Vasco di Gama, Americus Vespuccius, and Christopher Columbus—gave to *their* world, two others, greater than itself. Nor is it less difficult, to read the acts of that providence, which came into this distant region, and these narrow seas, to select the unknown and apparently unsuitable instruments of designs, by whose accomplishment, the whole world was to be thoroughly revolutionised, and its total destiny reversed. Once more,—it is astonishing, to reflect, that the sublime conceptions, which took possession of the great souls I have named, and which consumed them like an indwelling fire, till they developed by deeds, what their words could not make their dull cotemporaries comprehend; that these vast ideas, should have possessed the human mind, precisely at the era, when of all others there was the least room to suspect their existence.—

Yet why marvel? the excellency of the power of all good and all great deeds, is constantly of God: and therefore the weaker the instrumentality the more obvious, is the power and guidance from above. It was from the cell of an unknown monk, that were heard the first renewed whisperings of that lost truth which will regenerate the world. It was from the distant verge of civilization, that the sounds of that freedom came, before whose voice all thrones tremble; and at whose call the astonished world fixes its eyes with horror upon the long track of blood which the footsteps of tyrants have drawn across all past ages!—Thus too, those great discoveries could not have been made sooner—without becoming subservient in the existing condition of the world, to the exclusive propagation of ignorance, superstition and oppression; nor could they have been delayed later—without arresting for a time the onward progress of the human race—and robbing liberty and virtue of a shelter for their exiles. The invention of printing, the construction of the mariner's compass—the final overthrow of the ancient order of society in the east—the consequent revival of learning in Europe—the opening up of the new world—the glorious reformation the American revolution—the era of modern efforts to convert the world. What a chain of events, having their seeds germinating in the midnight of the world,—and already so developed as to show that universal freedom and universal Christianity, will attest the accomplishment of their mission!

I felt of course a peculiar interest in the private history of Columbus, and endeavoured to make some researches about his family, the place of his birth, &c. &c. I soon found however that nothing certain could be ascertained. Six or seven villages, are asserted by as many different authors to have been the place of his birth. His name if not extinct in his native region is confined to persons totally unknown. At Turin there is a Senior Colombo, an extensive silk manufacturer, a remarkable noble looking man—who is the only person of the name, I saw or heard of.—No history seems to me, more pointed in its instructive and solemn teaching than that of this great discoverer. Perhaps of all the men that have lived, he will be found to have exercised the largest influence over the destinies of the world. And yet the world rarely inscribes his name, upon any list, however extended, of its illustrious men; and the lands he brought to light substitute for his, an inferior designation. The history of the human mind develops nothing more grand than the profound and foresighted wisdom which guided his meditations to their sublime result; nor does any thing in human conduct surpass the noble constancy with which he sustained, conducted, and achieved his glorious purpose, against the pity and contempt, if not the scorn of his generation. The gratitude of his sovereigns repaid him for his services beyond all that subject ever rendered—with insult and chains; and posterity has awarded to his magnificent character, the meed of praise due to a good seaman and a bold Guesser!—

It is probable that the peculiar situation of Italy, at the present moment, and the great difficulty of penetrating the cordons which each little state draws around itself, nominally to exclude cholera, —but in part also perhaps to check the influx of unwholesome

opinions—may have been the means of accumulating an unusual number of travellers, along the northern shore of the Mediterranean. Nice, Toulon, Marseilles, Nismes—and indeed all the cities, and even villages from Leghorn to Montpellier—a distance of four or five hundred English miles, were during this autumn thronged with strangers. The same result has presented itself, however, in every part of the continent in which I have been; and that to such a degree, as to afford here as well as in our own country a striking illustration of that trait of the latter times, which the prophet expresses when he says that the multitudes “shall run to and fro.” We have reason to rejoice, that the predicted consequence, is already manifesting itself every where; and that the necessary result of a free, rapid and enlarged intercourse, amongst the nations must be that “knowledge shall increase.” Men behold reflected in the conduct of others, the follies and weaknesses, characteristic of their own countries—and they grow wiser and more charitable at the same moment. They see in the peculiar evils and views of others, the strongest illustrations of the contrary virtues or blessings vouchsafed to their beloved homes—and they are doubly fortified both in the purpose to uphold with renewed vigour what is good in their own lot, and in the ardent desire to bestow on all, the same mercies which appertain to themselves. It is thus our own conceptions are enlarged and rectified, and our purposes of good fortified and enlightened, by the passive influence of others over us. How great must be the active influence of such multitudes, upon the communities, through which they incessantly flock, or amidst which they take up their temporary abode. Errors are corrected, new wants are created, higher efforts are promoted, better methods are diffused—and activity and energy before unknown, imparted to every portion of the living mass. On one side of all the cities of Europe, you find what is called the *new town*, the *west end*, or by some similar appellation distinguished in name, as its whole aspect distinguishes it in reality from the *ancient town*. The one is dirty, dark, and damp; its streets crooked, irregular, and narrow, and its whole compass heaved into the narrowest possible space, crowded with high and desolate looking houses, and compassed about with immense defences. The new town, is airy, neat and striking—its streets wide, regular, and beautifully adorned—its compass ample and free, and its whole aspect one of comfort, elegance and prosperity. Such are the present and the past of human society. There is what the wave of civilization must purify or obliterate; here is that which must spring up, in its fertilising course. The Steamboat, and the Rail-Road have not wrought a more thorough revolution in the means of human intercourse—than that intercourse itself, in the degree that it is enlarged must work in the whole conditions of the world.

The great mass of European travellers are English; after them perhaps Germans, then Italians and Russians,—and fewest of all French. There is not much individual wealth in France—and the French live at home, more to their minds, and at a cheaper rate than any where else. The world has nothing to offer them like Paris, and to Paris they who travel go. Their climate is equal to any in

Europe, if not the best of all;—and their domestic excitements, and means of knowledge of a particular kind before all others. On the contrary the English have more individual wealth, and fewer means of spending it pleasantly at home, than any people in the world; while even those whose circumstances are confined, may live in almost any part of Europe, for less money, in better style, in a better climate with incalculably better means of improvement and more respectably than in any part of Britain. In England, poverty is not only the greatest of misfortunes, but is counted by the upper classes amongst the most serious offences; in so much that *beggary*, is the most contemptuous epithet in their vocabulary. In France, I think it would make little or no odds in a man's standing with the world, whether he walked, or drove one, two or six horses; whether he lived on five Francs a day, or wasted a thousand. In England "a respectable appearance"—is in all cases not only indispensable, but in the majority of cases, the nature of the *appearance*, is the principal ground on which society bases its estimate.—It is not strange then that the French travel very little and rarely abide permanently out of France; nor that the English travel a great deal and abide in every part of Europe.

Upon the whole, this is good to all concerned. The English of all people need most this extensive intercourse with strangers; and of all people in Europe they have most with which to repay others in kind for the advantages they receive. Many of the useful arts are with them more advanced than on the continent; their language is stored with a more robust literature than any other; many of them have more accurate and elevated ideas on religious subjects than most other Europeans, and though neither they nor the rest understood as yet the true principles of human freedom—they have on some few points, better matured and more thoroughly practised the knowledge they possess than most of their neighbours on the continent. These are amazing gifts to bestow. And on the other hand, their inordinate pride of wealth, place and rank, attended by a subserviency to it in others that exceeds all belief—even if incurable, is subjected to profitable discipline when abroad. Their extraordinary national vanity, and national prejudice against all other people—are liable to be rectified when they see that others possess many advantages over them in very important particulars—and that many of those representations of their writers, by which their evil and selfish passions are pampered from childhood—are as false when they sedulously depreciate other nations—as when they habitually overrate their own. Every American reader will need only remember what every Englishman has said of us, every time he has spoken of us in comparison with themselves, from the 4th day of July, 1776, down to the present moment, to be fully satisfied that very little credit is to be attached to what they say of other states, in the same relation. For my own part, if I should characterise the English by a single epithet, I should say they are *the abusive* nation. Their daily and periodical press, even what they call their religious press, lavishes upon the most distinguished men of their own country every epithet of scorn and infamy, in which the language so copiously abounds; and they all turn upon all others, who for any reason, or by any chance

are brought into conflict, or even into comparison with themselves, the united abuse, which had before been spent in their domestic broils. The national judgment, and temper, this perverts and embitters itself to a degree—which has no parallel in the history of the world.

I speak of whole nations—and therefore speak in general terms. There are multitudes of both these of which I have now said most, to whom these observations could have no true application. Some of the most arduous and adventurous of modern travellers have been French; and some of the most interesting volumes of travels ever written are in that language. It is also true that multitudes of English are amongst the most candid, and enlightened men of Europe;—and their great works of charity sufficiently attest, that true religion makes all men who are baptized in its glorious spirit essentially the same. But there are also multitudes of them, upon whom all that benefits and corrects others, is lost—and who seem to seek in intercourse with the world, only new food for their prejudices. I heard an English traveller say that the best oranges in the world could be obtained in England alone; another that their grapes were better than those of the south of France; a third that their figs were incomparably superior to all others. And yet these are tropical fruits and the southermost point of England is above the 50th degree of north latitude. I heard an English gentleman who had seen all Europe say that after seeing London, and its public monuments—there was nothing worth looking for any where else; and yet there is not a city in Europe so poor of sights, in comparisson with its size as London. I have heard and read times out of number that England was not only the most enlightened and free of all nations, past or present—but even that it was the only one, in which perfect liberty and complete civilization, now reigns—And yet they have no written constitution—the powers residing in their king and parliament are such as define the most absolute despotism—their oligarchy is the most powerful and privileged in Europe—their established hierarchy the richest and idlest that ever existed in any Protestant country—their national means of superior education limited to those who hold peculiar religious opinions and denied to all others, and no system of popular education adequate to the wants of a fiftieth part of the people existing at all,—while a quarter of the entire population beg bread, or live in poor houses,—and their statute book is crowded with fictitious crimes, and cruel punishments to a degree unprecedented amongst nations!—

At Nice as in every part of Italy, the multitudes of Romish Ecclesiastics, continually surprises you,—and gives an extremely fantastic appearance to society. If you dine at a table d'Hôte; in any considerable hotel—a third of the guests at least, are sure to be ecclesiasticks. If you enter a caffè, to take some slight refreshment, or read a gazette, you find ecclesiasticks sauntering or lounging about the rooms, sipping chocolate, coffee, or con de vie,—or earnestly engaged in conversation, in those under tones, required by the place, and so appropriate to their habits. If you walk the streets, you are absolutely certain to encounter ecclesiasticks, of all grades and ranks—from the filthy, and barefooted friar, up to the luxurious

prelate in his costly equipage, and down to the delicious fop, mincing along as gingerly, as a thorough exquisite. They all wear their costume,—or at least enough of it to distinguish themselves at all times. And it is curious to see how various that costume is—and how carefully, at the same time, it preserves its generic character. Some dress in black, some in brown, some in white, some in a mixture of the two last named colours. Some go barefooted—some wear shoes without stockings, some a sort of sandal; but most generally short breeches and stockings. Some go bareheaded, some wear caps, and most use large hats, cocked up, into all sorts of shapes. All these particulars, so far from being indifferent, are matters of deep import, and belong, to the rule of the particular order, or the rank of the party; and so well settled are they that any resident of the country will at once, designate the wearer by his dress. I speak exclusively of the male sex; for the varieties in the costume of the female professed, though very great, and exceedingly ridiculous, are always within the bounds of entire propriety.

The most striking thing about these priests of all orders and conditions seems to be, their universal idleness. They do no work, they never preach, they write no books. What do they do? Alas! the universal ignorance which has settled like a pall over Italy shows too plainly what they never do: while universal corruption of manners, which makes the land an abomination—gives too much reason to fear that they who impress upon public morals their general tone—have not been merely passive in their deep pollution.

It is rather surprising to find, that the great body of the people, neither are, nor pretend to be at all deceived as to the real character of the papal priesthood. I have conversed with hundreds, freely and directly on the subject—I have sought information from all classes of the people—I have tried to penetrate into the real sentiments of the multitudes, as to the character of their own clergy. And I solemnly declare I never heard a single human being in any part of Catholic Europe, express the slightest confidence in the piety, or even morality of their own priesthood. On the contrary with one universal consent, more unanimous than any by which I have found any other disreputable fact established—they admit that in general their priests are dissolute, rapacious and ignorant. It is indeed true, that I have found persons defend the admitted conduct of the priesthood—either on the ground of strong necessity—or resulting good—or the official sanctity of the sinner; but nobody questions the facts themselves. Nor am I at liberty to conceal, that the universal impression attributes to them, not vice merely, nor gross sin only—but deep, general, and habitual crimes. Crimes such as history has charged them with in all stages of their apostacy—and the public records of so many nations fastened upon them; crimes, which by the admission of their own analysts have so often and so thoroughly polluted the holy see itself;—which have so defiled multitudes of their orders, and houses, (as the Templars and Jesuits) as to require their suppression by papal authority, and which more than at any former period, seem at the present day, to pervade the hierarchy as a body. They who doubt what I assert—will

no longer be incredulous, if they will appeal to the same testimony on which I rest for these grave assertions.

There is another fact, not less important—but perhaps even less generally supposed to exist. The masses of the Catholic population of Europe, but especially of Italy and France, not only have no respect for the personal character of their clergy—but nourish a deep sense of injuries received at their hands—and a profound sentiment of bitterness towards them. I do not speak of the immense multitudes who have openly forsaken the papacy, and who though nominally still Catholics, treat all the pretensions of the church with unconcealed scorn: nor yet of the proportion not less considerable who retain a sort of shy and qualified relation to the church, while they shun and despise its ministers. What I have said is doubtless true, in an eminent degree of both these classes; and how large they are, may be inferred from the statement by De Pradt in his work entitled *Les Quatre Concordats*, that in Paris the Easter Communions, during the whole period of the restoration, that is from 1815 to 1830 never exceeded eighty thousand—and often fell short of forty thousand a year. That is to say, there were only about one in twenty of the population of Paris, who during the brightest days which the papacy has witnessed for half a century—were willing to avoid mortal sin, by confessing and communing once a year.

But as I have said, it is of the real and true adherents to papism, that I speak. And it is not easy to imagine, how they could think of the personal character of their priests as they do, and not feel towards them, a sentiment of terror, if not of hatred. It is the last and highest evidence of corruption indicated in the Scriptures, that we should have pleasure in those who commit things which we are conscious God judges to be worthy of death. But even nature itself, in its worst estate, seems incapable of such degradation—provided the offences be committed upon, or against ourselves. We may be so circumstanced as to bear in silence, what we are not able to redress—and what we dare not even avow. Marshal Marmont was loth perhaps to be called traitor and have his jaws boxed by the Duke of D'Angouleme, when he communicated to him the inevitable ruin of the house of Bourbon. So to the sincere papist, who sees no alternative between the loss of his own soul, and the souls of his children—and communion with a church, whose ministers, in a thousand forms of injury, make him the victim of their lusts, may indeed submit to his cruel destiny.—But he will nourish in his soul, the sense of his injuries;—and he will retain the impression of the personal worthlessness of those whose official character alone is any thing, but that every thing to him.

It is in this way we find it easy to account for the extraordinary fact that in all Catholic countries, the priests are the very first victims of the fury of their own flocks in all times of popular commotion. The moment any impulse stronger than the habitual awe, with which they are taught to regard the pretended representatives of God, takes possession of the soul, and obliterates that servile terror; the fury of long restrained passions overleap all bounds, and is quenched only in the blood of those under whose injuries they writhed, but which the power of superstition prevented them from

redressing in proper times and due measure. These facts are unique in the papacy and find no place in relation to any other religion true or false. And how strongly do they illustrate that awful denunciation of John in the Apocalypse—by which we learn, that although the nations shall give their power to Rome, until the word of God shall be fulfilled; yet when the day of recompense does come, those very nations, shall not only hate her, and make her desolate and naked but “shall eat her flesh and burn her with fire.” (Rev. xvii.)

The events of the last six years in Europe, have been calculated to increase in a very great degree, the mutual alienation of the priests and the people—and to furnish the latter with public and permanent grounds of distrust, hardly less cogent than the private and personal ones they before had for aversion. For it can no longer be doubtful, that the whole papal hierarchy of Europe, is committed sold and transferred to a system—against which the masses of Europe have for fifty years, but especially since 1830 contended not only with energy, but with the vehemence of desperation. France, Belgium, Poland, Switzerland, Sardinia, Naples, the Pontifical States, the Sclavonia provinces of the Austrian Empire, Spain and Portugal—have within the last six years, been the scenes of convulsions more or less bloody, and more or less successful; but in every case originating from the same causes, and tending to the same result. The world is fatigued with the insolence of power—and exhausted in its sufferance of its stupid and cruel domination. The voice which issues from the ruins of the past; has no longer any charm for the human soul. But there is a new and ravishing voice whose sounds come to the nations from the bosom of the unknown future; at the gentlest whispers of which their spirits vibrate—and amidst whose loud calls they rush furiously to battle. Call it what you please—the spirit of the age—the spirit of movement—the spirit of life or that of death: its spell is upon the human race, and to resist it is as idle, as to bid the sun return in his glorious march. It is not an impulse which was engendered yesterday, or which sprung from accident. Look along the whole ark of time, and you behold in all great eras the operation of one of those grand impressions. Nay more—you may see amongst them all, taken as a series, a cord of deep and quick sympathy—and a grand progressive development throughout. The heroic ages illuminated the dawn of civilization. The sublime sentiment of patriotism—the single absorbing passion of devotion to country, presided over all the glory of Rome. A third development occurred, and the bright, lofty and romantic spirit of chivalry conferred all their grandeur on the middle ages, and held its vigils by the cradle out of which modern society emerged. All the spirit of our own great era is summed up in a single word,—intense, abstract, quenchless love of liberty. Liberty to think,—behold the reformation of religion, and the birth of all modern science. Liberty to speak—behold the power of the press, the advancement of popular education, and the resistless energy of organized public sentiment. Liberty to obey the dictates of the great truths we have discovered and proclaimed—behold the necessity to reconstruct all human society upon a model free, equal, and prac-

tical,—behold the cause; and doubt if you can, the issue of those fierce contentions; which every where agitate the world.

The Pope of Rome is a temporal prince—as well as the pretended spiritual chief of the whole world. He is the vicar of Jesus Christ;—and it is of faith in the Roman Catholic church, to believe, that he is invested with all the powers, as the temporal and visible head of the church which would reside in Christ if he were on earth. The outward unity of a body like the papacy—necessarily involves the existence of an infallible tribunal—to dispose of such questions as might endanger its oneness. And although, various attempts have been made to place that infallibility, in other hands, either conjointly with the Pope, or to the exclusion of him; yet the strength of logic is surely in favour of the claims of Christ's vicar to that prerogative,—and the necessary course of events, must settle the practical exercise of all its functions, in the same hands in which the power, the patronage, and the active control rests. Whatever therefore councils may have defined, or scholars proven,—the Pope is the active depository of the infallible and plenary authority of the church. But this same Pope is the head of a temporal monarchy, whose important functionaries are all priests, and which from the days of Charlemagne, has entered largely into the social system of Europe. To imagine that the successive pontiffs should have one system of conduct and one code of morals, in their capacity as spiritual head of the church,—and an opposite one, as chief of the temporal monarchy of the church—is totally absurd and puerile. This mixture of temporal and spiritual functions has disturbed Europe for above a thousand years—and has finally led the papacy into a line of policy which has identified Rome with the cause of despotism—and sealed her ruin in the coming triumph of free opinions.

The subject is too large to permit our entering into it here, in the way of simple speculation. The mere proofs of what I assert are scattered through so many ages, and are so redundant—that for that very reason, all mention of any, but the latest is omitted. But the very latest acts of this solemn drama are clear and full—and to them I beg the serious attention of the reader.

“On the 18th day before the calends of September (the 15th of August) being the holy day of the assumption of the blessed Virgin Mary, in the year of the incarnation 1832*—and the second of our pontificate”—as his own words are—Gregory XVI, at present occupying the See of Rome, issued his first Encyclical Letter. It is addressed to all the Patriarchs, Primate, Archbishops, and Bishops of the earth—and gives professedly, the authoritative and infallible solutions of the Pope to the difficulties which then and still beset the church. In this formal document, it is decided amongst other things: 1. That every species of novelty, of what sort soever, or in reference to what thing soever, endangers the universal church; 2. That the fertile source of the most dreadful evil is the opinion diffused amongst men, that salvation is possible out of the doctrine and pale of the Roman Catholic church; 3. That one of the most “absurd and erroneous, or rather delirious maxims” which flows from the horrid *indifferentism* of the preceding principle, “is that *liberty*

* This Letter will be found entire, beginning at page 190, of the vol. of this Mag. for 1836.

of conscience should be assured and guaranteed to all men:" 4. That, from the same source flows the liberty demanded with such ardour and tumult by many—"the fatal and detestable liberty of publishing whatever any one chooses:" 5. That these writings thus scattered amongst mankind, inculcate the horrible absurdities, that it is lawful to revolt against princes, to withdraw our fidelity from them, and to subvert thrones: 6. That, on the contrary "invariable submission to princes" is necessarily and universally a clear precept of the Christian religion; the reverse of which was in former ages, never taught except by the "Vaudois, the Beguards, the Wickliffites, and other children of Belial, who were the scum and disgrace of the human race, and who have been so often and so justly struck with anathema by the Apostolic See: 7. That the interests of kings are necessarily promoted by all their acts of support and succour rendered to the papacy; that the union of church and state has been in all ages favourable to both—and is now disturbed only by the partizans of unbridled liberty; and that all Roman Catholic princes are, and should be exhorted to promote by their assistance and authority the principles and wishes expressed in this present letter.

This Encyclique Letter was the result of an examination which had then been just concluded, into the writings of the Abbe de la Mennais, and his associates; but especially into the doctrines and scope of the periodical called the *Avineï*, which commanded so much attention, and exerted so great influence at that period, in France. The Cardinal Barthelemi Pacca in a letter dated August 16, 1732, addressed from Rome to the Abbe de Mennais—enters into the private history of the whole cause, and gives some cotemporary and authoritative expositions of the Encyclique itself—which indeed it was the chief object of his letter to transmit to the Abbe, by the Pope's command. In this letter the cardinal, by the express order of the Pope, as he asserts, complains to the Abbe amongst other things; "That he had entered into any sort of digressions, upon subjects whose decision appertained not to the tribunal of the public, but to that of the government of the church: 2. That, the "Holy Father disapproved, and even forbade his doctrines relative to *civil liberty*, and politics, doctrines which by their nature could only tend to excite and propagate sedition and revolt on the part of subjects against their sovereigns;" 3. That "the doctrines of the *Avineï* in regard to *freedom of religion and freedom of the press*, were equally reprehensible, and in opposition to the doctrines, the maxims and the practice of the church;" 4. That the "Holy Father was extremely astonished and afflicted, that any Catholic should openly avow such doctrines; which although in certain circumstances, prudence might require them to be tolerated, as the least of several evils, should never be represented as either desirable or good in themselves:" 5. That "the grief of the Holy Father was rendered complete, by the proposal to form a society amongst those, who notwithstanding the butchery of Poland, the dismemberment of Belgium, and the conduct of governments which call themselves liberal, still hoped for the liberty of the world, and were willing to labour for it."—

"On the 8th of May 1833, and in the third year of his Pontificate," the same Gregory XVI. addressed a bref to his "venerable brother Paul—Therese—David Archbishop of Toulouse"—in the course of which he says he "had published the sound doctrine—which alone any should be permitted to follow." Our Encyclique—he adds, has been received every where with joy, with eagerness, with sentiments of veneration; as we have been assured, with expressions of gratitude, both by bishops and other persons, of the greatest respectability in all orders of society.

A few months after the preceding, the Pope dispatched another bref, dated the 5th of October 1833, and addressed to his "Venerable brother C—L—bishop of Rennes." This brief was intended for the Abbe de la Mennais' guidance and direction in the difficult circumstances in which he found himself, by reason of his thorough devotion to the interests of the papacy, and his equally ardent attachment to principles of liberty, and humanity which he found too late—were intolerable to Rome. He had sent a humble address to the Pope, through the hands of the Bishop of Rennes, asking the commands of the holy father, "We have, the Pope answers, but one single thing to reply: it is that he shall engage to follow uniquely and absolutely the doctrine laid open in our Encyclique Letter (in which, as we can say with INNOCENT I, our most holy predecessor—we have imposed no new precepts, but those which have been established by the tradition of the Apostles and Fathers)—and that he shall neither write nor approve, any thing which is not conformed to this doctrine."

About a month after this, we find Cardinal Barthelemi Pacca writing to the Abbe, by the Pope's commands on the everlasting subject of the Encyclique Letter of 1832. After passing in review the existing circumstances of the case, he says that nothing would satisfy the most holy father, but a declaration "*simple, absolute and unlimited*"—that he believed as the Encyclique taught, and rejected what it prohibited.—

Just a month after this, namely, on the 28th of December 1833, the Pope dispatched a bref to his "dear son F. la Mennais" acknowledging the receipt of "*the humble and simple declaration*," which had been so long demanded. It was finally obtained from that extraordinary man. In this Bref the Pope exhorts him so to employ the talents and knowledge which so eminently distinguished him, "that others might think and speak, unanimously, according to the doctrine laid down in our Encyclique."—

Things stood in this posture for about six months, at the end of which time the Abbe published his *Words of a Believer*: a work which he declares to the Archbishop of Paris, in a letter dated April 29, 1834—is exclusively political, and destined particularly for the people, and that its only object was to plead the cause of "political and civil liberty" and to enforce upon its friends the necessity "of order, law, and justice"—in the prosecution of their great objects. As the proceedings of the Abbe and his friends, had given occasion to the Encyclique of August 15th, 1832, which had been leveled more particularly at the *Avineï*; so the *Words of a Believer*, produced

the Encyclique of the 7th of the callend of July 1834—in the fourth year of the Pontificate of Gregory XVI.

The last Encyclique is if possible more pointed, virulent and outrageous than the first; it more thoroughly identifies Rome with the cause of tyrants;—and more completely renounces all sympathy with the wants, the sufferings, the aspirations—the rights of the great body of mankind. “Venerable brothers—all the patriarchs—primates, archbishops and bishops”—begins this horrible bulletin; “we have experienced a most lively joy, from the signal testimonies of faith, obedience, and religion with which, we have been informed, our Encyclique Letter of the 15th August, 1832, has been every where eagerly welcomed; in which, to acquit ourselves of a duty imposed by our charge, we have announced to the universal Catholic flock, the sound doctrine, which alone any one is permitted to follow, on any of the points there treated.”—“Venerable Brothers we were seized with horror, at the first coup-d-œil, we cast over this book” (*Words of a Believer.*) “It has endeavoured to shake and to destroy the Catholic doctrine, such as we have defined it in our Encyclique already cited—both in regard to the submission due to power—and in regard to the duty to turn the people away from the pernicious scourge of *indifferentism*, and to put a curb upon the unbounded freedom of opinion and of speech:—and in regard, finally, both to the absolute liberty of conscience, a liberty entirely to be condemned, and to that horrible conspiracy of societies for the ruin of the church and the state, composed of all false worships and sects.”—“Not satisfied with an audacity even thus great, it would establish by force, the absolute freedom of opinion, of speech, and of conscience.”—“In the transports of its fury, it provokes the people to unite and associate themselves in all parts of the world, and without ceasing, it urges and presses towards the accomplishments of its pernicious designs, in a manner to make us perceive, that on this point also, it tramples under foot, both our advice and our prescriptions.”—“It is a book in short which is filled with propositions, respectively false, calumnious, audacious, anarchical, contrary to the word of God, impious, scandalous, erroneous, already condemned by the church, and especially in the cases of the Vaudois, the Wicklefites, the Hussites and other similar heretics;” and therefore the most holy fathers—having as he says heard some of the cardinals of the holy Roman church—his venerable brothers,—and on his own proper motion,—of his certain knowledge,—and in all the plenitude of his apostolic power “reproves, condemns, and desires that all shall perpetually hold as reprovèd and condemned”—both the book, and its propositions.—

I will add but one more, to these conclusive extracts,—but one additional Bull to those already proving with unanswerable certainty, the league of Rome with all that is at work to degrade, and oppress the human race. In the month of July 1832, Pope Gregory XVI. addressed a Bref to the Bishops of Poland. Poland, heroic, unfortunate, illustrious Poland—whose name is identified with all that is noble in courage and constancy, all that is grand in devoted patriotism and love of liberty—all that identifies a people with the profound interests of the whole human family,—and demands from the

entire race the tenderest sympathy and the loftiest veneration! In the midst of her murderous struggle against the most ferocious tyranny which modern times have witnessed, and for rights which every nation in Europe, had guaranteed by solemn compact—and which every man on earth if the case be made his own—will acknowledge to be precious as life; in such a crisis—what says the father of the faithful, to his bleeding children: What words of tenderness, consolation and affection shall his lips distil, for those whose righteous cause is perishing amidst the tears of all the friends of man, and whose great souls are overwhelmed under the burden of insupportable misfortunes? Hear him, ponder his words! “Venerable brothers, —the Bishops of Poland; health, and the apostolic benediction. We have been informed of the frightful misery into which this flourishing kingdom has been plunged during the past year; we have understood at the same time that this misery has been caused exclusively by the plots of the malevolent, who in these unhappy times, have used the interest of religion, as a pretext for conspiring against the power of legitimate sovereigns, and have precipitated their country into an abyss of misery; by breaking all the bands of legal submission.”—“Your duty obliges you to watch with the greatest care, lest these evil-minded men, the propagators of false doctrines, spread amongst your flocks the germ of corrupt and deceitful theories. These men, making zeal for the public good their pretext, abuse the credulity of the simple, who in their blindness, serve as instruments for troubling the peace of the kingdom and overthrowing the established order. It is necessary for the benefit and honour of the disciples of Jesus Christ that the perfidy and wickedness of such prophets of lies should be placed in their true light. It is necessary to refute their fallacious principles, by the immutable word of Scripture and by authentic monuments of the tradition of the church. These pure sources, from which the Catholic clergy should draw the principles of their actions and of the instructions which they give the faithful, make clearly manifest that submission to power instituted by God is *an immutable principle*, from which no one can ever withdraw himself, except when the power violates the laws of God, OR OF THE CHURCH!”—“Your *magnanimous Emperor* will receive you with bounty, and will hear our representations and our prayers, concerning the interests of the Catholic religion, which he has always promised to protect in this kingdom. Certainly reasonable people will commend you, and your enemies will be forced to keep silence.”—

For this Bull Nicholas the Emperor of Russia, put at the disposal of Gregory XVI. Pope of Rome, a column of Russian soldiers—and guaranteed the integrity of his temporal power. At least so says the Abbe de la Mennais, in his late work entitled *Affaires de Rome*. The thing which imports us, is the fact rather than the motive of the Bull.

Then we assert that the papacy has declared its cause to be indissolubly united with that of European despotism. It has staked its infallibility—it has invoked the scriptures, the fathers, and its own constant principles, maxims and traditions—and has made its fate the fate of oppressors of the earth.

Since the 15th day of August 1832 till this hour not a whisper has been heard from any part of the earth calling in question these horrible profanities, on the part of one single papal bishop or higher ecclesiastic! The universal Roman Catholic and apostolical church is therefore delivered over, finally and forever to an alliance with the workers of every dark deed against freedom, knowledge and civilization.

Now will the nations announce their hopes, their light, their convictions, their assured triumph—and of free will put on again the chains they have already broken—or bow meekly for the tripple fastening as those which have already eaten into the bone? Will they do this at the command of a voice impotent as it is unlovely—and which scarcely heard above the noise of the falling sepulchres around. As habitation could not so arrest the attention of the world that half mankind were unconscious it had spoken?

Or rather is it not certain that Rome has fortified herself so impregnably that she cannot sally forth, from a position where she must finally die in solitary scorn—despised, abhorred by the world she had so long betrayed, and which she finally conspired to sacrifice?

At this moment the solitary cord which binds the most devoted papal communites to the priesthood and the church—is a belief in the *official* sanctity and authority. These religious doctrines are refuted by the senses and are incapable of belief;—their political code is contradicted by the consciousness of every human being, and draws in its train the surrender of every right, privilege enjoyment and ornament of human nature. Yet they who demand these unspeakable sacrifices so far from having any personal claims to superior holiness, intelligence, or excellence,—are rarely respected for their virtues, often abhorred for the injuries they have inflicted.—The action of such a system while it endures is replete with misery—and its nature is such that when it terminates it must be by convulsion.—If men can be persuaded that God has in reality selected from amongst them, as his sole representatives those who are distinguished chiefly by the turpitude of their principles, the unreasonableness of their dogmas, and the looseness of their conduct,—it will be utterly in vain to persuade them at the same time, that God requires of themselves other and better things. But we should never cease to remember that nature is a revelation from God as real as any—and that it was in knowledge as well as holiness he created man after his own image. The dictates of nature and the teachings of enlightened reason—must be coincident with all subsequent revelations of the mind of God; and if they be not, nature must hush her giant energies to silence, and glorious reason sleep upon her shining throne—before we are capable of hearing the pretended voice of heaven! The papal system, belongs to the midnight of the world. By a fatal but unerring instinct it has united itself so indissolubly to most of the capital evils which have afflicted mankind, that while society cannot complete its perfect development until it is destroyed,—it will carry with it in its final overthrow most of the obstacles to that great and blessed necessity.

Before taking our leave of Italy there is a subject kindred to the preceding which should on no account be omitted. The Alps of

Piedmont, lying behind Susa as you enter Italy over Mont Cenis, and to the right hand of Pinerole, as you go from Turin to Nice—in the deepest recesses of the Cottian Alps—conceal one of the most interesting communities, that exists on earth. Shut up in the rugged bosom of the mountains is a little band of Waldenses—the direct descendents of those ancient and persecuted men who, at such terrible cost, and amidst such frightful darkness, kept the light of truth burning steadily and quenchlessly. Sprung from an antiquity so remote, that none can disprove the tradition which unites them to the apostles of the Lord; luminously, gloriously recorded for seven hundred years, in the curses of the books of the enemies of God—through every century of which, their blood has attested their intrepid sincerity, and the anathemas of Rome made manifest the pureness of their faith. Driven into these inaccessible fastnesses, by the keen sword of the crusader, and the gibbet of the fierce inquisitor—they “of whom the world was not worthy”—have preferred the “dens and caves of the earth” to palaces stained with the blood of God’s saints; and have chosen rather to be “destitute, forsaken, afflicted” than to make “a covenant with death,” and be “at agreement with hell.”—

There are three principal vallies inhabited by these interesting people. The valley of Lucerna is the most southerly, and lies under the august form of Mount Viso. Farther to the north, and just behind the village of La Perosa are the vallies of San Martino and Chesone. The torrent from which the last named valley takes its name, rises under Mont Genievre, near Briancon. In the region of the first named valley is Mount Vaudalin, on whose summit is the cavern which afforded shelter to the feeble remnants of the persecuted Vaudois—in their times of sorest need. In the same district is Prê-du-Tour, the ancient seminary of the Vaudois pastors, before the reformation. In the valley of San Martino is situated the defile of Balsille, which served as a rampart against the armies sent to exterminate these Christians in 1689, and 1690.

The three vallies are divided into thirteen parishes, which embrace all the villages and numerous hamlets. There are at present settled pastors in all these parishes:—and I have thought it not uninteresting to give their names. They are Messrs. Mondon. Best (moderator of the presbytery.) Goante. Gay. Mouston (secretary.) Peyrot. Monastier-Monnet. Vincon. Talla. Rostaing, the father (Adjust Moderator.) Rostaing, the Son. Peyran. The population of the thirteen parishes is about 21,500 souls—of whom somewhat less than 2000 are papists.

From the period of the reformation less has been known of these retired and humble disciples than could have been wished,—and far less interest felt in them, than their past history deserved. They seem indeed to have been set as a sort of spectacle for the world; for not only were they objects of relentless persecution for ages before the reformation—but at every crisis since, whenever that sword has been unsheathed, it has fallen with the most unpitied edge upon them. Nay even where prudence required that the rights of other protestants should be respected—or their power was sufficient to vindicate itself—these weak and unpitied victims, were often made

to bear the two-fold bitterness of a malignity rendered furious by repression. Nor is it alone from those whose religious principles inculcate persecution as a sacred duty, that these unhappy mountaineers have suffered wrong. Their pastors seem to have been imbued with the same woeful spirit of declension, which during the last century, carried away all the world; and if the true knowledge of spiritual things remained amongst their body, it was so feeble as to be ready to perish. Educated at Geneva they imbibed the spirit which had supplanted the spirit of Christ there;—and the pastors of the Vaudois whose ancestors for countless generations had given up all for Christ,—themselves gave him up;—and they who had been even more persecuted of all—became enemies of the followers of Jesus amongst their own flocks! In short, they were arians and persecutors.

That wonderful man of God, Felix Neff, during his residence in the neighbouring districts of the high Alps of France—visited these secluded vallies. He spent a few weeks only in the scattered villages and hamlets. But God was with him, and those feeble labours were the beginning of a work of grace, which with more or less power has extended through all the churches of the Italian Vaudois. Some of the pastors are believed to have been converted to God; others are less decidedly opposed to evangelical religion, and the whole body is said to be gradually but decidedly tending towards the right way. Meanwhile many of the people are already far in advance of their pastors, in the knowledge of spiritual things—and an eager desire for the return of the entire flock to the good old paths in which their fathers trod—and found peace, even amidst the furnace of affliction. In Italy itself, the land of darkness and of blood, God hath not left himself without a witness. And it is striking to observe that at the moment and in the degree, that the cause of his enemies waxes feeble—his children come forth clothed anew in vestments borrowed from the skies, and shining with the light of heaven.

NATURE OF CHRIST'S INTERCESSION.

To intercede means literally to pass between. The term is used figuratively, to denote mediating between two parties with a view of reconciling differences, particularly in the way of supplicating in favour of one with another. In this sense "intercession" is frequently affirmed of Christ in the Scriptures:—"Who also maketh intercession for us;" (Rom. v. 34.) "He ever liveth to make intercession for them." (Heb. vii. 25.) The verb employed in these passages (*entunghanein*) when connected with the preposition that follows (*uper*) includes every form of acting in behalf of another; it is improper to limit it to prayer, as it denotes mediating in every possible way in which the interests of another can be promoted. But other terms are employed in speaking of the same thing. It is expressed by *asking*:—"Ask of me, and I will give thee the heathen for thine inheritance." (Ps. ii. 8.) It is expressed by *praying*:—"I pray

(eroto) for them; I pray not for the world; (John xvii. 9.) which shows that supplication is included, though not to the exclusion of other ideas. It is also described by *advocacy*:—"If any man sin we have an *advocate* (paraketon) with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous." This is a law term, which was in common use among the Greeks and Romans, to denote one who appears in a court of justice to maintain the cause of the person accused,—an attorney, a pleader, a spokesman, a patron, who, placing himself in the room of his client, advocates his interests with all zeal and ability. This term is expressly applied to Christ in the passage quoted; and, in his own words, it is distinctly supposed to belong to him, when, consoling his disciples in the prospect of his own removal from them, he says, "I will pray the Father, and he will give you **ANOTHER comforter.**" But with reference to him, there must be understood this difference, that *his* plea is not the innocence of his clients but his own merits;—his appeal is not to absolute justice, but to sovereign mercy; what *he* sues for is not a legal right to which they are entitled, but a free favour to which in themselves they have no claim.

How the intercession of Christ, thus explained, is conducted—in what form this asking, praying, advocacy, is carried on, it does not become us anxiously to enquire, or dogmatically to affirm. It becomes us rather to content ourselves, with the account given of it in scripture. Beyond this, it is useless, and worse than useless to conjecture.

It may be remarked that, for one thing, Christ is said to *appear in the presence of God* for his people. "Christ is not entered into the holy places made with hands, which are the figures of the true; but into heaven itself, *now to appear in the presence of God for us.*" (Heb. ix. 24.) To this there seems to be an obvious reference in the preternatural vision of Stephen, "*Behold I see the heavens opened, and the Son of man standing on the right hand of God.*" (Acts vii. 56.) The same also is the reference in the apocalyptic vision, "And another angel came and *stood* at the altar, having a golden censer, &c. (Rev. viii. 3.) His presenting himself before God, is denoted by his *appearing*, and *standing*, language which plainly enough marks some sort of official activity. This is the first thing implied in his intercession, when our case is called, so to speak, at the bar of heaven, he *appears* in our room; when we are summoned to appear, he *stands* up in our name.

But appearance is not all. He is farther said to *exhibit his atoning sacrifice*, as the ground on which the blessings for which he pleads are to be conferred on his people. The Hebrew high priest's entering into the sanctuary, on the day of expiation, prefigured the intercession of Christ. But it was a simple appearance within the holy place that was made by this typical functionary; he carried with him the blood of the victim which had just been offered in the outer apartment, and sprinkled it seven times on the mercy seat and the ark of the covenant—without this his appearance could be of no avail, his entrance could have no efficacy; corresponding to which is Christ's *presenting the memorials of his atonement* before God in heaven. "Christ being come a high priest of good things to come, by a greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands,

that is to say, not of this building; neither by the blood of goats and calves, but by HIS OWN BLOOD, he entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us." (Heb. ix. 11, 12.) To the same circumstance does the apostle refer when he says, "It was therefore necessary that the patterns of things in the heavens should be purified with these; but THE HEAVENLY THINGS THEMSELVES WITH BETTER SACRIFICES than these; (Heb. ix. 23.) By his blood and sacrifice, represented in these passages as carried by him into heaven, it is almost unnecessary to remark, we are not to understand the material blood which flowed in the garden and on the cross, but the merits of his sufferings and death, the virtue of his atonement, the substance of his sacrifice, the whole essence of his passion. The intercession is founded on the oblation. The former is nothing without the latter. It may without impropriety, be said that it is the sacrifice which intercedes: it is the blood of Jesus Christ in heaven which cries to God in our behalf; "the blood of sprinkling SPEAKETH better things than that of Abel." (Heb. xii. 24.) Even in the midst of the throne he stands: "a Lamb as it had been slain." (Rev. v. 6.) The vestments of mediatorial exaltation conceal not the marks of mediatorial suffering; the diadem of glory hides not the impression left by the crown of thorns; he is still red in his apparel, and his garments dyed with blood; the scars of conflict are visible in the body of the Conqueror. His wounds are still open, and every mouth pleads our cause with God. His death pleads for our life; his blood cries for our safety; his tears procure our comfort; and everlasting joy is borne to us on the breeze of his deep drawn sighs.

It is not difficult for us to understand, how intercession is made for us in heaven by the memorials of the Saviour's sacrifice. The language of sighs is no strange thing among men. God has condescended to allow himself to be addressed in the same way:—"The bow shall be in the cloud and I WILL LOOK UPON IT that I may remember the everlasting covenant between God and every living creature of all flesh that is upon the earth." (Gen. ix. 16.) Or to adduce an example more directly bearing on the present subject;—"And the blood shall be to you for a token upon the houses where you are; and when I see the blood; I will pass over you." (Exod. xii. 13.) In like manner, there is a rainbow round about the throne like unto an emerald, which pleads with God our exemption from the deluge of wrath, and which derives its vivid tints from the rays of the Saviour's love, refracted by the shower of divine anger, and reflected from the dark cloud of his suffering. It is when he sees the blood of the everlasting covenant that Jehovah passes by those who were deserving of destruction.

Even profane history has been happily adduced in illustration of this subject. Amintas had performed meritorious service in behalf of the commonwealth, in course of which he had lost a hand. When his brother Æchylus is about to be condemned to death for some offence of which he has been guilty, Amintas rushes into the court; without uttering a syllable he holds up the mutilated limb, the judges are moved; and Æchylus is set free. Thus the sacrifice of our Redeemer,—the wounds in his hands and his feet, and his transfixed

side, plead the cause of his people with perfect clearness, and infallible power. The advocate and the propitiation are the same:—"We have an *advocate* with the Father—He is the *propitiation* for our sins."

In the intercession of Christ there is also included an *intimation of his will* that the purchased blessings of redemption be conferred. In whatever form conducted, it supposes substantial prayer or petition. There is the expression of a wish, the intimating of a request. "Father, I WILL that they also whom thou has given me be with me where I am." (John xvii. 24.) "Simon, Simon, satan hath desired to have you that he might sift you as wheat: but I have PRAYED for thee that thy faith fail not." (Luke xxii. 31, 32.) This seems to correspond to that part of the function of the Levitical high priest, which consisted in burning incense on the golden altar, within the sanctuary, on the day of expiation. It was appointed that he should take a censer full of burning coals of fire from off the altar before the Lord, and his hands full of SWEET INCENSE beaten small, and bring it within the vail, and put the incense upon the fire before the Lord; that the cloud of incense may cover the mercy-seat that is upon the testimony. The intercessory prayers or requests of the Saviour himself, not the prayers of his people which he presents, constitute the antitype of this expressive symbol. Incense and the prayers of saints do not yield corresponding ideas. It is the prayers of Christ which breathe the sweetness, and produce the effects of incense. Accordingly, in the vision of the angel seen by John, "the smoke of the incense came up WITH the prayers of the saints out of the angel's hand;" thus demonstrating that the incense and the prayers of the saints do not mean the same thing. And what can we understand by this cloud of incense, but those innumerable intimations of the Saviour's will, which in performing his work of intercession, ascend to God with so sweet a savour, and such glorious results?

We take not upon us to determine the question, whether these requests of Christ are conveyed vocally or symbolically, by word or by signs. Indeed we are inclined to think the question is unworthy of being entertained at all. It seems useless and foolish, if not hurtful and presumptuous, to speculate on this point. The majority of sober writers incline to the opinion, that the intercession is conducted silently, without the use of spoken language altogether. Without calling in question the soundness of this conclusion, we must be allowed to say that we are little satisfied with some of the arguments by which it is supported. To say that words are *unnecessary* to convey to God the Saviour's will, is saying only what might with equal truth be affirmed of the exhibition of his sacrifice. It is not because it is *necessary* to express his will, that Christ appears before God a Lamb as if he had been slain. It is not to remind God of what he would otherwise forget, or to make known to him what he would not otherwise know, or to incline him to that to which he would be otherwise indisposed, that Christ's intercession is introduced at all. No. It is to illustrate the divine majesty and holiness; to display the wisdom, grace and merits of the Son; and the more to impress the redeemed themselves with their obligations

to deep and lasting gratitude;—these are the purposes which this part of the mediatorial economy is designed to subserve. And if for ends like these vocal utterance could be shown to be better adapted than silent symbols, we can see no reason why it should not be supposed to be used. Besides, what are words, but signs? They are nothing more than symbols; symbols, it is true of a particular kind, but, after all, only symbols of thoughts and ideas. We are not to be understood, in these remarks, as maintaining the position that vocal language is employed by Christ in making intercession; we only object to some parts of the reasoning to which those who oppose this view of the subject have recourse. We express no opinion of our own. We regard the whole question as vain and trifling. Without indulging in foolish conjectures, it should be enough for us to know, that the intercession of our Divine Advocate is conducted in the best possible way, for promoting the glory of God, his own honour, and the good of his people. And one thing is certain, that such is the efficacy of the Saviour's blood, such the value of his death, such the merits of his sacrifice, that the memorials of his atonement exhibited before God in heaven, advocate our cause more powerfully than could ever be done by the language of men. No tongue of orator, or eloquence of angel, can ever plead so effectually in favour of guilty sinners, as "the blood of sprinkling which speaketh better things than that of Abel."

[Symington on Atonement, pages 341, 349.]

Christians afraid their money will be lost.

He is unworthy the name of a servant of God, that will run no hazard for him. Venture your charity in a way of duty, or pretend not to be charitable. Will you not sow your master's corn, till you are certain of a plenteous increase? And do you think he will take this for a good account? This is the foolish excuse that Christ hath told you shall have a terrible sentence; you will hide God's talent for fear of losing it; but woe to such unprofitable servants. *Baxter.*

Not Rich Enough.

Sometimes the flesh will tell you that you may want yourselves, or your posterity at least; and that you had best gather till your stock arise to so much, or so much, and then God shall have some. A fair bargain! Just like ungodly men, by their repentance and conversion, they will sin till they are old and then they will turn. But few turn that delay with such resolutions. If God hath not right to all, he hath right so none. If he hath right to all, will you give him none but your leavings? A swine will let another eat when his belly is full. What if you are never richer, will you therefore never do good with what you have? *ib.*

Paul's Charge.

"Charge them that are rich in this world, that they be not high minded, nor *trust* in uncertain riches, but in the living God, who giveth us richly all things to *enjoy*; that they do good, that they are rich in good works, ready to distribute, willing to *communicate*; laying up in store for themselves, a good foundation *against* the time to come, that they may lay hold on eternal life."—(1 Tim. vi. 17, 18, 19.)

CAN A PROTESTANT, WITH A SAFE CONSCIENCE, BE PRESENT AT THE
POPISH MASS?

THE importance attached to this question, will be in proportion to the desire of the enquirer, to be found in the path of duty; and the sincerity of heart in the service of the Most High God. With many of the professors of the religion of Jesus Christ, the desire to appear charitable, and liberal in their sentiments, outweighs, all the commandments of God, all their obligations as Christ's followers. Towards no class of men, or denomination of Christians, does this desire to appear liberal and charitable, manifest itself as in the conduct of many Protestants, towards those who hold to the idolatrous system of popery. Treat every Roman Catholic with all kindness; for cursing return blessings; for evil return good; let them ever see that you are moved with the spirit of your master, and that you desire their welfare: but never let them see that you approve, and countenance their errors; that you can look on quietly, and unmoved attend upon those of their ceremonies, which are so dishonouring to your Lord and Saviour, and so ruinous to their souls.

This question on the Mass which we have so ably discussed below by *Bishop Davenant*, was translated for the London Protestant Journal from a volume printed by him in 1634. It will be found in the December number of that journal for 1832.

"It has been justly observed by Bellarmine himself (*Tim. I. de laic. lib. 3. cap. 19.*) *That if all other controversies were settled, yet between Papists and Protestants, peace cannot be effected, because they judge the mass to be the most divine worship of God, while we look upon it as abominable idolatry.* But it is not my present intention to expose the blasphemous impiety of masses, but to shew, that we who do abhor this impiety in our minds cannot be present even with our bodies at its celebration. This discussion we institute in opposition to those who foolishly think that there is no danger or sin in the act of external communion with idolaters, provided the mind itself abhors their depraved superstitions. But indeed, he who acts thus, violates the integrity of a good conscience, and sins in many ways.

First, towards himself; whilst by an unlawful and impious pretence he wounds his own conscience, and defiles and contaminates his soul. For the mind of a well instructed Protestant is clearly convinced, that the Popish Mass, is not an expiatory sacrifice for the living and the dead, but a sacrilegious violation of the sacrifice once offered by Christ; but the very act of any one entering a popish temple, and uniting himself with those who venerate the mass, bears upon the face of it the hope of the expiation of sins from it, and the approbation of the thing itself as a legitimate and sacred action. Moreover the understanding of a Protestant pronounces, that morsel of bread which is elevated by the sacrificing priest is not Christ, the God man, the Son of the living God; nevertheless, the act of prostrating and adoring, signifies to all those present, that God himself is worshipped and acknowledged under the empty appearance of bread. This opposition between external actions and the internal persuasion of the mind, I call a most base act of simulation, falsehood no more to be tolerated, than if any one in express

words should affirm that he approves the Popish Mass. For it pertains to the essence of truth, that every one should shew himself by exterior signs to be such as he really is: and it is a direct contradiction to this truth, when any one by the signs of contrary actions, signifies the very opposite to what is in his mind; an act of simulation which may properly be called a *lying by actions*, as Aquinas regularly says. He therefore, who from his heart abhors the Papistical Masses, and in the meantime externally participates in them, is *thereby the more to be condemned, because what he falsely demonstrates in his actions, he yet demonstrates so, that the people suppose it to be done under the influence of truth*, as Augustine writes concerning Seneca the philosopher; De Civit. 6. 10.

Secondly, if any one of us shall attend the Masses of Papists, he sins against his brethren, especially the weak; for whom he lays a stumbling block, whilst by his examples he allows and entices them to a license, whereby their consciences are necessarily polluted. And how great this sin is, appears from those words of Christ, (Matt. xviii. 7.) *Woe to that man by whom the offence cometh*. Nor can it be denied, that an offence is occasioned by such an act, at least to the weak; since an offence is nothing else, than an incorrect word or deed, affording to another an occasion of falling. But this deed affords occasion to the weak, to imagine that the Mass is not an impious and idolatrous act; and so he paves the way for him to revolt to the Papists. They, therefore, who assume this license to themselves, to join themselves to the papists in the external celebration of the Mass, although the mind may reject their idolatry, yet violate that apostolical injunction, (1 Thess. v. 22.) *Abstain from all appearance of evil*. Nor will it avail in excuse to say, that they do not intend by this act to approve the things which are wont to be done in the Mass; much less to induce their weak brethren to think that the sacrifice of the Mass is lawful and pleasing to God; because the offence is estimated, not from *the secret intention of the doer*, but from *the manifest nature of the act*. But such is the meaning and nature of the act, that it impels the weak into the aforesaid error, and draws them into sin: therefore, whatever might be the intention of the doer, the act itself will have in it the nature of an offence. Therefore since every one is bound to refrain from any act to which he is not necessitated, and from which an occasion of offence to the weak may be justly apprehended; how much more from this act of attending Mass, to which he is in no way bound, and by which the minds both of the weak and strong are justly offended.

Thirdly, those lukewarm Protestants, who frequent Masses, sin against the Papists themselves, whom by this pretence they render more obstinate in their errors and idolatries. Indeed, when they perceive that we attend their Masses they forthwith think within themselves, that not only these, but all the other corruptions of Popery are approved; especially since the Mass is accounted a symbol or mark whereby Romanists are distinguished from Protestants. Let them therefore, answer, how they can, with a safe conscience, confirm those those in their superstitious acts of worship, whom they are bound, by every means, to reclaim from such works of darkness. For it is a peremptory command of the apostle.

Have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness, but rather reprove them. (Ephes. v. 11.) Now consider how admirably they fulfil this command. The apostle forbids fellowship with unlawful works: these men on the contrary attend and make common cause with idolaters in those very deeds of darkness. The Apostle commands us to reprove such works: but these men not only seem to consent to them by being silent, but by conforming themselves to those superstitious rites, really approve and commend (if not in words, yet by their acts) the idolatrous practice itself. By this outward conduct they harden the Papists in their pernicious error. They therefore sin against that charity which is due even to enemies—an offence impossible to be committed with a safe conscience.

Lastly, they sin directly against God himself: for the religion which binds us to God, obliges us likewise to the profession of that religion, and forbids a dissembling of the true, and much more an assumption of the external garb of a false one. And hence it is, that God himself acknowledges those alone for his genuine servants, who do not communicate with idolaters in the external acts of worship: *I have left to myself seven thousand in Israel who have not bowed down unto Baal, and every mouth which hath not kissed him.* (1 Kings xix. 18.) If they had bowed their knees with the worshippers of Baal before the idol, although they despised that idol in their hearts, God without doubt would not have reckoned them as his. For every one is under a perpetual obligation to that profession of his religion, which consists in the uniting himself externally with the pious, and orthodox, and the separating himself from the idolatrous and heretical. (1. Cor. x. 21.) For since God is the creator both of body and soul; since Christ is the Redeemer of both alike; it is just that we worship God as well with the reverence of the body as of the mind; that we cleave to Christ as well with the fellowship of the body as of the mind. (1 Cor. vi. 20.) Therefore in vain do they allege, that they abide in duty to God and to Christ, who join themselves to the service of the devil and of antichrist in an idolatrous worship. Elegantly and piously said Tertullian, *It is wicked for any one to lie about his religion: for by his pretending that he worships any other being than the one he does worship, he denies what he worships; and furthermore does not worship what he has denied.*—(Apolog. cap. 21.)

All these things might be illustrated by examples of the saints, drawn as well from the sacred Scriptures as from ecclesiastical history; but brevity forbids. Since, therefore, Protestants, who attend the idolatrous sacrifice of the Mass, pollute their own souls by hypocrisy, wound the weak brethren by causing them to stumble; injure Papists by confirming them in their impiety, and finally dishonour God himself, by halting between his true worship and idolatry: We conclude that Protestants cannot, with a safe conscience be present at Mass."

The Indian eating a Popish God.

"*How many gods are there*" said a Popish missionary to an Indian whom he had taught that the consecrated wafer was God, and that there was but one God. "None" said the Indian convert. "*What! have I been so long labouring with you, and you do not now know how many gods there are.*" "*There was one, but the other day you gave him to me and I eat him.*"

DESTROYING OF CHRIST IN THE MASS;

As taught in the standard works, and practised by the Priests of the Church of Rome.

“The Mass in the Roman church, consists in the consecration of the bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ, and the offering up of the same body and blood to God, by the ministry of the priest, for a perpetual memorial of Christ’s sacrifice upon the cross, and a continuation of the same to the end of the world.”
(*Page 74 of Challoner’s Christian Instructed. Phila. edition, 1824.*)

The same body of Christ, born of the Virgin and now in heaven—present in the Eucharist, &c.

“The Catholic Church, then, firmly believes; and openly professes that in this sacrament [the Eucharist] the words of consecration accomplish three things; first, *that the true and real body of Christ, the same that was born of the Virgin, and is now seated at the right hand of the Father in heaven, is rendered present in the Holy Eucharist*; secondly, *that however repugnant it may appear to the dictate of the senses; no substance of the elements remain in the Sacrament*; and thirdly, a natural consequence from the two preceding, and one which the words of consecration also express, that the accidents which present themselves to the eyes, or other senses, exist in a wonderful and ineffable manner without a subject. The accidents of bread and wine we see; but they inhere in no substance, and exist independently of any. The substance of the bread and wine is so changed into the body and blood of our Lord, that they, altogether, cease to be the substance of bread and wine.”

[*Catechism of the Council of Trent. Balt. Ed; 1833, page 207.*]

Christ whole and entire, divinity and humanity in the Sacrament.

“In this Sacrament are contained not only the true body of Christ, and all the constituents of a true body; *but also Christ whole and entire*—that the word Christ designates the man-God, that is to say, one person in whom are united the divine and human natures—that the Holy Eucharist, therefore, contains both and whatever is included in the idea of both, *the divinity and humanity whole and entire, the soul, the body and blood of Christ with all their component parts—all of which faith teaches us are contained in the Sacrament*. In heaven the whole humanity is united to the divinity in one hypostasis, or person, and it were impious, therefore, to suppose that the body of Christ, which is contained in the sacrament, is separated from his divinity.”

[*ib. page 211.*]

The Eucharist instituted for two purposes.

“The Eucharist was instituted by our Lord for two great purposes, to be the celestial food of the soul; preserving and supporting spiritual life, and to give to the church a perpetual sacrifice, by which sin may be expiated, and our heavenly Father, whom our crimes have often grievously offended, may be turned from wrath to mercy, from the severity of just vengeance to the exercise of benignant clemency.”

[*ib. page 230.*]

Difference between the Eucharist as a Sacrament and Sacrifice.

"The difference between the Eucharist as a sacrament and sacrifice is very great, and is two-fold: as a sacrament it is perfected by consecration, as a sacrifice all its efficacy consists in its oblation."

All cursed who deny it to be a true and proper sacrifice.—ib. page 231.

"With regard to the institution of this sacrifice, the Council of Trent has obviated all doubt on the subject, by declaring that it was instituted by our Lord at his last supper, whilst it denounces anathema against all who assert, that in it is not offered to God a true and proper sacrifice; or that to offer means nothing more, than that Christ gives himself to be our spiritual food. [ib. page. 231.

Priests ordained to immolate and offer in sacrifice the precious body and blood of Christ.

"He then, as the holy synod has defined, ordained them priests, and commanded them and their successors in the ministry, to immolate and offer in sacrifice his precious body and blood." [ib. 232.

The Sacrifice of the Mass, the same as that of the Cross.

"We, therefore, confess that the sacrifice of the Mass is one and the same sacrifice with that of the cross: the victim is one and the same Christ Jesus, who offered himself, once only, a bloody sacrifice on the altar of the cross. THE BLOODY AND UNBLOODY VICTIM IS STILL ONE AND THE SAME, AND THE OBLATION OF THE CROSS IS DAILY RENEWED in the eucharistic sacrifice, in obedience to the command of our Lord: 'This do for a commemoration of me.' [ib. 232.

The Sacrifice also propitiatory.

"That the holy sacrifice of the Mass, therefore, is not only a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, or a commemoration of the sacrifice of the cross; but also a sacrifice of propitiation, by which God is appeased and rendered propitious, the pastor will teach as a dogma defined by the unerring authority of a General Council of the Church." [ib. page 233.

*"And since the same Christ who once offered himself by his blood on the altar of the cross, is contained in this divine sacrifice which is celebrated in the Mass, and offered without blood; the holy council teaches that this sacrifice is really propitiatory, and made by Christ himself."—"For this is one and the same sacrifice which is now offered by the ministry of the priests as that which Christ then offered on the cross,, only the mode of offering is different."

[Council of Trent, Sess. XXII. Decree on the Mass. Chap. II.

"Whoever shall affirm, that a true and proper sacrifice is not offered to God in the mass; or that the offering is nothing else than giving Christ to us to eat: Let him be accursed."—[Ch. IX. Canon 1. Session XXII.

*[Et quoniam in divino hoc sacrificio, quod in Missa peragitur, idem ille Christus continetur, et incruente immolatur, qui in ara crucis semel seipsum cruento obtulit; docet sancta Synodus, sacri-

ficiam istud vere propitiatorium esse, per ipsumque fieri——Una enim eadem que est hostia, idem nunc offerens sacerdotum ministerio, qui seipsum tunc in cruce obtulit, sola offerendi ratione diversa.]
Sesi. XXII. Cap. II.

[Canon. I. Si quis dixerit, in Missa non offerri Deo verum et proprium sacrificium, aut quod offerri non sit aliud, quam nobis Christum ad manducandum dari: anathema sit.] *Cap. XI. Canon I.*

That which is offered in sacrifice is entirely destroyed.

"All things which in scripture are called sacrifices, were of necessity entirely destroyed, if living they must be deprived of life, &c."

["Et omnia omnino, qua in scriptura dicuntur sacrificia, necessario destruenda erant; si viventia, per occisionem, si in amina solida, ut similia, et sal, et thus, per combustionem, &c."]

Bellarmino Vol. III. Book I. on the Mass, chap. 2, Page 714. Paris Ed. 1668.

"For a true or real sacrifice it is required, that, that which is offered to God in sacrifice should be utterly destroyed, that is, so changed, that it shall cease to be that which before it was."

["Ad verum sacrificium requiritur, ut id quod offertur Deo in sacrificium, plane destruat, id est, ita mutetur, ut desinat esse id quod ante erat."]

[*ib. chap. II. Page 717.*]

"The consumption which takes place from the sacrificing priests (in the Mass,) is not so much an eating up of the victim, as the perfection of the sacrifice and properly is thought to refer to the burning, of the holocaust—or burnt offering."

["Consumptio autem, quæ fit a Sacerdote sacrificante, non tam est comestio victimæ, quam consummatio sacrificii; et proprie combustioni holocausti respondere censetur."]

[*ib. chap. 27. page 791.*]

Christ is offered in sacrifice, therefore he is entirely destroyed.

"In the Mass there is either a true and real slaying and killing of Christ, or there is not. If there is not, there is no true and real sacrifice in the Mass; FOR A TRUE AND REAL SACRIFICE REQUIRES A TRUE AND REAL KILLING, as the essence of the sacrifice is placed in its slaughter. But if there is, THEN INDEED IS CHRIST REALLY AND TRULY KILLED BY CHRISTIAN (ROMAN) PRIESTS."

["Denique, vel in Missa fit vera, et realis Christi mactatio, et occisio, vel not fit. Si noh fit, non est verum, et reale sacrificium, Missa; sacrificium enim verum, et reale, veram, et realem occisionem exigit, quando in occisione ponitur essentia sacrificii.—si autem fit; ergo verum erit dicere a sacerdotibus Christianis vere, et realiter Christum occidi: at hoc sacrilegium, non sacrificium esse videtur."]

[*ib. chap. 27. page 793.*]

Pause reader—consider for a moment that which the Roman Catholic church firmly holds, as an essential article of faith, as contained in the above extracts. In the sacrifice of the Mass the Priest, daily kills, and destroys by sacrifice, the same body of Jesus our Saviour, that was born of the Virgin, which "with wicked hands the Jews, slew and hanged upon a tree." (Acts II. 36: v. 30.) This same Jesus, whom we read in the Scriptures, "God hath highly ex-

alted," "and given a name which is above every name in heaven and earth." (Acts v. 31. Phil. II. 6, 10.) This very exalted Saviour, the church of Rome declares, *is now sacrificed afresh, every day upon the altar.* (Compare Heb. VI. 6.)

Of Christ's sacrifice, we read, (Heb. IX. 26, 28.) "But now **ONCE** in the end of the world, hath he appeared, to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself."—"So Christ was **ONCE OFFERED** to bear the sins of many." (Heb. x. 12, 14.) "After he had offered **ONE SACRIFICE**, for sins, **FOREVER** sat down on the right hand of God."—"FOR BY ONE OFFERING he hath perfected forever, &c." (VII. 27.) "*He needeth not DAILY TO OFFER UP SACRIFICE*, first for his own sins, and then for the people's; **FOR THIS HE DID ONCE**, when he offered up himself."

That is the doctrine of Scripture, which declares that Jesus once died, and rose again, and ascended to the right hand of God, where he ever liveth to make intercession for them that come unto God through him, and that from thence he will come to judge the world at the last day. That precious body of his, is never again to suffer; that blood is never again to flow; he is never more to be mocked, spit upon, cruelly treated, persecuted, and put to death. No—Blessed be God—Never—Never again will his body be nailed to the tree. *He ever lives*, and will live till all his enemies are put under his feet. (Acts II. 35.) So saith the Word of God.

But the church of Rome says, He is really, truly present in the Mass, as when he was on earth—and **DAILY**, is it the business, and the chief business, of her priests to offer him up, as did those Jews who with wicked hands crucified and slew him. Yes—this from their own works is not only the inevitable conclusion, but almost their own words! See all the quotations above.

What can be the interpretation of any man of common sense, but that the regular, daily business of the priest offering the Mass, is that which was performed by the wicked Jews? If indeed they believe that which they say, they are guilty of greater sin, and inconceivably greater cruelty, than were those murderous Jews. They crucified Jesus, for declaring that he was the Son of God, and because *they* did not believe him to be the Son of God. But the priests more base, more brutish, and cruel,—declare that they believe him to be Christ, the Saviour, the God man—the Son of God,—and yet *day by day*, and year after year, *attempt to slay him afresh!* Oh! Horrible impiety! *Sacrifice their God!!!*

But alas! this sacrifice they will perform for *fifty cents*, and for the poor soul of a priest of this city, Roger Smith, another priest Dr. Deluol, was to sacrifice the Lord Jesus Christ, *two hundred times*, for *one hundred dollars*. On such blasphemy, we must forbear. It is too shocking for comment.

This is the doctrine, for rejecting which, papists have burned and murdered, thousands upon thousands, of their fellow men.

THE PRINCIPAL REASON FOR DEPRIVING THE LAITY OF THE COMMUNION IN BOTH KINDS.

It is confessed both in the Decrees of the Council of Trent, and the catechism issued by its order, that Christ gave his disciples, bread and wine at the last supper—when he enjoined upon them to eat the one and drink the other in memory, of his broken body and shed blood. Those who have read the last chapter of Revelation, know what will be the portion of those who take from the Word of Life. (19 v.) What must be the condemnation of those who change, add to and take away from the ordinances which Jesus Christ has appointed in his church?

“The Church, no doubt, was influenced by numerous and cogent reasons, not only to approve but confirm by solemn decree, the general practice of communicating under one species. In the first place, the greatest caution was necessary to avoid incident or indignity, which must become almost inevitable, if the chalice were administered in a crowded assemblage. In the next place, the Holy Eucharist should be, at all times in readiness for the sick, and if the species of wine remained long unconsumed, it were to be apprehended that it might become vapid. Besides, there are many who cannot bear the taste or smell of wine; lest, therefore, what is intended for the nutriment of the soul should prove noxious to the health of the body, the Church, in her wisdom has sanctioned its administration under the species of bread alone. We may also observe that, in many places wine is extremely scarce, nor can it be brought from distant countries without incurring very heavy expense, and encountering very tedious and difficult journeys. Finally, A CIRCUMSTANCE WHICH PRINCIPALLY INFLUENCED THE CHURCH in establishing this practice, *means were to be devised to crush the heresy which denied, that Christ, whole and entire, is contained under either species,* and asserted that the body is contained under the species of bread without the blood, and the blood under the species of wine without the body. This object was attained by communion under the species of bread alone, which places, as it were, sensibly before our eyes, the truth of the Catholic faith.”

[Page 228, *Cat of the Council of Trent.*

Who can read these reasons without being shocked at the high handed, and heaven daring impiety of those who have thus taken from the ordinance of *the Lord's Supper*? First, “to avoid accident or indignity.” Second, “to have it always in readiness for the sick,” then “for fear the wine should become vapid by remaining so long unconsumed.”—again “many cannot bear the taste or smell of wine.” They surely were not priests to whom this referred. But they feared that “it would injure the health of the partaker”—and thus, “THE CHURCH,”—mark it,—“the church, in her wisdom, has sanctioned,” contrary to Christ's institution, “its administration under the species of bread alone.” “In many places wine is scarce and it will cost much to get it, &c.” This must be an expression of the importance attached by the church to the command of her Head, when they cannot do what he enjoins because it will cost something.

However this is nothing but trifling with the subject, and these are only a sham to cover over and prepare the way for that which did really influence them, "TO CRUSH THE HERESY, WHICH DENIED CHRIST, WHOLE AND ENTIRE WAS CONTAINED UNDER EITHER SPECIES." That is, as they had turned away from the ordinance of Christ, and had taught contrary to his teaching and this error had been exposed, it became them, to declare that this was a heresy. Yes reader the institution of Jesus our Lord, is a heresy in the eyes of that church, and in the language of that very council and church which acknowledges that, Christ did institute this sacrament under both kinds, as we read at the top of the 228th page of this Catechism: "*Christ it is true, as has been explained by the Council of Trent, instituted and administered to his apostles at his last supper, this great sacrament UNDER BOTH KINDS.*"

Bear it ever in mind, that Christ instituted this sacrament in both kinds, the Catholic church, being judge. And then place beside it the following:—THE PRINCIPAL REASON for taking away one and enforcing the other, even by fire and sword.

"*Finally, A CIRCUMSTANCE WHICH PRINCIPALLY INFLUENCED the church in establishing this practice; MEANS WERE TO BE DEvised, TO CRUSH THE HERESY which denied, that Christ whole and entire, is contained under either species, &c.*" directly in opposition to Christ's institution.

TRIAL OF A PRIEST'S FAITH IN TRANSUBSTANTIATION,
by a Lady.

A Protestant lady entered the matrimonial state with a Roman Catholic gentleman, on condition he would never use any attempts, in his intercourse with her, to induce her to embrace his religion. Accordingly, after their marriage, he abstained from conversing with her on those religious topics which he knew would be disagreeable to her. He employed the Romish priest, however, who often visited the family, to use his influence to instil his popish notions into her mind. But she remained unmoved, particularly on the doctrine of Transubstantiation. At length the husband fell ill, and during his affliction, was recommended by the priest to receive the holy sacrament. The wife was requested to prepare bread and wine for the solemnity, by the next day. She did so; and on presenting them to the priest, said, "these sir, you wish me to understand, will be changed into the real body and blood of Christ after you have consecrated them." "Most certainly," he replied. "Then, sir," she rejoined, "it will not be possible, after the consecration for them to do any harm to the worthy partakers; for says our Lord, "my flesh is meat indeed, and my body is drink indeed;" and he that eateth me shall live by me." "Assuredly," answered the priest, "they cannot do harm to the worthy receivers, but must communicate great good." The ceremony was proceeded in, and the bread and wine were consecrated; the priest was about to take and eat the bread; but the lady begged pardon for interrupting him, adding, "I mixed a little arsenic with the bread, sir, but as it is now changed

into the real body of Christ, and as none of the accidents remain, it being Christ entire, it cannot do you any harm." The priest after all his zeal to make a convert of the woman, and his declaration that it was now, by consecration really and truly the body of Christ, that it must do great good to the worthy partaker, could not raise courage, and faith enough to prove that the accident of arsenic was changed. Thus confounded by his expected convert, and ashamed of himself, he left the house. He did not likely make another attempt at her conversion.

It has been so long since we first read this, that we cannot tell where it took place. But it is one of those simple, unanswerable arguments, that can be brought to bear on any priest who denies it, at any time he may feel willing to demonstrate his principles. It will be found by applying this test to any priest or laymen, whether they do believe that which they profess.

UNCERTAINTY OF CONFESSION.

THE doctrine of confession in the Roman church is one of the very first importance as will be seen from the following extracts, of the Catechism of the Council of Trent.—"The care and exactness which its exposition demands, must be at once obvious, if we only reflect, that whatever of piety, of holiness, of religion, has been preserved in the (R. C.) church of God, is in the general opinion of the truly pious, (*true papists*) to be ascribed in a great measure, under divine Providence, to the influence of confession." [Page 252, *Baltimore Ed.*

What is meant by confession.

Bishop Challoner, in his *Catholic Christian Instructed*, (page 97, Phila. Ed.) says "By confession, we mean, a full and sincere accusation made to God's minister, (the priest) of *all mortal sins*, which after a diligent examination of conscience, a *person can call to his remembrance.*"

As to the number of sins.

On page 98, as follows: "Q. Is a person to examine himself as to the number of times that he has been guilty of this or that sin? A. Yes: because he is obliged to confess as near as he can *the number of his sins.*"

The difficulty of distinguishing which are venial sins.

On page 101.—"Though it be very easy to know that some sins are *mortal* and others *but venial*, yet to pretend to be able always perfectly to distinguish which are *mortal* and which are *not*, is above the reach of the most able divines; and therefore a prudent Christian will not easily pass over sins in confession, under the pretence of being venial, unless he be certain of it. And this caution is more particularly necessary in certain cases, where persons being ashamed to confess their sins are willing to persuade themselves they are but venial; for in such cases it is much to be feared, lest their self-love should bias their judgment."

One mortal sin unconfessed renders the whole confession null.

On page 102.—"Q. But is he obliged in this case (when he has before made a bad confession and now repeats it) to confess again those

sins which he has before confessed. A. He is, because *the concealing of any one mortal sin in confession makes the whole confession nothing worth; and all the following confessions, until this fault is repaired, are all null; and therefore they must all be made again.*"

Without confession there can be no absolution; without absolution no salvation. By the doctrine of the church of Rome, as we have given it above in the words of their Catechism compiled by order of the Council of Trent, and approved by the Pope,—then in the words of one of their standard writers, whose works are very extensively circulated, it appears, that prior to a man's being absolved by the priest, he must confess all his mortal sins, *every one* of them,—he must carefully number them, as near as it is in his power; and oh how vast, and innumerable are they,—he is then unable to tell whether they have been, mortal and deadly—or only venial. Their most learned divines are undetermined on this point. The infallible guides of the flock. The gods on earth who have the power of binding and loosing—shutting or opening heaven,—*who can really absolve from sin*—yes, these infallible bishops, and most learned men, are not yet decided wherein mortal sins consist, and whether some of those which are considered venial may not be mortal. We cannot but admire their prudence; but so great prudence is rather a *mark*, we should think of *uncertainty* in the minds of the bishops, priests &c. Infallible men ought not only to be infallible in their decisions, but in their knowledge of things, especially when it is a matter of life and death, the happiness or endless ruin of the soul.

Then another point presents itself which puts the priests, and penitent in a puzzle. The penitent when confessing may conclude something he has done is a *venial sin* and being of rather a delicate character, may avoid confessing it. So when the holy priest asks, are these all the mortal sins, may be answered in the affirmative, and he having enjoined penance absolve the penitent. *Aye, really absolves from sin.* But there—*the mortal sin*,—that sin which was not confessed, no matter what was its character. *It*—the one sin, perhaps *venial*, but most likely *mortal*. *It* overthrows the whole confession,—renders it altogether null.

Now my reader, if you are a Catholic;—see in what a predicament this throws you. If you forget one sin—if you thought it was venial, when it was mortal, your priests enjoined penance, and absolved you on your confession, yet this one overthrows all. Here is the failure of memory as to the *number* of your sins—your uncertainty as to the *nature* of the sin. But alas, is not the priest on whom you are depending for absolution, more uncertain than both. And on such uncertainties, admitting the doctrines to be true, every Roman Catholic has to depend for salvation. Truly the infallibility is not worth boasting of!

TWO QUESTIONS FOR A CONFESSION.

A young man of this city who had been raised a Catholic, became attached to a young lady, to whom he was afterwards married by a priest of this city. Before the priest could, or would do this, *he must confess.* Having put it off as well and as long as he could, he

at last consented. The priest put the questions, for there were *two*. You will certainly have concluded they were *deadly sins*. One of them we shall be excused from publishing,—the other was, *Have you ever kissed your intended wife?* Truly this must be a mortal sin, in the eyes of the Priest of St. Patrick? See this conduct—Then look at the doctrine. On what ground would the absolution be based? Certainly not on a full confession.

CONFESSING THE BIG SINS TO A STUMP—THE LESSER ONES TO THE PRIEST.

A physician of Baltimore county, some years since, was riding along through a wood on his way to see some of his patients, when unexpectedly he beheld a man on his knees,—he halted—the man arose,—he recognized in him one whom he had long known, and whose character was no better than it ought to have been. He was however a firm Roman Catholic. This unexpected meeting, and his posture led to an enquiry on the part of the doctor, as to what he was doing there. When to his amusement he related, "That always before he went to confess to the priest—he stopped at that stump, and confessed his chief sins,—and then when he went to the priest, he confessed from the last confession, leaving him but a small account with his holy father." If not by confessing to a stump there are many ways of avoiding the exposure consequent on confessing every thing to a priest. There is too much respect for themselves left among men to come down to this.

ENUPNION.

I have a story to recount so extraordinary, that I can hardly expect for it, a ready reception from serious persons, and so striking and solemn that I deem it a duty to record it.

The entire facts relate to persons intimately related to each other and refer to events which passed under all our eyes, and extended over a series of years. Mistake and deception are alike out of the question; and nothing remains but to say, that a most remarkable series of coincidents have occurred—or else to admit that a still more remarkable intimation of future events, has been vouched safe by God. The reader will decide for himself.

In the winter of 1832, Mrs. B. lost her favourite brother; a young gentleman, of uncommon excellence and promise, to whom all his family, but especially his sister, was most tenderly attached. He was very young, not long married, universally esteemed—rich, well educated, and promised from a constitution remarkably robust, a life as long, as it seemed likely to be useful, and honourable. He died after a short illness, and at a distance from his sister—their homes being in different states. As he had never professed conversion to God—and his sister was a disciple of Jesus Christ—the subject of most bitterness to her spirit, in his loss—was her painful uncertainty,

as to his hopes—his destiny, in that dread eternity into which he had been suddenly translated!

Some months after his death, in the visions of the night, this departed brother stood before her. The sister was, at that time in a state of dangerous illness—with a disease (whooping cough) which threatened the immediate termination of her life; a disease which, is known to be so often fatal, to adult persons, by its resulting disorders, even if it be not presently so—and which on several accounts, was peculiarly dreaded in her case. Under such circumstances the vision occurred.

She thought she was travelling—and had stopped for a night, at an Inn. Her brother entered the room where she sat; and as she sprung forward to embrace him, he said, tenderly, "Sister, I am come for you."

She realised all the time that he was dead; and when he spoke thus to her, her painful apprehensions about his own fate, recurred so strongly to her mind, that she stopped in the midst of the floor, and answered solemnly: "Charles, I cannot go with you; for I don't know, where you have gone."

He looked at her with a smile of inexpressible sweetness, for which, in life, he had been singularly remarkable, and replied, "Sister—have I ever asked you to go with me, any where, where you might not be happy." Then changing his tone and expression he added, "but you will not go with me now."

He then commenced speaking of his wife and child—a boy of two years old. "Be kind to Mary; remember always that she has been my wife." Without saying so in words, he left the impression that his wife would marry again,—and in that view bespoke from his sister, continued affection for her.

As he enforced this request, his manner changed. "Poor Mary" said he "Frank, (his little boy) will be taken from her. She will have a female child. But it will not be spared long to her."

The vision changed—and the object was passed.

This occurred as I have said in the early part of the year 1832. It made a very great impression on the mind of Mrs. B.; more especially, with reference to the hope, which she yet hardly dared to indulge on such grounds, of the eternal state of her beloved brother.

Now let me state the facts that followed:

Long after this dream, opportunities of personal intercourse, were afforded in the course of providence with the physician who attended the deceased, and with a pious female relative who waited often by his dying pillow. They both expressed a confident hope in his death. He asked those around him to pray for him; told them he trusted himself wholly into the hands of Jesus Christ; and that he had neither fear of death, nor reluctance to die. Then taking his little boy in his bosom, "fell on sleep."

Between one and two years after the death of the father, and about as long after the dream, the little boy died.

Some time after the dream, the widow gave birth to a little girl, not long subsequent to the father's death.

Years elapsed. In February 1837, Mrs. B. was in Europe, perfectly restored, almost beyond all hope, to the enjoyment of health:

and apparently delivered from all the usual effects of the disease, which had for three or four years so frequently endangered her life.

One busy day, on returning home to her lodging, late in the afternoon, she found a letter from America which announced the death in December 1836, of the posthumous female infant of her brother: and the speedy marriage of his widow; the latter event, being only postponed, for a time, by reason of the former.

Every part of the dream is at last accomplished. And I record with astonishment—and without a word of comment—facts, undubitable facts, which have been transpiring for five years—before a whole family of witnesses—scattered over the world—foretold in a dream in all their solemn detail and complexity, before a single one happened—and every one against equal or superior probability of happening in an opposite kind!

I add that the lady to whom this extraordinary vision occurred—is so far from paying attention to dreams—that this is the only incident of the kind in her life, which has fixed her attention, or made a strong impression on her mind. But this from the first excited the most anxious attention, and as its points successively came round,—fastened with indescrivable interest on the mind.

It may be proper also to confess, that the individual who repeats this statement, under the eye, of Mrs. B. herself—is the farthest possible from having any bias towards a faith in any sort of wonders; and that this very case, during its progress, as well as before any fact confirming it had occurred—was many times treated in conversation as a mere dream—sufficiently accounted for, by the extraordinary state of the parties—and the phenomena of dreaming in general. If he were to repeat that opinion now, the subsequent coincidences are well nigh miraculous; and yet if he were to relate it—the same conclusion is rendered only more necessary.

Paris, February 10, 1837.

THE SOUL OF MAN.

The eternal salvation of one soul, is of greater importance, and big with greater events, than the temporal salvation of a whole kingdom, though it were for the space of ten thousand ages; because there will come up a point—an instant, in eternity, when that one soul shall have existed as many ages, as all the individuals of a whole kingdom, ranged in close succession, will, in the whole, have existed in the space of ten thousand ages; therefore, one soul is capable of a larger share of happiness, or misery, through an endless eternity: for there will still be before it, more than a whole kingdom is capable of, in ten thousand years.

Doddridge.

THE EXCOMMUNICATION OF BONAPARTE

And his Adherents, by Pope Pius the VII.

The following curious paper is translated from the Latin Original, which was sent over by Mr. Hill, the British Minister in Sardinia. A translation in French was circulated by the British Government, for the information of the Catholic world.—The present translation is from the Literary Panorama of March. 1810.

Apostolic Letters, in Form of Brief,

‘Whereby are declared excommunicated, and *de novo* are excommunicated, the Authors, the active Agents, and the Partisans of the Usurpation on the State of Rome, and on the other States appertaining to the Holy See.

PIUS PP. VII.—*Ad Perpetuam rei Memoriam:*

‘WHEN, on the memorable 2d of February, 1818, the French troops, after having invaded the other and the richest provinces of the Pontifical State, with a sudden and hostile *impetus* entered Rome itself, it was impossible that we could bring our mind to attribute that outrage simply to political or to military reasons, reported among the people by the invaders, that is to say, to defend themselves in this city, and to exclude their enemies from the territories of the Holy Roman Church; neither did we see in it merely the desire of the chief of the French nation to take vengeance on our firmness and constancy, in refusing to acquiesce in his requests. We saw instantly that this proceeding had a much more extensive view than a temporary occupation, a military precaution, or a simple demonstration of anger against ourselves. We saw revive, and again glow, and again burst out on all sides, those fraudulent and impious plots, which appeared to be, if not subdued, at least suppressed; which originated among those men deceived and deceiving ‘by philosophy and vain deceit, in introducing damnable heresies,’ and who had long planned, and formed parties to accomplish the destruction of our holy religion. We saw that, in our humble personage, they insulted, they circumvented, they attacked the Holy See of the most blessed Prince of the Apostles, in order that they might by any means overthrow it, from its very foundation; and with it the Catholic Church, although established on the most solid rock, by its divine Founder, in this Holy See.

‘We had thought, we had also hoped, that the French government, taught by experience the evils in which that most powerful nation had involved itself by unreined impiety and schism, and convinced by the unanimous declarations of by far the greater part of its citizens, was truly and heartily persuaded, that its own security, as well as the public happiness, was deeply interested in the free and sincere restoration of the exercise of the Catholic religion, and in its defence against all assailants. Moved by this opinion, and excited by this hope, we, unworthy as we are, who upon earth represent the God of Peace, scarcely perceived any prospect of repairing the disasters of the Gallican church, when—the whole world is our witness! with what alacrity we listened to proposals of peace, and how much it cost us, and the church itself, to conduct those treaties to such a conclusion as it was possible to obtain: but, immortal God! in what did our hopes terminate! What has been the fruit of our so great indulgence and liberality! From the very promulgation of that agreement, we have been constrained to complain with the prophet, ‘Behold, in peace my bitterness becomes most bitter.’ This bitterness we have not concealed from the church, nor from our brethren the cardinals of the Holy Roman church in our allocution to them in consistory, May 24, 1802. We then informed

them, that, to the convention we had made, were added several articles *unknown to us, and disapproved by us the instant we knew them*. In reality by these articles, not only was the free exercise of the Catholic religion withheld, in points of the greatest consequence and interest to the liberty which had been verbally assured, stipulated, and solemnly promised, as introductory to the convention, and as its basis; but also, in several of these articles, the doctrine of the gospel was closely attacked.

'Nearly the same was the result of the convention concluded by us with the government of the Italian Republic. Those very articles were interpreted in a manner altogether arbitrary, with highly perverse and peculiar fraud, as well as injury; against which arbitrary and perverse interpretation we had guarded with the utmost solicitude.

'Both these conventions being violated in this manner, and disfigured in whatsoever had been stipulated in favour of the church,—the spiritual power also being subjected to the will of the *laic*; so far were the salutary effects that we had proposed to ourselves following these conventions, that other and still greater evils and injuries to the church of Jesus Christ, we saw growing and spreading daily.

'We shall not here enumerate particularly those evils, because they are sufficiently known in the world, and deplored with tears by all good men: they are besides sufficiently declared in the two consistorial allocutions, which we made March 16, and July 11, 1808; which we caused to be made public, as much as our state of restraint admitted. From those all may know, and all posterity will see, what at that time were our sentiments on so many and great injuries suffered from the government of France, in things appertaining to the church: they will know with what long suffering and patience we were so long silent,—with what constancy we maintained the love of peace; and how firmly we retained the hope, that a remedy adequate to such great evils might be found, and that an end might be put to them, for which cause we have deferred from day to day the lifting up of our apostolic voice. They will see what were our labours and anxieties, — what our endeavours, deprecations, protestations, sighings, (incessant have they been!) that the wounds of the church might be healed,—while we have intreated that new sufferings might not be inflicted upon her: but, in vain have been exhausted all the powers of humanity, of moderation, of mildness, by which hitherto we have studied to shield the rights and interests of the church from him, who had associated himself with the devices of the impious to destroy it utterly, who, with that spirit had affected friendship for her, that he might more readily betray her,—who had feigned to protect her, that he might more securely oppress her.

'Much and often, even daily, have we been bid to hope, especially when our journey into France was wished for and solicited; but from that period our expostulations have been eluded by bold tergiversations and cavillings; and by answers given purposely to prolong the matter, or to mislead by fallacy. At length they could obtain no attention: As the time appointed for maturing the councils already taken against this Holy See, and the church of Christ approached, we were assailed, we were harrassed perpetually, and perpetually were demands, either exorbitant or captious, made; the nature of which shewed clearly enough, and more than enough, that two objects, equally destructive and ruinous to this Holy See and church, were kept in view; that is to say, either that by assenting to them we should be guilty of betraying our office, or that if we refused, occasion might from thence be taken of declaring against us an open war.

'As we could in no wise comply with those demands made upon us, they being contrary to conscience, from thence a pretext was formed to send, in a hostile manner, military forces into this holy city: they seized Fort: Saint Angelo; they occupied stations in the streets, in the squares; the palace itself, in which we resided, the Quirinal Palace; was threatened with all the hor-

rors of war and seige, by a great body of infantry and cavalry: but we, being strengthened by God, through whom we can do all things, and sustained by a conscientious sense of our duty, were nothing alarmed, nor dejected in our mind by this sudden terror, and this display of the apparatus of war. With a peaceful, an equal mind, as we ought, we performed the sacred ceremonies, and the divine mysteries appropriated to that most holy day, with all becoming solemnity; and neither thro' fear, nor through forgetfulness, nor by negligence, were any of them omitted, which were appointed as our duty in such a situation of things.

'We recollected with Saint Ambrose (de Basilic. Tradend. No. 17) that the holy man Naboth, the possessor of his vineyard, when called by demand of the king to surrender his vineyard, in which the king, after having rooted up the vines, might plant a vile garden of herbs, he answered him, 'The Lord forbid that I should give the inheritance of my fathers to thee!' Much less could we suppose it was lawful for us to deliver up so ancient and sacred a heritage (i. e. the temporal sovereignty of this holy see. Not without the evident appointment of Divine Providence, possessed by the Roman Pontiffs, our predecessors, for so long a series of ages) or even by silence, to seem to consent, that any should obtain this city, the metropolis of the Catholic world, where, after ditsurbing and destroying the most holy form of discipline, which was left by Jesus Christ to his holy church, and ordained by the sacred canons under the guidance of the Spirit of God, he should in its stead substitute a code, not only contrary to the holy canons, but in opposition and even repugnant to the precepts of the Gospels, according to his custom, and to the new order of things of the present day, which manifestly tends to confound by consociation all superstitions, and every sect with the Catholic Church.

'Naboth defended his vineyard, even with his own blood' (St. Amb. *ibid.*) Could we, therefore (whatever in the issue might befall us) decline from defending the rights and possessions of the holy Roman Church, which, to promote as far as in us lay, we had bound ourselves by the most solemn of religious obligations? or, Could we refrain from vindicating the liberty of the Apostolic See, which is so intimately combined with the liberty and utility of the universal church?

'How extremely fit, and even necessary these temporal principalities are to secure to the Supreme Head of the church the safe and free exercise of his spiritual functions, which by the divine will, are committed to him over all the world, may be from the present occurrences (were other arguments wanting) already too clearly demonstrated. On this account, although we affected not this temporal sovereignty, neither for grandeur, nor for wealth, nor for dominion,—an unwarrantable desire, equally distant from our natural disposition and our most holy character, which from our earliest years, we have always regarded,—yet we have strongly felt that it was due to the indispensable duty of our office, from the very day of the 2d of February, 1808, to the utmost of our power amidst such constraints, to issue by our Cardinal, Secretary of State, a solemn protestation, by which to render public the cause of the tribulation under which we suffered, and to declare our resolution to maintain whole and entire the rights of the Apostolic See.

'When in the mean while, the invaders obtained no advantage by threats they determined to act towards us on another system. By a certain slow but most vexatious and even most cruel kind of persecution, they attacked, with intention to weaken, by little, and little our constancy, which they had not been able to shake by sudden terror. Therefore, while they held us in custody, not been in our palace, there passed scarcely a single day from the said second day of February, which was not marked by some new injury to this Holy See, or by some new vexation to our very soul. All the troops, which had been employed by us to preserve civil order and discipline, were taken from us, and mixed with the French bands. Our very body guards, men the

most select and most noble, were imprisoned in the Castle of St. Angelo; there they were detained many days, then they were dispersed, and their companies dissolved. At the gates, and in other places of this most celebrated city *corps de garde* were posted. The post office, and all printing-offices, especially that of our Apostolic Chamber, and that of the Congregation *ad Propaganda Fide*, were subjected to military force and orders; by which we were deprived of the liberty of printing, or of directing others to print what we desired. The regulations for administering public justice were disturbed and hindered. Solicited by fraud, by deceit, by every kind of evil artifice, to swell the mass of what they called National Guards, our subjects became rebels against their lawful prince. The most audacious and most abandoned of them accepting the tri-coloured French and Italian cockade, and protected by that as by a shield, with impunity spread themselves everywhere,—now in bodies, now single; and, either by command or by permission, broke out into every enormity against the ministers of the church, against the government, against good men. Journals, or, as they call them, *Feuilles Periodiques*, in defiance of our complaints, were printed at Rome, and circulated among the populace and in foreign parts, filled with injuries, sarcasms, and calumnies, decrying either the pontifical power or dignity. Sundry of our declarations, which were of great moment, and signed with our own hand, or by that of our first minister, and by our order affixed in the customary places,—these, by the hands of the vilest satellites (amid the greatest indignation and lamentation of all good men) were torn down, torn in pieces, and trod under foot. Ill-advised youth and other citizens, were invited, elected, and inscribed in suspicious conventicles, although such were most strictly prohibited, under the penalty even of anathema, by laws, both civil and ecclesiastic, enacted by our predecessors, Clement xii. and Benedict xiv. Many of our administrators and official agents, as well of the city as of the provinces, men of the greatest integrity and fidelity, were insulted, were thrown into prison, were exiled to great distances. Searches after papers and writings of every kind, in the private repositories of the magistrates of the pontificate, not even excepting those of the first minister of our cabinet, were made with violence. Three of our first ministers, secretaries of state, whom we had been obliged to employ one after the other, were carried off from our own residence; and at last, the majority of the most holy Cardinals of the sacred Roman Church, our fellows and fellow labourers, were torn from our side, and transported afar off by military force.

‘These facts, and others not less contrary to every right, human and divine, wickedly attempted and hardly perpetrated, are so well known by the public, that there is no necessity to recount them numerically, or to expatiate on them at large. Neither have we omitted, that (we might and so much as seem to connive at them, or in any manner to assent so them) to expostulate sharply and strongly according to the duty of our place.

‘Despoiled in such a manner, as it were, of all the ornaments of dignity and supports of authority,—deprived of all the accessaries to the fulfilment of our office, and especially of those in which all the church were interested,—suffering injuries of every description,—vexed by all kinds of terrors and excruciations,—oppressed so extremely, that even the exercise of both our powers was daily further impeded,—after the singular and evident providence of God, the best and greatest which has supported our fortitude, we are beholden to the prudence of such of our ministers as remained, to the fidelity of our subjects, and to the piety of the faithful, that any semblance of those powers is yet remaining.

But, if our temporal power were reduced to a vain and empty appearance, in this city and in the adjoining provinces, it was in the most flourishing province of Urbino, of March, and of Camerini, at the same time absolutely taken away. Wherefore, we did not fail to issue a solemn protest against this manifest and sacrilegious usurpation of so many states of the

church; as also to admonish our beloved against the seductions of an unjust and illegitimate government; nor did we omit to address an instruction to our venerable brethren the bishops of those provinces.

‘That government, however, was not slow! How speedily did it prove by facts, and furnish decisive evidence, that in that instruction we had foretold what religion had to expect from it! The occupation the plunder of the patrimony of Jesus Christ, the abolition of religious houses, the expulsion of the Holy Virgins from their cloisters, the profanation of churches, the allowance of unbridled licentiousness, the contempt of ecclesiastical discipline and of the Holy Canons; the promulgation of a code, and of other laws, contrary not only to those Holy Canons, but also to the precepts of the Gospels and to the divine rights; the abasement and oppression of the clergy; the subjection of the sacred power of the bishops to the power of laymen; the force in many ways put upon their consciences; the violent displacing of them from their cathedrals, and sending them away, with other equally nefarious, equally sacrilegious atrocities against the liberty, the community, and the doctrine of the church in those our provinces committed instantly, as before in all those other places which had fallen under the power of that government,—these, these, are the wonderful rewards!—these the illustrious monuments of that astonishing attachment to the Catholic Religion, which, even at this day, is incessantly boasted of and promised!

For us, who experience so many bitternesses on the part of those from whom we could least expect them, already filled with them, and afflicted by them on every side, we grieve not so much for the present as for the future state of our persecutors: — ‘for if the living Lord be angry with us a little [*while*, Eng. tr.] for our chastening and correction, yet shall he be at one again with his servants: but thou, who hast been the author of all mischief against the church [the Hebrews] how shalt thou escape the hand of God? God will not forgive any, neither will he respect the greatness of any: for he made both the small and great; and to the most powerful he has reserved the most powerful punishment. Moreover, we desire, that by whatever means, even by our own life, the eternal perdition of our persecutors might be prevented, and their salvation ensured!—for still we love them; and never have we ceased to love them! We desire never to depart from that spirit of charity, that spirit of meekness which nature has imparted to us, which our will has exercised, and that we might in future, as we have hitherto, *spare the rod*, which has been given to us, together with the charge of the whole flock of the Lord, in the person of the most blessed Peter, from the Prince of Pastors, for the correction and the punishment of wanderers, and of obdurate sheep, and for making them an example and a salutary terror to others.

‘But this is not the moment for lenity. Every one who beholds cannot but see, unless he be wilfully blind, to what such atrocities tend, if they be not opposed in some manner, while it may be done. On the other hand, there is none who does not see, that there remains no hope, in any shape, that their authors either by admonitions, or by councils, or by intreaties or by expostulations, may be rendered friendly to the church. ‘To those means they have left no access: they neither hear them, nor answer them, but by accumulating injuries upon injuries;—nor can it be pretended that they submit to the church as sons to a mother, or ‘as disciples to their mistress, —by those who devise nothing, who do nothing, who attempt nothing, but with intention to subject her as a servant to her master, and by subjecting her to overturn her very foundations.

‘What then remains for us to do, unless we would incur the reproach of negligence or slothfulness, or perhaps even that of having wickedly deserted the cause of God!—except to lay aside all reference to terrestrial things, to renounce all fleshly prudence, and to follow the precept of the Gospel, ‘If he will not bear the church, let him be to thee as a heathen man, and a publican. Let them once again understand that, ‘by the law of Christ,

their sovereignty is subjected to our throne: for we also exercise a sovereignty; we add also, a more noble sovereignty, unless it were just that the spirit should yield to the flesh, and celestial things to terrestrial.' Many great Pontiffs, illustrious by their doctrine and holiness, by one or other of those crimes which are subjected to anathema by the sacred canons, have been reduced to equal extremities in behalf of the church, against kings and contumacious princes. Shall we fear to follow their example even in this, after so many crimes so nefarious, so atrocious, so sacrilegious, as universally known, so openly manifest to all? Should not our fear be greater, rather to have justly deserved the accusation of having so done too late, rather than too early; especially, when by this last crime, the most wicked of all that have hitherto been perpetrated against our temporal sovereignty, we are warned, that from henceforth we shall not be more free to discharge those so weighty and necessary duties of our Apostolic Ministry?

'Wherefore, by the authority of Almighty God, and of the most holy apostles Peter and Paul, and by our own, we declare all those who after the invasion of this holy city, and the ecclesiastical dominions, and the sacrilegious violation of the patrimony of the blessed Peter, the Prince of the Apostles, by the Gallic troops (outrages complained of by us in the aforesaid two consistorial allocutions, and in many protests and reclamations published by our order in the said city, and states of the church) against the immunity of the church, against the church itself, and the rights of this holy See, and its temporal authority, perpetrated either by themselves or by others, together with all their abettors, advisers, adherents, or others in any manner concerned in the furthering of the aforesaid violence, we decree that they have incurred the

GREATER EXCOMMUNICATION,

with the other censures, and penalties inflicted by the Sacred Canons, by the Apostolic Constitutions, and by the General Councils, especially by that of the Council of Trent (Sess. xxii. chap. xi. de Reform); and if it need be, we do anew excommunicate and anathematise them; we declare that they have incurred, as penalties, the loss of all and every kind of privilege, grace, and indulgence, in what soever manner granted to them, whether by us, or by the Roman Pontiffs our predecessors: neither from this censure can they be liberated or absolved by any, unless by us, or by the Roman Pontiff for the time being, unless in the article of death; and then falling again under the same censures in case of recovery; and further, they are incompetent and incapable to obtain the benefit attending on absolution, until they have publicly retracted, revoked, annulled, and abolished, to the utmost possible, all and every kind of outrage; and have effectually reinstated all things; or otherwise have made condign satisfaction to the church, and to us, and to this Holy See, in the premises aforesaid.

'Wherefore we decree and declare by these presents, that all those, and likewise all others, deserving of the most special mention, together with their successors in office, shall never, under any pretence, be in any degree relieved from the retraction, revocation, annulling, and abolition of all the outrages above mentioned; but shall be bound to make adequate, real, and effectual satisfaction to the church, to us, and to the said Holy See, according to these presents; yea, they are always bound under these obligations, and shall so continue, in order to the validity of whatever benefits they may obtain from absolution.

'But, while we are constrained to draw from its scabbard the sword of ~~obedience~~ severity, we do not in the least forget, that, unworthy though we be, we hold the place of him who, when he exercise his justice, does not forget mercy. Therefore, we direct and command, first our own subjects, and also all Christian people, in virtue of holy obedience, that none of them, on occasion of these letters, or by any pretext derived from them,

should presume to hurt, injure, prejudice, or damage in any manner whatever, the said parties, their property, rights, or prerogatives. Even while inflicting those punishments which God has put in our power, for so many and so great injuries to God, and to his Holy Church, we propose to ourselves, above all, 'that those who now trouble us should be converted, and be troubled with us (St. Aug. Ps. liv. 1.) if haply it might prove that God should give them repentance to the acknowledgment of the truth.

' For these causes, lifting up our hands to Heaven in the humility of our heart, we do again remit and commend to God, whose, rather than ours, is that most just cause which we support; and again by his grace assisting us, we profess our readiness to drink to the very dregs, on the behalf of his church, that cup which he himself first of all condescended to drink for her. We beseech and intreat him by the bowels of his mercy, that he would not despise nor reject the prayers and deprecations addressed to him by us day and night for their recovery. Certainly, no day so bright or equally joyful could shine for us, as that on which it were granted us by the Divine Mercy to see our sons, now the cause of so much tribulation and grief to us, again taking refuge in our paternal bosom, and speedily returning to the sheepfold.

' We decree that the present letters, and every thing in them contained, or deducible from them, may not at any time (even under the parties before mentioned, or any others interested in the premises, in whatever manner, or of whatever state, degree, order, pre-eminence, or dignity they may be, or otherwise; or who ought to be mentioned individually, or specially, by any other expression or term of dignity, by pleading that they have not consented, or that having been called, cited, and heard, that they have not been sufficiently convinced of the verity and justice of the occasion of these presents, or for any other cause, colour, or pretext whatever) we say, may not at any time be impeached of subreption or obreption, or nullity, or want of intention on our part, or want of consent of the parties interested, nor of any other defect whatever; neither shall they be held, impugned, infringed, refracted, questioned, or reduced to terms of right; neither shall any remedy lie against them by special pleading, or by restitution to the import of the whole, or by other evasion of right, of fact, or of grace; neither shall this remedy, having been solicited, granted, and issued of our knowledge and plenitude of power, be questioned in judgment, or out of judgment; but the present letters shall always continue firm, valid, and efficacious, and shall maintain and obtain their full and entire effect; and by those whom they concern, and for so long as they concern them, they shall be held inviolable and unshaken: so, and not otherwise, shall they be taken by all judges, ordinary, or delegate; also by the Auditors of causes of the Apostolic Palace, and by the Cardinals of the Holy Roman Church, also by the Legates *a latere*, and by the Nuncios of the said See, and by all others enjoying or to enjoy whatsoever pre-eminence, or power; depriving them and each of them, whoever he be, of the power, faculty, and authority of otherwise judging of them, and interpreting them: declaring null and void whatever may be attempted against them by any one, whether by authority and of knowledge, or by ignorance.

' Notwithstanding the foregoing, and so far as need be, our rule, and that of the Apostolic Chancery, *de jure quaesito non tollendo*, and the other Apostolic constitutions and appointments, and whatever other statutes and customs established by oath, or by Apostolic confirmation, or by any other corroboration and establishment,--notwithstanding all usages and styles from time immemorial; all previous privileges, indulgences, and Apostolic letters;--notwithstanding all other, or whatsoever persons, and with whatever dignity resplendent, whether ecclesiastical or worldly, and however qualified, and requiring specially to be expressed, under whatever tenor and form of words,--notwithstanding, also, whatever clause déro-

gatory of derogatories, or other efficacious of most efficacious, or insolite or irritating, and all other decrees, purporting to be of motion, of knowledge, and of full power, whether consistoral, or otherwise, in whatever manner, contrary to these premises granted, yielded, made, and and often repeated, and however often they may have been seen, approved, confirmed, and renewed,—from all and singular of them in the present instance, we derogate;—from their whole tenor general and special, specific, express, and individual, word by word, and not only by general clauses, under whatever form expressed,—according to the tenor of these presents, as if they were here inserted and explained word for word, formally, and nothing of them omitted; taking them as if they were wholly and sufficiently expressed and inserted in these presents, which notwithstanding, shall still continue in their full strength and primary effect for this special purpose; and we do expressly derogate from whatever is contrary to them; and our will is that such be derogated from.

‘And whereas these present letters cannot be safely published, especially in those places where there is the greatest need, as is a notorious fact, our will is that they, or copies of them, be affixed and published at the doors of the church of the Lateran, of the Basilica of the Prince of the Apostles, also of the Apostolic Chancery, of the General Court of the *Monte Citorio* and in the Square of the *Campo di Fiore* in this city; and that, being so affixed and published, they should be binding on all and singular who are concerned in them, as if they had been served on each of them nominally and personally.

‘And further our will is, that to the same letters, or otherwise printed copies of them, subscribed by the hand of some notary public, and furnished with the seal of some person of ecclesiastical dignity, faith be given, in every place, and among every people, as well in judgment as out of judgment, wherever they may be exhibited, as if these presents themselves were there exhibited and shewn.

‘Given at Rome, at the Church of Santa Maria the Major, under the Fisherman’s Ring, the 10th day of July, 1809, in the Tenth Year of our Pontificate. Pius, PP. VII.’

A FEW THOUGHTS.

The entrance upon any holy enterprize is commonly encountered with many discouragements, which if we have once overcome, the passage is smooth.

What great enterprize was ever on foot for God, which found not some crosses?

Never was God’s church but subject to reproaches.

It is better to have God strong in our weakness, than to have flesh and blood strong in His neglect.

The resolutions of faithful hearts, are heroic.

The fidelity of the Almighty, never disappointed the confidence of his servants.

If the power or influence of others hinder us in the work of God, we will not be guilty.

Who ever put his hand to any great work, for the advantage of God’s church, without opposition?

Envy is more quick sighted than love.

The most favourable persecution of any good cause is the lash of lewd tongues; whether by bitter taunts or by scurulous invectives: which it is impossible to avoid, as it is necessary to dispise.

How basely do carnal minds think of the projects, and actions of God’s children; therefore vilifying their outward probability.

BISHOP HALL.

THE
BALTIMORE LITERARY
AND
RELIGIOUS MAGAZINE.

MAY, 1837.

No. 5.

We publish a hasty translation of a discussion of the question, "*Is not the Pope Antichrist,*" from the able work of *Andrew Rivet*, entitled "*Catholicus Orthodoxus oppositus Catholico Papista.*" It was written by him in reply to the catechism of *William Baily* a Jesuit. As will be seen below, he states the popish doctrine from *Baily* under the head of *Catholicus Papista*, and his reply under that of *Catholicus Orthodoxus*.

Rivet was born July 2. 1572, died January 7, 1651, aged 78 years 6 months, and 5 days. He was a Frenchman by birth, and for many years a minister of the Reformed Church, in France. But on account of his bold and zealous defence of the doctrines of the reformed, he was compelled to take refuge in Holland, where he died. He was an ornament to the reformed church in piety and learning, as his works will show. "Mr. Leigh says of him, that he was a learned and godly divine, that he hath well expounded Genesis, Exodus, the Prophetical Psalms, and Hosea, and wrote learnedly against the Papists in his work above mentioned, also against Grotius, with several other learned treatises in Latin and French." We have examined a great number of his quotations in the tract following, and find them accurate."

IS NOT THE POPE ANTICHRIST?

Catholicus Papista.

1. No. For Antichrist will be a single man, the man of sin, the son of perdition, who will come at the end of the world. (2 Thess. 11.) And from the death of Christ until the present time, popes followed each other in immediate succession. Also Antichrist will call himself the true Christ, so that he can have no successor, and will be consumed by the spirit of Christs mouth and the brightness of his coming. If the pope can be Antichrist, St. Peter the light of the world was Antichrist, and Linus, Clement, Anacletus, Evaristus, and all those who have succeeded them. Calvin. Book 4. Institutes cap. 7. Sect. 22. does not deny the name of holy, to Pope St. Gregory, calling him a holy man, therefore he is not Antichrist nor are his successors.

Catholicus Orthodoxus.

Paul, (in 2 Thess. chap. 2.) teaches us, that "Antichrist will be the man of sin, the son of perdition," not about to come in the end of the world, but before the second coming of Christ. He does not say whether the time preceding will be long or short. That Antichrist may be a single man, can be differently understood; either that he would be a single individual having no successor; or indeed that he might be a single man, and one person from a number at the same time: nevertheless remaining in the same person, because of that one person remaining at different times, of the same nature, appearance, and rank. He may live by succession, or substitution; as in one kingdom there is only one king, by death he sends a living one into possession of his throne: whence the saying, *kings do not die*; And in this respect we are accustomed to speak, of the king, not as of many but as one person. In this second sense we call Antichrist that one person to be at one time, to whom another succeeds by substitution, so that there never should be more than one Antichrist in the world. The first signification held forth, cannot be proved from scripture, and is opposed to that scripture, (1 John IV. 3.) "*Even now already is Antichrist in the world,*" although he had not yet been revealed but remained hidden; this mystery worked secretly, as long as the power of Christ by the simplicity of the gospel hindered his progress. It was not probable that that horrible apostacy of which he should be the head could reach half its height in three years, but it would be the whole lifetime of man. Hence the apostle Paul (II. Thess. II. 7.) speaking of this apostacy and its head, said. "*For the mystery of iniquity doth already work.*" And that is according to John, Antichrist whom they had heard was to come, and *even now was in the world*. Yet, in his time, Says Paul, will be revealed. But all these cannot be understood of one man unless in that manner of which we have spoken. Unless he was a man living even in the time of the apostles; who can say that he would be revealed in this our time.

2. To this our opponents have nothing to reply, but that Antichrist existed in the days of the apostles, in his heretical predecessors, not in his own person: so Christ was in the world in those who predicted his coming. In John Baptist before he appeared in person. Thus Bellarmine endeavours to remove this objection, but is disappointed, because John distinguishes the lesser antichrists who were heretics, from the great Antichrist whom the faithful heard was about to come. And not only does he say that there are many antichrists his ministers and emissaries, but also that the chief Antichrist was in the world. If so that his precursors were roaming through the world preparing his way, it is true then that he was in the world though not seen, known or manifested. Thus Christ is opposed to him. He was in the world, when John the Baptist prepared the way for him, but before the appointed time he was not revealed. Who then they ask was that person? I answer that he was hidden and *not yet revealed*, as says Paul. But it is absurd to seek that which it is shown was hidden. Nevertheless *he was*, as John says; *though*

not revealed, according to Paul. This only we know of him at that time; but now we see him revealed, and manifest, and we make him known to all who wish to beware of him. To these Bellarmine objects, that if the Roman seat can be properly called the seat of Antichrist, it follows that he was from the time of the apostles, and that Paul and Peter were Antichrists, (and Bailly the Jesuit adds, Linus, Clement, &c.) for they sat in that seat. I reply, this is a false conclusion. For when we say the Roman seat would be the seat of Antichrist, we do not speak of Antichrist hidden, but manifest and reigning, and in this sense also the seat is his. The name presupposes the power and authority as known. On the contrary we say that those good bishops were the cause of Antichrist's remaining hid, who by their vigilance and patience resisted the apostacy, that it could not make an increase. This simplicity being taken away, Antichrist occupies the place, in which he domineers over those minds which he has reduced under his power by apostacy, in which he has drawn them down, and of which Cyril of Jerusalem, most bitterly lamented in his time, saying "*Now is the apostacy; for men have departed from the true faith.*"

(Cyril. Hier. Cath. 15.)

3. It does not follow, that Peter, and the good Bishops of Rome were Antichrists, because he reigning and revealed, may have occupied the seat in which they sat, any more than that Paul and those Bishops of whom he spoke were wolves, because he predicted, "that after his departure grievous wolves should enter in not sparing the flock, and of themselves those would arise, who should speak perverse things;" or that Alexander bishop of Constantinople, a great champion of piety and defender of the Catholic faith (as Baronius says) was a heresiarch, because Macedonius, Nestorius, Sergius, &c. who afterwards occupied the same seat were. The apostacy of those coming after in no way affects the faith of those preceding them. Nor do I think, this Jesuit would judge of the state of the Church at Rome under Linus, Clement and such like, by that which Baronius (*an. 807. sect. 4.*) says of it. "*When the princes of Tuscany thrust into the seat of Peter, the throne of Christ, MEN WHO WERE MONSTERS, most base in their lives, most dissolute in their morals, and in every way, most vile.*" And 900. (*sect. 1*) which he calls, "*an iron and leaden age,*" and again immediately following is compelled to confess, "*that it seemed as if the abomination of desolation was in the temple.*" Again he exclaims "*How much shame and grief should they manifest, who dare thrust MONSTERS, horrible to be seen, into the chair revered by angels? the many evils produced by them, have finished the tragedy! By these she who was without spot or wrinkle, is bespattered with filth, made to stink, polluted and blackened with perpetual infamy.*" In the same age. (*year 912—sect. 8*) "*Such was the state of the Roman church, that the most powerful and filthy strumpets reigned at Rome. The bishops were removed, the seat of judgment changed, and what is horrible, and abominable to be heard,—their lovers, and FALSE POPES were thrust into the seat of Peter.*"—"For who could say that those were lawful Roman Pontiffs, who had been thrust in after this manner without law, by Prostitutes; No choice of the clergy, no mention even of their consent to it

all the canons pressed into silence, the decrees of Popes choaked, ancient tradition outlawed; the ancient custom of choosing the supreme Pontiff, sacred rites and former usages all abolished." Truly then Antichrist could easily occupy that seat, where now, there are no more Clements, no more Anacletus's and the like to be found, but Christopher usurping the seat of the captive Leo; then Sergius doing to Christopher, as when he seized it; "an impious man, the servant of all vices, the most villanous of all," as says Baronius, (Anno 908. Sec. 2.) Lando who was put in by the request of the strumpet Theodora, made way for John X. Archbishop of Ravenna, who by the work of the same prostitute occupied the Roman seat after Lando. After some time, John XI. bastard of Sergius and Marozia occupied the same seat. During this time one pope disposed of the popedom to another, thus those who were appointed by their predecessors acted, and resigned it to their posterity: so that at that time, "one Auxilius wrote a dialogue under the person of a plunderer and defender, fortifying it with examples from divines and the canons, against the internal discord of the Roman church, &c." (Baronius An. 908. Sec.3) Genebrard in the 4th. Book of his Chronicles and year 901. says. "That in this unhappy age for nearly one hundred and fifty years, about fifty Popes, from John VIII. who succeeded those holy popes Nicholas I. and Adrian II. until Leo XI; had departed ENTIRELY from the virtue of the ancients, and were APOSTATICAL rather than apostolical, &c. that they did not enter the fold by the door, but entered through the tyranny of the emperors." He declares the same, in the year 1007. "That the popes of that time thrust in by the emperors, rather than by election, were MONSTERS." According to the doctrine of the Papists, where there is no lawful succession there is no church. Where then was the true church at this time?

4. Who does not see that in that and preceding periods, Antichrist had all things to his mind under these monsters of men? The man of sin who by decrees had possessed the seat itself, now in its possession, and covering it as with a pestilence, is reckoned only for one man; to which apostacy in morals, at that time, there was only one head, as conceded by our adversaries; which apostacy from the faith we prove from their opposition to the doctrine of Christ. Ought they to deny the oneness of those succeeding to it, when in the pretended succession of the spiritual monarchy they do not disapprove it. "For (says Pope Boniface*) of one church and one only, there is one body, ONE HEAD (not two heads as a monster) viz Christ and his vicar Peter, and Peter's successors." From all these the Pope makes only one head. So also Cardinal Hosius. "I confess among these ministers that Peter is the first, not that Galilean Simon, who having partaken of the reward of Peter departed; but Peter is that man, who under this name was appointed in the church by Christ, for the distribution of gifts and offices to be used for the safety of Christ's sheep; who never dies, but lives perpetually by succession, is in the church, was, and will be until the end of the world. I believe, and confess, and doubt not, that this Peter lives at Rome. All antiquity called this Peter, Pope." Hence the gloss of the decretal of Gregory IX. says, "THE POPE FOLLOWING ANOTHER IS

* See Bull of Boniface VIII. page 173. of this Mag. for 1536.

RECKONED THE SAME PERSON WITH HIM.* Christ speaking of Peter, named him particularly; and discoursing of the foundation of the church, which they wish to be Peter, designated the particular rock by the pronoun *this*, and added the Greek article in the gender of the rock. All these things do not hinder them from making out that there is only one rock, one foundation, one head of Peter and his successors. Why then do they wonder, that from so many men succeeding each other we should say, that there is *one Antichrist, one man of sin, one head of the Apostacy?*

5. But they say Antichrist will come near the end of the world, and the Popes succeeding each other whom we call Antichrist began a long time since. I reply: The end of the world here is taken for the three or four years before the coming of Christ, and thus we deny that Antichrist will come or be revealed at the end of the world. Truly we grant that he will be destroyed at that time by his glorious coming. (2 Thes. II, 8.) But if by the end of the world be meant the time between his ascension and his return, we grant that in that time Antichrist will be revealed and also made manifest. So said Peter. (1 Ep. 4. 7.) "The end of all things is at hand, be ye therefore sober and watch unto prayer." And John (Apoc. 1. 3.) Says. "The time is at hand." Again speaking of this matter; (1. Ep. 2. 18.) It is the last time and as ye have heard, that Antichrist shall come, even now are there many; whereby we know it is the last time. Therefore it does not oppose it because Antichrist should reign a shorter period, because the Jews and Greeks by *the last time*, mean that which will come to pass, not a few days from the extreme end of the world but in after time. For often in relation to times past, they are called, *the last times*. I send my prophets for the last time, limited to the old time all of which things are long since fulfilled. The apostles predicted, what would be in the last times, that many would depart from the faith, &c. The Jesuit Lorinus, (On Acts. ii.17) says, "this happened a little after, while they were yet living." The Jesuit Baradas (lib. 2. cap 4. Harm. Evang.) says "so the time of the New Testament is called because it is the last age of the world." So Antichrist could long since have come, even in the last time and at the end of the world.

6. Again they object; Antichrist will call himself the true Christ, he will have no successor, and will be consumed by the spirit of Christ's mouth and the brightness of his coming. The apostle says "that the Lord will destroy him by the spirit of his mouth," that is, by his word, which as a two edged sword will slay Antichrist. That we believe, and have daily proof of, but his entire destruction is not to be looked for, before the glorious coming of the Lord. This does not prove that he will be one man without a succession.

Indeed John, (1 Ep. 4. 3.) says "whatsoever spirit shall not confess that Jesus Christ has come in the flesh is not of God, but the spirit of Antichrist. Hilary says "*the proper name of Antichrist is, that which is contrary to Christ.*" It can indeed be openly, or secretly. But Antichrist calls himself Christ in the last manner, and shows that he is the enemy of Christ. Now, says Hilary again,

* Gloss, on Proem to Decretal of Gregory IX.

"This will be effected in hypocrisy, under the pretext of preaching the gospel, so that it will be believed that the Lord Jesus Christ is preached, whilst he will be denied." In this way preachers of Antichrist have been made. That beast is described with two horns like to those of a lamb: That is according to *Primasius* on Rev. xiii. 11: "The two horns like to those of a lamb, are the marks of the true lamb, which we will endeavour to apply to himself in the character of a lamb, yet as a dragon he is said to speak, because he deceives those whom he has seduced, pretending, or feigning the truth in hypocrisy. For he would not have been like a lamb, if he had openly spoken as a dragon: now he feigns the lamb, that as a lamb he may enter the body of Christ." And *Thomas* on the same place, "They will speak, feigning to have the horns of a lamb, that they may deceive." Whence *Gregory* on this passage, "Therefore that beast, that is, the multitude of his preachers, will assume the appearance of a lamb, that he may exercise the power of a dragon; hence very little faith is to be put in the outward appearance, or words of hypocrites." Says *Augustine*, "who will deny that we look not to the language, but the acts; for if all were interrogated, all would confess with one mouth that Jesus is the Christ. Let the tongue be a little quiet.—ask the life. From which it will appear that those are Antichrists, who deny Christ in their life." Yet indeed, "says he," Antichrist is the greater deceiver, who with his mouth professes that Jesus is Christ, and by his actions denies him."

7. Not only the life, but also the consequence of the doctrine and the titles usurped by the Pope shew sufficiently, that he is the enemy of Christ; that he denies Christ: so *Epicurus* destroying the doctrine of Providence denied God. This is sufficiently demonstrated by many when they shew that the Pope has proudly assumed the chief part, of the kingly, priestly, and prophetic offices of Christ, rendering those which remain to Christ useless. Withdrawing men from the true Saviour, he grants them indulgence; from the true doctrine that they may submit their consciences to his commands:—from subjection to Christ, that he may bring even kings and princes under his feet. The *Romanum Ceremoniale* (Lib. 1. Tit. 7. Sec. 7. fol. 85) says "the Roman Pontiffs on the great celebration of the birthday of Christ are accustomed to give or appoint a splendid sword, to some illustrious Christian (Popish) prince; which thing indeed is not without mystery. It represents the supreme temporal power given by Christ to the Pope his vicar on earth, according to that passage, "All power in heaven and earth is given me." Then truly the Pope goes beyond the temporal power, and attributes to himself that which belongs to Christ only, when he pretends that, that which was given to Christ in heaven and on earth is given to him. And *Augustine of Ancona* (Præf. in lib. de potestate Eccles:) does not hesitate to say of the power of the Pope, "that it is infinite, inasmuch as he is the great Lord; his great power and majesty are boundless; every created intelligence is found wanting in his sight." All this he says of the ecclesiastical power, "which places itself above all principality and power, that every knee may bow to him, of beings in heaven, earth and hell." What then remains for Christ? *Durandus Episcopus*

says, (Divin. off. lib. 2. chap. 1. num. 17.) "He is Melchisedeo, whose priesthood has none to be compared with it. Also he is called the Chief Pontiff, because he is the head of all Pontiffs, from whom they all descend, as the members from the head, and of WHOSE FULNESS THEY ALL RECEIVE." Panigarola, openly asserts; "that he may be that ONE LORD, of whom Paul speaks in his epistle to Ephesians, iv. ch: that *Jesus Christ is not the only Lord of Christians.*" Indeed Episcopus in a full council at the Lateran, called Pope Leo. "*The Lion, (Leonem) of the tribe of Judah, the root of Jesse.*" Is not this expressly calling him Christ, when all even the incommunicable attributes of Christ are attributed to him? Let us now collect a few flowers from the canonists and theologians. *Cardinal Bertrand* says, "Because Jesus Christ the Son when in this world and from eternity, was its natural governor, and by natural law, could pass sentence of deposition or condemnation against emperors or any one, as he had created, bestowed favors upon and preserved them; FOR THE SAME REASON, his vicar can do as he wishes. *For the Lord would not seem to have acted discreetly* (I speak with reverence) *unless he had left one such vicar after himself, who could DO ALL THESE.*" According to these men, * *he has divine Judgment, and therefore changes the nature of things, by applying the substance of one thing to another; of that which is not, he can make that which is, and an opinion which is as nothing, he can make important, for what he desires in these things to him, his will is for the reason, nor is there any one whocan say unto him, what doest thou? For he can dispense without law, so of injustice he can make justice, by correcting and changing laws, and has the fulness of power.*" His law is even divine. (Says John Sylva) "Although the divine law declares that in the mouth of two or three witnesses every word shall stand, the Pope decrees contrary to it." For against the apostle, the apostolic canons of the Old Testament, in not giving tythes, and in the matter of vows and oaths, he dispenses—If he is not superior to God, he is at least equal to him, † "*The judgment of the Pope and of God is one, as is the judgment of the Pope and his follower.* When an appeal is made it is from an inferior judge to a superior; as there is none greater than himself, so no appeal lies when made from the Pope to God, because there is but one council of the Pope and of God,"—also, "there is one judgment, and one court of God and the Pope." And if we may believe Alvarus Pelagius, ‡—"The Pope partakes of each nature with Christ."

S. Gregory, the Pope who was called holy by Calvin was very far from any such profane and impious arrogance. So far was he from it, that he preferred being like Christ, to have all earthly power, and when pleading with the Lombards reigning in Italy, he called himself their servant. "If I a servant wished to engage myself in the death of those Lombards, then their nation would have neither king nor subjects, and would be thrown into the utmost confusion; but because I fear God, I fear to engage myself in the death of any man."

* See note (a) at the end of the article.

† August. de Ancona, de potest. Eccles. q. 6. Art. 1.

‡ De P lanet. Eccles. lib. 1. Art. 3.

Oh ye Jesuit Fathers! can you with sincerity say that your Pope is moved by this kind of fear? Did he not commend the doctrine of Guingard and Garnett, &c.? In this he is not the successor of Gregory, as all of you well know. And it becomes you to acknowledge that in ecclesiastical jurisdiction he ought not to be his successor. If you will not acknowledge it, even this shall be extorted from you. The present Pope calls himself the universal Bishop. Gregory, calls that title, "*vain, profane, blasphemous, perverse, foolish,*" Not only did he condemn it in John, Archbishop of Constantinople, who wished to assume it but explicitly in any one. "But I say confidently, that whosoever calls himself universal Priest (or Bishop) or desires to be so called, he is the forerunner of Antichrist; for in his growing pride he prefers himself to others." But Boniface III. who succeeded Gregory the great in the Roman see, says Platina, "obtained from Phocas with great contention, that the seat of the blessed apostle Peter, should be the head of all the churches, which the church at Constantinople had endeavoured to obtain for itself." This, Boniface obtained from Phocas through the murdering of the emperor of Mauritius, "so that he alone and not the Bishop of Constantinople should be called universal" as Baronius candidly confesses. Therefore from the testimony of Gregory it follows that Boniface III. who immediately followed him, was the forerunner of Antichrist; and it is perfectly plain that the succeeding Popes in their pride have advanced him to perfection.

(a) The doctrine which is here maintained, that the Pope is Antichrist, can not be so clearly demonstrated, in any way, as by presenting the pretensions of the Popes, and the divines of the Papacy, in their own language. We have selected but two quotations, the original of which we publish, and that because of their force, and the scarcity of the works from which they are extracted. The translation of each of them will be found in the body of the argument, the first is referred to in sect. 4, under the †; the second in sec. 7. under note (a.)

1 Gloss, in proem, decret. Gregor. ix. fol. 2. ad hæc verba. "resecatis superfluis." "*Papa eadem persona censatur cum eo cui succedit.*"

2 Decretals. Lib. 1. Tit. 7. canon "*quanto;*" in the gloss, at the words "*veri dei vicem.*"—"Unde dicitur habere celeste arbitrium,"—"ideo etiam natura rerum immutat, substantialia, unius rei applicando alii."—"de nullo potest facere aliquid."—"et sententiam quæ nulla est, facit aliquam,"—"in his quæ vult, ei est pro ratione voluntas,"—"nec est qui ei dicat, cur ita facis,—de injustitia potest supra jus dispensare,"—"idem de injustitia potest facere justitiam, corrigendo jura et mutando,"—"et plenitudinem obtinet potestas."

ANTIQUITY OF THE RELIGION OF PROTESTANTS,

DEMONSTRATED AND VINDICATED, IN THE CORRESPONDENCE OF
JACOB SPON WITH FATHER LA CHAISE, CONFESSOR OF LOUIS XIV.

Dr. Spon, had published a history of Geneva, a copy of which he sent to La Chaise: in returning thanks for which (says the editor of the London Protestant Journal, from which we extract the translation of the letters) "the wily Jesuit adroitly seized the opportunity of proposing a change of religion to his correspondent and friend, and thus called forth the masterly letter which we present to our readers. Dr. Spon was one of the venerable confessors of the French Reformed Church, who were driven from France on the iniquitous and unprincipled repeal of the edict of Nantz, by Louis xiv. He died at Vevay, in Switzerland, in a state of absolute destitution! But his record is on high: and the following letter though the writer of it perhaps little expected that it would survive for the benefit of future protestants, shows the utility of cultivating one's talent.—By his antiquarian erudition, he was enabled to give a speedy, and decisive reason of the hope that was in him, and also to leave it as a precious bequest for others."

1. Letter of Father La Chaise to Jacob Spon.

Paris, January 2nd. 1680.

SIR,—I think you have no doubt of my great inclination to serve your booksellers, at Lyons, but as the affair is not within my province, I can scarcely interfere with it. I will however, speak to the Chancellor on the subject. I thank you with all my heart for your history of Geneva, in which there are many very curious things. I shall wait, impatiently, for the first section of your *Miscellanea*, which you give me reason to expect; as every thing from your pen is always agreeable to me, and highly valued by me, on account of the merit of the author, as well as the friendship which he entertains for me. I wish, more earnestly than I can express, that, being so well informed as you are, you should profit by your own light; and that, by turning your antiquarian information to the best possible use, you might repair the misfortune you have had to be born among novelties, and set your conscience at rest, and make your salvation sure. You must at least forgive me the fervent prayers I make for this, and the sincerity with which I speak of it from my own heart to yours.

Sir, Your very obedient,

and humble Servant,

—
LA CHAISE.

2. Reply of Jacob Spon to Father La Chaise.

SIR,—In the course of my antiquarian researches, you must not suppose that I have never investigated the antiquity of that religion in which it pleased God that I should be born. In order to do this I have divested myself as much as possible, of all the prejudices of birth and education, to see if I could discover that novelty with which you affect to reproach us. Besides, in those hours of morning and evening which I devote to pious duties, I have often con-

sulted him, whom St. Augustine, calls the *Ancient and the New Beauty*, in order to learn from him, whether our religion is ancient, as we believe, or new, as you pretend. But the more I have meditated on every point, and the more I have consulted the divine oracles, the more have I been convinced of its antiquity; and that if it appear new, it is so only to those who have heard it talked of without understanding it; as the new world was to our Europeans when they first discovered it, or as one might call an old ship new, which has been refitted.

I believe, truly, we may say, that without any hyperbole, our religion is as ancient as the world; and that a religion, which comes short of that antiquity cannot justly pretend to be the true religion, for how is it possible that God, who is an immutable being, should condemn the grounds of a religion which he himself taught from the very beginning, and that he should establish another widely different from it? Jesus Christ came not to abolish the law, but to fulfil it. Christianity, therefore, strictly speaking, is not a different religion from Judaism. Christians are the true offspring of Abraham. A full grown man is the same person that was formerly an infant; though while he was an infant he spake indistinctly, he had a school master, and was clothed according to his age. Judaism was the infancy of religion; it spoke indistinctly, and beheld only through a veil. The Law was its school master to lead it to the Messiah; and it was arrayed in numerous ceremonies, which were to cease at the coming of the Messiah, whom they prefigured. In some, the curse of that law, the veil of Moses, and the ceremonies, having ceased by the advent of the Saviour, the grounds of religion stood firm, since the Jews were saved by the Messiah whom they expected, and Christians are saved by the same Messiah, who has actually come.

Having laid down this indisputable principle, it only remains that we examine whether we have, in our belief and worship, opinions and practices different from those which were believed and practised by the ancient Jewish Church,—the typical and ceremonial parts alone accepted. Now the opinions or tenets of that church may be easily known from the Old Testament; from the rabbins, and from the actual tenets and worship of the modern Jews.

1. We believe in common with them, that God requires to be worshipped in spirit and in truth, after a manner worthy of Him, without images or representations, which He has expressly forbidden; and we without offering to make glosses upon this commandment, do entirely submit ourselves to it in our worship.

2. With them we invoke God only, and not angels or saints, which they never invoked; invocation being one of the chief acts of worship. We believe indeed, as they did, that we are to imitate them, and hold their memory in veneration, but that we are not to pay them any religious worship.

3. With them we perform our service in a language that is understood by all the people; for how can we expect that God would hearken to us, if we did not comprehend ourselves? This is a prac-

tice as ancient as the world, because at the beginning there was but one language for all mankind.

4. We believe that we are obliged to make a hearty confession of our sins unto God, as David did; and in extraordinary cases, when we require extraordinary instruction or consolation, we are to unbosom ourselves to our pastors, as David did to the prophet Nathan, and conformably to the practice of the ancient Jewish Church.

5. We believe in common with Solomon and the whole ancient Jewish people, that marriage is honourable in all; and that the presbyters and pastors of the church are at liberty to marry as well as the laity, since we do not learn that the new covenant has abolished this custom, which is as ancient as the world.

6. We believe that there are only two sacraments in the Christian church, in the place of the sacraments of the Jewish church, the signs of which have been changed, but not the thing signified; that baptism is the sacrament of our admission into the Jewish church, as circumcision was (to the Jews;) and that the Eucharist is the sacrament of our spiritual sustenance, as the paschal lamb was to them, since it is said, that our fathers "did all eat of the same spiritual meat, and did all drink of the same spiritual drink," which was Christ. I Cor. x. 3. 4. We also believe that we cannot, without guilt, deprive ourselves of those sacraments, though God does not limit his grace so strictly to the signs, that he cannot impart it to us without them if we have not neglected them; for thus he does not cease to save the infants of believers dying without baptism:—just as the Jews doubted not that he saved those who died amongst them without circumcision; otherwise they would not have delayed administering it until the eighth day.

Further, we have on our side the evidence of antiquity, in our explanation of the sacramental expressions in a figurative sense: for it is well known that the Jews, when they ate the paschal lamb, said, *this is the passover of the destroying angel*; and, in eating the bitter herbs which were served with it, *these are the bitter herbs which our fathers did eat in the wilderness*; and, in eating the bread, *this is the bread of affliction of which our fathers have eaten*;—without believing that they were one and the same, but using them commemoratively. Thus, we do not acknowledge, any more than they did, any transubstantiation or change of substance in our Christian passover: for we have no more reason to believe it in the one than in the other, since the thing signified is the same,—Jesus Christ who was to die, and Jesus Christ who actually died. What novelty, then, is there in this explanation, which is so ancient and so natural, and which was particularly made use of in all the sacraments and mystical ceremonies of the ancient church. Circumcision, which was the seal of God's covenant, is called *the covenant*; the lamb was the *passover*; the rock was *Christ*; the seven ears were *seven years*; and as these expressions were so common, we are not to think it strange that they did not surprise the Apostles at the institution of the Lord's Supper, neither also did they surprise the believers of the primitive church. Tertulian says: "The bread which he took and distributed among his Apostles, he made his body, by saying *This is my body*, that is to say the figure of my

body." (contra Marcion lib. iv. c. 40.) And Augustine says: "The Lord did not hesitate to say, *This is my body*, when he gave the symbol (or figure) of his body." (Contra Adimantum c. 12.) I once heard a Dominican preacher attempt to elude the force of this passage of Augustine, but I could never make out the meaning of his words.

7. We believe, as the ancient Jews did, that there is a heaven for the righteous, and a hell for the wicked: but we do not believe any more than they did, that there is any intermediate place, such as Limbus or purgatory. We believe that the blood of Jesus Christ cleanseth us from all sin, as the blood of the victims offered in sacrifice by the Jews, typically cleansed them from all their sins. We do not pray for the dead, as we cannot find in the canonical books, a single instance of such a practice among the Jews.

8. We say that faith only justifieth us, as the scripture saith it justified Abraham, whose faith was imputed to him for righteousness; but we believe that this faith must always be accompanied with good works; and that, if the term justify—means to declare a person just or righteous, we are justified (as St. James says) by works and not by faith alone.

9. We rest on the seventh day, and devote it to pious duties according to the commandment of God, and as the ancient Jews did: and we do not impose upon Christians other holy-days which are not of divine institution. The Jews indeed did so, but their festivals were instituted by and for God only, and belonged to the ceremonial law which is now abolished.

10. We believe, all Christians have in their baptism, vowed to God the spirit of poverty or of the word, of charity, and of obedience to this law; but we are persuaded that they may very well dispense with making a vow of celibacy, because continence is a gift of God, which he has not promised to bestow upon every person. We are further persuaded that they may also dispense without making a vow, of poverty, especially after the fashion in which it is now made, when those who make it are rich in common; and that we ought not to make vows of obedience to a superior, who is no more than a man, and to whom without any other vow, we owe obedience, if he command us to do things agreeable to the law of God.

What novelties, sir, allow me to ask, have we introduced in all these particulars.

A divine might discuss the preceding topics at length, which I have only touched upon; but what has just been stated may suffice to convince any disinterested and unprejudiced mind of the antiquity of our religion. This, to me, makes it the less strange, that so many men among you, of such fine parts, entertain not the least jealousy of the novelty of their religion, notwithstanding there is so great ground for it: for, if they had ever seriously reflected upon it, they must have perceived—

1. That the worshipping of images was unknown in the primitive church, in whose temples there were neither statues nor images. In proof of this fact, it requires only to be acquainted with history, and to observe the ancient churches, which had images only on the

outside, because (as M. Delauney, a Doctor of the Sorbonne has said,) *the saints were considered only as servants, but now, having become masters, they will not have them any longer pay their attendance at the entry.* The introduction of this practice must have been of very late date. As you, sir, have a high esteem for the illustrious bishop of this city (Lyons), you will not refuse to believe one of his predecessors, who lived in the ninth century,—I mean St. Agobard, bishop of Lyons. He says that, *in order to avoid superstition, the orthodox fathers carefully provided, that there should be no image in the churches, fearing lest what is worshipped should appear upon the walls.*

2. That the scriptures do not contain a single commandment either for the worship or the invocation of angels and saints, nor any threatening against those who do not invoke them; but they reprove those who do invoke them; as in the case of St. John. (Rev. xxii 9.) Such invocation, consequently, is a novelty which never was preached either by Jesus Christ or by the Apostles.

3. That divine service was not performed in a language unknown to the people for the first six centuries, nor indeed until the Latin language had lost its purity.

4. That the priests, pastors, or bishops were at liberty to marry; that most of the apostles were married, and that marriage was never prohibited by them; that several holy bishops and presbyters in the primitive church, were married, as Spiridion, Euphrosimus, bishop of Cæsarea, Gregory of Nicea, Sidonius Apollinaris, bishop of Clermont, Novatus, and Gregory of Nazianzum, &c. that the law of celibacy was not introduced until the time of Siricius, towards the end of the fourth century, and that it was only received in the Latin church; for the eastern churches, which are at least as ancient as the Romish church, do not allow of priests unless they are married.

5. That Monachism cannot plead antiquity, for the date of each order is known; and that it is also known when many of their festivals were instituted, lent was enjoined, ceremonies were established and the pope's authority was enlarged. We medalists, for instance, knew that there was no triple crown anciently put upon the heads of the popes. The medal of pope Adrian, (as you know) was simply a bishop's mitre: and in the Mosaic-work at St. Susannah and other places in Rome, the head of pope Leo is bare.

6. That the communion in both kinds was instituted by our Lord, as the Greek church has observed it in all ages, as pope Gelasius commanded it, on pain of excommunication; consequently, the denial of the cup is a new thing in the Latin church.* Gregory de Valentia, indeed, states, that communion in *one* kind did not begin to prevail generally until a short time before the Council of Constance, viz. towards the close of the fourteenth century; and, according to the opinion of Scotus, it was received as an article of faith only in the (fourth) Lateran council. (A.D. 1215) Where then is your antiquity in this point? The primitiveness (or antiquity) of transubstantiation may well be questioned, since no corresponding word to

* That this doctrine is a novelty is most decisively proved by the standards of the church. See pages 133. 134. of this vol. chaps. 2. 3. in which the council of Trent admits it. And pages 178. 179. where the quotations from the catechisms prove the same.

denote it, is to be found in any ancient Greek or Latin dictionary, notwithstanding the copiousness of these two languages: nor have I been able to find any trace of it in the lexicon of Suidas, who was a Christian, and who gives the words used by Christians and pagans: and I think that the ancient fathers, and the canons of most ancient councils, will be searched for it in vain.

7. That there is no word to be found which expresses purgatory: and if it were to be found any where, the proper place would, unquestionably, be in the epitaphs of the ancient christians. You, sir, are very conversant in antiquity; and I shall be very glad to learn from you, whence it comes that we never read in ancient epitaphs, before the seventh or eighth century, the phrases, *orate pro eo*, (pray for him) or *requiescat in pace* (may he rest in peace!) which are so common in modern epitaphs: but we simply meet with *obiit in pace* (he died in peace,) *abiit in somnum pacis*, (he departed into a sleep of peace,) *depositus est in pace*, (he was interred in peace,) *quiescit in pace*, (he rests in peace,) *acceptus est apud Deum*, (he is accepted of God,) with the addition of the day of their death. Whence I infer, that it was their opinion, that the faithful were supposed to enter into a sleep of peace, that is to say, into heaven as soon as they were dead. I have many inscriptions of the first six centuries, but I have not met with one, in which any mention is made of the remedy of souls, which is so commonly wished to the deceased in modern epitaphs. Nor, in any of the ancient bas-reliefs which I have seen, have I ever observed any representation of purgatory, or of priests saying mass at an altar, with congregations kneeling, though in such we meet with the principal mysteries of the church.

Are not all these considerations and facts well calculated sir to make any, but especially an antiquarian, suspect that there are various novelties in that very church which imagines herself to be so very ancient? For when a question is about antiquity, it is not an antiquity of four or five hundred years, that we must adhere to; but the first and purest antiquity. After all, you cannot boast of antiquity, except in those essential points in which you agree with us, and in the greater part of your ceremonies which are copied from those of the heathens, as M. DuChoul, an antiquary of this city, has acknowledged, notwithstanding he was a member of your communion.

Allow me now to add, what one of our ministers said on this subject:—"you say, that you have antiquity."—In a certain sense, I admit that you have: and in one respect we are new. The whole of the western church was a sick body: we, by the grace of God, are cured: in this respect we are new. You still continue sick: in this respect antiquity is on your side, which is as much the more disadvantageous to you, as inveterate distempers lead to death. As reformed, indeed, we are new, just as a body is new when it is healed; but, as orthodox Christians, we are ancient. The reformation is an event which befel the church that by no means effects its essence. *The fundamental points on which salvation depends, are true faith and lawful worship.* "Where were you before Calvin," is the question asked of us. We reply, "we were in such a society

much like that in which the true Jews lived, in the time of Jesus Christ; in a place where we were not very safe."

Forgive me for adding a remark, which I do not offer for the purpose of making an odious comparison between you and the Arians, the enemies of the Deity of Jesus Christ: God keep me from entertaining such a thought! I wish not to give you pain, but only to explain myself the better. You know, that when the Roman empire was almost entirely Arian, the Arians pretended that they were to be called Catholics, and were offended when they were called Arians: and, on the other hand they treated the orthodox as schismatics and heretics, calling them *Athanasians*, *Eustachians*, and *Luciferians*, after the names of the orthodox bishops, who had boldly defended the truth. Would they have been justified in saying (to the Orthodox) "you are altogether new; where were you before Athanasius, before Eustachius, before Lucifer of Cagliari?" as it is said to us, "where were you before Luther, before Calvin, before Zumgle?"

Upon the whole matter, whatever eclipse the Romish church has suffered in matters of faith, there always have been doctors, and whole nations, who have protested against her errors;—such, for instance, were Iconoclasts, the council of Frankfort, the Berengarians, Bertram, and those of his judgement; the Vaudois the Albigenses, and the Hussites. Nor will it avail you in order to ward off this blow, to say that they were heretics, since neither God nor the holy scripture has condemned them but only the Romish church, which was both judge and party, and which is not infallible, though she herself pretends to be so. So that we say, that THERE ALWAYS HAVE BEEN PROTESTANTS, who did protest against abuses, both publickly in their assemblies, which were much the purest part of the church, and privately within the very bosom of the Romish church.

Will any allege, in behalf of the antiquity of your dogmas, those books which have been inserted in your *Bibliotheca Patrum*, and which are either evident forgeries or very uncertain? For instance, the Liturgy (or mass) of St. James, St. Peter, St. Mark, the catholic epistle of Barnabas &c.: for, if these books are really the productions of those apostles, why are they not put among the books of the New Testament? The epistles of Ignatius, the works of Dionysius the Areopagite, cited by the same author for the invocation of saints, purgatory, and the monastic life, though he elsewhere admits that it is very uncertain whether that book was really written by Dionysius.

But, to pass to something less serious; I have no doubt, sir, as you are curious in medals, that you will read with pleasure a singular instance of the prejudice which the ablest men of your communion entertain, concerning the antiquity of their religion. You know that father Veron found, or put, the mass in the Holy Scriptures, though your subsequent translators have not been of the same opinion. What I am about to mention is yet more surprising. M. De Peiresc, that distinguished antiquary, for whom the learned have cherished the highest veneration, pretended that he had found the mass on medals. His manuscripts have come into my possession and I am enabled to prove what I state. The very medal in ques-

tion is by no means as rare as has been supposed; and there are very few among the curious who have not seen it. He imagined, then, that a medal of Constantine, on the reverse of which was a species of altar, and a figure raised upon it with the inscription *Beata Tranquilitas*—was a representation of the Sacramental Host upon the altar. Upon this he wrote a dissertation of four or five pages, and endeavoured to prove his opinion by reasons which he deemed incontrovertible. Unhappily, however, a petty antiquarian, (the same if you please who is now writing to you) has discovered, by inspecting a better impression of the medal, that this round figure is nothing but a globe of the world, set on its basis, with the zodiac and planets engraved upon it, to express the public happiness and peace which existed during the reign of Constantine.

Thus, sir, I conclude, by protesting to you, that, by the grace of God, I have my conscience in perfect peace; daily beseeching God to teach the truth to those who are ignorant of it, or who only partially know it, whosoever they may be; and that he will vouchsafe to inspire us all with his love, and with the love of our neighbour, with which dispositions we cannot perish, and without which we cannot possess Him who is very love and charity. For the rest, I most humbly thank you for your kindness to our printers (at Lyons): and I should only have had my thanks to write, if I had not considered myself bound to reply to the earnest solicitations with which you have honoured me, by opening my heart as sincerely as you could wish, intreating you to take this liberty in good part, and to believe me ever, Sir, yours, &c.

JACOB SPON.

The Religion of Christ and of Antichrist.

“*Where was your religion before Luther?*” Just where it is now, —in the Bible. Just where it was when John said, “if any man shall add unto these things, God will add unto him the plagues that are written in this book, and if any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life, &c.” (Rev. xxii. 18. 19.) “*Where is the Popish religion?*” In their books, published by order of Councils and Popes. He that denies these, is under sentence of anathema by the holy council of Trent. (See art. xi. Cat. creed.)

Here are two religions the one in the Bible, the other in the sacred canons, general councils, —and decrees of the council of Trent. The head of the one is Christ, the head of the other the Pope. The follower of one is called a *Christian*, of the other a *Papist*; one promises obedience to Christ, to run in the way of his commandments, the other promises vows and swears obedience to the Pope. The one obeys the command of Christ to “search the scriptures,” to learn of him,—the other obeys the commands of the Pope, “not to study them,” as they are dangerous when read privately, but to search the prayer book, catechism, &c., and there learn what the papacy teaches. That is, the one is a follower of Christ—the other of Antichrist.

CATHOLIC PROPAGANDISM IN THE UNITED STATES.

In the *Rue Vivienne*, which is one of the principal streets of Paris, is a very extensive reading room, circulating library, and book store, owned by M. M. Galignani; and here is one of the most common resorts of the English and Americans in Paris. The same establishment issues a daily English News-Paper called *Galignani's Messenger*, which has a very extensive circulation, and is perhaps the largest Gazette published in France. From the No. of that paper dated March 2, 1837. I cut out the advertisement which follows, and which I venture to elucidate by a few notes.

To the Charitable and Humans.

Gentlemen and Ladies.—You are already acquainted with the history of America since its first discovery. That portion of it especially to which I wish to draw your attention, is the government of the United States, rescued from the hands of the King of England sixty years ago. This territory is larger than all Europe, and comprises twenty-four separate republican governments, united together under one President, chosen by the States every four years.*—The Catholics who came here from Europe experienced the same persecutions which they suffered in England, the law being the same; they were consequently debarred from the free exercise of the Catholic religion.† But after the date of the declaration of independence, every person had a right by law (*de jure*) to profess and practice the religion of his conscience, without restriction or impediment. As the Catholic emigrants from Europe, especially from Ireland, Germany, and France, were very numerous, and increasing every year from the period of the revolution up to this date, it is evident that their numbers have at length become a very considerable portion of the population, dispersed and spread over all parts of this vast and extensive region: so that twelve dioceses (each diocese having its own respective bishop, appointed by the Holy See) have been created and erected in the United States within these thirty years past, viz.—Baltimore, Philadelphia, New York, Charleston, Boston, Cincinnati, Bardstown, St. Louis, New Orleans, Mobile, Detroit, and Vincennes.‡ Each diocese is as large and extensive as a kingdom is in Europe. Here are many tribes of Indians (savages), many of whom are converted occasionally to the Catholic and Christian faith. All the different sects and heresies prevalent in Europe are to be found here, with their peculiar prejudices. The mission is very difficult here; the country being thinly peopled, missionaries have long and painful journeys to undertake, and are subject to privations of every kind. §

The object of this address is to solicit charitable contributions for the purpose of erecting and establishing places of divine worship, and seminaries for the education of youth of both sexes. || My diocese requires assistance more than any other in America, as it comprises three States, viz. Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Delaware, and has a population of two millions of inhabitants, scattered through this vast extent of territory "where the harvest is great and

abundant, and the labourers are few." Benevolent societies in different parts of Europe, feeling for the state of America in the above regard, have sent charitable donations to the other dioceses; but Philadelphia, which requires more assistance than any of the rest, has been totally neglected and forgotten up to this date.† Besides, I have purchased a lot of ground to build a church upon, where it is much wanted, in this city; but I am totally destitute of the means of accomplishing that great object, without charitable assistance, which I am under the necessity of soliciting, and which I now earnestly recommend to your consideration. Whatever aid the friends of religion in your good city may be disposed to give on this occasion, by your kind agency, can be sent by good bills of exchange, drawn in my favour, on merchants in London, Amsterdam, Paris, or any of the other great commercial cities in Europe or America, and forwarded to my address in Philadelphia, where the same will be gratefully acknowledged, and kept for ever on record, in the archives of this diocese.

By your most sincere and faithful friend in Christ.**

HENRY CONWELL, Bishop of Philadelphia.

Philadelphia, A. D. in the year of our Lord 1837.

*When this was written, at least bears date, there were twenty-six states in the Union; or if Michigan could not be considered as actually admitted, still then twenty-five. The States never elect the President; that duty being performed by the *people*—and the President being the chief magistrate of the *nation* as such—and not the agent of the *states*, in their sovereign capacity. The Catholic priests and prelates in the United States, are generally foreigners—and are not only ignorant of the actual state of our country—but deplorably so, of the peculiar principles of our free institutions. This is the more worthy of serious consideration, as the Catholic ecclesiastics of all countries are not only keen political partisans,—but aspire to the direction of the political opinions of their flocks.—The instances of this conduct, in the United States are innumerable.—

† This statement, is utterly untrue. Several of the states were originally settled by Papists—as Maryland and Louisiana. In which of the colonies were Catholics, treated as they have often been in England? On the contrary, which Papal government, even in any age awarded to Protestants, the same privileges that even England has secured to her papal subjects in many of her colonies—as for example Lower Canada?—But what country exists on earth, or ever did exist where the papists had the power to persecute protestants, that they did not apply fire and sword to them without mercy? In America, it is true, liberty does not depend on religious opinions, all sects are equal in the eye of the constitution and law; and this is right. But even now in America, the spirit of the papacy interferes with the execution of law, to a dreadful extent. How many Roman Catholic murderers and rioters have escaped conviction in Maryland alone, solely because they were papists; through the influence of papal principles on witnesses, jurors, and prosecutors? How many convicted felons, have been pardoned, solely to conciliate for political ends, the papal party?—This spirit

is part and parcel of Romanism—and is only another manifestation, of that which produced the Massacre of St. Bartholomew, and the revocation of the Edict of Nantz.* It is of faith in the papal sect to exterminate heretics; and the people of America have no alternative but to convert papists—or be killed by them—or to be their slaves. It is a political superstition, which tolerates no other religion—*except while prudence requires it.* The French Papal press are now defending the policy, wisdom, and piety, of the conduct of Louis XIV. in butchering and exiling his protestant subjects!—

‡ There has undoubtedly been a very great augmentation of the papal population of the United States, within the present century. This has resulted principally as Bishop Conwell says from emigration. And while this increase is such as to give just uneasiness to the people of the United States; the change has undoubtedly been of much temporal advantage to the papal emigrants themselves.—If the papal population of the United States continues to increase, for a century, as it has done for the last twenty-five years—it cannot be doubted that the most serious and unhappy modifications will necessarily occur, in the state of society, manners, religion, freedom and prosperity of America. And in the event of that party becoming greatly the strongest, in a few of the states—the dissolution of the union and religious wars, are to be looked for as nearly certain. It is probable that some modification of the naturalization laws of America might be serviceable in retarding the evil day. But the true course is—to attack the subject with spiritual arms, which alone are mighty in this contest. The papists are sent to America by the Lord for their good—and for our rebuke, according as we meet the crisis. Enlighten them, and teach them the word of God—and they become valuable citizens; neglect them, and they will for ages trouble our country and our children.—It is certain that conversions from Protestantism to Papism, which were not uncommon in America a few years ago, are now nearly unknown; while opposite conversions are common. This is only the first fruit. The final result, if the people of America do their duty—must be, the conversion of the great body of the papists themselves. Why should we forget that Luther, Calvin, Zuinglius, Beza, Knox—were all, once blinded papists?—Truth is mighty.

The papacy has undoubtedly sustained great losses, by the progress and results of free opinions. But in some important respects, it has also wonderfully gained. During the highest influence of the Bishop of Rome, all papal kings deemed it indispensable to keep some check on his power over the clergy in their kingdoms. In no former period of the world, not even in the darkest ages, was the direct power of the Pope so great over the catholic clergy, as at this moment: In Ireland, in France, every where—even in the United States, the Pope of Rome has an army of ecclesiastics, devoted to him—appointed by him—dependent on his wealth for honour, promotion, and every thing! These men are of course thoroughly imbued with his Spirit—and active agents for promoting his cause. That Pope be it remembered, not only rules a temporal kingdom, and is a king himself—

* See the Edict of Revocation in this number.

but is of all kings the most opposed to free governments, and political liberty. Now this king appoints, says Bishop Conwell, all the American papal Bishops! Every other sect in America is *national*; the papal sect is *anti-national*. No other sect recognises any temporal head at all, still less any *foreign* one. But this superstition, is based on sworn fidelity to, and absolute dependance, on a *foreign King*—who is the most corrupt and ignorant of all kings—and whom they not only believe to be infallible, but absolutely to stand in God's place, as his vicar on earth!—Every one of these bishops swear once every year to render true obedience to the reigning pope—King of Rome: and every private member swears as often as he repeats his creed, to believe all this Pope—King, expounds as of faith!

§. It is obvious from the whole history of the Roman sect, in the United States, that they aim at the conversion of the whole nation—whites, Indians—and all, to their superstition. They are not to be blamed for this as no doubt, it is the duty of all men, to propagate what they consider truth. But they are to be blamed for the secret, sly and underhand methods they use—and the innumerable false representations they make on this subject. And the people of America are to blame for their credulity in believing that the papists have no idea of trying to convert their sons in their schools, and their daughters in their nunneries.—As to the *privations* supported by papal priests in America,—it will doubtless be news in that country: and their *painful* journeys—in the best steam-boats in the world, or in comfortable and speedy coaches—are surely as endurable as their pedestrian journeys in the dominions of their Pope-King—whose fears of human intercourse induce him to prohibit diligences and stages!—As to the *heresies*, of America—it is certainly true, that even the annual cursings upon them on Holy Thursday—have not yet suppressed them.—

|| The schools of the Romanists in the United States, are generally designed for the education of Protestants—and are used as their most effectual means of propagating their opinions. Young persons educated in them, are generally materially injured in their religious opinions, either by becoming familiarised to error, and thus losing a proper aversion to it—or by being disgusted with their own former and true opinions by the falsehood and sophistries of their teachers against them—or even, in many cases becoming papists, by reason of the assiduous and unscrupulous *proselytism* of the priests. In the mean time, they lose some of the most precious years of their life, in schools, which are without exception of an inferior order, conducted on methods at once ignorant and antiquated, and in studies not directed to the best objects. In the midst of these attempts against protestant youths—hundreds of papal youths are totally neglected by their proper and natural teachers—and allowed to remain in total ignorance—because they are already in their power.—In Europe, national education, is *only* on a good footing in protestant states; and in papal countries, the first step towards doing any thing the power of the priests over education, has been abolished. For they not only do all they can to defeat *popular* education of their own sect, but are found incompetent as a body, to take a distinguished part, in the

higher branches of instruction. In France for example, priests have nothing to do with education—except the education of priests only. Is it not extraordinary that such men—unfit for such employments and opposed to such extension of knowledge in Europe should be so anxious to teach *protestants* in America, and so capable of doing it? Is it not strange that France, which ranks about the *fortieth* amongst states in point of general education should furnish *money*—and Ireland which ranks *last of all*, in the same scale, should furnish *teachers*; to America, which as a nation ranks *second or third*, and some of whose states rank *first* of all?—

¶ Bishop Conwell is certainly entitled to sympathy that he has been entirely passed by in the distribution of the bounties of the faithful. And the good people of New Jersey, Delaware and Pennsylvania which compose his diocese—are hardly fairly dealt by, in having their spiritual wants overlooked by the society of the Propaganda at Rome—the Leopold society in Austria—and I know not how many besides.—It is not possible to ascertain how much money is annually contributed by the papists of Europe, to Romanise the people of the United States. It is no longer doubtful however that an organised system is on foot to effect this object, that many of the Oligarchy of Europe, and especially the Royal House of Austria are deeply engaged in the scheme; and that the whole power of the church of Rome is secretly but assiduously devoted to it. There are always one or two American Bishops in Europe on this errand,—and Bishop England especially seems the hero of the plot. The rich give money—the kings encourage emigration—the poor unite in brotherhoods such as that to worship the heart of Mary, and pay for masses in her honor, that she may become favourable to the great object—the priests and nuns go forward personally to the work. This effort must be met by a corresponding effort. We must redouble our exertions to enlighten and convert the papists of America.—We must contribute money in aid of protestant efforts in Catholic countries: France gives about fifty thousand dollars a year, to convert our nation to Rome—while we give little or nothing to convert France to God. The Evangelical societies of France and Geneva, are nobly engaged in efforts to spread the gospel; and the *Conductors of the Magazine will gladly receive and remit monies to them*. But it is high time that missions were established by us in all papal countries. Faithfulness to God, to our fellow men, to our country, and to our children require this of us.—

* * * This letter is obviously a circular—and no doubt is published in the principal Catholic cities of Europe. By itself it is of little importance; but as a portion of a great system, and an indication of the character and objects of that system, it is worthy of profound regard.—It is sufficiently humiliating to an American spirit that ignorant and conceited foreigners, who are indebted to our humane laws, and just institutions for ten thousand blessings denied to them in their native lands—should do all in their power to create false impressions concerning our real state, and render us ridiculous to the enlightened portions of Europe, by representations and solicitations which are entirely unjustifiable. But that such men should

enter into a league with all the ignorance, fanaticism, and despotism of Europe to effect objects as to us, and our country—which if successful must destroy every thing for which that country is so inestimably precious to us, and important to the whole world—is surely calculated to arrest the attention of the nation—and rouse it to the necessity of countervailing exertions. In this as in every other case the path of duty, safety and honour, is one. To enlighten and convert the papist is to bless him—and preserve ourselves.

MEMORANDA OF FOREIGN TRAVEL,

BY RO. J. BRECKINRIDGE.

Departure from Nice.—Sardinian functionaries.—Anti-chamber of the Commandant of the Gendarmerie.—Provence and Languedoc.—Their ancient inhabitants.—Roman Colonies.—Sketch of the ancient condition of the south of France.—Its early civilization and conversion to Christ.—The sufferings and faithfulness of the people.—The physical aspect of the country as connected with the history of religion in it.—Traces of Greek and Roman language and manners.—Face of the country.—Evergreens—Canres.—All Saints day.—The Sacrifice of Christ in mere parade.—Frejus.—Its former and present state.—Roman antiquities—their era—their classes.—Ruins of a Roman aqueduct of Frejus.—Curious facts about Roman aqueducts.—The magnificent ruin of the aqueduct of Nismus.—

WITHIN an hour after leaving Nice we had passed the *Pont de Var*, and were in France. Disappointed in our expectation of finding a communication by steamboat, established between that city and the more southern parts of Italy;—we had no alternative but to retrace our steps, seeking to reach Rome by land—or to go forward as far as Marsailles, and embark there. The latter was, as we had every reason to hope an open route—and by it we hoped to reach Naples within eight or ten days; and for these, as well as on other accounts we preferred to advance. At Nice we found an American consul, who added the name of our only remaining domestic to our own on the back of my passport,—and we passed the barrier, having experienced for the twentieth time a civility on the part of custom house officers, for which the world gives them little credit.—I am sorry to make an exception to a fact otherwise nearly universal—of some of the Sardinian functionaries. I have already spoken of those at Turin; at Nice they were not less offensive, though probably less directly criminal. In every part of Europe in which I have been except this kingdom, the personal attendance of travellers is not required at the bureaux,—the passport sent by the hands of another—generally a person who makes a profession and a living out of such little offices, being deemed sufficient. At Turin, and Nice every thing must be done in person. At the latter place I called to get the last signature to my passport—being that of the

commandant of the Gendarmerie of the department—pretty early on the morning I left the city. The small anti room was full—and amongst the assembly, if I might except myself, and a tremendous Turk—there was not another person who was not both ragged and filthy. Some were persons of the poorest sort from the adjoining parts of France,—some were Italian sailors and their wretched companions—many were subjects of the king of Sardinia, seeking permission to go from one of his states to another—or possibly to leave his kingdom. The contrast between the wretchedness of these miserable beings, and the sleek, and pampered insolence, of the slaves hired to watch them, and in whose presence we all stood, awaiting their good pleasure to go about our lawful business, and digesting as we might their habitual impertinence—was strong and painful in a high degree. The Turk got tired of the scene, rose up from a bench on which he was reclining, stuffed a handful of phials of perfumes into his bosom and marching up to the wickered door which separated the office from the anti-chamber, rammed a thick bundle of ragged papers through it, and left the room. They seemed to be ships' papers. Perhaps he had just entered port. The men in authority looked at him in silence, and with perfect contempt, and the crowd gazed listlessly after him as he stalked slowly off. I concluded I would follow the Turk's movement, only inversely: so I walked up to the wicker and demanded my passport in broad English. As nobody understood me, they all looked up. I then repeated the demand in French. After much hesitation and a long trial to memorise my name, and then a hunt after the passport, it was produced. Then came fifty questions. Where had I come from? I showed them the last visa of the Sardinian police, which was an official answer. Where was I going? To Rome. Then I must take my passport to the representative of his holiness and get his signature, before they could do any thing. I pointed to the proper signature and seal. The passport was in English—which was a dead letter to the querist; and hence another series of interrogatories. What countrymen was I? I told him. Then it was necessary for me to get our consul's visa. I pointed to it on the back of the passport. He read it, being in French—and as it stated that the persons named were going to France whereas I had said to Rome;—another cross-questioning became necessary. You must have the visa of the French Consul. There it is, I go to Rome by way of Marseilles. In short, every thing was as it should be—but still nothing could be done. At length another person sallied out from an inner apartment—and taking the case in hand, settled it at once. It appeared that the first interrogator, had no other object, but to prolong the discourse indefinitely, with me and all others—till the veritable Simon Pure saw fit, to attend to his business; and as he had not been so moved for several hours, about a dozen such scenes as I have described had transpired. The Turk understood the matter sooner than I did and bolted. The poor wretches around us seemed to take it in complete earnest to the last—and as many as had passed through the hands of the catechist seemed in despair as to their prospects. A woman with three little children, stood near the door, ejaculating French imprecations, upon

herself and her evil lot. I put a trifle into the hand of the child nearest to me—a bright faced boy of six years old—and left the room. The day afterwards, as we drove along the shore of the sea twenty miles from Nice.—I saw a boy get up behind our carriage—and at once recognised the lad. Did you ever see me before, said I? *Oui Monsieur* was his instant reply. Where? In the passport office at Nice.—This is well thought I.—Who knows what the same prompt, observant, and perspicuous spirit may do towards surmounting the ills of poverty—and the evils of a state of society so infinitely unnatural?—He had come from the opposite side of France, with his mother and little sisters—on foot, on a visit to their relatives—after their fall labours were finished;—and were now returning home. This is well too: for after all, it is the ties of blood that bind us most tenderly and indissolubly to each other; and that heart is open to all kind and good impressions, which beats strongly under the power of this great sentiment. I shall never see that boy more; I shall never know him, even if we should be again jostled together in the short journey of life. But it pleases me to recall his look of ready and affectionate recognition; and I count it a mercy, to have had the chance—by a kind word, and a small token,—to quicken the power of human sympathy in his young heart.

The distance from Nice to Marseilles, following the route by Toulon is perhaps a hundred and twenty or thirty English miles. The same boundaries separate France from Sardinia—that separated the ancient Ligurians from Dauphne and Provence. The last named district extends from the Var to the farthest mouth of the Rhone embracing the three departments of the Low Alps the Var, and the mouths of the Rhine: to which should be added Vaucluse, containing the principalities of Orange and the county of Venaissim, both belonging to ancient Provence: stretching beyond Provence from the west bank of the Rhone, and like it hugging the Mediterranean sea, ancient Languedoc, covers the departments of Ardeche, Gard, Hersult, Aude, High Garonne, Lozere and Tarn. As there are only eighty six departments in France—these two provinces, it will be seen embrace more than one eighth part of the entire surface of the kingdom—and cover the whole region that skirts the Mediterranean—except a small district at the southern termination of the Appenines. Peopled originally by the same heroic race of Celts which seem to have been the first inhabitants of all the west parts of Europe—we know almost nothing of their history, until we find them in arms against the whole power of Rome—and their story, told in that of the conquests of the republic—the greatness and the decay of the empire. What was the nature of the contest between the half naked barbarians of trans alpine Europe and the mailed legions of Rome—may be apprehended from the fact that it required above seventy years for the best generals of the State, to subdue Gaul alone—the first of their conquests in upper Europe. The fury and despair with which the aboriginal inhabitants defended their liberty and country is strongly impressed on the reader by the statement of Julius Cæsar—that he himself, whose characteristic as a soldier was in his own judgment *clemency*—slew in battle 1,192,000 of them! The reader is perhaps familiar with

the story of the slaughter of 300,000 Cimbri, by Caius Marius near Aix in Provence; a victory says Vellens, which in some degree mitigated the grief of the republic, that he had ever been born. So too those extraordinary plains or fields about Toulouse in Languedoc—which occupy a space of one hundred by seventy French leagues—were dyed red with blood in all their vast extent—during that fearful day when Aetius the Roman Lieutenant in Gaul, discomfited the countless host of Attila, and slew in a single conflict 180,000 Huns and other confederate barbarians.—With a gratitude worthy of our Emperor Valentinian rewarded his valiant captain with the block!—

Of the four Provinces into which the Romans divided France after its conquest—Languedoc and Provence, with Dauphene, and a part of Savoy, composed the first under the name of *Narbonensis*: a name bestowed upon it after the city of Narbonne in the present department of Aude,—which was once a principal seat of the Phocians, and became the first colony, after Carthage, planted by the Romans out of Italy.—By the way, it would be extremely curious and instructive, to trace accurately the system of colonization presented by the Romans—and to develop the effects of that system upon their own vast power—upon the colonists themselves, upon the various people amongst whom they were planted—and upon the interests of the world and of posterity in promoting directly the knowledge of the Roman language, laws, acts and civilization—and in affording indirectly the most important assistance to the spread of Christianity. Such a work seems indeed of singular importance at the present time—when this chief means of promoting the advancement of the human race in all past ages—had found people in several parts of the world, so deluded as to denounce it as barbarous and unjust, as well as needless. To show that the subject would not at least be barren—I may say then some little attention to it enables me to assert that the Romans had about 150 colonies in Italy,—57 in Africa, 29 in Spain, 26 in France, 4 in England, 20 in Syria—besides others in smaller numbers in other countries.—But to return to the provinces of which I now speak; on the decay of the Roman power they passed successively into the hands of the Goths, the Ostro-Goths, the Visi-Goths, the Burgundians, and the Franks. They were subsequently overrun by the Moors of Spain—and again reconquered by the French—and after the usual vicissitudes of the feudal times, and the dreadful butcheries of the wars against the Albigenses—were both united permanently to the crown of France: Languedoc by Philip III. in 1270; Province by Louis XI, in 1481.

Of all that part of Europe called by the Romans Trans-Alpine, this part of France was undoubtedly the earliest and the most completely civilized. Its intercourse with Rome itself was more easy, direct and constant than that of any other portion of the Roman territory out of Italy: and so great was its prosperity, wealth and power, that the best parts of Italy scarcely surpassed it; the family of the Emperor Antoninus Pius were of Nismes in Languedoc—and there are still in that city the mighty ruins of works projected by him, and those who occupied the Imperial throne both before

and after him—which still attest the truth of those ancient statements which represent it as another Rome. And throughout both provinces—and as far north as Lyons, more than two hundred miles from the sea, are fragments of wealth, luxury and greatness, which twenty centuries have not effaced. In the days of Pliny, their condition was such that he says "*Narbon Gaul*, by reason of the perfection of its agriculture, the refinement of society, and the immensity of its riches, cannot be placed after any other province: in short it seems more like Italy, than a province."—Arles in Provence, was called by Ausonius the Rome of France; and Constantius Flavius when elected Emperor by the British legions—in the declining times of the western Empire, selected it as the spot designed for the Imperial seat.—I mention these facts the more readily because it is by having a true idea of this region of Europe, at an early period of its history, that we shall be able to solve a variety of problems regarding its subsequent conditions—which are otherwise of extreme perplexity. I do so from a double sense of duty and shame: for such was the imperfect state of my own information regarding this most interesting and neglected region—that in all its wide extent, I was filled at every step with astonishment, to find myself surrounded by monuments of a former greatness and civilization of which we find so faint traces, in the common tracks of instruction.

It is not to be wondered at that such a region, enjoying during the ministry of the Apostles of the Lord so great distinction amongst the provinces of the Roman Empire—should have very early received the light of the Gospel. And we find in truth that some of the most ancient and renowned disciples—as well as many of the early martyrs—and not a few of the first as well as several amongst the most important subsequent councils, are to be referred to this region. Irenæus of Lyons, was removed from the Saviour himself, only by two glorious links, filled by Polycarp and the beloved John: and of all men perhaps Hilary of Poitiers had the greatest influence in preserving the western church from the Arian heresy, during the latter part of the fourth century, by which nearly the whole seemed ready to be carried away after the council of Rimini. Nearly every city even to the second and third degree of importance in those times, within the whole district—has been the seat of councils, many of whose decrees are in force to this day—altho' the councils themselves be not recognised as general. And on the other hand of the few which have been so considered, by any portion of the Christian world—two met at Lyons, and a third at Vienna—both cities seated upon the Rhone some distance northward of the point where it becomes the boundary between Languedoc and Provence. Indeed so firmly did the true knowledge of God take possession of the people—that we find the latest evidences of its existence here, where the Roman superstition had filled nearly all the world; and when returning light glowed upon the nations we find its earliest rays illuminating these balmy regions. In vain did successive councils denounce anathemas against their faith:—They had the witness within themselves that they were taught of God. In vain did successive hords of armed ruffians,

with the cross upon their breasts, and the fires of hell within them, desolate with fire and sword, these peaceful abodes, by the command of Popes—and under the guidance of Kings. They looked their hard destiny calmly in the face—and died for Christ rather than live like Rome. In vain did the whole order of Dominicans—constructed expressly for this service—devote their whole energies for successive ages, whose whole track is red with the fires of the Inquisition established at first for this single object—lastly the work of bringing back these Christians from the way of life. Their murderers were fatigued with detailed slaughter—before they wearied in providing victims. One last and terrific swoop, annihilated as was intended and hoped—the accursed men and doctrines both together—their country was bestowed by the Pope, on those who had made it a desert and the papal court took up its abode for seventy years, at Avignon—in the midst of ruins still smoking with blood!—Look at Avignon now;—contemplate the present state of Rome;—then turn towards the glorious light of Zion, and the brightness of her rising—and learn a lesson of wisdom and gratitude.—

The land of the Troubadours, or in other words of poetry, chivalry, and extended and refined civilization—this favoured region had a literature of its own, when the rest of Europe was covered with profound and universal darkness. Superior to all others in arts as well as in knowledge and religion—it seems to have smiled like the garden of the Lord in fruitfulness and beauty—during those ages of the stupor of the human race from the seventh to the thirteenth century, when the greater part of Christendom besides was sunk into the most pitiable ignorance and the most degrading superstition. And when the powers of darkness could no longer bear the rebuke of its presence in their midst—and the whole power of the church, and of all surrounding states came upon it with resistless fury and emptied the land as one would shake out an unclean garment; the ferocity that made it a waste, scattered the seeds of truth and knowledge throughout Europe. John Wickliff the great apostle of modern Christianity, was their disciple. John Huss, and Jerome of Prague—lit their tapers first, at the same quenchless light. And Luther and his sacred associates, no sooner blew the trumpet with a bold and certain sound—than from the Alps to the Pyrenees, and from the deep recesses of the intervening mountains, the humble and true hearted disciples of Peter Waldo answered with joy the thrilling sound. Ever more the victims of unsparring persecution, no sooner was their existence known than the same ferocious bigotry which hunted them to the dens of the mountains three hundred years before—pursued them there with an appetite famishing for blood. The two little villages of *Merindoll* and *Chabriers*, in the upper part of Provence, were rased and their inhabitants to the number of several thousand indiscriminately sacrificed, in the year 1545, by FRANCIS I. who prided himself upon being the most generous and accomplished Prince of his day: just as their ancestors all over both provinces had been in 1250, by LOUIS IX. the most religious king of his day—and who for that and similar services, was canonised by the Pope of Rome!

The physical aspect of this region is not less completely the same, in its grand features,—than its striking destiny has been one in all its great points. Indeed, it seemed to me obvious, as I passed back and forward in its length and breadth—that its great relations to Christianity,—which had surprised me before, because of my want of knowledge were made plain and easily accountable, as soon as I saw its face, and comprehended its history. In short, that its structure fitted it, if possible more perfectly to retain and shelter religion, than its condition had at first eminently prepared it to receive and cherish it. On the east the mighty Alps separate it from Italy;—On the west the rugged Pyrenees divide it from Spain. The Mediterranean washes its entire southern shore, and gave it on that side all the advantages of security and privacy—from the moment of the destruction of the Western Empire. While on the north at a distance of fifty to a hundred miles from this sea—the mountains of Ardache stretch from the Pyrenees to the Rhone—beyond which the white summits of Mont Blanc and Mont Ventouse, are visible over the tops of the numerous spurs of the Alps, which penetrate thro' Dauphene, to the same impetuous stream. Along the whole coast of the Mediterranean, her iron bound shore is indented, with immense ponds, and the mouths of rivers spreading out into vast lagunes. In addition, the general face of the whole of Languedoc and Provence thus secured on every side, is wild and abrupt—penetrated by numerous torrents—cut by ranges of mountains in all directions—and naturally difficult of free penetration. The rich vallies, the level plains—the beautiful hill sides, the numerous cities,—these were indeed swept with the besom of destruction. Nor perhaps was any place so remote or inaccessible, as to escape the vigilance of the Inquisition, or the tender mercies of Rome. But when the little glen was made a waste—one household perhaps were absent, and so escaped. When the small hamlet was burnt and the ploughshare of ruin passed over it,—one little innocent crept into the hollow of the rock, and the hand of God covered it till the fury was overpassed. When the marshes were beaten on the scent of blood—one lad was at sea in his little shallop,—and by the glare of his native village, as it sent up its long red flame—he read the fate of his race,—of which not another survived to hear his tale of anguish, and bind up his broken heart.—These be the deeds which kings and priests have wrought—in pure love for the souls of men. So works not he, who will not quench the smoking flax, nor break the bruised reed. These scattered remnants were the seed of his own children—they were the progenitors of the future generations of his people thro' countless ages—they were the salt of the world! “Away with them from the earth,—it is not meet that they should live”—was the sentence of the infallible church.—“Of whom the world was not worthy”—is the response which came forth from the bosom of eternity. The shepherd of Israel, took them into his arms—bore them gently in his bosom—hid them in the caves of the rocks—nourished them with food from heaven. Six hundred years have passed away: And now in the midst of the same cities, the same hated and persecuted race, rebuild their temples

and take up the song of praise. In the spot where their fathers' blood was mingled with their sacrifices—the children repose in peace under the shadow of the Almighty! More—much more.—Europe is alive with the fervency of the same faith, which Europe slew their fathers for cherishing. Continents of whose existence they were all alike ignorant—rejoice in that light which their fathers kept burning upon earth. Behold from the ends of the earth—men come to learn the story of their sufferings and their truths and as we catch the lessons which their history unfolds—we rejoice the more in the faithfulness of him that doeth wonders—and press closer to his side who is able to keep all we have committed to his hands! Oh! blessed are all they that put their trust in him!

At a period long anterior to that at which the Romans first visited this part of Europe, it was occupied by colonies of Phocians—who seated themselves in various places along the coast—especially at Narbonne and Marseilles,—and gradually spread themselves to a considerable extent over the surrounding regions. Many traces of the Greek language, and some even of Greek manners, are still observable—especially in Provence. It is singular however, how numerous are the small, and often unnoticed peculiarities—which cleave to the people of all countries—and confirm more eloquently than language itself, the events which have peculiarly influenced their condition. All along the coast of the Mediterranean, when two friends meet—especially if they be persons of humble condition—the one who approaches, or who is considered the returning person, salutes the other on both sides of the face—without regard to age, or sex. The custom is oriental: did they get it from the moon—or is it a fragment of the Asiatic manners, of those barbarous ancestors, who subverted the Roman greatness—Or did their Phocion progenitors bring it from Asia Minor?—In all this part of Europe, if you ask for eggs—no matter at what time, or in what form—they are universally served first and by themselves; whereas apples, are as universally served the last course,—no matter whether two or a dozen courses preceded them. Such was the Roman method: “from the eggs to the apples”—was descriptive of an entire feast. So too, the Roman habits of eating are simple, but an immense meal, after the business of the day was closed—contenting themselves with a very slight repast in the forepart of the day,—is still the common habit of all those countries into which they introduced their manners. This is peculiarly the case with the upper classes of society—amongst whom all examples that are against nature, and that favour vice and luxury soonest take root: as indeed such only would be in the way of receiving impressions as to personal manners from that extraordinary people. In our day however—little can be said in favour of the preceding abstemiousness through the day, of those who eat and drink the Romans themselves to shame at night. The richest food in the greatest varieties, and at the most exorbitant cost;—the highest flavoured wines, in incredible quantities,—and the feast prolonged for hours together, as a nightly affair—this is not the whole description of the matter, as regards all who are able to afford it, throughout the higher classes of European society. For to this is to be added, a

preceding and daily course of eating and drinking—which an American observer, would consider appropriately closed, by the light repast which with us concludes the day: rather than by a course of gormandising, which nothing but preceding famishment, could adequately explain. It is incredible how often, and at what cost, the privileged classes of Europe, eat and drink inordinately!—

From Nice to Marseilles—the route turns the southern extremity of the maritime Alps. Sometimes you are on the margin of the sea—then in the midst of low but barren and wild looking mountains—and again in the narrow dells which penetrate them—or threading the sheltered and beautiful vallies which are hid in their bosom. The prevailing aspect of the country is one of extreme antiquity—and of original want of fertility. Many of the hills are completely denuded not only of timber but of soil; and their black, lifeless, and melancholy forms, constitute one of the most peculiar objects in the landscape, throughout the South of France. Again there are to be found, another description of hills or low mountains, composed of strata of a different kind,—and, presenting figures far less abrupt—which are covered with the red pebbly soil peculiar to the region and sustain a thin growth of evergreens, of several species, the most valuable of which is the cork-tree, which I have spoken of in another place.—I have seen the sentiment many times repeated, that the fact of the class of evergreens being found chiefly in high Northern latitudes—where the severe cold strips all other vegetable productions of their foliage so great a portion of the year,—was a singular proof of the minute goodness of Providence. It is well to be observant of the smallest, as well as the greatest tokens of God's beneficence; or rather to be attentive at all times to the tokens of that almighty goodness,—in whose sight there is nothing small,—nothing great. But it is not good, to found our sensibility on fallacious observations; of which this is remarkably one. The evergreens, pervade all the regions and climates of the earth,—and seem to abound in them all, in total disregard of every principle which men have derived from a single class, or a single region, and applied without thought or enquiry to the rest. Indeed it is not at all uncommon to find the same gems, presenting in one latitude a species that is green all the year—and in another a species which annually casts its foliage. The live oak of Florida, the cork-tree of Spain and Provence, and the chene vert of Languedoc—all evergreen are but other species of the oak, which in a hundred species more casts its leaves in all the temperate latitudes of the earth. And so of many other species.—

The first day of our journey we arrived in the middle of the afternoon, at the little village of Cannes, which is built along the sea-shore—at the foot of a steep and lofty crag—surmounted with an ancient ruin—which was first a Roman post, then a monastery, then a feudal castle—now appropriated in part to the purposes of a prison, and in part to the ceremonies of the papal church. It was a great day—designated in the calendar as the “feast of all saints.”—All seemed to keep the day—but each after his own fashion. Along the beach, a row of fishing boats was drawn up on the sand—and they who owned and manned them, sat in squads

about them,—pictures of listless abstraction. Along the public walks the half grown boys in whom the power of life seemed so vigorous as to mock all temperate modes of expressing it, keep the fete in boisterous mirth, and aimless rudeness. On the green near our hotel—the young men of the village and surrounding region—amused themselves with various athletic games. Where are the women? Where the children of the village?—They were still at high mass—in the church on the cliff before me: had commenced at noon—and were still engaged in hearing and seeing high mass, in commemoration of the day, and the holy dead. Thither I went; and when I had reached the summit, was rewarded for the toil of the ascent, by a wide and grand view of the Mediterranean, and the surrounding country. Not the least interesting object in this landscape was the little Island of *Sainte Marguerite*, on which the celebrated “Man in the Iron mask”—of whom the world knew so little, and desired so eagerly to know every thing—was so long confined.—In our country the agents of Rome wear masks. It is good to see—as it is virtuous and manly to show the naked visage. I stepped into the church to enter, I had to pass through scores of young children, from eight or ten years old, down to tottering infancy—who filled the little yard before the church—and crowded all its approachers within and without. Their only occupation seemed to be, to keep the little candles, of which each held one in his hand, constantly burning. Their want of skill, and the strong currents of air rendered this no easy affair; and the consequent confusion produced by the ceaseless relighting of extinguished tapers, from the candles of their fellows, or the consecrated ones borne in the hands of the grown up children within, may be easily imagined. Each of these tapers was paid for—and the price went into the pockets of the priests—who rendered full value in return by saying mass in honour of “all the saints.”—Very good; if the priests choose to drive a trade in candles, it is their affair: and if it amuses the babies of the parish to burn them, that is their affair. But the propriety of calling such proceeding a means of grace, and encouraging them in a place set apart for the worship of God—might be questioned after hearing the terrible imprecations of the little creatures upon each other when standing within reach of “the host”—for putting out each other’s candles—or refusing each other permission to light at theirs, those already extinguished.—As I entered the body of the house, I came full and suddenly upon the procession, that in circumambulating the church had come opposite the door. The house was crowded to excess—with a congregation composed almost exclusively of females. Tapers burnt in various parts of the room; and the entire employment of the congregation seemed to consist in listening to the chant of the procession, as it marched slowly about, and sung bad Latin in low monotonous and melancholy tones. On the first view I had of the scene, the congregation had their backs to the scanty procession; and it struck me that nothing could more forcibly illustrate the utter insufficiency of the papal system as a means of religious instruction than the spectacle before me. Here are a thousand people brought together to worship God—to learn their condition and their duties,

—to fortify their souls against evil—to prepare for the dread eternity before them! And what do they find? A meagre dumb show—a shabby procession—an ill-sung song, in a jargon which they who spoke it when they lived could not comprehend if they were alive and heard it! I never felt a sentiment of more profound compassion for my fellow beings; nor invoked more earnestly the pity and mercy of a long suffering God upon his erring children, than in the midst of that mournful spectacle.—

There are some practices in the Romish church that freeze my blood with horror. What is the mass—if their own faith be true? It is the renewal of the sacrifice of Calvary: it is the very same sacrifice,—unbloody—but the very same. The whole substance of the bread, is changed into the body of Christ,—and the whole substance of the wine is changed into the blood of Christ—so that the soul, body, blood and divinity of Christ is really present in every particle of each. Then, in the mass, the Saviour of the world, is offered up, a propitiatory sacrifice, for the living and the dead. If these things were really and sincerely believed, it is conceivable that some should be willing to offer up this sacrifice for themselves: it is conceivable I admit—but it seems the last stretch of desperate and hardened egotism. It is going a long and horrible step beyond this, to sacrifice Christ anew,—in the doubtful chance, of some good accruing to the dead—if perchance these dead be not already in heaven. But to lay hands deliberately, as we profess to believe, on the Lord Jesus—and crucify him unto ourselves afresh—in mere parade, is unspeakably horrible. All the dead saints are already in heaven: so teaches the church itself; it were fatal heresy to believe the contrary. Yet that church not only sacrifices the Lord of life, to the separate honor of each particular saint on his or her peculiar fete; but lest the terrific act should have failed year by year, towards some forgotten demon—yearly Jesus, Jehovah, is sacrificed anew to the glory of them all!

Frejus, called by the Massilians who built it *Ferials*, and by the Romans who conquered, adorned and fortified it with impregnable works, (the remains of which are still visible, after the waste of so many ages, the assaults of so many and such various instruments of destruction in the hands of such a multitude of nations—and the changes rendered necessary by the varying modes of defence peculiar to each,) *Forum Julium*,—still preserves some striking evidences of its former magnificence. It was once a city of a hundred thousand souls,—the post of one of those invincible legions which conquered the world—and the abode of many of that extraordinary aristocracy of the human race, which possessing every thing, and despising every thing—made the name of *Roman citizen*, the only title of supreme dignity throughout the earth. At present, it is a dark, narrow, and filthy village of three or four thousand souls—shut out from the sea on which it once stood, by one of those remarkable alluvions common on these shores,—sustained by a scanty trade in wine and oil—and despicable but for its ruins and its recollections. The fashion of this world passeth away; and all its interests from the least, to the very greatest, lie under the same fatal destiny. Empires, cities, systems,—all perish in the using,

and to man himself, the lord of all—the highest possible attainment here below, limits itself to a day of graceful toil in soothing the bitterness of life; and when the evening comes, to rock it gently to repose—and wait the morrow in eternity! Blessed lot—only because eternity will follow it: blessed alas! to how small a remnant!

In whatever countries the Romans established themselves—they left behind them traces of their greatness which nothing has yet been able wholly to obliterate. The transforming power of their civilization recoiled before the stern barbarism of their invaders, and was almost extinguished by the degrading superstition of the two great apostacies of the East and the West—But the physical evidences of their taste, science, power and riches still exist in every part of their immense possessions; and though most frequently in ruins,—and not seldom so disjointed as to leave their original use uncertain,—their very fragments are studies over which modern genius bends in eager contemplation, and before which modern greatness hides its diminished head. These precious relics belong generally to the last period of the Republic—and the first ages of the empire; and what shows clearly the superiority of those eras above all others in their history, is that as you recede from Rome the ruins mount to a higher antiquity; insomuch that out of Italy, it is uncommon to find constructions of later date than the age of Constantine the Great. That is, they are coincident with the era of the birth, the fiery trials, the glorious dissemination, and the general reception of Christianity throughout the world: and they recall human attention to that era, as the most illustrious “in the tide of time.” The Roman Empire, and the Greek literature had fulfilled their great mission—in providing the double facility—the vehicle, and the route, by which Christianity might encompass the earth; and thenceforth they declined to the common level.—All these remnants, besides their general reference to a period, though so remote, yet comparatively short—may be comprised under a very limited classification, public amusements—public worship—public comfort, and public defence—will embrace all whose uses, are known to us. Nothing private, nothing selfish, nothing personal in its strict sense. If you find a sepulchre it is the magnificent burial place, not of a single man, even tho’ that man were Augustus; but of an army of friends, dependents and freedmen. Or if it commemorates a single name,—its modest proportions respond to personal insignificance, in an age when man was nothing, and Rome the idol of all hearts: and its brief words admonish you, that child, parent, friend, compatriot had reared it—not in the usual exercise of human tenderness,—but to commemorate this or that signal service to the state,—this or the other act of striking virtue.—You find the ruins of theatres, amphitheatres, and circuses,—the remains of temples, aqueducts, baths, towers, encampments and military roads, and triumphal arches and columns; you find traces of them all in all the provinces,—and may read in their discoloured fragments the clearest proofs, that the very same institutions, policy, manners, and principles that were roman on the banks of the Euphrates, were known at the pillars of Hercules; and that the giant whose sha-

dow covered the earth, moulded every creature, with an unsparing energy after the image of himself. Is it wonderful that a single village, inspired with such a spirit, and directing it ceaselessly towards conquest for a thousand years—should at last conquer and subvert every thing human? Or is it not rather to be marvelled at, that the world should by any possibility emerge from such a domination, and shake off the influences of such a training? On the one hand and on the other—history does not afford us more striking indications of the profound and invariable cognizance which God takes, of all secondary causes—in effecting the great designs of his providence—than are furnished in the means, by which these two opposite and gigantic results were consummated.

There are at Frejus several of these immense ruins, especially those of an amphitheatre and an aqueduct,—not to mention those of minor importance—as a gate way, said to have been built by Julius Cæsar—a Pharos—and some traces of a temple. I shall have many occasions on which I might be obliged to repeat descriptions of these and various other monuments, to avoid which, I prefer speaking of them with double reference to locality and classification—throwing what it may be necessary to say of each class, under the head of that place where I saw the most perfect of its kind—or the first, or the most worthy of notice. For the present therefore I will speak only of the ruins of the aqueduct at Frejus, in connexion especially with the superb ruin of the same description over the river Gard in Languedoc.

As you approach Frejus from the other side, you pass through an extensive plain which descends gradually towards the village—and beyond it to the sea shore. The sea is on the left—a low ridge close on the right, beyond which successive spurs of the Maritime Alps rise interminably beyond each other,—and before you the little river Argenes on which Frejus stands passes from the right towards the left obliquely through the plain. In the midst of the plain, cutting your path diagonally, you see, first near the ridge, what appears to be a low thick wall. As you draw nearer, you find it assume the appearance of a gigantic collonade, jutting into the hill, and stretching obliquely towards the high road. In approaching rapidly you soon discover that, the pillars rise in height, as they get farther and farther from the ridge—so as to overcome the slope in the ground, and keep their tops in the same horizontal plain. The next moment, surprises your eager curiosity by revealing to you the new fact—that the collonade is not one continued line, as you supposed, but that it changes its direction at short distances, making very obtuse angles—and presenting an appearance faintly resembling what is called in America “a worm fence”—supposing every pannel to be several hundred feet long. Presently we reached the line of this immense ruin,—and halting where we intersected it in a large field of olives—I discovered on the tops of the columns, a small chamber resembling a covered mill race.—It is an aqueduct! These pillars are the remains of its enormous arches. And that mighty ruin at its end near the village, is the terrible arena, whose blood of man and beast, this ever flowing current was hardly sufficient to efface!—

Such was the order of development to my own mind, of the fate of these ruins which I saw. The facts I have stated indicate the character of them all: and how numerous they were may be inferred from the single fact—that one was an invariable appendage of every amphitheatre—not to say of every city of the least importance—and of all their extensive baths. The bath and the amphitheatre were indispensable necessities of life to every Roman.—

The remains of this aqueduct, extend over a larger space than those of any other I have seen. It originally extended many miles over hill and dale—sometimes elevated upon pillars eighty feet high; and at others penetrating the mountains, or borne along their faces in subterranean channels. The very first principle of their construction, would require them to preserve a surface, not much declined from a horizontal line, from their commencement to their termination, and in subordination to this necessity countless obstacles were met, and surmounted. Partly to prevent the accumulated velocity of the current in the aqueduct, if only a slight descent were allowed for a long distance on a right line—the numerous angles in the structure itself, of which I have spoken, were probably introduced. It is most probable however that the principal object was, to give greater strength to the aqueduct itself.—The masonry must have been very beautiful—being not only constructed of hewn stone—but of stone so cut as to present in each portion of the work, materials of the dimensions and figure best fitted to their respective uses. The lower part of the pillars which support the arches, are made of large blocks of stone; the upper parts faced only on all sides with small stones all cut of the same size—and covering an inner mass of solid stone and mortar. These pillars are all thicker at the bottom than above—being gradually, sloped on all four of their sides: and they all had the support of a great rib of stone work on the two broad sides, which occupied about half of the respective surfaces, and were worked into the body of the pillars. The arches were of every variety of space, according to their height; and those at the angles of the aqueduct were always extremely narrow in proportion to those of equal height where the work was straight. This particular aqueduct discharged its surplus water into the river on which Frejus is situated, and might with great ease have been dispensed with entirely by the use of the river itself; a part of whose current could have been readily conducted to the spot, and made to supply the apparent uses to which the waters of the aqueduct were applied. Yet I was assured the fountains which supplied it were many leagues distant. Indeed the Romans in this as in a thousand other things, exhibit themselves to us, in a most extraordinary light. It is nearly impossible to look at one of their aqueducts, even in the ruined state in which we beheld them, and admit that they who planned and executed such works—could have been ignorant of one of the simplest and most obvious principles of the great science of nature; and which the moment it was perceived, rendered all these vast constructions useless. On the other hand it is inconceivable how such minds, with all their acuteness, promptitude, and vigour, should so

incessantly occupy themselves with constructions which required them to study the laws of hydraulicks, and yet never perceive one of the first and most uniform of them all. Or are we rather to conclude, that this is to be classed with other of their unaccountable caprices—and to admit that what seems not to be otherwise more easily accounted for, was the dictate of a national caprice, of some lost policy, or of a peculiar taste? There are other things about these constructions not much more easy of solution. In this very case why did they go so many miles for water—where a pure river ran through the town? Why did they conduct the water of the fountains of Vaucluse to Arles, a distance about as far—and across several rivers—when Arles itself is seated on the river Rhone? Why finally did they carry any aqueduct to Nismes, when within the city is one of the amplest and sweetest fountains in Europe;—and above all why did they carry to it the very waters most distant, most difficult of transportation, and carried only after constructions whose ruins are to this day amongst the most stupendous and magnificent architectural monuments on earth?

I must attempt to describe one of these astonishing fragments. The river Gardon, or Gard running from the mountains of Ardache, falls into the Rhone on its right side near to Beaucairé so memorable in the wars of the Albigenses. The only perfect remains of an aqueduct, which was constructed to conduct the waters of the fountains of Airan and Ure to Nismes a distance of about thirty five English miles—is where it crossed this river. It is called the *Pont du Gard*, and is situated a short distance above the spot where the main road from Nismes to Avignon crosses the same river, on one of these beautiful wire bridges, so common in this part of France—a noble specimen of which I have particularly described when speaking of Fribourg in Switzerland. The massive and exaggerated grandeur of the *Pont du Gard* contrasts strikingly with the light grace and exquisite ingenuity of the wire bridge of Lafoux. It is France and Rome viewed side by side. Fifteen minutes, walk up the garden transports you from the dynasty of July—to the greatest of the Cæsars.

The spot itself is full of beauty. The basaltic hills which shut up the river for leagues above—finally expand on both sides, and the valley of the Gardon widens itself gradually into the open plains of the Rhone. The aqueduct is traced along the brow of the last range of these naked hills on the left bank of the river; and after passing it, plunges into the side of that on the opposite shore, and passes it by a subterraneous channel, now entirely obstructed. The *Pont du Gard*, occupies the entire space from cliff to cliff—and presents as you see it for the first time a spectacle absolutely gigantic. It consists of three rows of arches elevated above and upon each other, and which become gradually smaller and more numerous as they ascend. The bottom row contains six arches; the second, eleven; the highest one thirty five only at present, but formerly several more existed at its northern extremity. The length of the structure at its summit, is three or four times as great at the width of the river at the surface of the water: a result produced by the inclination of the

cliffs on both banks—and which imparts to the whole the appearance of the section of an inverted wedge. Another striking peculiarity of the work is, that its real centre is not the centre of its proportions; which at first sight, produces a vague and confused feeling of defect in the entire structure; but as soon as the eye discovers the real state of the case, and its cause, it immediately discerns the admirable symmetry which pervades the whole. The second (counting from the north bank) instead of the third or fourth of the six arches, of the bottom row was obliged to be much larger than either of the others, in consequence of the state of the ground and the course of the river. This becomes the architectural centre of the pile, and with reference to it—every part is in perfect harmony, and the impression of the whole inexpressibly imposing. The material of the work is a light colored stone, every piece of which is exactly cut—and the whole laid without mortar or cement of any kind, of blocks of enormous size. It is built in the Tuscan order of architecture; and is generally supposed to have been erected by Agrippa the son in law of Augustus—who in the year 19 before Christ, was sent into Gaul—and there acquired perhaps with no little reference to the aqueduct of which this is a part, the title of *Curator perpetuus aquarum*. The entire elevation of the Pont above the water is 174 French feet, of which about 60 feet are occupied by the first row of arches, and 58 by the second, and 24 by the third; the remaining 32 feet being taken up by the foundation for the second and third rows, and by the trough for the water on the top of all—to sustain which indeed all the rest was made. This trough is about two and a half feet wide, by four and a half deep, and passes upon the top of the uppermost row of arches. It is covered over with a row of large thin stones, six or eight feet long, laid loosely over its top;—and which afford to a man of steady nerves one of the most noble promenades on earth, in the midst of a scene grand beyond conception. I have mentioned its elevation; its length is 798 feet; that of the second row is 773, that of the lowest row 485 only; the river at the surface of the water, being pent into a deep sullen pool, is as I have said much narrower than the length of the first row of arches. The bottom and sides of the trough seemed to have been lined with a paste of red ochre; above which was an artificial cement of about three inches thickness at the bottom, and much thinner as it turned up the sides. Above both, a stalagmitic formation, much more considerable than both of them united, of carbonate of lime.

The whole structure is simple, destitute of all ornament, and stands in the midst of a perfect solitude, with an aspect at once august and severe. Question it, if you would learn the surpassing greatness of a people, who set up monuments of which this is only a small fragment saved by accident,—even along all the outskirts of an empire three thousand miles square! Question it again, if you would learn the utter fertility of all human greatness—when even such a people reeled to and fro like a drunken man, under the burden of glory which crushed them, and in its issues debased all their posterity;—when even such movements as this have not utterly perished,

only because the barbarous track of man did not lead directly across it—and devouring time found yet more precious relics to consume.

OBITUARY

Of the Rev. George Morrison.

Died at his residence Long Green, Baltimore County, (Md.) on Wednesday, April 19th, the REV. GEORGE MORRISON, aged 40 years, 3 months and 4 days.

The deceased was born near Whitely Creek, Delaware, Jan. 15th, 1797. He pursued his classical studies under the direction of the Rev. Mr. Russel of New-Ark, (Del.)—studied theology with Dr. Martin of Chanceford, York Co. Penn., and was licensed to preach by the Presbytery of New Castle in the year 1822. A short time after this, he was called to take charge of the Academy at Bel-Air, Harford Co. (Md) as Principal and Teacher. In this situation he continued until the fall of 1824; when in the discharge of his duties as a teacher and guardian of the youth committed to him, he offended a vicious youth that had been sent to his school from Baltimore. This youth determined on revenge, armed himself with a pistol, and one day as Mr. M. returning from the school room to his house had passed, he fired upon him, the ball entering the back above the hip joint, passing through the body, lodged on the opposite side within the skin. From this wound he was confined for a number of months, during part of which time, all hope of his recovery was given up, by himself and his physicians. To the surprise of all he recovered, and removed to Baltimore, where he commenced a classical school; here he continued for 5 years, and at the end of that period removed to Long Green, where for the last six years he was engaged in teaching, and at which place he died.

While at Bel Air, he was called to preach one half of his time to the Presbyterian church at Bethel, Harford co. Having accepted of their call he was ordained over them, and continued to preach to them until the beginning of his last illness. (In 1824, he was transferred from the Presbytery of New Castle to that of Baltimore, by order of synod.) The distance of this congregation, was 12 miles from Bel Air—24 from Baltimore and nine from his residence at Long Green. We may judge of his labors as a Minister and Teacher, when we remember that he had to travel to and from them, always between the intermission of his school on Saturday and its opening on Monday morning. He usually preached twice on the Sabbath. On the alternate Sabbaths and during the week, he preached extensively through Baltimore and Harford counties. These labours were blessed of his Lord and Master; during this time he collected a congregation, and succeeded in erecting a house of worship at Wisburgh, on the turn-pike road to York.—At his residence at Long Green for the last six years he preached almost every Sabbath and often once in the week; the congregation here increasing, he enlarged and fitted up his School Room, for their accommodation. The object which he had chiefly in view at the latter place, was to enable the children

boarding with him, regularly to hear the gospel preached. In all these attempts his labours were blessed, not only in the gathering of a people, but we have cause to believe in the bringing of sinners to the Saviour.

It was in the midst of these labours, and prospects of usefulness, that he was compelled to stop, and lay himself upon a bed of suffering protracted through 20 months. From the time of his recovery from the wound of the ball, until about 20 months back, he was enabled by the pressure of his finger to discover it. At that time it removed from its former position and from being perceived by the touch of the finger, and about the same time he began to suffer most violent pain in his bowels. Not conscious of the ball affecting them, and most of the Physicians whom he had consulted pronouncing with great confidence that it could not in any way injure him, he attributed it to another cause, and with several eminent physicians concluded that it was a case of violent dyspepsia. Five or six months he was troubled with it, and with all his precaution it continued to increase, until from the intense suffering and debility of his system he was compelled to take his bed. To it he was confined for *five* months, the greater part of which time, suffering most acute pain. In August last he began to improve, and for a few weeks bid fair to recover. He rode out several times short distances, and on September 18, 1836—which was the Communion Sabbath at Bethel, he rode up in his carriage, and the next week came to Baltimore, the distance of 16 miles. On his return home he was again seized with the pain, was compelled to take to his bed, where he lay for the last *seven* months suffering much as before mentioned. All this time the efforts to remove it, and relieve him, proved only temporary, the disease bidding defiance to the skill of the Physicians, and confounding their counsellors. He died under it on Wednesday April 19th 1837.

At his own request the Physicians proceeded to a *post mortem* examination, which resulted in a satisfactory solution of the cause of the disease and the violence of the pain. It appeared that the ball had remained for the period of 11 years in the fleshy part of the abdomen (at which he felt it), until the time at which he missed it, (20 months since) that then it had from some unknown cause escaped, and fallen among the lower bowels; in which situation it had become fixed by the formation of a thin membranous covering which fastened to one of the lower folds of the bowels. Its position, with its action on the other bowels from the motion of the body irritated and inflamed the adjoining bowels, and produced the violent pains which he so long and so severely suffered.

Thus closed the life of a man, whose disease, from its violence, and the length of its continuance, has excited the attention of multitudes, besides friends and Physicians. Had the ball been extracted at the time of its entering, it would have saved the suffering, but while ever it remained where it was,—pain, disease—and eventually death must have followed from it.

So far we have given the particulars in his life, his labours, his sufferings. We shall now say a few words of the manner in

which he bore them, and the temper exhibited under them.—No one could have sat by his bed-side, and heard his conversations for this last year, without seeing that the Lord had blessed it to him,—without perceiving that he was learning in the school of affliction. Those that have not been afflicted; neither know what it is to feel for others, nor what it is to bear patiently under their affliction.—Many are furious, in labour and zeal, who are a shame to Christianity when called upon to suffer. It was not so with this departed brother. While he would speak of his pain, its violence, its constancy,—he would close by saying, “How much less than we deserve!” “How trifling compared with the sufferings of Jesus!” On a Sabbath morning, about two months before he died, he requested a friend that was to preach for his people, to ask them to pray for him. Tell them said he, “I can say that I am a man that have seen affliction,” “I have labored for them, prayed for them” —“I have loved them.”—“I have not laboured for their money,” “though unworthy, I can say with the apostle, I have not coveted their silver nor gold, but *with these hands I have labored to preach the gospel unto them.*”—“Ask them to pray for me, and when they pray, tell them, to use the language of Jesus,” “Father if it be possible, let this cup pass from me, but if not, **THY WILL BE DONE.**”—At this moment one of his children coming into the room, and to his bed-side, he said, “For the sake of these children it is, that I cling with such tenacity to life,—with too much I know, I desire to train them by the grace of God for his service.”—“But that grace can work with or without means,”—“and that grace can do without me,”—“into his hands I would commend them.”—These are a few words recollected by the writer which may serve to shew the state of his mind, and the manner in which he bore up under his affliction, and in the prospect of death. Every one that witnessed him during the period of his affliction noticed the meekness and patience with which he endured, even to the end. In the last gasps of life, when recovering from one spasm and another, he would say, “*Oh life! Why didst thou return!*” and quietly fell asleep in death.

Thus ended the days of a servant of Jesus Christ; one who had been tried in the furnace, whose dross had been gradually consuming, his gold refining, and he preparing for a dwelling place with the “Blessed who die in the Lord.” His bereaved widow, and five fatherless children, mourn his loss,—*their loss*; for it was gain to him. The whole neighborhood in which he lived—mourn his loss. Beloved by all that knew him,—he was not a common loss. Not a man in Baltimore county will be as much missed, said *many*, at his funeral—and all that knew the respect entertained for him by the community around will assent to it. He was a public loss! A loss as a teacher—as a minister of the gospel—as a friend—a husband—a father. But that which is loss to us, is gain to him. He is released from his pain,—delivered from sin,—and at home with his Saviour

REVOCATION OF THE EDICT OF NANTZ.

The word *Revocation*, is only known in the papacy, in the sense of withholding, withdrawing, reversing, repealing, taking away, all the privileges which they may have been induced, by policy or compulsion, to give to those who dissent, from the supremacy of the Pope in temporal as well as spiritual matters. The end justifies the means—that which will accomplish the end is therefore right. On this principle, every reader of history is aware how the pope and his servants the priests, have acted. If not by fair means, foul means will become fair from the necessity of the case. This is a policy which is ground into the very existence of the Roman system, under the dominion of the Roman pontiff. To meet such principles, when carried out by cunning and skilfully trained Jesuits, is next to impossible. If they bind themselves, it will afterwards prove, when they desire a release from the obligation, that there was a mistake in the manner of doing it, that they had no authority to act, or the Pope disapproves it, which will without any thing more, render it entirely null and void. This abominable principle which originated with the *father of lies*, and is continued by those who are led captive by him at his will, is one from which every honest man flees, and can scarce bring himself to believe that there are men capable of such iniquity. The very idea of it in this country is considered horrible. When it is brought up before those who have maintained it, and acted upon it, they deny, and resort to *their own—old* principles, to get rid of it. It is only necessary to call the reader's attention to the discussions which have taken place in this country on the doctrines and practices of papists, to see where it lies with all its force. Equivocation, artifice, and denial, has marked their whole course. While they deny that they maintain the doctrine that it is no sin to break faith with those differing from them, you will find on examination that wherever one of their shocking doctrines are exposed, they act upon it.

We have said thus much preparatory to an exhibition of this principle, which will remain, while history can preserve the records of the past. France, through the indefatigable zeal, and pious labours of the reformers, had become during the sixteenth century, the residence of very many who embracing the doctrines of the Bible, had protested against the corruption and idolatry of the papacy. These men were among the most noble and worthy of that nation. They were in every respect deserving the attention of the powers that rule: instead however of being respected, or noticed except to be destroyed, they were misrepresented, scandalized, persecuted and put to death. This did not destroy their zeal, and faithful adherence to the revealed will of God as contained in his holy word. Their numbers increased and the fury and zeal of their popish neighbours was kindled with the desire and determination to extirpate them.

The history of France for many years is a history of the outrages of the papists under the pretence of religion to exterminate them from the earth. From this bondage to the papal system, they were seldom relieved even for a period, and never by the approbation of the heads of the empire until the *edict of Nantz*, given by *Henry the iv.* called the *Great*. This edict dated at Nantz April 30th 1598, and signed *Henry*, contains *ninety two*, articles. To this he added an additional edict, dated May 2nd 1598.

In this the reformed, have granted to them the exercise of the liberty of conscience,—privilege of preaching to their own people,—and deliverance from paying for the support of the popish churches, and by the 6th article they are not compelled to do any thing in matters of religion against their consciences,—by the xviii, they have their children preserved to them, and all papists are forbidden to take them away to baptize or confirm them in the Roman religion—they were permitted to inherit and dispose of their property, as the popish subjects, &c.

This edict, thus given as we doubt not in good faith by the king; cost him his life, at the hands of *Francis Ravalliac*, an assassin who had been prepared for the horrid deed by the Jesuits. It is probably the first treaty that was ever made, with good faith towards protestants. Before this, as after, they were made only to surprize and murder the whole of those that did protest. This treatment lead the protestants to prepare themselves for defence, by taking up arms, but it does not belong particularly to the point in hand, and may serve for another occasion. "This famous edict," (says the author of *Free Thoughts on the toleration of popery*.) "it will be said, is a clear proof that Romanists can both tolerate heretics, and keep faith with them. Indeed that they can sometimes do both when they cannot do otherwise, no body doubts: but never was there an edict which afforded a clearer proof of Catholic tolerance and perfidy. Never was an edict, law, or treaty, more deliberately made, more solemnly ratified, more *irrevocably* established, more repeatedly confirmed, nor one whereof policy, duty or gratitude, could have more insured the execution; yet never was one more scandalously and absolutely violated. It was the result of three years' negotiation between the commissioners of the king and the deputies of the Protestants, was the termination of forty years war, and troubles, was merited by the highest services, sealed by the highest authority, registered in all the parliaments, and courts of *Henry the Great*, was declared in the preamble, to be perpetual and irrevocable; confirmed by the queen-mother in 1610, by Lewis XIII, in 1614, twice in 1615, again in 1616;—by the edict of Nismes in 1629; and by repeated promises and edicts in the reign of Lewis XIV, as in 1643, 1652, *etc.* Yet all the while the design of overturning it, when it might conveniently be done, was kept in view, and gradually advancing. When the edict was first projected, some zealots were ready, to set on foot a new league, and begin a new war to prevent its taking effect. Henry, indeed, seems to have had so much of the remaining taint of heretical pravity as really to desire, intend, and, in some measure, enforce its observation. But for this he was hated, libelled, incessantly persecuted and at last murdered by the Jesuits: and, even in his time, it was, in many instances, infringed, of which complaints were made in two national synods of the Protestants. But after his death there was nothing but breach upon breach, and a series of encroachments on the rights and liberties of that people. During both the subsequent reigns, especially the latter, a thousand devices were fallen upon to defeat the intent of that salutary law, and render it useless;—a thousand acts of oppression and robbery in opposition to it, were connived at, or authorized: their privileges were taken piece by piece, until all were snatched away at once by the edict of Revocation in 1685. All which may be found at length in the *histoir de l'edit du Nantz*: in the introduction to *Quick's Synodicon*; in the *account of the persecutions and oppressions of Protestants in France*, published in 1686, and many others. In the whole of these scandalous proceedings, the clergy took still a leading part, and were restless till the work was accomplished. The severe mandates, which were ever issuing from the court, were procured or fabricated by them. The Richelieu, the Mazarins, the Talliers thought it a work worthy to engage their political heads; and the Bossuets, the Pelisons, &c. travailed heartily in it. The old Chancellor Tellier, the Jesuit, in signing the edict, which annulled the faith of treaties, and put an end to all security among men, cried out, full of joy, *Nunc dimittis servum tuum, Domine quia viderunt oculi mei salutare tuum.* "He knew not," says Voltaire, "that he signed one of the great misfortunes of France." It proved indeed the last act of his life, for immediately he sickened and died."

This edict which from its length we cannot transfer to our pages, will be found in the 5th vol. Laval's, Hist: of Ref: in France, from page 196 to 274.

The privileges granted are annulled in the revocation; and as it will be

a matter of interest to those who feel on this subject, and convenient for reference, we print it entire, from page 1183 of the 6th vol. of the same work.

EDICT OF FONTAINEBLEAU,

Of the 22d of October 1685. N. S. repealing that o Nantz, &c.

LEWIS, by the grace of God, King of France and Navarre, To all present and to come, GREETING. Whereas King Henry the Great, our grandfather, having procured peace for his subjects, after those great losses they had sustained during the civil and foreign wars, desiring to remove whatever might disturb it, especially on account of the pretended reformed religion, as it had fallen out in the reigns of the kings his predecessors, had therefore by his edict given at *Nantz*, in the month of *April*, 1598, enacted certain rules to be observed with reference to those of the said religion, the places wherein they might exercise it, and had established extraordinary judges for the administering justice unto them; and finally, had provided also by special articles whatsoever he thought needful to maintain tranquillity in his kingdom, and to diminish that aversion which had arisen between his subjects, of the one and the other religion, that so he might be the better enabled to carry on his design of re-uniting them unto the church, who had been too easily estranged from it: And forasmuch as this intention of the aforesaid king, our grandfather, could not by reason of his sudden death be accomplished, and the execution of the said edict was also interrupted, during the minority of the late king our most honored lord and father of glorious memory, by the new enterprises of those of the pretended reformed religion, which gave occasion to deprive them of divers privileges granted them by the said edict: Nevertheless, the said king, our late lord and father, using his wonted clemency, did vouchsafe them a new edict at *Nismes*, in *July* 1629, by means whereof, peace being again restored, the said late king, animated with the same spirit and zeal for religion, as the king our grandfather, had resolved to improve to the utmost this peace, by endeavoring to bring his godly design to an issue; but the foreign wars falling out in a few years after, so that from the year 1635 to 1684, the kingdom has had but little rest: It was hardly possible to do any thing for the advancement of religion, unless it were the diminishing the number of churches belonging to the pretended reformed, by interdicting such as had been built contrary to the said edict, and by suppressing the mixt chambers, which had been only provisionally erected.

God having at last granted to our people the enjoyment of a perfect peace, and we also, being no longer incumbered with the cares of protecting them against our enemies, have been able to improve the present truce, which we effected for this very end, that we might wholly apply ourselves to seek out such means, whereby we might successfully accomplish the design of the said kings our father and grandfather, upon which also we entered as soon as we came unto the crown. We now see, and, according to our duty, thank God for it, that our cares have at last obtained that end which we aimed at, inasmuch as the far greater and better part of our subjects of the said pretended reformed religion have embraced the Catholic. And inasmuch as hereby the execution of the edict of *Nantz*, and of whatsoever has been ordered in favour of the said pretended reformed religion, is become useless, we have judged, that we could do nothing better towards the total rooting out of the mind the remembrance of those troubles, confusions and mischiefs which the progress of that false religion had caused in our kingdom, and which occasioned that edict, and several other edicts and declarations which had preceded it, or had been in consequence thereof enacted than totally to revoke

the said edict of *Nantz*, and the particular articles, which in pursuance of it had been conceded, and whatsoever else had been done in favour of that said religion.

I. We therefore make known, that for these causes, and others thereunto moving us, and of our certain knowledge, full power, and royal authority, *we have by this present perpetual and irrevocable edict, suppressed and revoked, and we do suppress and revoke the edict of the king our grand-father given at Nantz, in the month of April 1598, in its whole extent, together with those particular articles granted the 2d of May following, and the letters patent expedited thereupon, and the edict given at Nismes in July 1629; we declare them void, and as if they had never been, together with all grants made, as well by them as by other edicts, declarations and decrees, to those of the said pretended reformed religion, of what kind soever they may be, which shall in like manner be reputed as if they had never been: And in consequence hereof, we will, and it is our pleasure, that all the churches of those of the said religion, situated within our kingdom, countries, lands, and lordships of our dominions, should be out of hand demolished.*

II. We forbid our said subjects of the said pretended reformed religion, any more to meet together in any place or private house, for performing any part of their said religion, under any pretence soever; yea, and all real exercises, or such as were in Lord's houses, though the said exercises had been maintained by the decrees of our council.

III. In like manner, we forbid all Lords, of what rank and quality soever, the exercise of their religion in their own houses and manors, whatsoever be the quality of their said manors, and that upon pain of forfeiture of bodies and goods for those of our said subjects, who shall offend in that way.

IV. *We command all ministers of the pretended reformed religion, who will not turn from it, and embrace the Catholic apostolic Roman religion, to depart the Kingdom and the lands of our dominions, within a fortnight after the publication of this our present edict, and not to tarry beyond that time, nor during that said fortnight to preach, exhort, or perform any other function of their ministry, upon pain of the galleys.*

V. Our will is, that such of the said ministers, who will turn Catholic, shall, during their whole life, enjoy, and their widows also after them, as long as they continue unmarried, the same exemption from taxes, and quartering of soldiers, which they enjoyed during the time of their ministry; and farther, we will pay unto the said ministers, as long as they live, a pension, which shall exceed by one third the stipend they received for their ministry; and their wives also, as long as they continue widows, shall enjoy one half of the said pension.

VI. If any of the said ministers desire to become advocates, or will proceed doctors in laws, it is our will, that they shall be dispensed, as to the three years study, prescribed by our declarations, and having undergone the usual examination, and thereby being judged capable, they shall be admitted doctors, paying one half only of those fees, customarily paid on this account in the universities.

VII. *We forbid all private schools for the instruction of children of those of the said pretended reformed religion, and generally all other things whatsoever, that may bear the sign of privilege or favour to the said religion.*

VIII. *And as to children that shall be born of those of the said pretended reformed religion, our will is, that, for the time to come, they be baptized by the curates of the parishes, enjoining their parents to send them for that purpose to their parochial church, on the penalty of 500 Livers fine, or a greater sum; and those children shall henceforth be brought up in the Catholic apostolic Roman religion. And we most strictly enjoin all judges, in their respective districts, to see that this be executed.*

IX. And that we may show our clemency towards those of our subjects

of the said pretended reformed religion, who were gone out of our dominions before the publication of our present edict, we do declare, that in case they return within the space of four months, from the day of its publication they may, and it shall be lawful for them to enter into the possession of their estates, and to enjoy them even as they might have done, if they had been always at home; whereas; such as within that term of four months shall not return into our dominions, their estates forsaken by them, shall be and remain forfeited, according to our declarations of the 20th of *August* last.

X. And we do more strictly renew our prohibitions unto all our subjects of the said pretended reformed religion, that neither they, nor their wives, nor children, do depart our said kingdom and dominions, nor transport their goods and effects, on pain, for men so offending, of their being sent to the *galleys*; and confiscation of bodies and goods for the women.

XI. We will and declare unto them, that all declarations published against *relapses*, shall be executed according to their form and tenour.

XII. And furthermore, those of the said pretended reformed religion, till such time as it shall please God to illuminate them, as others have been, may abide in the towns, and places of our kingdom, countries, and lands, of our dominion, and continue their traffick, and enjoy their goods, without being molested or hindered on account of the said pretended reformed religion, *provided as before, that they do not exercise it, nor assemble together on pretence of prayers or of any act of devotion, according to the rules of the said religion*, on the penalties before mentioned, of confiscation of bodies and goods. We command all our truly and well-beloved councillors in our court of parliament, and chamber of accounts, and court of aids at Paris, bailiffs, seneschals, provosts, and other our justices and officers to whom it shall belong, and to their deputies, that they cause this present edict to be read, published and registered in their courts, and jurisdictions, yea, in the vacation time; and to entertain it, and cause it to be entertained, kept and observed in every particular, without swerving, or in any wise permitting the least swerving from it. For such is our WILL and PLEASURE. And that this may be for ever firm and stable, we have caused these presents to be sealed with our seal. Given at *Fontainebleau*, in the month of October, in the year of grace 1685, and of our reign the 43d. Signed”

LEWIS.

To this revocation of the King, we add the following letter (from the Appendix to Free Thoughts &c. page 420) of Innocent XI. congratulating the King, on his putting in force this abominable edict.—

Innocent XI. to our dearest son in Christ Lewis XIV. the most Christian King in France.

Our dearest Son in Christ.

SINCE, above all the rest of those illustrious proofs which so abundantly declare the natural inbred piety of your Majesty, that noble zeal, and worthy the most Christian king, is most conspicuous; with which, being ardently inflamed, you have wholly abrogated all those constitutions that were favourable to the heretics of your kingdom, and, by most wise decrees set forth, have excellently provided for the propagation of the orthodox belief, as our beloved son, and your ambassador with us, the noble Duke d'Estrees, hath declared to us;—*we thought it was incumbent upon us most largely to commend that excellent piety of yours*, by the remarkable and lasting testimony of these our letters, and to congratulate your Majesty on that accession of immortal commendation which you have added to all your other exploits by so illustrious an act of this kind. *The Catholic church shall most assuredly record in her sacred annals a work of such devotion towards her, and celebrate your name with never-dying praises*: but, above all, you may most deservedly promise to yourself an

ample retribution from the divine goodness for this most excellent undertaking, and may rest assured, that we shall never cease to pour forth our most earnest prayers to that divine goodness for this intent and purpose. The rest you shall understand from our venerable brother Angelo, archbishop of Genua. In the mean time we greet you most kindly with our apostolical benediction.

Given at Rome the 19th of November, in the 10th year of our pontificate.

AGNUS DEIS.

How made—For what use.

All that is needed in the controversy with the Papists, is to get at what they do really teach, and let the public know it. This we have laboured to do, even to the wearying of our readers with dry, and heavy matter, adding all the dulness, and stupidity and nonsense contained in some of their standard works. From a little Popish work called, *Man's only affair*, published at the office of the Jesuit, Boston 1831, and intended for general circulation. We extract a chapter on *Agnus Dei*, which explains the origin of and the importance attached to those little trinkets, that are fastened to a string which is thrown around the neck, for convenient carriage. Many wear these things, who would be much ashamed for it to be known that they were ministering to this foolish superstition. The object of them will be seen on reading the following.

OF AGNUS DEIS.

"An *Agnus Dei* is a little cake made of virgin wax, and blessed by the Pope on the first low sunday after his inauguration, and afterwards every seventh year on the same day.—The ceremonies used by the Sovereign Pontiff on this occasion, are of great antiquity in the Church. Mention is made of them in the *Roman Order*, which, in the judgment of the learned, is anterior to the eighth century. The ceremonial of the church of Rome prescribes the matter, the form and prayers of this consecration; and even explains their mystical significations.

These *Agnus Dei* are made of the whitest and purest virgin wax, a symbol of the human nature which the Son of God was pleased to assume by the operation of the Holy Ghost in the chaste womb of the most holy Virgin. On the wax is impressed the image of the spotless Lamb of God, immolated for us on the altar of the Cross. Holy water is used, because with that element God both in the Old and New Testament has wrought very great prodigies, and it is the matter of the Sacrament of our regeneration. Balsam is also used, to signify that Christians in all their words and actions ought to be the good odor of Jesus Christ. Lastly, use is made of the holy chrism, with which the church consecrates all the things which are especially destined to the divine worship, as Churches, Altars, Priests, &c. Chrism is also an emblem of charity, the most sublime of virtues.

The Sovereign Pontiff dips these wax-cakes in the water which he has previously blessed, and into which he has poured and mixed the balsam and holy chrism. Before and after the immersions, he addresses to God his prayers, beseeching him to *bless, sanctify and consecrate this wax, and to pour upon it such virtue as to enable those who will use it piously, and preserve it with devotion and faith, to obtain the following graces.*

1. That seeing and touching with faith the image of the Lamb impressed on the wax, they may be excited by these exterior symbols to a remembrance of the mysteries of our redemption; to sentiments of adoration, gratitude and love, for the infinite goodness of God towards man; and

a firm hope and confidence that through the divine mercy their sins shall be forgiven, and their souls cleansed from all the defilements of sin.

2. That at the sight of the sign of the cross impressed on this blessed wax, the evil spirits seized with fright, may fly away from the servants of God; and that by virtue of the same, they may be protected against storms, winds, hail, whirlwinds and lightning.

3. That by an affect of this divine benediction, we may be enabled to discover the artifices of Satan, to resist his suggestions and to avoid his snares.

4. The same blessing may procure to pregnant women a happy deliverance and the preservation of their fruit.

5. That those who will make a pious use of those Agnus Deis, may be protected from adversity, pestilence, the corruption of the air, the falling sickness, shipwreck, fire, inundations, and all malignant influence.

6. That in prosperity as well as in adversity, we may be defended by the divine power against all the snares of men and devils, that we may be preserved from a sudden and unprovided death, and from all dangers, through the mysteries of the life and passion of our Lord Jesus Christ.

A great number of miracles have placed it beyond all doubt, that the Author of all good gifts pours his graces and favours on faithful souls, by the means of these wax images of the divine Lamb; as an effect of the blessing of the sovereign Pontiff, Vicar of Jesus Christ on earth, and of the prayers which he offers to God in the name of the whole church. If therefore, those who carry about them an Agnus Dei, do not always obtain the effects of these prayers, they must ascribe it only to their want of faith, or their ill directed devotion. God may also have in his adorable heart secret reasons not to hear our prayers. It is often for his glory and our salvation, that he refuses to grant our requests."

Translated from the original of the Apostolical Chamber printing office.

A TEXT FOR EXPLANATION.

"Let no man seduce you, wilking in humility and religion of angels, walking in the things which he hath not seen, in vain puffed up by the sense of his flesh."
Colossians iv. 18.

Such is the text precisely, as it is printed in the editions of the New Testament; which are for sale, and in circulation among such of the Catholics, as are permitted to have a copy in their possession. Will any man, woman, or child,—or Priest— or Pope, tell us what those words mean?

WILL IT BE DENIED NOW

That Rome endeavours to destroy freedom of inquiry?

Who can believe that there is a committee at Rome even to this hour, consisting of seven cardinals, a secretary of the Dominicans—the famous inquisitors, with twelve consultors, whose duty it is even to examine, the public addresses which are delivered in the hearing of the Pope! What!—will heresy creep in even in the hearing of the Pope? Or do they think the old man may be drunk and not perceive it, while those hearing may be led astray? If not, it savours of it. The Pope has a theologian of that humane order of the papacy, the Dominicans, the inquisitors—the murderers, and not an address can be delivered in Rome without his inspection

and permission.—This is the head of the Papal church indeed! But we must let them speak.

Page 57 Catholic Almanac and Laity's Directory, 1837, chap. iv. sec. 4.

CONGREGATION OF THE INDEX.

"This congregation established by Sixtus V. consists of several Cardinals appointed by his Holiness, a Secretary of the Dominican Order, and twelve theologians called *consultors*, who are charged with the examination of books, and report on this subject to the congregation. One of them is always master of the Sacred Palace, a dominican, who is the Pope's theologian, and *has the inspection of discourses for the Papal Chapel, also the power of licensing publications, none of which can appear in Rome without his permission.* The Index which generally meets once a month in presence of the Pope or the eldest Cardinal, *has the power of examining all publications that treat of matters relating to faith, morality, ecclesiastical discipline or civil society, also of pronouncing upon their merits, of suppressing and correcting those which are found objectionable, or restricting their use to a certain class of persons.*"

It is then, even so. The point on which Mr. Hughes did equivocate, if he did not deny it, is settled by higher authority, and published at the Cathedral of Baltimore. Who will now deny, that the very life of the papacy, is the prohibition of knowledge, the prosecution of her inquisitorial labours, and her determination, to bring every thing under her control? If the people of these United States suffer from Popery, they will have to blame themselves. Popish priests have publicly taught among us their system, which is directly at enmity with the life and spirit of ours. They have not failed to declare unto us in the face of all their professions, all their denials, all their dishonest equivocations; that in the nineteenth century, amid its light, and the increase of knowledge, religious and political; that the church of Rome professing and claiming to be the Mother and Mistress of all churches, does by law prohibit any man from speaking what he thinks, unless he shall think precisely as the church thought, in the days of her glorious tyranny, over the souls and bodies of men. But with all this, with this very declaration prepared by high authority in this country—Priests pretend to teach that Popery is not the enemy of civil and religious liberty. What then, we ask is its enemy?

How would freedom of enquiry sound, in the ears of the Pope, or of the committee of this congregation?—with a dominican inquisitor as secretary?

THE
BALTIMORE LITERARY
AND
RELIGIOUS MAGAZINE.

VOL. III.

JUNE, 1837.

No. 5.

MEMORANDA OF FOREIGN TRAVEL,

BY RO. J. BRECKINRIDGE.

Marseilles.—Disappointment of getting to Rome.—Description of Marseilles.—Gathering of nations in its harbour.—Varieties in the human race.—Amalgamation.—Importance of Marseilles and Trieste, as missionary stations.—Arabs at Marseilles.—Necessity of Christian missions to countries nominally Christian.—Brief demonstration of this necessity touching the church of Rome.—Chapels to the Virgin.—Unsuitableness of climate to invalids.—Arles, its situation, surrounding country.—Mouths of the Rhone.—Alluvions at Frejus, and the mouths of the Po and Nile.—The moral and physical desolations of the past.—Depopulation of all ancient states, and deterioration of the long peopled parts of the earth.—Shores of the Mediterranean as illustrative of this truth.—Carthage.—Egypt.—Palistine.—Troy.—Tire.—The Turkish empire.—Venice, Rome.—Desolation of the country around Arles.

DURING the period of the utmost glory of ancient Rome, *Taurentum* reposed in all its pomp and magnificence,—near to the little hamlet where an exiled colony of Phocians, had pitched their habitation, about the time of the expulsion of the last Tarquin from Rome. I have stood upon both their sites.—Some dim vestages of *Taurentum*, may be imagined, rather than traced, in the fragments of broken marble, that lie buried under the sands of the Mediterranean; but, in the rich and beautiful town of Marseilles—the Phocian hamlet has expanded itself into the second city of France. I was very reluctantly obliged to stay several weeks in it—when I earnestly desired to be elsewhere; and therefore was little capable, perhaps of doing it entire justice. The object of my visit to this part of Europe—the object I had been constantly pursuing for eight hundred miles, since I had left Constance, was to reach central, and southern Italy.—I have mentioned at each era how our route was obstructed by vexatious and lengthened quarantines: and when every thing seemed ready to favor us,—we found our object more distant than ever. Before we reached Marseilles the cholera which

had been for ten months at Venice,—and had then recently decimated Ancona—suddenly crossed the Apenines and fell with terrific violence upon Naples. This of course shut up the possibility of getting to Rome by Naples. As to the direct route from Marseilles to Civetta Vecchia (the port of Rome) or to one of the ports of Tuscany, there seemed no difficulty—as steamboats went every week. But on applying to the representatives of the Pope and the grand Duke, they refused to sign my passport until the required length of the quarantine, then eighteen days, should have elapsed—after the date of the last Sardinian signature to it. It was in vain to urge what the whole world knew, that no cholera had existed for a whole year in any part of Sardinia but Genoa, and that my passport afforded on its face indisputable proof that I had not been within a hundred miles of that city. It was replied with an unanswerable shrug; the kingdom of Sardinia—all of it, was under the ban for eighteen days—and it behooved, to await their accomplishment. My first hope was, by a fresh passport, obtained from the American consul at Marseilles to evade their absurd regulations; but I found, it would be necessary to add a false oath to the passport to make it efficacious—namely that I had not been in any place *considered by them infected*—within the prohibited time before attempting to land at Leghorn or Civetta Vecchia. If I had been content to swear *for substance* only—I might easily have done so, and with truth; for I had not been in any place really infected. The only alternative was to abide the efflux of the portion of eighteen days yet to run—since my passport had been signed at the Pont de Var. Never did two weeks pass more slowly;—never was their close expected more anxiously. For I was sure in the actual state of things at Naples, that the authorities at Rome would forbid all intercourse between the two cities; and yet, as the French authorities at Marseilles required vessels from Naples to perform a quarantine of five days only—steamboats could be at Leghorn or Civetta Vecchia from Naples, by way of Marseilles in eight or nine days. I watched the boats as they left Marseilles;—I watched them as they returned; no *commissionaire*, as the refined French call a street porter, watched more eagerly the departing or returning travellers—than myself. The very day before my quarantine expired, the very boat by which I was sure of embarking in two days more for Rome—came slowly round into the harbor, amongst the crowds of vessels of every nation that obstructed her way—and landed again the same passengers, she had taken off two days before for Italy. I was sure something was wrong—my heart misgave me; and I found in a moment, that all was over, as to any hope of getting by water to Rome. The Papal and Tuscan authorities—had not only absolutely refused to permit the passengers to land, but had prohibited all intercourse between Marseilles and either of those states, so long as matters stood with respect to Naples on their present footing. There remained no alternative but to return by land, with all the evils before us, which deterred us before—and this in addition, that if we should chance to get beyond the cholera, or it should break out behind us, our return would be as difficult as our advance; or to consider the providential circumstances so decidedly indicative

of the course of duty, or to give up, a purpose so long cherished, so ardently pursued, and so clearly founded in apparent good, as this had been. They have not been subjected to the usual vicissitudes of life, who have reached my time of it—without having been often called on to make such sacrifices, to duty, to conscience, to affection, or to stern necessity. They who have made them—have been negligent observers of the course of providence, if they have not traced in many of them the germs of the most precious enjoyments of subsequent life; and delighted to recall them, as evidences, not only of the ceaseless care, but of the faithful tenderness of our Heavenly Father. How easy would it be for him to whom pertaineth “all the fulness of God”—to open his hand, and out of his unwasting fulness, satisfy every desire of every living thing? How infinite is that condescension which prompted by a beneficence infinite as itself,—watches over our daily errors, weakness, ignorance, and perversity—and would grant to us in the midst of ingratitude what it is good for us to have—and deny even to our tears, that which would do us harm! Perhaps the first mercy incident to our condition as sinners, is that the things which minister to the passions, are absolutely incapable of satisfying the soul,—which else were undone; and the next, that we should learn this truth, before the spirit is wearied, and the strength of our being wrecked, in pursuits whose best possible result is, that they have yielded nothing!

Marseilles is however a large, and striking looking city built of cut sand stone of a yellowish tinge—and containing about 120,000 souls. It is situated on the margin of the sea—being cut insunder for half its depth by its long narrow harbor—and surrounded by lofty hills, in the midst of which it is seated, as it were on the edge of a wide bason. Here, as in all large European cities the difference between the old and new town is extremely marked; the former is narrow, crowded, filthy and dark;—the latter airy, regular, finely decorated—and provided with those noble squares, promenades, and gardens, which form so delightful an appendage to all continental cities—and which are so sadly deficient in America. From any of the eminences about the city, especially from the gate of Aix, from the observatory and the adjacent fort and church of *Notre Dame de la Garde*, as also from the public walk and garden, at the end of the grand promenade of the *Cours Napoleon*—magnificent views are enjoyed, of the city, the sea, and the whole surrounding region. The promenade which is afforded by the wide street between the harbor and the houses, is one of the most singular and picturesque spots in Europe. It extends along the northern end, and western side of the harbor—and is, I presume, little short of a mile in length. The sun shines upon the whole of it from the moment of its rising, until it is ready to sink below the horizon; and whatever might be the effects of such an exposure in the warm months—they were all delightful, towards the end of autumn, when I was in the habit of taking a daily saunter along it. It is hazarding less than is ordinarily done by such expressions, to say that persons from most of the nations of the globe are to be seen at once—and perhaps, always, along this crowded mart. At your side lay the vessels of every nation enjoying

any commerce; and around you are those who navigate or who own them—who deal in their cargoes—or use them as the instruments of a ceaseless activity. Men of every shade of complexion from the blackest up through all the amazing varieties to the very whitest; the white German—the ruddy Englishman,—the dark Frenchman—the sallow Italian—the olive coloured Spaniard—the swarthy Turk—the yellow Arab—the copper Egyptian, the red Chinese—the blue Hindoo—and the jet black African. It is incredible how various, and how multiplied, and yet how exceedingly distinct are the shades of complexion amongst those races that are in some degree original and distinct,—and yet how exactly they all relate to the three great families of white, black, and copper—Japhet, Ham, and Shem. Whatever may be thought of the ordinary methods of accounting for these diversities—it is striking to observe that other diversities not less observable, always accompany, if they do not even exceed those of complexion. The figure, the dress, the physiognomy, the manners, the social habits—the language—the moral and religious systems—the very sky, and earth, and air—all seem to sympathise, and move in one grand and harmonious system around the earth. It might be too large an induction perhaps to infer a unity of cause—by reason of such a union in these manifestations: but we may at least infer, contrary to the opinion long entertained, that the causes, few or many, are fixed, and not in any sense accidental;—and that while they are within the whole experience of the race, as constant and invariable as any other causes whose effects are known to us,—they are on the other hand more ancient than any existing notices of the early condition of mankind. Before Isaiah the skin of the Ethiopian was the subject of remark in Asia—and we are indebted to Moses, not only for the fact that language was confounded at Babel—but what is little less important, though much less remarked—for the proof that it was unique before. It is in the midst of such crowds of these—and under the influence of such proofs and such reflections—that the utter absurdity of the two extreme opinions on this subject is most manifestly felt. It is inconceivable how a sceptic can pass through such an assemblage—and not perceive that the human race is essentially *one*—and its unity incontrovertibly certain. And yet it is quite as inconceivable how a modern abolitionist can look attentively at a similar crowd—and for an instant retain the hope, that these numberless varieties, can be made the *same*. The race is *one*; and the atheist a madman. But the varieties of that race, are not, cannot be made, *the same*; and the Garrisonist is equally mad.

It were well if we could call to mind how strikingly different the tone of the Bible is, when it speaks respectively of duties and of rights. Our duties are urgently, incessantly enforced; our rights seldom spoken of. The right to liberty itself, is subordinate to the advantage of being prepared for heaven; how futile and wicked then is it to jeopardise great and inestimable results, by fierce contentions—upon doubtful methods, of obtaining other results, which though of immense, are yet at last of secondary importance? What comparison is there between the interest these crowds on the docks of Marseilles, have in the questions which touch their souls and lay

hold on eternity—and those which belong to their rights, not only of personal freedom from mutual oppression—nor only to that of a social and political equality which never existed upon earth between different races—but to that, worthless and repudiated in every preceding generation—of universal amalgamation! In all this crowd of nations, there is not one individual who would not despise and reject a claim set up on his behalf—or on behalf on others as against him—which in other quarters of the world men are found wild enough, to place at the basis, not only of all rational effort to do good—but of all Christian duty!

Such reflections may be without importance; but they are not misplaced; for no Christian can visit this city without being struck with its great importance, as a field of effort, for the spread of the gospel,—and consequently without revolving often in his thoughts, the methods by which the reign of God may be promoted here—and every where.—The Seamen's Friends' Societies may perhaps be most naturally looked to—for planting missionaries in the great commercial cities of countries nominally Christian; and there is now at Marseilles an excellent man, who is sent out and supported by the American Society. If these societies are to be looked to chiefly for this important object, they need to be greatly strengthened—and to have their efforts take a new range; for I think it is not saying too much to assert, that at this moment they might employ at least a hundred persons, where they now have one—and each one just as beneficially, as those now at work. Of all the cities of Europe Marseilles and Trieste—are in my view the most important with reference to the extension of the Redeemer's Kingdom, in the way of missionary labour. They are situated on the opposite sides of the peninsula of Italy—one at the head of the Adriatic—the other near the southern termination of the Alps. They are the nearest and most effectual points from which Italy itself can be operated on; Trieste being in half a day's sail of Venice—while Marseilles is within a day and a half of Rome. Trieste is most advantageously situated with reference to the Empire of Austria of which it is the chief port—as well as to the adjacent provinces of the Turkish Empire; while Marseilles is in daily communication with Spain and the larger islands of the Mediterranean. With reference to the northern coast of Africa the situation of both is in the highest degree important, so that an active man stationed at either point, might after he had obtained some acquaintance with two or three languages, occupy a position of incalculable importance. When I was in Marseilles there were several hundred Arabs there; prisoners to the French, taken in the regency of Algiers—and destined perhaps to remain there an indefinite length of time. Now what work more important than to take this band of unhappy men—as my portion, attach myself to them,—learn their language—teach them the gospel of God—return with them to their tents and their little ones—and follow them over the trackless course of a life of wandering—that “if by any means I might win some?”—What result more deplorable than for them to see and despise the superstitions of the Roman church—and return and scatter over Africa contempt and abhorrence for the very name of Christian? Alas! that we cannot do

the good we would; that we do not, the good we might!—

The people of God are not, it is to be feared, sufficiently alive to the fearful truth, that an immense, undoubtedly the larger part of the nominal church of Christ, has yet to be brought to the knowledge of the truth. It is time the Christian world felt, and began to act in view of the impressive fact—that the Greek, and Roman churches—and especially the latter, have as real need of the efforts of missionaries, as the Mahomidan, the Hindoo, or the heathen population of the earth. I am sensible, that all who have not examined this subject, and many who think they have, will look upon such a statement as at once fanatical and absurd. I beg them to consider the following simple statement, in reference to the Roman church.—1. That church offers religious worship to an almost innumerable variety of objects—and to some, (as the Virgin Mary, the true cross, and the host in the eucharist) the very same kind of adoration that is offered to God himself. But it is the very first principle of the religion of the Bible—that the object of religious worship is absolutely unique—that God is one—that nothing that is not God, shall be adored in any sort, or manner whatever—and that he who does so, is an idolator. That church then is in fatal heresy as to the very nature and objects of religious worship. 2. The mode of access to God, for the pardon of sin, is also absolutely unique,—namely through Jesus Christ the only mediator between God and man; and hereon hangs the plan of redemption, as on the preceding point hangs all acceptable worship. But in the Roman church are hundreds of thousands of mediators—in so much that every Papist seeks access to God through some common to all, (as the Virgin Mary, Michael the archangel, &c. &c.) and in addition every one has his special mediators (as the saint he is devoted to, his guardian angel &c. &c.) From whence it results, that they reject the only mediator and intercessor by whom sinners can be saved. 3. Salvation is from sin—and is deliverance from its corruption and its pains:—or in other words pardon, regeneration—and sanctification—must precede admission to heaven. In the nature of the case repentance towards God—and in the nature of the Christian plan faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, are indispensable towards salvation. But it is of faith in the Papal church—that the sacraments of themselves, necessarily confer grace—that salvation is impossible out of the faith, the idolatrous faith of Rome—and that salvation is certain within its pale and ordinances; that the new birth is a mere phantom—that good works are meritorious grounds of pardon—and that justification by grace through faith in Christ crucified, is a lie invented by the devil. Now it follows, that in the Roman church there is no true knowledge of the nature of sin and holiness—any more than of the nature of true worship or of the only way of salvation. 4. The only instrument of salvation is divine truth,—that truth contained in the revealed word of God; without the knowledge of at least a portion of which, the salvation of sinners is simply impossible. But the church of Rome sedulously keeps back the word of life from her members—and as sedulously teaches in its place those “traditions of men”—which make it void. But these four categories cover the whole ground—which the divine

teachings of the spirit cover, in bringing the souls of men "from darkness into light"—; and upon each by itself, and upon all unitedly—it follows with the certainty of absolute demonstration—that the Papacy, is apostate—that God's people—if any still linger in her, should according to his express command at once come out of her—and that all his people should labour, as for other sinners, for the salvation of those attached to her communion—until its great and signal predition, declared of God, puts it out of our power to do any thing for them.—

This is no new opinion—though haply it may at present be no common one. For all the reformers without exception,—all the martyrs for the last thirteen centuries,—and every church, and fragment of God's people who kept the word of his testimony—during the midnight of the world—have with one voice, in the prison, at the stake, on the gibbet—in the caves of the earth—in king's palaces—in the pulpit, and through the press—proclaimed evermore the same truths now asserted.—It is to this point the church must come back before much effort, or much beneficial result can be expected in the conversion of Papists. And although the aspect of that superstition as a political organization commensurate with the earth's limits, and directed against the best earthly hopes of man—deserves and must command a ceaseless vigilance; yet to the true Christian, its most striking features are its vast capacity to ruin the souls of men—its ceaseless activity and prodigious energy in resisting the extension of Messiah's kingdom.—

I have mentioned incidentally the church of our *Lady of the Garde*—(Notre Dame de la Garde.) It is filled with votive offerings, by Sailors chiefly commemorative of the signal preservations and mercies they have received *from an image of the Virgin Mary* deposited in the church. At Leghorn the magnificent church of Monte Nero was raised by the piety of the same unhappy class of men, to an old picture of the Virgin—which they are taught flew through the air from Judea, and perched on the hill on which the church is situated for their special protection. Its walls also, are covered with every sort of *ex voto* offerings—indicative of the hairbreadth escapes, to which the adventurous life of the poor sailor gives occasion,—and in all which he has attributed his deliverance to this miraculous daub. At Savona, where Pius VII, during his quarrel with Napoleon had his court, or rather perhaps his exile, for some time,—a statue of the Virgin which overlooks the anchorage—has engraved on its pedestal two lines—which are at the same time Latin and Italian—and which run as follows:

In mare riato, in subita procella,

Invoco te, nostra benigna stella.

That is: *in the angry sea, in the sudden tempest, I invoke thee, our benign star.*—No Italian ship sails past any such temple, or image without the most reverend salutations; and hundreds of them bear the name and effigy of one of the innumerable goddesses, who have been made out of the virgin. When things go well, they pay all honour to their titular protectress; but if things go ill, they heap curses and imprecations upon her—and not seldom inflict blows upon her image. It is at once painful and curious to find priests

who call themselves Christian—teaching their deluded followers, the same worship, and training them in the same religion—which, if we can believe Virgil, and Ovid and Statius, they were eye-witnesses to, on the part of heathen sailors—who had never heard of Christ—in the very same spot!—

I was very much surprised to see the number of invalids, who seemed to be afflicted with chronic complaints—and especially with diseases of the lungs—throughout that region which under the general appellation of “south of Europe”—is reckoned in America, to be not only exempt from such afflictions—but blessed with a climate so pure, and an atmosphere so balmy, as to restore those in whom the principle of life is not attenuated to the last shred. My circumstances when in that country—imposed on me the closest watchfulness, of such things—by duties the most imperative, and feelings at once the most tender and powerful—that attach to relations purely earthly—The senses sharpen, and the powers of observation and reflection become doubly active—when we watch for a life dearer than our own.—In such a situation I formed my opinion—and I express it freely, for the benefit of all invalids.—The whole northern coast of the Mediterranean—is not only unsuitable for a winter residence for persons threatened with pulmonary affections—but it is a country in which such complaints form a very decided class of indigenous diseases. The climate is liable to excessive vicissitudes from hot to cold—and from dry to moist; the atmosphere is agitated by repeated and violent winds, some of the worst of which blow for days if not weeks together—and one of which, called *mistral*, and coming from the north, is the most piercing, chilling wind I have experienced in any part of Europe. During four days we were in Nice, in the end of October, this wind blew two days: during fifteen days we were in Marseilles in November it blew nine: during three days we were at Nismes early in the same month it blew two; and these are fair average specimens of October and November, as I found them along that coast. Add to this the extreme scarcity and dearth of fuel—the unskillful structure of the deep and low fire places—the tiled floors uncarpeted—and the general want of comfortable provision against a climate of which damp and cold are such large elements—and it may easily be seen how small a chance the poor invalid has of comfort, or restoration. How long this weather may last, I cannot tell, but as all the central and northern part of France was covered with snow for a day or two in the latter part of October—we cannot reckon the season of cold at a shorter period than five months; that is from the beginning of November to the end of March. During this period more than half the time, is doubtless much more mild than we have it, even at a parallel ten or eleven degrees farther south: and very much of it has a blandness and delicious softness, entirely unknown during our winter. It is doubtful how far such excessive alternations are beneficial to the invalid. The degree of cold, though not excessive is greater than is generally supposed. In Paris during December and January—for several weeks the ponds in the garden of the Thuilleries were covered with ice four or five inches thick. I can distinctly remember half a

dozen winters, within the last twenty years, which were so mild in the western part of the United States—Kentucky for example, that ice could not be obtained for preservation for summer's use.

The summer climate of this region is liable also to very great objections. The immense alluvions which are formed at the mouths of all the rivers—and which are in many places covered with a rank growth of weeds and coarse grass forming a sort of marsh—make the air pestilential for considerable portions of every year. Arms of the sea project into these marshes, and other low places—and letting in the water by a narrow neck, expand themselves into lakes, or *Etangs* as they are called—obstructing the free intercourse of the people—preventing population, and spreading malaria. Many regions are afflicted with periodical diseases—others are shunned as pestilential—and every where the heat for several months is as ardent as our own. In the south of France the early commencement of spring signalises itself by the advent of crowds of insects—especially of a species of gnat hatched in a few hours upon the surface of the *Etangs*, under the fierce rays of the sun—and which in myriads beyond computation possesses the land, until the mistral cuts them, and autumn off together.—

The country between Marseilles and Arles—embracing also the region between the two principal mouths of the Rhone—and that east of the river is marked by the peculiarities I have here mentioned—in an uncommon degree. Arles is seated upon the top and sides of a conical pile of calcareous rock—about twenty miles from the sea—at the spot where the Rhone begins seriously to arrest its furious current—and where also it first begins to divide its sullen waters into the numerous channels by which they creep, rather than run into the Mediterranean. The width upon the sea shore, occupied by the mouth of these various channels, is nearly double the distance from Arles to the sea. Or in other words, a space of twenty by forty miles—is covered by the alluvion formed by this river, the channels it still requires to disgorge its waters, and the *Etangs* and marshes over which they spread. There is every reason to believe the tradition, which represents the spot on which Arles now stands to have been at least on the very margin of the sea, if not indeed an island, in the remote antiquity at which the foundations of the city were laid. A great portion of the immense alluvion described above, is not fully reclaimed—and serves only for pasturage for the droves of black cattle—and white horses that feed over it by hundreds together. The waters instead of subsiding—seem to hold a doubtful contest with the accumulating deposits—since the hand of industry has been for so long a period withdrawn almost entirely from the conflict; and while new formations push themselves out in one direction—the waters of the *Etangs* spread themselves in others to compensate for the doubtful triumph. It is difficult to imagine a wilder scene than that presented to the traveller—as he is carried swiftly through the canal that borders the western branch of the Rhone from Arles, to the desolate and neglected cluster of huts, called the Port of Brucque. On one side is a waste of water, and marshes; on the other a wide, level region covered with coarse grass, and grazed over by the herds I have described—

apparently in a state of nature,—while the distance is closed by the usual amphitheatre of barren and naked mountains, surmounted here and there by the ruins of cities now destitute of a single inhabitant—or perhaps the silent and wretched hamlets into which princely abodes have shrunk.

This species of formation—is far from unusual—and is of various descriptions around the Mediterranean. At Frejus the ruins of a Pharos, which once stood at the entrance of the harbour—are now about three miles from the sea; and what was the harbour two thousand years ago, is at present a richly cultivated region of vineyards and gardens. Nor does it seem at all surprising that a river so small as the Argen should form an alluvion—a mile and a half wide by four long—when one turns in all directions and sees the last ranges of the maritime Alps around him—with their rugged sides as naked, as if the hand of man had scraped and scoured them.—The formations at the mouths of the Po and the Nile—the two most important rivers which discharge their waters into this sea are second in magnitude, perhaps only to that of our gigantic Mississippi: and both of them—have produced the most important effects, directly—upon the regions immediately surrounding, by their injurious effects upon health, agriculture and navigation,—and indirectly, upon the whole of Egypt and Italy—themselves originally, far the most important kingdoms of the continents to which they respectively belong. The influence exerted by such natural causes in the ruin of States, is greater than we are apt to suppose.

There seems however to be, in all human affairs a sort of cycle, whose revolutions appropriate to the magnitude or littleness of the interests to which they appertain recur with an inevitable fixedness—hurrying forward all things to their maturity in despite of obstacles which would appear to be insurmountable—and when their climax is passed, dragging them on towards decay with an impitiable vigour. Dynasties are extinguished in a few brief ages,—and what is more to be regretted the great names which signalize their respective epochs, or embalm the peculiar virtues which they illustrated—perish from amongst men—leaving neither issue, nor successor to their glory. The Seleucids, the Ptolemies—and almost the august line of Cæsars—may be discharged with all their prolonged and expanded greatness—with a few sentences in the great memorial of the past:—while the very institutions which they created, and sought by every method to make eternal—have varied with the same wasting revolutions—and perished under the same consuming fate that have devoured all things beside.—This is a stern and harsh necessity—which as it smites us all in turn, with all our works small and great—leaves us no alternative but to meet it, with becoming dignity. But, there is even a wider and a sader reign, to this strange and insatiable principle;—and when we behold the highest interests of man involved in the common destiny—we are ready to tremble at the very advance of letters, civilization, and religion itself—because we have seen without exception, their graves dug in the midst of rejoicings for their triumph.—Nay, not only is every interest of man,—both as it touch-

es him individually—and as it pertains to his various associated conditions, subject to this law—but the human face itself bows under it, like a blade of grass nipped by the frost. The great perishes, institutions are effaced—religion is extinguished—civilization departs; but even this is not all:—for the race itself is eaten up,—continents wax feeble with the weight of years—and the earth itself mourns in a sullen sterility, the decay of all, that made it smile—with beauty and abundance!—

There are few regions in which these solemn truths are more frequently forced upon the heart, than all those which surround the Mediterranean. How many vast empires have grown here from small beginnings—flourished with grandeur of which the slight details left us, fill our minds with amazement—and then utterly perished? Perished not only as to their arts, resources, laws, wealth and power—but perished as to their material existence.—The people are dead and none have succeeded them—the land is barren, where luxuriance once reigned—the air is full of pestilence where health sat on every brow—the earth is waxen cruel to man, where she once rejoiced to lay every treasure at his feet—and man himself is reduced to a tenth—perhaps a hundredth part of his numbers in the very infancy of the world—on the spot where his own infancy was nursed and his manhood wrought such illustrious deeds!—If we should commence at the straits of Gibraltar, and pass our eyes around this renowned sea how forcibly would these truths appear to us!—Carthage so powerful so populous, so rich, so long the dangerous enemy of Rome herself—is not only effaced—but the lands which Pliny tells us yielded five hundred heads of wheat to every grain sown, and which Burdæus computes on the statements of Pliny to have been worth above a hundred and twenty thousand Roman sesterces per acre—now yield a scanty subsistence to the flocks of the Bedouin Arabs; and the total conquest of the country is deemed of so little importance, and of such easy attainment that France has occupied its principal strong holds for eight or ten years, with a few thousand troops, without deeming the matter of sufficient importance, to be seriously considered.—If we come to Egypt we not only find universal ignorance and poverty—where exhaustless wealth had her abode and letters had their birth;—but the harvest which fed the millions of Rome, and the lack of which spread famine through the eternal city, is reduced to a supply hardly sufficient for the diminished and miserable slaves who gather it in tears—while the teaming population that overrun the east, and so stoutly defied Rome, is shrunk to a handful, the easy prey of foreign slaves (for such were the Mamelukes,) or domestic mercenaries and brigands.—The physical desolation of Palestine, indeed of all Syria—is hardly less remarkable. The fruitfulness and the populousness of Judea, in the times of its original inhabitants, before Moses and Joshua subdued them; its almost incredible advance in both, under the dominion of the Judges—and until the death of Solomon, nay its condition in the days of Titus, as compared with its present scanty population, unhealthy climate—and unproductive soil—give us some faint ideas of the greatness of those miraculous interposi-

tions—which will, one day cause it to be replenished and to flourish again with so much glory—that in their new deliverance the people, will cease to rejoice in the God that brought them up out of the Land of Egypt that they may exult in the God who gathereth them “out of the North Country.”—It were useless to speak of Troy or of Tiro, or to illustrate the melancholy truths before me, by recalling the former and present *material* condition of the states which composed the Greek, and afterwards the Mahomedan Empire:—or passing another step around the map—to weep over the fate of Venice—that wise and puissant commonwealth—whose very walls will soon be covered by the waves of the Adriatic,—and the tread of man silenced in her streets, by the double peste of Austria, and the marshes of the Adige and the Po.—Rome herself, terrible Rome—the grandest in her day of power—commands the least sympathy in her signal ruin. Those vast walls which once exceeded fifty miles in circuit—and embraced five hundred thousand free denizens, who bore arms,—and counting all—not less than three, or as others say eight millions of souls when at the greatest—contains neither soldier, freeman nor citizen,—and only about a hundred and fifty thousand souls—of whom nearly all the adults are servants, strumpets and priests.—The Pontine marshes which once contained thirty three cities—now cover a space of more than a hundred and thirty eight square miles of land, with one vast pestilential bog: on the spot where patricians once contended for the office of *Curator viæ* (“path master,” as they call it down east) and prized among their greatest honours, that of inscribing their names, above works and repairs which ruined them,—is now inhabited by thieves and banditti. The campagna which was once the garden of Italy, and whose high ways, for fifteen miles from the outer gates of the gigantic city, were streets of palaces, and gardens and villas; now surrounds Rome with a belt of desolation and infection, whose common atmosphere has given its name (*mal’ aria*)—to that subtle poison which is supposed to generate the worst malignant fevers, in the worst localities of the earth. The very soil is parched with the heat of those internal fires, on whose bosom all southern Italy reposes—and nothing is more to be expected than that the miserable remnants of “that great city which reigned over the kings of the earth”—should be swallowed up together—if it is not too speedily depopulated, by the malignant atmosphere which every year draws its circle, tighter and closer around it.—

From such illustrious examples, it seems too great a descent to make minute statements regarding the interesting matters, which the history of the South of France, so particularly explains; yet surely no one can stand in the irregular and rather mean looking city of Arles, with nineteen or twenty thousand pale and common looking inhabitants—and realise that he is in the midst of a city which once contained above a hundred thousand souls—was called the Rome of France—gave name to a kingdom of which it was the capital—was the seat of important if not general councils before hat of Nice—and still preserves monuments of its former magnificence of which Rome itself might be proud. No one can

stand upon the towers of its amphitheatre, and looking over the desolate regions which surround it on every side—feel that he beholds a country, once fertile and populous on an extreme degree—and which even so late as the wars of the league in France was esteemed a strong hold of any party for whom it might declare.—Still less is possible to conceive that the hamlets which at various distances surround it, were ever the princely abodes, the impregnable fortresses, the imposing cities, of which history speaks so largely.—In every part of this section of France, you feel the constant impression of a country worn out, and consumed—of a population left as a sort of remnant to guard the land till its cycle of wo is run out. It is an impression, impossible to communicate, but yet defined and full of bitterness—The human mind in ruins—madness—has always seemed to me the most solemn and imposing sorrow, we can be called to witness. Next to that, a city, a country in decay, in ruins. He who would have a vivid impression of the former, need only pass from some hall of science, or some noble display of mental power,—into a hospital for the insane; he who would strongly realise the latter, must leave America with a clear conception of its vigour and the irresistible impulsion with which all things move, and pass through any of the more ancient habitations of man. After that, it will no more need to demonstrate the incalculable pre-eminence of his country—than to discourse to a philosopher on the blessings that distinguish him above the poor maniac. Oh! that we knew the day of our visitation;—that we may so use our power and our blessings, great and yet not half developed—that every being may rejoice in us, while our grandeur abides—and bless our memory if it should pass away!

ROMAN COUNCIL OF BALTIMORE—PREACHING OF BISHOP ENGLAND.—

The city of Baltimore, as the seat of the Archiepiscopal power of Rome in the United States, occasionally witnesses the assemblage of all the high and mighty dignitaries of that superstition in this country.* A few years since, a council was held here—and

*From the *Baltimore Gazette*, May 2.

PROVINCIAL COUNCIL OF THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH.

We have abstained from noticing the session of this Assembly until we should be enabled to lay before our readers such an account as we could rely upon as fully correct. That which we give is, in some measure extracted from the *Catholic Herald* of Philadelphia, to which additional information, derived from a member of the council itself, is attached.

The Bishops of the Catholic church form its legislative assembly and its court of judicature; but their acts of Legislation, and, in many instances, especially of weightier causes, their judgments must be examined by the Pope, their presiding bishop, whose spiritual jurisdiction extends over every portion of the world. The object of this examination is to ascertain their conformity to the doctrine and the discipline of the whole body over which he is placed, and, in many instances, his sanction is necessary to their validity. The Church is divided into districts, which are called provinces; and each province into dioceses.

Each Diocese is governed by a Bishop, and one of those in each province is called the Archdiocese or Metropolitan diocese. The Bishop of this see is called the Archbishop; he can convoke the assembly, and preside in its session; the other Bishops are called Suffragans, because their suffrages, united with his, create the acts of the council.

its decrees after being approved at Rome, became law for the papists of the nation. We have endeavoured in vain to lay our hands on an authentic copy of the proceedings of that assembly;—and may not uncharitably infer the nature of the decrees, from the seditious care with which they have been kept, as far as possible from the public eye. At the present time a similar council is assembled in our good city—and the presence of “their Lordships,”—as the prelates delight to call themselves—has not only occasioned great excitement amongst the faithful,—but the public at large have been benefitted by various shows, and enlightened by several discourses, on the part of “the purple.” We shall take occasion hereafter to

Several priests are usually invited as Theologians, or Canonists, to examine the questions to be discussed; indeed, the Bishops may invite for the purpose any persons from whose experience or information they expect to derive aid, even though they be not priests nor in any orders. The Bishops and Theologians assemble in congregation to receive the reports of the several committees to which the different questions have been referred for a first examination; the matter of these reports is open to free discussion; the Bishops subsequently assemble in council and act upon the business thus discussed; their acts then forwarded to Rome for approbation, and, when returned approved, are published and executed.

In most of the countries of Europe, the tyranny exercised over the Church, under the pretext of its protection, has extended so far as to prevent such assemblies; and, therefore, during centuries, comparatively few, provincial councils have been held in Spain, Portugal, France, or Germany. Two had previously been held in this city, one in October, 1833. The council of the present year was opened on Sunday, the 16th of April, the previous assembly having in their diocese fixed upon that day for its commencement.

The prelates present on this occasion were ten in number, including the Archbishop, the Most Rev. Samuel Eccleston. The Bishops sat according to the order of their consecration, as follows:

- “The Right Rev. John England, Bishop of Charleston.
- “The Right Rev. Benedict Fenwick, Bishop of Boston.
- “The Right Rev. Joseph Rosati, Bishop of St. Louis.
- “The Right Rev. Francis Patrick Kenrick, Bishop of Arath, and Coadj. of Philadelphia.
- “The Right Rev. John Baptist Purcell, Bishop of Cincinnati.
- “The Right Rev. Guy Ignatius Chabrat, Bishop of Bolina, and Coadj. of Bardstowa.
- “The Right Rev. Simon Gabriel Brute, Bishop of Vincennes.
- “The Right Rev. William Claney, Bishop of Orié, and Coadj. of Charleston.
- “The Right Rev. Anthony Blanc, Bishop of New Orleans.
- “The Very Rev. Felix Varela, V. G. appeared as Procurator of the Bishop of New York, who sent reasons for his absence.
- “Three other prelates were absent, one being in Europe, another called away by urgent affairs and a third, who had set out from a remote diocese, not having succeeded in reaching Baltimore before the close of the Council.
- “The Bishop of Boston, and the Very Rev. Louis Deluol, V. G. were Promoters.
- “The Rev. Edward Damphoux was Secretary.
- “The Rev. Charles White Associate Secretary.
- “The Rev. Francis L’Homme, Master of Ceremonies.
- “The Very Rev. William McSherry was present as Provincial of the Society of Jesus in Maryland.
- “The Very Rev. P. Verbagen as Provincial of the Society in Missouri.
- “The Rev. John Hickey, Superior of the Sisters of Charity.
- “The Rev. Thomas Mulledy, S. J. President of the College at Georgetown.
- “The Rev. John J. Chanshe, President of St. Mary’s College.
- “The Rev. Thomas Butler, President of the College of St. Mary’s near Emmetsburg.
- “The Consulting Theologians were—
- “The Very Rev. Lewis Debarth.
- “The Very Rev. Peter Richard Kenrick.
- “The Very Rev. John Hughes.
- “The Rev. Peter S. Schreiber.
- “The Rev. Stephen Theodore Badin.
- “The Rev. Regis Loisel.
- “The Rev. Ignatius A. Reynolds.
- “The Rev. Augustin Verot.”

pay our respects to the ladies of Mount Carmel—and to renew our salutations to Mr. Gildea, and Mr. Eccleston, on the occasion of the creation of their new chapel for the worship of the human hearts of Mary and Jesus. At present we owe our service to the council and especially to Bishop England.—

It is a part of the faith of every papist—that the decisions of a council of the whole church, are as infallible, and as binding as the word of God: because they are equally inspired by the Holy Ghost. It is also received doctrine that the decisions of inferior councils, of whatever kind, become universally binding and infallible, if they should acquire the sanction of the Pope, and the approbation of the whole papal sect.—On the other hand, the ultra montain theory, which is the prevailing one, since the restoration of the Jesuits, does not allow a council to be general, unless the Pope calls it and approves its decisions; nor does it allow the acts of any council to be valid until submitted to his holiness—and assented to, by him.—Our present council therefore, though honoured by the presence of such and so many spiritual powers, and guided by the wisdom even of the Lord Bishops of Charleston and Cincinnati—is of no more authority, than an assemblage of old ladies—nor their acts of more value than the waste paper of their own printed discourses—until a miserable old man at Rome, who calls himself Saint Peter, under the name of Gregory, shall examine and decide, whether or not, the divine Spirit, was really present in the assembly.

Unhappily, we who are nearer the scene of action—have too much reason to fear, that Gregory would be obliged to set aside the council—if he should make that fact the ground of his decision. If he should decide on the nature of the council from the character of its acts—we shall never perhaps be able to estimate the value of his decision;—for the acts themselves will in all probability be concealed, like their predecessors, from the public.

There are several considerations connected with this subject which appear to us, to cloathe it with an importance which is not generally attached to it. In the first place,—what has the Pope of Rome to do with the religion of us Americans? He is a King—we are republicans; he is a papist, and the father of them—we are protestants, and mean to continue such; so that both civilly and religiously, we are the very antipodes of each other,—and we especially are the objects of his hatred and abuse. It seems to us, that if the Episcopal church of the United States, after the American revolution had continued its connexion with the established church of England—and with the King of England, as its temporal head—the country would have had just grounds of suspicion against that body—Or if the presbyterians of this country had still persisted in a subordinate relation to the Kirk of Scotland, even although that venerable body, never acknowledged any head but Christ—there would have been much reason to suspect their loyalty to the country. In the case of the papists the argument, is rendered doubly strong by the fact, that their acknowledged head is not only a foreigner, and a tyrant—but he professes to be all but a God. He is not only utterly hostile to every principle involved

in one social system, but his people here profess to believe that he is the vicar of God, and spiritually infallible. When we add to this the alarming fact, that the majority of the papists of the United States are foreigners—that all their Bishops, except Mr. Eccleston are also foreigners, and nearly all their priests aliens, we augment greatly the grounds of public apprehension. But the whole case seems complete in its evil aspect when we remember that the influence of the atrocious society of the Jesuits, is absolute over the papal clergy of America,—and that every portion of the Roman communion in the civilized world, is systematically engaged in a conspiracy to subject this country to the influence of the Pope.

There is little we apprehend in the past history, either of the Jesuits, or the entire papal sect, to lull our apprehensions in regard to their designs against our beloved country. Two centuries and a half of unparalleled crimes, caused the expulsion of that society from nearly every Christian state, and at last forced the Pope of Rome to dissolve it—although he foresaw, as the event proved truly, that he signed his own death warrant, when he signed the bull for their suppression. So also, the unvarying history of the papacy shows that, no dissent from the principles of Rome, has ever been tolerated where Rome was able, by force to suppress it in the blood of its martyrs; that no people has preserved itself from the pope's domination except after long and bloody wars, and as the fruit of victory—Every protestant nation of Europe, has in turn been the theatre of both civil and foreign wars, waged solely to reduce them to the yoke of popery—and are protestant at this moment, only because God has blessed their arms in the day of battle. With such facts before our eyes, we beg to ask reflecting men, what are we to expect from the *secret* deliberations, of a set of agents of a foreign King,—who are bound to him by interest, by the ties of religion, and by the most solemn oaths; and who in turn control the whole papal sect in this country?—Why are their deliberations *secret*? Why are their acts *concealed*? Why do they alone, of all sects of religionists shun the light, and concert their plans darkly in suspicious silence—and then lay their unknown decrees for approval, humbly at the feet of a prince, whose throne in all ages has been filled by the most unscrupulous, ambitious, and detestable succession of rulers, that ever cursed the earth?

The papal clergy of America have one title to praise which none of their brethren in other nations share with them. Every where else the public services of their religion are all mummery; while with us only half is mummery. That is, they do in this country make an attempt to teach their people, their moral duties, by public instructions on the Sabbath-day. Every where else, this is omitted, except during lent;—and the people at all other seasons, come and go without one word of admonition, instruction or reproof—from those, whose *only* commission from the Saviour, if they be indeed his ministers, is *to teach mankind, and so gather and guide the flock of Christ. Go teach all nations—was the commission of Christ; receive power to sacrifice for the living and the dead, is the ordination of Rome,*

During the sessions of the present council of Baltimore, the community has been more than usually favored, with these unusual instructions. Bishop England, has been the chief, if not the only speaker, and in so far at least, resembles Saul of Tarsus. This good city, has often before had the good fortune to enjoy the services of his Lordship—and we have therefore been the better prepared to profit by his present efforts to enlighten us: Having once had the advantage ourselves of hearing him prove the excellence and advantage of the holy Inquisition, we were, of course somewhat prepared for his lucubrations on the mercifulness of Purgatory, the delicacy of auricular confession, and similar subjects. We would respectfully remind Mr. England, that there is an unsettled account between him and us, on the first of these subjects, namely the Inquisition—and that our gage has been lying at his feet, unnoticed for about three years. Did he formerly misunderstand us? Then let us repeat what we have said. We charge the Bishop with upholding a system, hateful to God, and ruinous to man. We offer to prove this charge against him—or any other Bishop—or any man, that any Bishop will designate. And the time, place, and method are under his own choice. If he thinks us beneath his notice—we can only beg him, to fix his eye, upon the man in the Presbyterian church of this country, whom he deems worthy of his notice—and no effort of ours shall be wanting to accommodate the matter to his content. This, we have repeated, in word and in print, many times, for three years last past. We therefore humbly conceive, that the recreant party, should either change his boastful and insolent tone, or vindicate the truth of his doctrines and the propriety of his conduct, in some clear and public manner.

Our principal design in introducing the Bishop's name, at this time, is however to speak of a discourse we had the fortune to hear him deliver, at Saint Patrick's church on Fell's Point, on the feast of the ascension. We beg leave also to direct the attention of the reader to an article in the present number of our Magazine—intended as an analysis of another discourse of his, on auricular confession. That is from the hand of a friend who heard the sermon—and may be relied as substantially correct. The two representations will give the public, who are not so fortunate as to have heard the gentleman himself—some idea of his manner and matter in the pulpit.

The sermon had already been commenced when we entered the little church, and got well situated in front of the speaker. He stood in a little barrel looking pulpit, with an image of the Virgin in a niche in the wall on his left hand. The altar garnished with long wax tapers—a figure of our Saviour—various pictures, and several men and boys who looked as if they were in their shirt tails, but probably were not, occupied his rear to the right; and further over in that direction was an image of Saint Patrick, in a niche corresponding to the one occupied by the Virgin. Mr. England, is a stout, ruddy man—looking just as a good papist might be expected to look, after keeping lent, on oysters, terrapins, and champaign wine. He is a hail old gentleman; and we heartily wish him a long life, and freedom from all surfeits. His dress was rather gaudy—

and exceedingly queer. Part white—part lilack,—part male, part female, as unlike as possible to that of his audience—and not very similar, we suspect to that of Mr. Fisherman Peter. As the enormous ring, he wore on the little finger of his right hand is a badge of his rank—we pass by any suggestion touching its display.

The manner of the Bishop is exceedingly pompous and magnificent—and his rage for altitudenysing so great, as to weary both himself and his hearers. His favourite posture, is a bad copy of that in which Napaleon is usually represented, with his arms crossed on his chest—and one foot slightly projected. His utterance is fluent, and his speech copious. But his pronunciation is as indistinct, as if his mouth were half full of hot mush; and his treatment of the King's English murderous to a bloody degree. The words "children of Israel"—he pronounced several times—*childrin of Izrael*: "Isaac" he called *Isic*,—"realms," he pronounced as if the word were of two syllables, and spelt *ru-lums*; while the word "ignominy" was uttered with a strong accent on the second syllable—*ig-nom-isy*.

As samples of the matter of the discourse, we will attempt to state a few of what appeared to us, to be the principal ideas of the speaker. We have said the subject was, the ascension of the Saviour.

He called attention to the fact that the Bible informs us clearly that the Saviour held much familiar intercourse with his apostles, during the period that intervened between his resurrection and ascension. Then he asserted that the fathers, who were cotemporary with the apostles, inform us that during this period, the Saviour had taught his disciples—all those doctrines of the church, which are not found in the Bible; and made all those explanations and given all those instructions, which the church has faithfully preserved to elucidate and complete the written word; and amongst these things, he mentioned particularly the sacraments, the mode of their administration, &c. &c. He did not name any of the fathers, by whom these extraordinary facts could be established; nor did he seem to halt at all, at the indirect assertion, that many of their most important doctrines could not be proved from scripture.

A second theme of the Bishop, was the promise of the Comforter, and his coming as a consequence of the ascension of the Saviour. No portion of the Christian system has appeared to us so full of majesty and glory, as that which relates to the purchase, the promise, the shedding forth, and the eternal presence of the Holy Ghost, in the church,—as the agent, on the one hand of the regeneration and sanctification of the people of God, and as the witness on the other of the divine mission, infinite exaltation—and eternal Godhead of the Messiah. It was therefore with sorrow and shame that we heard one professing to be a Christian minister, teaching a religious assembly, mean, erroneous, and narrow views of these sublime and consoling truths. The church of Rome does indeed deny the new birth, as taught in the word of God, and held by all who have experienced its power: and its ideas of holiness are limited to such attainments as may be made by "bodily exercise"—which we know of God, profiteth little." But we were not prepared to find, the most distinguished prelate of the Ameri-

can church, so utterly unacquainted with spiritual things—even as to any methodical *head* knowledge. According to the orator, this promise of the Holy Ghost, derives its practical value from the fact that, in this way all the dogmas of the church are proved to be of divine origin, because a divine spirit testifies to them; and to the faithful the comforter is so called, as he dwells in the ordinances of the church, in his office as the Paraclete. So that the most stupendous facts of religion, are so to speak, only available in the narrow channel of a corrupted worship—and only strong to uphold what is revolting and absurd. As for example, are we to believe that the proof that Jesus is seated at the right hand of God with all power—is only important as it shows that he is to be worshipped truly, under the appearance of a cake; and that the promise of a divine witness with our spirits that we are God's children—has its accomplishment, when we believe “what the church tells us—and because he tells it”—even though she should call perjury and blood-guiltiness virtues, when they promote the cause of Rome?

A third point of remark, was the glory of the entrance of the ascended Redeemer into heaven.—The well known passage in the first general epistle of Peter, ch. III, 19—21, was made to teach that Christ was occupied during the three days that intervened between his crucifixion and resurrection—in proclaiming salvation to the righteous dead. The locality of this mission was not specified,— and we were left to guess, whether we should call it ‘limbo’—with Milton, the “place of departed spirits” by permission of the episcopal rubric,—or “hell” outright, with the creed called “the apostles’! The doctrine was laid down in the broadest terms that before the ascension of Christ, no human soul had ever been admitted into glory: but that “from Abel to the thief on the cross—not one soul had ever entered paradise”—such being, his own words. The promises and declarations of Scripture to the Patriarchs, and the Old Testament saints were interpreted in such a way as to confirm this new and frightful doctrine—and the grand and majestic passages in the xxiv. psalm, were especially adduced to prove the doctrine and illustrate the method, of Christ's ascension, followed by all the dead, who had died in the Lord from the beginning of the world—and who then for the first time were admitted into their rest. Every Bible reader will at once perceive the awful perversion of truth, involved in such statements—and the total ignorance of scripture which they manifest: we only report, without aiming to refute the nonsense.—

The last topic of remark we shall repeat, was somewhat of the following purport. The ascension of Christ to glory—after such a life of humiliation and suffering as his had been, affords one of the strongest possible proofs that virtuous efforts, privations &c. are of themselves meritorious, and that they will be finally rewarded.”—There is something exceedingly painful and affecting, in the manifestation of that species of judicial blindness, which while it is not utterly dear to the power of truth—seems incapable of perceiving it with sufficient clearness, to be guided by it. The life of Christ as contrasted with his taking up into heaven—does un-

doubtedly afford the finest and loveliest incentive to virtue, that all past time gives us, of human conduct. But oh! how much more does it teach us: how much higher and more awful are its lessons!—To fasten on the lowest aspect of the subject betrays a coarse and dull spirit; but to fix on a false analogy, to teach a fatal error,—as the lesson which the clearest truth inculcates, exhibits an ingenuity in going astray, which nothing but the “strong delusion” to which God has given over the Roman hierarchy, seems capable of explaining. What rational being, could otherwise, ever think of inferring, that the merit of good works, and voluntary sufferings, is proved by the fact that God has accepted of the sacrifice of his Son for sinners—and so can justify the ungodly, while he continues just himself?

Our great controversy with Rome, lies precisely here. She has perverted and obscured the truth of God, till she no longer knows it herself: and the system which she teaches, is such, that he who believes and practises it, is only the more confirmed in darkness and fatal error. We unhesitatingly assert, as the result of repeated attendance on the public discourses of the favourite teachers of Catholicity wherever we have had opportunity—that they are deplorably ignorant of scripture, even as a system of truth;—and that its influence on the heart and conscience, in the way of regeneration and sanctification—while it is pointedly denied in their faith—is utterly unknown in practice. Bishop England “*believest thou the prophets?*” Bishop England “*understandest thou what thou readest?*”

ANALYSIS OF A SERMON OF THE LORD BISHOP OF CHARLESTON.

Bishop England of Charleston, S. C. preached in the Cathedral in Baltimore on Tuesday, May 2d 1837, on the Popish Sacrament of Penance, Auricular Confession. The object of the discourse appeared to be a desire to establish the divine authority of this custom of the Roman Catholic church. He stated that in an early period of his life, the impressions made upon his mind in his ordinary school education were not Roman Catholic. He read in one of the school books a remarkable event which attracted his attention, that *Auricular Confession was first introduced in the year 1215*. His curiosity was excited to read ecclesiastical history, and he could not solve the difficulty which occurred to his mind from so extraordinary a fact. On investigation and examination the learned Bishop found the fact announced as history to be entire and deliberate falsehood. He had early read that monarchs were proud, that kings were ambitious, that knights were chivalrous, but had not learned that facts could be recorded as history which were false and without foundation. That so many people believed the doctrine of auricular confession to be of divine authority is evidence he thought of their sincerity in adopting that belief. Monarchs, senators and dukes went to confession.

How difficult now would it be to produce the conviction which then existed. Suppose it possible for Baltimore to adopt it, would

Philadelphia, and New York, and Boston, and Charleston follow; would the western world, would Europe join in the belief?

That auricular confession existed before the year 1215 appeared to him from the testimony of many Catholic writers which were quoted; from their opponents themselves; from the *practice* of the Greek church which separated from the Latin at Constantinople in the 4th century. The Bishop affirmed that the same writers who say that auricular confession was first introduced in 1215, also affirm that auricular confession was done away by Nestorius of the 4th century, who seeing evils arise from public confession, enjoined private confession; and drew an agreement in favour of his proposition from this fact, since if it was done away at this period, it existed before 1215. Auricular confession is not a doctrine of the dark ages, but existed under the Old Testament at the giving of the law to Moses by Almighty God, in the sacrifices offered by the priests of the Mosaic economy, and was sanctioned by Christ, the Saviour of the world and his associates. The doctrine was taught as essential to salvation by some of the Catholic writers. Except ye go to penance ye cannot be saved, was a doctrine taught. It is not tyranny over men's consciences, because the humblest knows the bounds of the confessors' jurisdiction. The priest confesses to the bishop, the bishop to the archbishop, the archbishop to the pope, the pope to God.

The Bishop called the reformation a novelty,

His style is energetic—his manner eloquent; and his voice indicates that his early education was received in Ireland. The Cathedral was filled with a crowd, and he was attentively heard by the assembly. The text was from John xx. v. 22, and 23. "Receive ye the Holy Ghost, whosoever's sins ye remit, they are remitted; and whosoever's sins ye retain, they are retained." Which was explained to mean, not that the priests and bishops could forgive sins, but that from confession they can form a judgment whose sins should be forgiven.

EDUCATION IN IRELAND.

WE give below a considerable portion of a speech recently delivered in the British House of Lords, by the Bishop of Exeter, on the national school system in Ireland. It appears that this prelate, had moved an enquiry into the working of the system, at a former session of Parliament, and on that occasion had indulged himself in some very heavy accusations against, the Irish school commissioners, against the system itself, and against the Romish Priests and schoolmasters of that unhappy country. The present speech seems to have been intended as a defence and illustration of his former one; and as it lets us behind the curtain, on a very interesting subject, we give it as testimony, rather than of approving of the principles and views of its author.

The author of the speech is Henry Phillpotts, Prebendary of Durham, and treasurer as well as Bishop of Exeter. He is a pluralist—a high churchman—a tory—and a violent politician. And there is much reason to fear that he knows little more about the true prin-

principles of liberty, and the humbling doctrines of the cross, than the papists he denounces, and grinds into the dust. It is however lamentably true, that most of his accusations, are in this instance too well founded.

The state of general education in Ireland, is worse, than in any part of Europe, except the states of the Pope. And such is the folly and bigotry of the opposing factions, that neither the Romish priests nor the Episcopal clergy, will do any thing to encourage the general instruction of the people—unless the subject be committed exclusively to their hands, or at least managed under their control and in accordance with their narrow views. At present, as there are more popish, than prelatical voters in Ireland the King's ministers seem disposed to court the priests of the former, rather than those of the latter sect. The results appear to be, that the clergy of the established churches of England and Ireland, have declared uncompromising hostilities to the plan for Irish education proposed by the government; and that the Roman priests, have used that plan, rather as an engine to raise money and spread popery, than as a means of instructing the children of the state, in the rudiments of knowledge. At its best, the system was imperfect and wretchedly inadequate; but it seems, in danger of being utterly ruined, and the country left in its Egyptian darkness—till selfish sectaries can be brought to hear reason—or robbed of the bad influence, which now avails to silence her voice.

Those persons in the United States who take any interest in the great papal controversy which now agitates the world, ought undoubtedly to make themselves acquainted with its aspect in other countries, and especially in Great Britain. Most of our priests are Irish; and here we have, a slight elucidation of their characters and acts at home. Were it not better for those priests who are natives of that land, if they have a vocation to teach children their letters, to remain where all their flocks are ignorant, than to waste their talents on us, of whom many know how to read, and even to speak without a brogue? How unspeakably absurd is it, for the priests of the most profoundly ignorant and illiterate part of the British dominions in Europe, to set themselves up, as the teachers of the youth of the United States. On the other hand, however, great care should be taken, not to confound our cause with the tory principles, and the heresies of the established church of England, which itself needs purgation and reform as much, as a church calling itself Protestant, well can. But we proceed to the speech.

In replying to Viscount Melbourn, the Bishop of Exeter said, he should now proceed to point out some of the places at which circumstances, to which he had adverted on a former occasion, actually occurred. The first case to which he would allude occurred in the parish of — (we did not hear the name,) in the county of Londonderry in the diocese of Armagh. His authority was a most respectable clergyman, the brother to a Noble Lord. This gentleman stated, that when the census was to take place in 1831, under the Population Act, he was extremely anxious to ascertain the number of persons of different religions in his parish. In consequence of this, he was brought in contact with the master of the

National School in the parish, who, he found, was avowedly an infidel. In consequence of this, that gentleman did what was highly becoming in him; and, above all, considering the situation which he held, he made a report of the circumstance to the inspector, and he thought that this person must have reported the case to the Commissioners, as he had expressed his astonishment and disapprobation. This Rev. gentleman then thought that there was an end of the matter. After some time, however, the schoolmaster appeared at Church, and therefore he presumed that this person had been admonished by the Commissioners. Shortly afterwards this man wished to attend at the communion-table, and the clergyman did what was the duty of every clergyman before he admitted any one to the sacrament, namely, to examine him as to his fitness. He did so with respect to this individual, and he found that his conduct was so immoral, that he felt himself bound to repel him from the altar.

He now came to a case which he could not mention or allude to without a feeling of disgust. He held in his hand some papers relative to the conduct of a schoolmaster in another parish in Londonderry, the name of the clergyman of which was the Rev. Mr. Townsend. This gentleman went into the National School-room, and on going up to the desk of the schoolmaster he found that it had no lock. On looking into it, he found that there were some papers, although not many, of such an indecent and disgusting character, that he would not presume to describe them. It had been asserted by the master that he saw these papers in the hands of some of his boys, and he took them away and flogged the boys; but still they were left in an open desk in the school-room. He had also received that day some copy books, which were written by the boys. They were regularly written from the top to the bottom of the page, and if the Most Reverend Prelate before him was anxious to satisfy himself, he would put these books on the table. Many of these copies are of a highly improper and indecent tendency, and they appeared to have been written in this school as a matter of course.

He now came to the case of a school near Dublin. This school had been built by the Board of Schools. Now this was not at such a distance from the Board that they could not have something like a good superintendence over it. This school had been established for two months, but still the master had made himself most notorious by his conduct. He had received a letter from a gentleman who lived in its vicinity, who informed him that dancing was the only art or science taught in this school, and this was practised for some hours each day, and it was attended by all the blackguards in the neighbourhood. He informs me that "the master of the Rushes National School had summoned a man, named William Norton, for a sum of money alleged to be due for the tuition of his children. The defendant proved that the school was a public nuisance, and that dancing was the only art or science taught in the school. He proved that two hours each day, before the school business terminated, all the idle and disorderly vagabonds of the neighbourhood congregated at the school, and that when dancing

commenced a scene of confusion and riot frequently followed. The schoolmaster, Thomas Lalor, acknowledged, on his oath, the fact of his being a fiddler, and that dancing was taught in the school during the hours of business; but he has asserted that he acted in conformity with the instructions of Priest Hickey, the only visitor, and that his salary was paid by the National Board."

He now came to another case of great importance: he alluded to the conduct of the master of the National School at Carlow. This place, he believed, was within a comparatively short distance of Dublin. It was a most notorious place, and whatever occurred there was sure to find its way into the newspapers. The schoolmaster of this place was one of the most remarkable agitators in the country, and was the agent and friend of the well-known priest Father Maher. At the recent election in Carlow he acted as poll-clerk, but was turned out for his partiality; but he abandoned the duties of his school to attend to the election. This schoolmaster in the autumn of the year 1835, was proved to have joined with the Priest Maher in one of the most foul conspiracies that had ever been concocted. It related to certain charges that had been brought against some soldiers who were accused of drinking party toasts. In consequence of this, a military investigation into this matter was ordered, but Priest Maher did not approve of this mode of proceeding. Upon this, the Lord-Lieutenant, in the exercise of his discretion, chose to direct an investigation of another kind, and Colonel Ward and Mr. Mahoney were ordered to inquire into the particulars of the case. The inquiry continued for thirteen days, and it appeared, that during the whole of this time the schoolmaster left his school and attended to drilling the witnesses and teaching them what they were to swear. He (the Bishop of Exeter) was using strong language, but he was only using language which he should be able to prove. Every one of the witnesses examined, admitted that he had been asked to attend by Priest Maher and Gorman the schoolmaster. One of the witnesses, of the name of Patrick Nolan, of Carlow, after giving his evidence, was asked by Mr. Mahony, one of the gentlemen, "At whose instigation did you come here?—Father Maher sent for us, and ordered me to attend the Court to prove against the military. Did any person tell you what you had to swear to?—They read out of a paper what he had to swear to. Can you read?—No. Who read the paper containing what you had to swear to?—(After great hesitation he replied) He could not tell; he did not know him. On your oath, was it not Gorman, the chapel or national schoolmaster?—After considerable hesitation, he said that it was Gorman. So Gorman read for you what you should swear to, and sent you here?—He did."

He would now proceed to some of the attacks made on him. He had been accused in the pamphlet published by the Commissioners with having accused them of giving utterance to positive falsehood. He did not charge them with positive falsehood. He contradicted the fact, "that 140 of the Protestant clergy had applied for schools under this system." He called for a return of the 140 persons who were said to be clergymen of the Establishment, for this fact, and referred to this to prove his correctness. These persons, however, said, that "the author had, in

the first place, misrepresented the Report, and then thought proper to charge them with falsehood; and that the Report, did not state, nor did it pretend to state, the number of clergymen so applying." Now, from the assertions used in different parts of the Report, in one place it might be fairly inferred that the 140 persons alluded to were all clergy of the Established Church. The extract he alluded to, and which he quoted, was in a part signed by the Secretary of the Board, but in another part of the Report there was an abstract which stated, that several Protestants, both lay and clergy, had applied for schools, and this part was underlined, and the numbers given were 123 and 17, making together 140. It might be well to suppose that this was merely a clerical error that had crept into the Report, and not from other motives. In the third Report there was made almost a similar statement, and there was an abstract of the numbers, and they took care to correct the part of the former Report, for it merely stated the number of signatures of persons so applying. This also might have the effect of deceiving, but not him, because he had taken the pains to inquire into the subject. This statement, so made, had deceived the Noble Marquis the President of the Council, the great friend of the system, and he honoured him for it, as he knew that he believed that it would work well. In reply to an observation from the Noble Earl, he recommended him to look at the Report, where he would find, that in one province, namely, Ulster, there had been 266 applications made by Protestant clergymen. He had moved for a return which would have rendered the matter tolerably clear, but the production of it had been continually delayed. It was laid on the table on the 8th of July, and he had moved for its production at the commencement of the session. Now all the information contained in it was contained in the Report, and that had been signed and presented early in June, and therefore there could have been no difficulty in furnishing it at an earlier period. He must, therefore, say that it was not good tact on the part of those who had the concoction of the Report. The Report gave the name of 116 clergy—men of the Established Church who had signed a declaration in favour of this system, but it appeared that some of the names put down were gross forgeries. One of these clergymen, residing at Hollywood, Tipperary, had been for the last ten years absolutely incapable of any act whatever, and his wife said she did not believe he could have signed the application. However, he (the Bishop of Exeter) would take it that he did sign the document, for it seemed to correspond with that unfortunate gentleman's signature. But this poor gentleman was in a state of absolute fatuity, and had been so for many years; it involved, therefore, in his opinion, the moral guilt of perjury in putting down his name as one of the applicants for these schools. The Most Reverend Prelate was most especially charged by him (the Bishop of Exeter) for being guilty of most extraordinary inattention to a case which he should have thought would have fallen peculiarly under the notice of the Most Reverend Prelate. It was stated, that to the application for a school in Dublin the name of a Rev. J. G. Robertson was subscribed. He (the Bishop of Exeter) had made some inquiry re-

specting this gentleman of a friend very high in the Church in Dublin; and the answer was, that he could not find any such person. He (the Bishop of Exeter) ventured to state this in a speech he made last year. Upon this point the Board said, "The author states, that Mr. Robertson, who signed one of the Dublin applications, was not resident within the parish from which it came; neither did we state that he was." But he (the Bishop of Exeter) did more; he stated that no such clergymen could be found to have existed in Dublin at all. The Board did not find it convenient to deal with that part of the charge. "It frequently happens that a school is attended by children of different parishes, and we should consider any clergyman residing in the immediate neighbourhood as a resident clergyman within the meaning of our rules." Nothing could be more correct. A clergyman so acting did what was perfectly right. But the Commissioners told their Lordships this:—"Mr. Robertson, we understand, died about two years ago in Queen street." Now he (the Bishop of Exeter) had made further inquiry; and the result was, that Mr. Robertson's existence was totally unknown. The schoolmistress of the school for which it was stated he applied never heard of him; there was no trace of him to be found in the school-books as a visitor there. But it did not rest there: the schoolmaster and parish-clerk of the parish in which Queen-street was situated had never heard of this gentleman, although he had lived in the parish seventeen years. The clergyman of the parish had never heard of him. The churchwarden, who had lived there thirty years, had never heard of him. The vestry-clerk had never heard of him; nay, the tax-gatherer had never heard of him. Could proof of nonentity go further? Well, but it was said he died two years ago. A clergyman had gone and searched the register of almost every parish in Dublin; but no where could this Reverend gentleman be found. There was one place to which his Reverend friend did not go—to the register of the diocese of Dublin. He should suppose that the Most Reverend Prelate, under all the circumstances of this most extraordinary case, by having neglected the most obvious duty of a Commissioner, in not ascertaining that there was any such person, would look into the registry of his own diocese, where, perhaps he might find some mention of this gentleman. The Most Reverend Prelate had not, however, stated this in the Report; perhaps he would tell their Lordships of it now. There was a remarkable circumstance stated in a note of the Report, in contradiction to a statement of his. He had averred, that a much larger proportion of the fund had gone to the Roman Catholic than to the Protestant schools. That was answered by its being stated, that whenever effective applications were made for grants to Protestant schools, those grants were larger than to Catholic applications. He was quite ready to believe this. He believed the Board would be more eager, if possible, to encourage Protestant education, especially if Protestant applications were made. In consequence, a return had been made, showing that the average granted to Protestants had been greater than the sums granted to the Roman Catholics where applications had been made. But unfortunately, whoever

concocted this Report did that which very crafty men were sometimes apt to do, proved too much; for he proved that, whatever might be the proportion of the grants, yet the numbers of resident Protestant applications, and of resident clergymen who corresponded with the Board, were very few indeed. It appeared that, in the whole province of Leinster (including the metropolis), only one Protestant clergyman had such a connexion with the Board as to be in correspondence with it. In the considerable province of Connaught there was only one Protestant clergyman, a correspondent of the Board. In Munster there were five, and in Ulster there was a very large majority of the whole, there being no less than twenty-three correspondents—making together thirty Protestant clergy corresponding with the Board. Now, it appeared that the number of Catholic priests who corresponded with the Board was 378; so that the number of Protestants connected with these schools was not so much as the one-twelfth part of the number of Roman Catholics who had the control of the schools, which in such vast numbers were under the immediate control of the parish priests, were in any instance likely to add to the peace of Ireland, to its morality, or to give to it any of those blessings for which this system was founded. He had looked into the list of those persons who had corresponded with the Board; and he had taken the trouble of looking also at those records which told of the conduct of the parish priesthood, and especially at the records contained in the Reports of the Committees of the other House of Parliament on bribery and intimidation; and it appeared, almost without exception, that every individual who was there exhibited was a person who, under the garb of a clergyman, was seeking to break the peace of society, to carry discord into families, and even urge his unhappy thralls to murder their fellow-creatures. These were correspondents with the Board of Education. So much for the schools in Ireland being under the auspices of the priests.

The next thing he would observe upon was, the answer contained in the Report to what he had said relative to the schools in connexion with nunneries and monasteries. The Commissioners said, "upon this point we had a consultation with Lord Stanley, and he thought it desirable, as we did, that such schools should be brought under our superintendence, and therefore we granted aid to them." Whether Lord Stanley's opinion was right or not he would not state; but there was one clause in this sentence of the Report which showed that the conduct of the Commissioners by no means rested upon that Noble Lord's opinion. It appeared that the Noble Lord wished these schools to be placed under the superintendence of the Board. Was that the case? The inspection of these and other schools was, on an average, once a year. Did their Lordships think it possible that an annual inspection of these schools, which, from the very nature of the case, must be constantly under the direction of persons who were bound by their religion to act in violation of those rules required by the Board, could be effective? But the obstacles offered to the visitors in going to those schools were enormous. A clergyman who went to one of these schools, had no sooner entered the gate of the convent

than the porter told him that he could not enter the school. The clergyman persisted, and finally inspected the school. He subsequently thought it right to take his rector to the school. The porter met them in a more authoritative way, and said they should not enter, and they were obliged to return without inspecting the school. A clergyman of the utmost respectability had written to him an account of what had been seen at a school at Carrick-on-Suir. The school was altogether Popish, under the entire dominion of the nuns. The nuns received an annual salary, which went, of course, to the support of the convent. This was not one of a few instances, but one of many, where the sums supplied by the Board, taken from the people of this land, went directly to support the monasteries and nunneries in Ireland. There was an exhibition at the school twice a year, where the children heard mass; and if they were pronounced fit, they were immediately admitted to the eucharist. A Mr. — (he would not mention the name of the gentleman,) on the 11th of November inspected the school. A nun being asked whether that gentleman examined the children? she replied, "that he was not very particular or curious; that he was a nice gentleman, and apologized for the few questions which he asked, saying, that he should be examined himself as to the state of the school. During this conversation nuns went and came from the interior of the convent through a large door in the school-room, opening into the house. The convent joins the chapel, into which there is a passage for the nuns." The Right Rev. Prelate then adverted to the statement made by him last year with respect to the celebration of the mass at a school in which was erected an altar. He was informed that mass was performed there every day; but probably his informant was mistaken; but still the Roman Catholic service was performed there every day, and the altar remained there with the permission of the board.

The Right Rev. Prelate then adverted to the statement he had formerly made respecting the language used by Dr. M'Hale at the Island of Achill. A Roman Catholic priest having, in the course of a sermon preached before Dr. M'Hale, among other violent things, said, that "the Protestant religion began in hell and would end in hell," Dr. M'Hale rose up and expressed his strong approbation of all that had been said by that minister of God from the pulpit. The Right Reverend Prelate next referred to the case of the Rev. Mr. Nangle, upon whom the Board had, by construction, cast some discredit. From the manner in which they spoke of that gentleman, it could not help being inferred that his conduct was at least called in question. What was the fact? Why, that Mr. Nangle had to complain of so grievous an outrage on the part of the schoolmaster on that island that he went into a court of justice to obtain redress. A Report of that case was sent to the Board; and the ordinary notion would be, from the manner in which he was spoken of by the board, that Mr. Nangle had been mentioned to them with disadvantage in the Report of those proceedings. The Report of the Board went on to say, "he is, as your Excellency is aware, neither rector nor curate of the parish, nor, as we understand, at all connected with the district, save by a mission which he

has undertaken for the conversion of the Roman Catholics there." Now, that seemed to him to savour much of a sneer at the occupation which that gentleman was pursuing in that island. He was confident that the Most Reverend Prelate near him did not draw up the Report. There were many other reasons for entertaining this opinion; but most certainly he was not likely to speak sneeringly of a gentleman who, "being neither rector nor curate" in that desolate island—an island deserted by all other clergymen, and without any other means of spiritual instruction for the many thousands that resided in that island—had gone there from the pure love of God, had fixed himself down there, and with a talent beyond the average of talent, and with a zeal greatly exceeding the zeal of other men, a zeal almost apostolic, had devoted himself to his Christian labours in that desolate place, encountering all the violence and hostility that a savage priesthood could direct against him. And this man was to be sneered at as being "neither rector nor curate." Let justice be done to this man. It pleased God to put it into his heart to devote himself to the instruction of the people of that desolate island in the knowledge of the true faith. He obtained sufficient means to build a chapel there, and he obtained the warm approbation, encouragement, and support of his diocesan, the Archbishop of Tuam. It had pleased God to prosper his exertions, and many were the souls he had been the means of converting to the knowledge of their Saviour. A missionary like this, though neither rector nor curate," was one whom he would ever treat with unfeigned respect; and even those who were clothed in the sacred vestments of spiritual authority might most justly covet the pure and holy spirit of such a man. This gentleman having heard that James O'Donnell, who was connected with the National School in that island, had been dismissed from the coast-guard service for having used seditious language, communicated this fact to the Board; but they made no inquiry into the circumstance, although Mr. Nangle told them where they might obtain evidence of the truth of what he said. No; but the Board, with the greatest anxiety to protect innocence, directed O'Donnell to institute a prosecution against the publishers of this communication. After the Commissioners sent forth their Report containing this advice, Mr. Nangle sent forth a letter on the subject, and in the month of August that gentleman received a letter from Lieutenant Irvin, an officer of high character in the coast-guard service, in which he stated, that he recollected that in the year 1833 he had dismissed a person of the name of O'Donnell from the coast-guard for using seditious language. Their Lordships would, therefore, perceive, that the statement which was made by him (the Bishop of Exeter) in their Lordships' House was all most true, and was, at all events, entirely justified by the facts within the knowledge of the Board. They knew that a respectable officer had declared that he had dismissed this man for using seditious language; the report, therefore, in the newspapers of that statement was most correct. The Right Rev. Prelate next complained of the use of a book called the *Catholic Christian Instructor*, in a school situated on one of the Irish estates of the Noble Marquis (Lansdowne) near him. It

was true the Commissioners denied that that book had been recommended by them; but on looking at the Report published by the Commissioners, he found, from their own declaration that, though not "recommended" by them, it had been read with their "sanction and approbation." Now to him it appeared that the words "sanction and approbation" went further than the word "recommendation." The next point to which he wished to call their Lordships' attention was the mutilation of the Gospel of St. Luke. The Commissioners had led their Lordships to believe that the whole of the Gospel of St. Luke was used in the National Schools of Ireland; and when the fact was pointed out that certain passages of it were entirely omitted, they replied, that no harm had been done, as the sense of the whole was given. That might be true; but why did they state in the first place that the whole of the Gospel of St. Luke was given? Did they not know that one of the great complaints against the Board from the very first had been, that the selected extracts did not give the pure word of God? It might be convenient, to prevent collision between the members of the Board, whose religious opinions were not the same, to agree upon some certain passages of Scripture to place in the hands of the children who were to be instructed; but, in his (the Bishop of Exeter's) opinion, a plan more unwise, more unfit, or more injurious to God's word could not be devised. But the question now to be considered was, whether the Commissioners had said that they gave the whole Gospel of St. Luke. He had already stated that the Commissioners on a former occasion declared that the whole Gospel was given; but on investigation it was found that the fact was otherwise. It would be in their Lordships' recollection, that some years ago he had stated that he did not object to Scripture extracts being used in schools; that he thought it a very wise thing, provided the Bible itself were not excluded, that extracts from the Scripture should be used. What he complained of was, that under the existing system there could be no extracts used from the real Scripture, because Dr. Murray, one of the Commissioners, had sworn before one of the Committees upon the subject of National Education in Ireland, in the year 1824 or 1826, that he would not consent to any exhibition of the word of God in any school where Roman Catholics attended, unless the exhibition so made were founded upon the Douay version of the Scriptures. He (the Bishop of Exeter) felt the full force of the responsibility he incurred when he made that statement. If Dr. Murray did not swear what he (the Bishop of Exeter) said he did, he had greatly injured him. If he (the Bishop of Exeter) had entertained a doubt upon the subject, he had been guilty of a calumny. If he (the Bishop of Exeter) had no doubt upon the subject, and yet Dr. Murray did not swear in the manner he had described him as doing, he had been guilty of most culpable rashness. But upon the fullest, the most deliberate, the closest inspection of the Report of the Board of Commissioners, he (the Bishop of Exeter) again re-affirmed the charge. He declared that Dr. Murray, on the occasion to which he referred, did swear what the Commissioners say he did not swear. He was speaking in the presence of one of those

Commissioners, and he called upon the Most Rev. Prelate, in the presence of their Lordships, to declare, whether he had read the Report, upon which he founded his charge, and whether, supposing him to have done so, he would state that Dr. Murray did not swear that which he (the Bishop of Exeter) attributed to him. In the letter which had been written to prove that he (the Bishop of Exeter) had put a wrong construction on some of the evidence given before the Committee, and also upon the intentions of the Commissioners themselves, it was stated, that the Board was very anxious to obtain a volume of Scripture extracts, for the general use of the National Schools. "Why," said they, could we not have a book in the authorised version, that should satisfy the clergy of our own Church? and in order to satisfy the clergy of the other Church, let it not profess to be Scripture." But there was a subsequent letter from Dr. Murray, which removed every particle of doubt as to the construction to be put upon his former declaration. "All the prelates," said Dr. Murray in his subsequent letter, "all the prelates fully agree in the propriety of the objection urged by the Roman Catholic Archbishop, against putting into the hands of Catholic children as Scripture, any book that does not conform with our own authorised translation; we therefore feel it our reluctant duty to declare, that the work, unless wholly changed, cannot obtain our sanction as a book of instruction to be used in schools wherein Catholic children receive education." He thought, then, he had fully made out the truth of his charge against Dr. Murray. He did not shrink from the responsibility of that charge, and as a further illustration of the truth of it, he took leave to direct their Lordships' attention for a moment to certain proceedings of recent occurrence in Ireland. He was emboldened to detain their Lordships by referring to those proceedings, because they were in some degree connected with the system of national education in Ireland. In the month of December last, the Committee of the Female National School at Drogheda thought fit to give a public dinner to two very great persons—Mr. O'Connell, and a personage whom they called the Primate of Ireland. In quoting again the words of Mr. O'Connell, he begged to repeat, that he did not quote them in reference to that individual himself, but merely as illustrating the subject with which he was dealing. The Rev. Prelate then alluded to the language used by Mr. O'Connell at various public meetings, to show that he considered himself to be a tool of the Irish priests; and concluded by saying, it appeared to him that one of the most important inquiries which could be made was, whether this system afforded increased means on the part of the Roman Catholic clergy of domineering over their flocks.

The Archbishop of DUBLIN trusted that their Lordships would bear with him for a short time, and for a short time only, because it was his determination not to enter into discussions upon matters which were out of place, and would be premature, as they would be much better reserved for other occasions. He would not enter into criminations or recriminations against any individual. If any one were to bring a complaint to impeach him for high treason, he, as an individual, was ready to appear in a court of justice and to

suffer punishment. As for the vague slanders and the multiplied rumours which had gone abroad, he would not notice them. Then with reference to the complaints which had been made against the Commissioners of the Board of Education in Ireland, against them as public officers, and their mode of discharging their duties, it appeared to him, and he believed that feeling extended to their Lordships generally, that, when the Committee should be appointed, that Committee was the place where the questions at issue might be calmly and satisfactorily investigated, where witnesses were called to prove and verify facts, where distorted accounts were set right, and before which tribunal nothing was brought which was not strictly examined into and proved. He rose then, not for the purpose of prematurely entering into a discussion which ought to be reserved for the Committee. He would say nothing of the Board of Education, or of the body of Commissioners; but with respect to the charges which had been made against himself, although he thought their Lordships were called upon to give him a hearing in his own vindication, yet he felt he should better consult propriety in not detaining their Lordships with matters relating to individuals. As that was a legislative and a judicial assembly the rules which had been established in the schools of education would be examined day after day, before a Committee; and he trusted that on all points time would bring the truth to light. If all men's minds were so constituted as not to receive truth, he was sorry for it, and they were not the persons whose esteem he had any wish or anxiety to cultivate. Various measures had been suggested for the extension and improvement of the system of education, and of course this would require that the reasons for and against its adoption should be well and maturely considered; and this could be done in the Committee alone. Supposing the system in the main were to be continued, it would be for the Committee to consider what modifications they would adopt to put it on an extensive footing, and bringing it into greater operation. The Committee was wished for by the Commissioners with a view to save their Lordships' House from being involved in fruitless and unsatisfactory debates, and the public mind from being poisoned by vague, irregular complaints which were brought forward, and which could not be stopped until a satisfactory inquiry was made. From time to time various complaints were brought forward, and if the Commissioners were present on these occasions it would be well; but they were not always present, and it was quite impossible that those who were connected with the system could carry all the particulars in their memories, seeing that there were 1,500 schools. If any thing were complained of in these schools in this country or in Ireland, the Board immediately instituted an inquiry into those complaints. The Rev. Prelate then referred to various mis-statements which had been made against the Board, and which had never been contradicted. The Committee, to whom these matters would be referred, would be very different from any other that ever was, if it did not classify the various heads of the subject, and leave the House to deliberate dispassionately upon it. Now, as to the system of education in

Ireland, the Commissioners were not responsible for it, except so far that they conscientiously acted upon it. If the Commissioners, however, and those who were the parties to work the plan, had conducted themselves unwisely, let them be examined before the Committee, and if the system were hopeless, let it be abandoned; if it were necessary to make an alteration, let the means of education be increased. If the Commissioners had been false to their duty, if they had harboured improper servants for the public service, let the system be tried under the direction of other parties. But let not this mixture of the questions be resorted to, seeing that they were much more easily discussed in an animated debate than they would be in a calm discussion before the Committee. Before a Committee, no one would be allowed to substitute premises without foundation for facts, by saying, that he had been told on good authority so and so. The authority must be produced. He had told their Lordships that in some instances he knew these statements were believed by persons whom they could not conceive would put them forward. A complaint had been very properly brought before him by the court, of a person in the neighbourhood of a small town in Ireland, who declared that the Protestant children could not in conscience attend the school, because there was no way to it but by going in at the gate of the Roman Catholic chapel-yard. Now he had said, that in some instances the schools had been erected on objectionable sites, but they were prevented in a variety of cases from selecting better sites. He therefore said, he would see, in this instance, how far the site was really objectionable, and that he would go and see the place himself. With this view he accompanied the curate of the parish to the spot. They passed along the street, and saw a board up with the words "National School." He (the Archbishop) asked him whether that was not the entrance to the school, but he assured him no, it was not, and that they must go through the chapel yard. They went, accordingly, through the yard—went to the back of it, where there was no entrance—and went to the entrance from the street, which had been the entrance for many years. But the parties, nevertheless, who had made the complaint in the first instance, no doubt believed it, or they would have sent the case up for the consideration of the English Legislature; they would never have appealed to him who was on the spot. He immediately found that the grievance here complained of was totally without foundation. The school in question had been under the management of the Board for two years; and he mentioned this circumstance as a specimen of the reports which were circulated. At the same time, he was not going to enter into details, or into the justification of any one. The Commissioners were ready to defend the system of education in Ireland, though they were not there to undertake this task, but to refer its defence, not to the present Government, but to the three or four last Governments. When the conduct, however, of the Commissioners was implicated, they were ready to defend it. In a Committee, they would be enabled to ascertain distinctly matters of fact connected with many cases, for the satisfaction of those who wished for the truth, and who were desirous of submitting the

case to a Committee, and not to the heat and ardour of debate. He knew it was strongly urged, that these schools had failed for the purpose of united education; and this was equally strongly set forth as a ground for abandoning it. Persons of some importance in the north of Ireland had stated this as a reason for the division of the grant. One gentleman had assured him, that in his own quarter no Protestant attended these schools; but he (the Archbishop of Dublin) should have asserted to the contrary. These facts, however, must all come out before the Committee. Before he sat down, he begged to observe, that when he talked of the efforts which had been made to poison the public mind on this subject, and of the vague and irregular manner in which the various charges and imputations connected with it had been thrown out, he was by no means making any complaint on the part of the Commissioners. He was not authorised to do so. The Commissioners had undertaken a most laborious task, in the discharge of which they had undergone every form of vituperation and obloquy. Of all this they never complained, but went on doing what they conceived to be their duty. They were anxious, however, that the system itself should be properly appreciated. They were not at all anxious about their own characters; for however deeply they might for a time suffer, they felt it could not be in a better cause than in endeavouring to enlighten the people of Ireland, and they knew that, in the long run, the slander which had been uttered against them would be mischievous only to their opponents. But they were anxious that the public mind should be disabused on this important subject, that a proper estimate should be formed respecting it, and that no petty bickerings should stand in the way of the general good. The House of Lords was a deliberative assembly, not a criminal court; and the Commissioners had no complaint to make in it. They had been abused by false reports of their conduct. They looked with satisfaction to the appointment of the Committee proposed by the Noble Viscount. If the result of the investigations of that Committee should be an opinion that the Commissioners had not fulfilled the duties entrusted to them, they would readily and cheerfully resign their offices to others; and in so doing would lose nothing but a great deal of trouble and vexation. If their successors should improve upon their system, they would be the first to rejoice at the event. But the great question to be determined was, whether the people of Ireland, who could not be coerced into the adoption of any religion, should be left in darkness, or worse than darkness, or whether an attempt should be made by conciliatory means to enlighten and improve them. Of this he was perfectly sure, that without some measure of that kind, all other measures, however important they might seem for tranquillizing and benefiting Ireland, would utterly fail. (Hear, hear.)

The Earl of WICKLOW observed, that the Most Reverend Prelate seemed to have forgotten the circumstances under which the Right Rev. Prelate who preceded him had spoken. Allusion had been made to the motion which he (the Earl of Wicklow) on a former occasion had made on this subject. He had made that Motion, because he thought that the system which the present

plan superseded had been eminently beneficial. The Kildare-street system was now, however, totally superseded; and the present one had been for some years in operation. Admitted so far by the Legislature, it was impossible now to abolish it; and therefore he was anxious that it should be carried on in the best way possible. That was the view which the Petitioner he had that night presented took of the subject. A modification might be adopted conciliatory to all parties. The Roman Catholic priesthood objected to the children being compelled to use the Bible. The Protestant clergy protested against the children not being allowed to use the Bible. The principle ought to be "no coercion: no rejection." That was, that the parents of children should declare whether or not they wished their children to read the Scriptures. He could not see what objection the Roman Catholics could entertain to such an arrangement; he had heard none; and he was satisfied that whoever had heard what had fallen from the Most Reverend Prelate would not anticipate any. No system could, however, be successful without the co-operation of the Protestant clergy. He (Lord Wicklow) agreed with the Petitioners whose Petition he had that night presented, that that House was the proper place for the calm consideration of the subject; and he was persuaded that any recommendation emanating from a Committee of their Lordships would be most serviceable. He threw no imputation whatever on the Board of Commissioners. With every exertion they could make, it was impossible for them to prevent abuses, if the gentry and the Protestant clergy did not lend their aid.

Lord PLUNKETT was satisfied that there was no ground for the Right Reverend Prelate's, (Bishop of Exeter) charges. Let their Lordships look at the charge, and let them look at the answer in the Commissioners' third Report, a Report highly creditable to them, and which, notwithstanding the opinion of the Noble Earl, he thought they owed to their own character; and he was persuaded they would agree with him that the defence was satisfactory and complete in all points. He was, indeed, quite at a loss to discover the cause of the Right Rev. Prelate's violent indignation, or account, in any possible way, why he should denounce the system in the extraordinary manner he had done. That Board was composed almost entirely of members belonging to the Right Reverend Prelate's own Church. The language of the Right Reverend Prelate was, that the present system of education was calculated to disturb the peace of the community, to produce immorality, to put an end to all religious feeling among the people, and cause dissensions between the teachers and pupils in these institutions. The Noble Lord then proceeded to quote some of the statements contained in the Report of the Commissioners, which were answers to the facts brought forward by the Bishop of Exeter. He would not delay the House by adverting at any length to the distribution of the funds in the hands of the Commissioners. It appeared by the Report, that while the Roman Catholics of Ireland constituted seven-eighths of the whole population, the proportion in which the money was distributed was, that the Protestant correspondents received 2,190*l.* per annum, and the Roman

Catholic correspondents 8,721. As to Mr. Nangle while he (Lord Plunkett) concurred in applauding the object of that gentleman in his mission to Achill—for doubtless it was a most disinterested one which could prompt him to go to that wretched part of the country in the desire of converting the Roman Catholics to Protestantism—he was not prepared to say that he admired that gentleman's discretion, or considered that he proceeded on his mission in a way at all calculated to promote peace in that part of the country. He denied, however, that the Commissioners had meant to throw any imputation on Mr. Nangle, or to involve him in any way in a charge of creating a breach of the peace. No such thing: but here was another glaring instance of the manner in which all sorts of charges were made, without the slightest foundation, for the purpose of exciting the passions. After some more remarks, the Noble Lord concluded by observing, that he had no hesitation in saying that he entirely concurred in the opinion expressed by his Most Reverend Friend (the Archbishop of Dublin,) and he sincerely hoped that there would speedily be an end to the existing acrimonious feeling. (Cheers.)

The Earl of FINGALL remarked on the Right Reverend Prelate having described the Roman Catholic clergy as a "crabid priesthood," notwithstanding the difficulties and dangers with which they were surrounded. The objection of the Right Reverend Prelate was, that the system was not founded on the principle of union—that it did not unite the Catholics and Protestants. He admitted that in his part of the country it did not; the Protestants would not go into the schools; but that was not the fault of the system, it was the fault rather of the recusants.

STATISTICS OF DESTITUTION IN BALTIMORE.

The Rev. STEPHEN WILLIAMS, so long and so favourably known amongst us, has been engaged for about a year, in labouring as a city missionary in Baltimore. He allowed us to take from his book of notes—the following statistical facts which will afford serious matter for reflection to every benevolent mind. The statements concern especially Fell's Point and Old Town, to which the labours of Mr. Williams, have been especially directed; and the period embraced, was eleven months, ending with the first of April of this year. It is also to be observed that the white families visited, were generally, amongst the most destitute of this community; and therefore, show the condition of the white *poor*, rather than of the city as a whole. The *coloured* families, on the other hand, may be considered as perhaps a fair average specimen of that population in this city.

Such tables as this, are of unspeakable value and interest. As a matter of pure science, they are indispensable, in settling some of the most difficult questions, which the economist has to consider; to the legislator and magistrate, they reveal with exact certainty the defects and dangers of the social system; and to the Christian, they show the greatness of the miseries which sin engenders—and the

pressing urgency for the full and immediate intervention of the Gospel—as the only, and all sufficient remedy for the moral evils which thicken around us.

	Whites.	Blacks.
Whole number of families, visited	676	654
Number of children in them all	2684	1544
Number of children above 6 years of age	1699	870
Number of children attending Sabbath schools	424	221
Number “ “ “ day schools	344	72
“ “ “ “ infant schools	24	—
“ “ persons out at service	252	237
Whole number of Church members	408	566
Members of Temperance societies	71	31

We solicit the reader's attention, to the following inferences from the preceding facts, as a portion only of the instruction which they might convey. That *much* of it, will be new to him, we cannot doubt,—any more than that portions of it will startle him.

1. It appears that upon an average of nearly nine hundred *white* families, there are only three children to each family; and that of these three, two only have reached six years of age. Amongst the *blacks*, the average in six hundred and fifty four families, is only about two and a third children to the family, and that of these children considerably less than one half, have reached six years.—It is therefore apparent, that amongst the poor of this city the average of life is short; their increase is very slow;—and the mortality amongst young children very great. It is also evident that the *black* population, increases more slowly than the *white*, as there are fewer children to each family, and fewer in proportion to the actual number—above six years of age, amongst the former than amongst the latter. It seems also that the proportion of coloured persons, at service, is considerably greater than that of whites; the former being about one to every three families, the latter about one to every four.

These statements show clearly, that causes are at work, in this city, which are so sensibly felt by the poorer classes, as materially to shorten life, prevent the natural increase of population—and force households to separate, that they may obtain a livelihood. They also prove that these causes operate, upon the *blacks*, with nearly double the force, that they do upon the *whites*.

What these fearful causes are cannot be doubted. Poverty, want, wretchedness, misery, crime!—Here are the terrible causes, of the physical evils which weigh so heavily, on such a large portion of our people.

It is then certain, that the means of subsistence must be in some way enlarged—and the difficulty of obtaining them diminished,—or a very great mass of our fellow men, continue to endure under our eyes, privations, which absolutely shorten life—and prevent population.—It is little to the credit of our city, that she is provided with proportionately fewer establishments for ameliorating the evils of life than her sister cities of equal importance: and far less benevolence seems to have entered into the views of our rich citizens, either during life or at death, than society had a right to ex-

pect—and has been blessed with elsewhere. Within half a dozen years, at least that number of exceedingly rich men, have died in this city,—without bestowing as many dollars to alleviate the wants of our suffering fellow men—as there appear to be destitute households in our town.—It is however true, that we have *some* wealthy men, whose names are a praise in the mouths of the poor; and it is also true that there is much general benevolence in the character of our townsmen. and that some valuable institutions for public charity, already exist. One of the objects we desire to accomplish in laying these statistics before the public—is to excite them to efforts, better directed, more efficient, and more extensive, than have been heretofore organised for the permanent relief of certain classes of the poor—who seem at present to labour under a burden of misery of which few have any idea.—And amongst these, we would suggest particularly, poor widows with families of small children—as being a class of meritorious and greatly oppressed and suffering poor. What rich man, will come forward and found a *House of Industry*, at which, such persons can be furnished with work, at fair prices, while they are in health—and with aid when in sickness?—We envy the man, who has the means and the heart to do such an act; even if by so doing, he should rob some profligate heir of a part of the means of dishonouring his memory.

2. In regard to the *intellectual* part of these statistics: it appears that of the children fit for school, taking six years as the period at which school instruction should commence, only one in five attends week-day schools of any kind, while only one in four goes to sabbath school. Amongst those under six, only one in forty one are pupils in infant schools. This all concerns the *white* population. In regard to the *blacks*, it appears that one child in four, of those over six years of age attends sabbath schools,—while only one in twelve attends week schools. There are no black infant schools.

These statements show how insufficient the means of public instruction are for the children of the city; or else how indifferent many parents are, to this important interest of their children. Perhaps both these facts are true. And they go a great way to account for those sufferings and privations which poverty and crime are so sure to entail. To rear up children in ignorance is to deprive them at once, of many of the strongest excitements to effort, of the principal means of success, and of a considerable portion of our consolation under the vicissitudes of life—A people four fifths of whose offspring are deprived of instruction—must continue to become more destitute and degraded, rather than to make any advance in comfortable living, much less in general civilization. Yet this is precisely the condition of an immense portion of the population of our city—as exhibited by an actual visitation of more than fifteen hundred families: and the same facts are probably true, to an equal degree in other large cities.

It is very affecting to observe that the *black* population has availed itself of the voluntary instruction offered to it, quite as fully, as the *white* has of that placed within its reach. Amongst both classes, the proportion in sabbath schools, is one fourth of the chil-

dren; while only a fifth of the *white* children attend day schools, although our public schools, which are nearly gratuitous are pretty extensive; and one twelfth of the *black* children attend day schools, although no public assistance whatever is rendered to them. There are two important truths revealed here. The first is, that the *blacks* appear to be more desirous of instruction than the whites; for when it is gratuitous to both, the same portion of each is found at school, although the physical condition of the *blacks*, has been clearly shown to be worse than that of the *whites*, and the obstacles to attendance on schools, therefore comparatively greater to them.—The second observation is that, the Christians of the city, are doing more in the cause of general education than the city itself is doing—and that they do gratuitously what, is but imperfectly accomplished at a great expense by the city. Of a thousand and sixty children at school, it appears that six hundred and forty five attend sabbath schools—and only four hundred and eighteen go to day schools. Perhaps many attend both; but this does not affect the nature of the calculations. While it is manifestly true that the whole subject has been much neglected—it is also clear, that Christian principle, is the greatest element at work, in the little that has been done; and this, like every other examination, continually shows, that it is the great lever with which the earth is to be heaved up, from the depth of guilt, ignorance and suffering, into which it is plunged.

3. The *religious* portion of these statistics, will surprise many of our readers. Amongst the *white* population the proportion of professors of religion is not quite one to every two families; while amongst the *blacks* the proportion is nearly one to each family.—If we take the proportion of professors of religion to that of the whole number of persons,—allowing one third of the families to contain only one parent,—we find that amongst the *whites* less than one person in nine is professedly pious—while amongst the *blacks* nearly one in five is so. Considerable investigation of the subject induces us to conclude that the proportion of Christian professors to the entire population of the nation, is about one to nine or ten: and we were not therefore much surprised to find no more amongst our city poor, whose means of religious instruction are not superior to the average of the country. But we were exceedingly surprised to find, that amongst our *black* population, a proportion equal to that of the most favoured portion of the earth professes to be Christian. When their poverty and hardships are considered—and their utter inability to command to any extent the religious instructions, of persons whom we should deem well qualified to impart them, is considered, it is truly astonishing to see that so many have profited by the means which Providence has allowed them.—We are aware that it is very easy to solve the whole case by pronouncing their religion to be fanaticism, and their professions hypocritical. We dare not say so, for while we have knowledge of much that we cannot approve amongst them—we see no reason to deny them in mass the name of Christians. We commend this part of the subject especially to the sober consideration of Christians, supposing that the great destitution, which ac-

tually exists, not less than the apparent blessing which has attended the feeble means used, will excite them to greater efforts to evangelize all classes of the people.

The friends of temperance are sometimes induced to boast a little of their success. Here is ground for an opposite feeling. Of *whites*, only one in fifty-eight have joined temperance societies; of *blacks* only one in eighty five. It cannot for a moment be doubted that intemperance is the most fruitful source of the miseries of the poor in this country: and therefore that one great means of benefitting them, though so long and so ardently pressed, has as yet hardly touched the edge of their sorrows. We have often had occasion to bewail the blindness or selfishness, which induced good men to shut their eyes to the horrible consequences of drunkenness amongst the poor, and allowed them to range themselves against the cause of temperance. We regret exceedingly that the friends of this cause have not only allowed their efforts to cool; but that many of them have been carried away by the fanatical spirit which torments the age, and have not only taken ground which the great body of sound friends of the cause can never take, but have pushed the whole subject to the verge of ruin. This is a dreadful evil; and for the sake of the unhappy persons, whose cause we now particularly plead, we would implore the true friends of the temperance cause to rally anew, and with fresh vigour recommence their wise and benevolent labours.—

The science of statisticks is one of the most available and certain—though one of the most neglected sources of knowledge. Who can furnish us with the moral statisticks of the rich? Alas! it is not the poor alone, who forget God, and sink under the trials and cares of life. The downy pillow is as full of thorns, as the cold and damp floor on which the head of want reposes: and the purple and fine linen, may cover a heart as ignorant of God, and a spirit as ill at ease with itself—as the rags and filth of squalid poverty.—Blessed are they who possess, and are content with, the golden medium, where virtuous industry presides, and heavenly gratitude and benevolence sit side by side. Blessed household—in which neither poverty with its terrible ills, nor riches with its fearful temptations, has ever found an entrance; but where they who feed out of the hand of God—receive his mercies in covenant love, and use them as stewards of his manifold grace.

DIFFICULTIES IN THE PRESBYTERIAN CONVENTION OF THE ORTHODOX.

The violent agitation which has existed for some years past in every department of human thoughts, and effort, has pervaded, with more or less intensity, all the religious sects of the earth. Indeed it was to have been expected that religion, which is the only interest that is eternal, would be the final and great battle field of the furious elements which so deeply convulse the world.

We give below a document which is full of interest, on its account as a landmark in the contest which pervades society—as well as, on account of its important bearing on the prospects and influence of the great Presbyterian denomination in the United States. It will explain itself. In a subsequent we shall be able to explain the action of the General Assembly, before the paper was laid on the whole subject.

TESTIMONY AND MEMORIAL OF THE CONVENTION OF 1837.

WHEN any portion of the Church of Jesus Christ is called in his providence to take a step which may materially affect their Master's cause, and influence for good or ill, the destinies of large portions of mankind through successive generations;—it is a very plain, as well as solemn duty, to state clearly the reasons of their conduct—the evils of which they complain—the objects at which they aim—and the remedies which they propose. This Convention, consisting of one hundred and twenty-four members, of whom one hundred and twelve are delegated by fifty-four Presbyteries, and twelve by minorities in eight other Presbyteries, all of which members are ministers or ruling elders of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America; after mature deliberation, full consultation with each other, and earnest prayer to God for direction, have agreed on the following memorial, and do hereby respectfully lay it before the General Assembly now in session—and through it before all the churches and the whole world, as our solemn, and as we trust effective Testimony against evils which faithfulness to God, and to the world, will no longer permit us to endure.

That we have not been rash and hasty, nor manifested a factious opposition, to errors and disorders, which were only of small extent, or recent introduction, is manifestly proven by the fact that these evils have been insidiously spreading through our Church for many years—and that they have at length become so mature, and so diffused, as not only to pervade large portions of the Church, but to reign triumphantly over the body itself, through successive General Assemblies. On the other hand, that we have not been wholly faithless to our Master and to truth, we appeal to the constant efforts of some through the press and pulpit—to the firm and consistent course of some of our Presbyteries and Synods—to the faithful conduct of the minorities in the Assemblies of 1831, 2, 3, 4, and 6—to the Act and Testimony—to the proceedings of the Conventions of Cincinnati in 1831, and Pittsburgh in 1835, and to the noble Assembly of 1835.

We contend especially and above all for *the truth*, as it is made known to us of God, for the salvation of men. We contend for nothing else, except as the result or support of this inestimable treasure. It is because this is subverted that we grieve; it is because our standards teach it, that we bewail their perversion; it is

because our Church order and discipline preserve, defend, and diffuse it, that we weep over their impending ruin. It is against *error* that we emphatically bear our testimony,—error dangerous to the souls of men, dishonouring to Jesus Christ, contrary to his revealed truth, and utterly at variance with our standards. Error not as it may be freely and openly held by others, in this age and land of absolute religious freedom; but error held, and taught in the Presbyterian Church, preached and written by persons who profess to receive and adopt our Scriptural standards—promoted by societies operating widely through our churches—reduced into form, and openly embraced by almost entire Presbyteries and Synods—favoured by repeated acts of successive Assemblies, and at last virtually sanctioned to alarming extent by the Assembly of 1836.

To be more specific, we hereby set forth in order, some of the doctrinal errors against which we bear testimony, and which we, and the churches, have conclusive proof, are widely disseminated in the Presbyterian Church.

IN RELATION TO DOCTRINE.

1. That God would have been glad to prevent the existence of sin in our world, but was not able, without destroying the moral agency of man: or, that for aught that appears in the Bible to the contrary, sin is incidental to any wise moral system.

2. That election to eternal life is founded on a foresight of faith and obedience.

3. That we have no more to do with the first sin of Adam than with the sins of any other parent.

4. That infants come into the world as free from moral defilement as was Adam, when he was created.

5. That infants sustain the same relation to the moral government of God in this world as brute animals, and that their sufferings and death are to be accounted for, on the same principles as those of brutes, and not by any means to be considered as penal.

6. That there is no other original sin than the fact that all the posterity of Adam, though by nature innocent, or possessed of no moral character, will always begin to sin when they begin to exercise moral agency; that original sin does not include a sinful bias of the human mind, and a just exposure to penal suffering; and that there is no evidence in Scripture, that infants, in order to salvation, do need redemption by the blood of Christ, and regeneration by the Holy Ghost.

7. That the doctrine of imputation, whether of the guilt of Adam's sin, or of the righteousness of Christ, has no foundation in the word of God, and is both unjust and absurd.

8. That the sufferings and death of Christ were not truly vicarious and penal, but symbolical, governmental, and instructive only.

9. That the impenitent sinner is by nature, and independently of the renewing influence or almighty energy of the Holy Spirit, in full possession of all the ability necessary to a full compliance with all the commands of God.

10. That Christ never intercedes for any but those who are actually united to him by faith; or that Christ does not intercede for the elect until after their regeneration.

11. That saving faith is the mere belief of the word of God, and not a grace of the Holy Spirit.

12. That regeneration is the act of the sinner himself, and that it consists in a change of his governing purpose, which he himself must produce, and which is the result, not of any direct influence of the Holy Spirit on the heart, but chiefly of a persuasive exhibition of the truth analagous to the influence which one man exerts over the mind of another; or that regeneration is not an instantaneous act, but a progressive work.

13. That God has done all that *he can do* for the salvation of all men, and that man himself must do the rest.

14. That God cannot exert such influence on the minds of men, as shall make it certain that they will choose and act in a particular manner without impairing their moral agency.

15. That the righteousness of Christ is not the sole ground of the sinner's acceptance with God; and that in no sense does the righteousness of Christ become ours.

16. That the reason why some differ from others in regard to their reception of the Gospel is, that they make themselves to differ.

It is impossible to contemplate these errors without perceiving, that they strike at the foundation of the system of Gospel grace; and that from the days of Pelagius and Cassian to the present hour, their reception has uniformly marked the character of a Church apostatizing from "the faith once delivered to the saints," and sinking into deplorable corruption. To bear a public and open testimony against them, and as far as possible to banish them from the "household of faith," is a duty which the Presbyterian Church owes to her Master in heaven, and without which it is impossible to fulfil the great purpose for which she was founded by her Divine Head and Lord. And this Convention is conscious that in pronouncing these errors unscriptural, radical, and highly dangerous, it is actuated by no feeling of party zeal; but by a firm and growing persuasion that such errors cannot fail in their ultimate effect, to subvert the foundation of Christian hope, and destroy the souls of men. The watchmen on the walls of Zion would be traitors to the trust reposed in them, were they not to cry aloud, and proclaim a solemn warning against opinions so corrupt and delusive.

IN RELATION TO CHURCH ORDER.

Believing the Presbyterian Form of Government to be that instituted by the inspired Apostles of the Lord, in the early church, and sanctioned, if not commanded, in the scattered notices contained in the New Testament, on the general subject; our hearts cling to it as to that order approved by revelation of God, and made manifest by long experience, as the best method of preserving and spreading his truth. When that truth is in danger we hold but the more steadfastly to our distinctive church order, as affording the best method of detecting and vanquishing error. That any form of administration should totally prevent evil, is manifestly impossible while men continue as they are; and it is no small praise to the institutions of our church that they so nearly reach this result, as to be incapable of regular action, in the hands of those who are themselves corrupt. They live with and for the truth; to

spread error, they must be perverted; and before a general apostacy, Presbyterian order must always perish.

Thus it has been in these evil times. Abundant proof is before this Convention, and indeed before the whole world, that the principles of our system have been universally departed from, by those who have departed from our faith; and that generally that has been done with equal steps. Or if, as there is reason to fear, some portions of the church, still hold the external form of Presbyterianism, and deny the power of its sacred doctrines, they are those only, who, in attaching themselves to us, have either evaded subscription to our creed—or subscribed without believing it. It is enough that any system should exclude honest errorists—and speedily detect, if it cannot *exclude those who are otherwise*.

Among the departures from sound Presbyterian order, against which we feel called on to testify, as marking the times, are the following:

1. The formation of Presbyteries without defined and reasonable limits, or Presbyteries, covering the same territory, and especially such a formation founded on doctrinal repulsions or affinities: thus introducing schism into the very vitals of the body.

2. The refusal of Presbyteries when requested by any of their members, to examine all applicants for admission into them, as to their soundness in the faith, or touching any other matter connected with a fair Presbyterial standing: thus concealing and conniving at error, in the very strong hold of truth.

3. The licensing of persons to preach the Gospel, and the ordaining to the office of the ministry such as not only accept of our standards merely for substance of doctrine, and others who are unfit and ought to be excluded for want of qualification—but of many even who openly deny fundamental principles of truth, and preach and publish radical errors, as already set forth.

4. The formation of a great multitude and variety of creeds which are often incomplete, false, and contradictory of each other, and of our Confession of Faith and the Bible; but which even if true are needless, seeing that the public and authorised standards of the Church are fully sufficient for the purposes for which such formularies were introduced, namely, as public testimonies of our faith and practice, as aids to the teaching of the people truth and righteousness, and as instruments for ascertaining and preserving the unity of the Spirit in the bonds of peace; it being understood that we do not object to the use of a brief abstract of the doctrines of our Confession of Faith, in the public reception of private members of the Church.

5. The needless ordination of a multitude of men to the office of Evangelist, and the consequent tendency to a general neglect of the pastoral office; frequent and hurtful changes of pastoral relations; to the multiplication of spurious excitements, and the consequent spread of heresy and fanaticism, thus weakening and bringing into contempt the ordinary and stated agents and means, for the conversion of sinners, and the edification of the body of Christ.

6. The disuse of the office of Ruling Elder in portions of the Church, and the consequent growth of practices and principles entirely foreign to our system; thus depriving the pastors of needful assistants in discipline, the people of proper guides in Christ, and

the churches of suitable representatives in the ecclesiastical tribunals.

7. The electing and ordaining Ruling Elders, with the express understanding that they are to serve but for a limited time.

8. A progressive change in the system of Presbyterian representation in the General Assembly, which has been persisted in by those holding the ordinary majorities, and carried out into detail by those disposed to take undue advantage of existing opportunities, until the actual representation seldom exhibits the true state of the Church, and many questions of the deepest interest have been decided contrary to the fairly ascertained wishes of the majority of the Church and people in our communion: thus virtually subverting the essential principles of freedom, justice, and equality, on which our whole system rests.

9. The unlimited and irresponsible power, assumed by several associations of men under various names, to exercise authority and influence, direct and indirect, over Presbyters, as to their field of labour, place of residence, and mode of action in the difficult circumstances of our Church: thus actually throwing the control of affairs in large portions of the Church, and sometimes in the General Assembly itself, out of the hands of the Presbyteries into those of single individuals or small committees located at a distance.

10. The unconstitutional decisions and violent proceedings of several General Assemblies, and especially those of 1831, 2, 3, 4, and 6, directly or indirectly subverting some of the fundamental principles of Presbyterian government—effectually discountenancing discipline, if not rendering it impossible, and plainly conniving at and favouring, if not virtually affirming as true, the whole current of false doctrine which has been for years setting into our Church, thus making the Church itself a *principal actor in its own dissolution and ruin*.

IN RELATION TO DISCIPLINE.

That a state of affairs even approaching to that over which we now mourn should obstruct the exercise of Discipline, may not only be easily supposed, but unhappily the very evils which rendered it imperatively necessary, conspired to prevent the possibility of its regular exercise. A Church unsound in faith is necessarily corrupt in practice. Truth is in order to Godliness; and when it ceases to make us pure, it is no longer considered worthy of being contended for.

With the woful departures from sound doctrine, which we have already pointed out, and the grievous declensions in Church order heretofore stated, has advanced step by step, the ruin of all sound discipline in large portions of our Church, until in some places our very name is becoming a public scandal, and the proceedings of persons and churches connected with some of our Presbyteries, are hardly to be defended from the accusation of being blasphemous. Amongst other evils, of which this Convention and the Church have full proof, we specify the following;

1. The impossibility of obtaining a plain and sufficient sentence against gross errors, either *in thesi*, or when found in books printed under the name of Presbyterian ministers, or when such ministers have been directly and personally charged.

2. The public countenance thus given to error, and the complete security in which our own members have preached and published in newspapers, pamphlets, periodicals and books, things utterly subversive of our system of truth and order, while none thought it possible (except in a few, and they almost fruitless, attempts) that discipline could be exercised; and therefore none attempted it.

3. The disorderly and unseasonable meetings of the people, in which unauthorized and incompetent persons conducted worship in a manner shocking to public decency; females often leading in prayer in promiscuous assemblies, and sometimes in public instruction; the hasty admission to church privileges, and the failure to exercise any wholesome discipline over those who subsequently fall into sin, even of a public and scandalous kind; and by these and other disorders, grieving and alienating the pious members of our churches, and so filling many of them with rash, ignorant, and unconverted persons, as gradually to destroy all visible distinction between the Church and the world.

4. While many of our ministers have propagated error with great zeal, and disturbed the Church with irregular and disorderly conduct; some have entirely given up the stated preaching of the Gospel, others have turned aside to secular pursuits, and others still while nominally engaged in some part of Christian effort, have embarked in the wild and extravagant speculations which have so remarkably signalized the times; thus tending to secularize and disorganize the very ministry of reconciliation.

5. The formation in the bosom of our churches, and ecclesiastical bodies, of parties ranged against each other, on personal, doctrinal, and other questions; strifes and divisions amongst our people—bitter contentions amongst many of our ministers: a general weakening of mutual confidence and affection; and, in some cases, a resort to measures of violence, duplicity, and injustice totally inconsistent with the Christian name.

METHOD OF REFORM.

Such being the state of things in the Presbyterian Church, we believe that the time is fully come, for the adoption of some measures, which shall speedily furnish relief from the evils already referred to. Under this conviction, we present ourselves respectfully before you, praying you to lose no time, in so adjusting the important matters at issue, as to restore at once purity and peace to our distracted Church. We are obliged to record our most solemn and settled belief, that the elements of our present discord are now too numerous, too extensively spread and essentially opposed, to warrant any hope that they can, in any way be composed, so long as they are compressed within the limits of our present ecclesiastical organization. Mutual confidence is gone, and is not to be restored by any temporizing measures. This is a sad, but a plain truth. It is a result over which the Church has long mourned, and at which the world has scoffed—but for the production of which we, and those who agree with us, cannot hold ourselves responsible, firmly believing, as we do, that we are, in this controversy, contending for the plain and obvious principles of Presbyterian doctrine and polity. In a word, it needs but a glance at the general character, the personal affinities, and the geographical relations of those who

are antagonists in the present contest—to be satisfied that our present evils have not originated within, but have been brought from without—and are, in a great degree, the consequences of an unnatural intermixture of two systems of ecclesiastical action—which are in many respects entirely opposite in their nature and operation. Two important families in the great Christian community, who might have lived peacefully under different roofs—and maintained a friendly intercourse with each other—have been brought beneath the same roof, and yet without an entire incorporation. Contact has not produced real union, except in a comparatively few instances: on the contrary, original differences of opinions and prejudices in relation to the principles of government and order, in many points of great practical moment, have, for a number of years, been widening instead of narrowing—and those who would have been friendly as neighbours, have, at last, by being forced together into the same dwelling, after many and painful conflicts, furnished abundant evidence of the necessity of some effectual remedy. We cannot consent to meet any longer upon the floors of our several judicatories, to contend against the visible inroads of a system which, whether so designed or not, is crippling our energies, and which by obvious but covert advances, menaces our very existence. We are in danger of being driven out from the home of our childhood.

While however we complain and testify against the operations of this unnatural, unwise, and unconstitutional alliance just referred to, we wish it distinctly to be understood that we do it, chiefly because of our sincere belief that the *doctrinal purity* of our ancient Confession of Faith is endangered—and not because of the preferences we have for a particular system of mere church government and discipline. We hold the latter to be important mainly from their relation to the former. Hence, we wish it to be distinctly understood, that we have not, nor do we wish to have, any controversy with the system of Congregational church government upon its own territory. Towards the churches of New-England, which stand fast in the faith once delivered to the saints—towards the distinguished and excellent brethren in the Lord in those churches who are now testifying against the errors which are troubling *them*, as they are troubling us, we entertain the most fraternal esteem and affection. Let there be no strife between us: and there will be none, so long as there is no effort made by either body to intrude upon the domestic concerns of the other. We want no more than to be allowed the fair and unimpeded action of our own ecclesiastical principles. We desire to stand upon our own responsibility—and not to be made involuntary sharers in the responsibility of other bodies and systems of action, with which we cannot entirely harmonise. We desire to perform our master's work upon principles which we prefer, because they are the first principles of our own ecclesiastical system of government—recognising at every step the propriety and necessity of responsibility, and refusing to commit to any man, or body of men, large and important trusts, without the right of review, controul, and if needs be, speedy correction.

These being our views, we earnestly urge upon the attention of the Assembly, the following items of reform.

1. While we wish to maintain as heretofore, a friendly corres-

pendence and interchange of annual visits, with the evangelical associations of New-England—we are anxiously looking to the General Assembly in the hope and belief that it will take into immediate consideration the plan of union adopted by the Assembly of 1801, (See Digest, p. 297, 298)—and that it will perceive in the original unconstitutionality and present pernicious operations of that plan, reasons for its immediate abrogation.

2. While we desire that no body of Christian men of other denominations, should be prevented from choosing their own plans of doing good—and while we claim no right to complain, should they exceed us in energy and zeal—we believe, that facts too familiar to need repetition here, warrant us in affirming that the organization and operations of the so called American Home Missionary Society, and American Education Society and its branches of whatever name, are exceedingly injurious to the peace and purity of the Presbyterian Church. We recommend accordingly, that they should be discountenanced, and their operations as far as possible prevented, within our ecclesiastical limits.

3. We believe that every Church, Presbytery or Synod now in nominal connection with this Assembly, but which is not organized on Presbyterian principles, should be immediately brought into order, dissolved, or disconnected from the Presbyterian Church.

4. We believe that it is highly important, that, at the present time, Presbyteries should be directed to examine henceforward all licentiates and ministers applying for admission from other denominations on the subjects of theology and church government, as well as personal piety and ministerial qualifications, and to require of them an explicit adoption of the Confession of Faith, and Form of Government.

5. We desire that immediate measures be taken, in order that such members of any Presbytery as hold any of the errors, or practise any of the disorders now testified against, may be subjected to discipline: that such Presbyteries and Synods as tolerate them, may be cited and tried, and such of these bodies as are believed to consist chiefly of decidedly unsound or disorderly members may be separated from the Presbyterian Church—provision being made at the same time for the re-union of orthodox churches, private members, or ministers, who may be found in any of them with other convenient bodies.

6. As these are times of high and dangerous excitability in the public mind when imprudent or partisan men may do great injury, especially when they have facilities for operating on a large field, this Convention is of opinion that the General Assembly ought to make known to our national societies, not previously noticed in this memorial, that the Presbyterian Church expects of them great caution in the selection of their travelling agents, and that it ought to be regarded as peculiarly unkind in any of them to give to the correspondence or general bearing of their institutions, a bias against the strictest order, and soundest principles of our beloved branch of the Church of Christ.

CONCLUSION.

And now we submit to the highest tribunal of our Church—to all our brethren beloved in the Lord—and to the generation in which our lots are cast—a Testimony which we find ourselves unable to weaken or abridge, and keep a good conscience towards God and man. We have performed a duty to which the providence of God has shewn us up. We have done it, in reliance on his grace, and in view of his judgment bar. Whatever the issue may be, we rejoice in the sense of having discharged a great and imperative obligation, manifestly required at our hands, and all whose issues ought to promote the purity, the peace, and the unity of the Church of Christ.

The whole responsibility of future results, is from this moment thrown first upon the General Assembly now in session; and afterwards upon the whole Church. The Assembly will of course, pursue such a line of conduct as will appear to acquit it, before earth and heaven. The destinies of the Presbyterian Church, as now organized, are in its hands—and our Saviour will require a strict account concerning it. The great body of the Church must needs rejudge the whole action of the Assembly and on her judgment we repose, with a sacred assurance, second only to that which binds our hearts and souls in filial confidence to her glorious Lord. For ourselves, the hardest portion of our work is past. Hearts which the past has not broken, have little need to fear what the future can bring forth. Spirits which have not died within us, in the trials through which we have been led, may confidently resign themselves to His guidance, whose words have rung ceaselessly upon our hearts "This is the way, walk ye in it"—and whose cheering voice comes to us from above, "Fear not, it is I." By order of Convention.

THOS. C. BAIRD, }
HORACE S. PRATT, } Clerks.

GEO. A. BAXTER, *President.*
C. C. CUYLER, *Vice President.*

Philadelphia, May 18, 1837.

THE
BALTIMORE LITERARY
AND
RELIGIOUS MAGAZINE .

VOL. III.

JULY, 1837.

No. 7.

TO THE PATRONS OF THIS MAGAZINE AND THE CHRISTIAN PUBLIC.

THE conductors of this work, find it necessary to address themselves to their patrons and the Christian public, on the subject of their present labours, and the prospect before them. They respectfully solicit attention to the following observations.

The Baltimore Literary and Religious Magazine, has been in existence two years and a half—the present number being the 7th of Vol. III. It commenced without one *single* subscriber, and by the end of the first year, had obtained nearly enough to sustain the publication, provided the subscriptions were punctually paid. This was accomplished without any special effort, and there the matter was allowed to rest—none of any consequence having been made since. In the mean time the work has been twice improved in its external character—and is at present, considerably larger, than was contemplated when it was commenced.

We are sorry to say that in consequence of the want of punctuality on the part of our subscribers, there is an annual loss of considerable extent, on the publication. The proprietors had no expectation of making money by the undertaking; but they cannot well afford to publish it gratuitously, even in part, and are not able to see the path of duty in such a course. It only remains that our subscription list should be enlarged—that our present subscribers should punctually fulfil their engagements—or that we should discontinue the publication. Our own decided preference is that the first of these three alternatives should be the one adopted.

We are satisfied that the discontinuance of this magazine would be a serious injury to the cause of truth in this community—and a source of signal rejoicing to its enemies of all classes around us. Nothing therefore but a strong sense of duty, would

allow us to withdraw from the field. We repeat however, that the sacrifices we are called on to make, are more than we can bear: and our friends must lend us their support, or our publication must cease.

We are fully sensible that the want of punctuality in our subscribers is not at all greater, than is usual; and know also that the inconvenience attending small remittances,—the want of considering that such small sums become important when united—and a thousand such causes, rather than want of interest in the cause advocated, or want of disposition to fulfil engagements—are the true reasons, for that remissness on the part of patrons, which has caused the ruin of so many periodicals in this country.

The true remedy undoubtedly is, so to enlarge our circulation, that the regular income, upon the usual system of payment, will sustain our work—and save us from yearly losses. Beyond this, we have no pecuniary care, connected with this publication; and to this extent—if we are worthy to live as publishers, we should be—nay must be supported.

In proportion as our circulation is diffusive and enlarged, of course, our usefulness will be extended—and our ability to make our publication both valuable in its matter, and handsome in its form and materials, proportionately increased. Without taking into the account, any supposed increase in our own fitness for our labour, derived from the studies and experience of the last two and a half years; we feel authorized to say that the promise of valuable and stated aid from other sources, has at no time been so considerable as at the present moment.

Will our friends then come forward, and by an united effort set our journal completely and permanently on its feet? A very small effort on the part of many persons—would make a very great aggregate impression. One single new subscriber obtained by each of those already on our list, would put all our anxiety at rest. Two or three for each one—would give us ability to act with immense efficiency, and to command assistance and materials, that would be almost invaluable.

Are we worthy of support? The public will decide. Would letters and freedom, and truth be benefitted by our silence? Let our friends reply.

SERMON

BY THE LATE EBENEZER DICKEY, D. D.

Of Oxford, Chester co. Penn.

And he shall purify the sons of Levi, and purge them as gold and silver, that they may offer unto the Lord, an offering in righteousness.

4 Then shall the offering of Judah and Jerusalem be pleasant unto the Lord, as in the days of old, and as in former years.—*Malachi III, 3, 4.*

WHEN God constituted his ancient people into a church and nation under his own government, he set apart a tribe to be ministers of religious instruction to the remaining eleven, dividing them in Jacob and scattering them in Israel, that every part of the community might have the benefit of their labours.

The same wise arrangement is preserved under the new Testament dispensation. Still there is a tribe of Levi an order of men, set apart to the office of ministering to the instruction of the rest of their brethren. It is perfectly obvious that the proper qualification and faithfulness of this class is of the utmost importance to the well being of the whole community. If they whose business it is to teach, neglect or mistake their duty; if they teach error instead of truth; if they inculcate sin instead of duty, the consequence must be deplorable. Indeed to this very source is to be attributed almost all the evils and nuisances which have cursed and desolated both the church and the world in all past ages. The text then promises an unspeakable blessing. "And he shall sit as a refiner." On the full accomplishment of this promise which has never yet taken place, depends the introduction of that millennial glory, which has been so long expected, and which we hope begins to dawn on the church. Let us contemplate,

I. The Nature of this Purification.

II. The Fruit of it, &c.

III. The means of its accomplishment.

I. The nature of this purification. It means an official purification. Such a purification as will qualify for the faithful discharge of official duty, and comprehends especially three things,—a purification from ignorance, from sloth, and a spirit of selfishness.

1st. From ignorance. He who teaches must himself be taught. The Bible is an immense field of knowledge. Its histories, its prophecies, its ordinances, its moral duties have each a depth as yet unfathomed by the most vigorous intellect, and owing to much ignorance of them on the part of those who teach, much false doctrine is inculcated instead of truth, much false piety instead of the true, to the exceeding injury of the church. And to this ignorance in part is to be imputed the disputation and vain janglings, the alienation and hostility and schism which disgraces the gospel before the world and destroys its power over the hearts of those who profess it. Every kind of knowledge when sanctified may be of use to the gospel minister. To undervalue classical learning and academical acquirements, demonstrates an inadequate sense of

the magnitude and difficulty of the ministerial office. God never blesses ignorance to make it of any use. There is something shocking in the idea of a minister standing before a people to teach them the holy mysteries of the Bible, which are the very wisdom of God, and uttering what is little better than nonsense, accompanied perhaps with much repetition, and loud vociferation. There is besides a faculty of communicating instruction in an efficacious way, ignorance of which is a sinful drawback on ministerial success. If a man had the learning of Gamaliel with the piety of Saint Paul, if he has not some *aptness to teach*, he is without a call to enter the pulpit. I shall not be understood for a moment, as countenancing the idea that mere speculative learning in the greatest amount, will qualify a man for the gospel ministry in the absence of the power of godliness in the heart. This to be sure is to be regarded as occupying the first place and after other things in their proper order.

2d. A second object of the purification contemplated in the text, is sloth and idleness. These belong to the worst vices of human nature, because they not only operate to a neglect of duty, with a disqualification of its right performance, but are an inlet to almost every vice. In the minister of Jesus they produce neglect of study, and this produces corresponding leanness in public ministrations. Ordinarily the sermon brought forth with little study, will have little power either on the speaker or hearer. Or if native vigour of mind enables a man sometimes to surpass expectation, it is certain that due study would increase the clearness and power of his instructions in proportion. "Give attendance on reading," "Meditate on these things," "Give thyself wholly to them." He who sets light by these injunctions of the Holy Spirit, need not wonder if his profit in the church is small.

But it must be remembered that the end of study is to prepare for public active duty. We are not to study for the gratification of hording up knowledge in our minds as the miser's gold. We are not to be always students in God's study. We are to be labourers in God's harvest, and God's harvest is the harvest of souls. Souls are the wheat to be gathered into the garner of heaven, and verily he that sleepeth (in such a harvest,) is a son that causeth shame. When ignorance and sloth go together, they constitute the debased character so emphatically described by the prophet Isaiah. "His watchmen are blind, they are all ignorant, they are dumb dogs, they cannot bark, sleeping, lying down, loving to slumber." Laborious diligence, marks the man of usefulness in any sphere. Such a man was Paul, Luther, Calvin, Knox.

3d. A third object of purification in the text is self, and this is a corruption at least equal to any of the preceding in criminality and destructive results. From self seeking has sprung the assumption of Lordship over God's heritage, the man of sin with all his full grown abominations. It has been at the bottom of all the divisions and schisms which have scattered the church into so many fragments over the field of Christendom. For only by pride cometh contention. Alas my fathers and brethren, have we not the best commentary on its abomination in our own bosoms. How often do we

consent or refuse to preach, according to the calculation which self makes of its gratification in the case. We select the text too often which may lead in the discussion, to do ourselves the most credit, rather than that which might be to our hearers most for edification. In delivering our sermons how are we influenced by a regard to self display, and how are we pleased after our labours are over according as we think we have succeeded in this object. In church judicatories what efforts do we make to honour ourselves by taking the lead, and what mortification do we feel if we are left in the back ground.

When Christ's ministers are purged from this ignorance, and see eye to eye; when they are purified from sloth and ranged to vigorous activity; when they are divested of self and become humble self denied men, seeking every one not his own, but the things of Christ, and esteeming each other better than himself, then the purification in the text will be accomplished.

II. Consider the fruit of this purification, which is twofold affecting, 1st. their own offerings &c, and the offerings of the whole church.

1st. Their own offerings. "That *they* may offer unto the Lord an offering in righteousness." Services of ignorance, sloth, and those defiled with selfish vanity, are in their nature very unrighteous offerings. They are the torn, the lame and the blind, which as offerings under the law, were an abomination to the Lord. Thus saith the Lord, "cursed be the deceiver which hath a male in his flock, and voweth and sacrificeth unto the Lord a corrupt thing." The labours of wisdom, of active energy, of self denial and devotedness to the divine glory presented in faith on the altar of the Lord Jesus, are offerings in righteousness, and will be accepted accordingly.

And now let us for a moment contemplate what would be the effect of *such* labours in promoting the advancement of the Redeemer's glory in the prosperity of the church, were they rendered by all who fill the gospel ministry in the different denominations of the Protestant church.

It will be conceded I think that a purification from sloth and idleness would produce double the amount of services that are rendered I believe three or four times, but I only say double, and here at once without any change in the quality of our services, the benefit done to the church would be doubled. As God works by means in the spiritual world as much as in the natural, and as the produce is ordinarily in proportion to the means used, it will be conceded that to double the service rendered (the quality of these services remaining exactly the same) would be a double increase of benefit, that is double the edification to the church, double as many souls saved. And what an idea is this!

But when we take into consideration the purification from ignorance that will be the effect, if all the sons of Levi were rendered wise, if all their sermons were the fruit of due study by well trained minds, weighty in matter and solemn in manner, delivered with the gifts of utterance; if all their ministrations in the pulpit and out of the pulpit were the ministrations of wisdom, the increase of

benefit would be not by addition but by multiplication, and that not less than four times. I think I might say ten times. But say only four times. The case then would stand thus, rating the present amount of ministerial services as two, doubling would make them four. But adding the purification from ignorance to the degree that is attainable through grace, making them wise, you multiply these four to sixteen. You profit society sixteen times as much by your ministrations, ultimately sixteen times as many souls are saved. Do you say this is altogether an extravagant assumption. Then I ask you how much one wise laborious man has been able to effect in society? One man by talent and energy has overthrown an empire. How much did Luther do, or Calvin, Knox or Wesley? One man of sound mind and active energy is himself a host.

But we must carry the matter still a great deal further. To wisdom and energy in the sons of Levi, add purification from self, make them humble, self-denied, devoted men, and how will the success of their ministrations be still farther multiplied. I do not hesitate to say that this would add a force to their ministrations little short of what the first preachers of the gospel possessed in the gift of miracles. Yes it would be under the present circumstances of society little short of what the gift of miracles was to the apostles at the commencement of the Christian era. The great use of miracles was to silence opposition and confirm the truth of the gospel as a religion from God. And this may be done under the present circumstances of society by the ministry of reconciliation multiplied as they are to such a goodly number, nearly as well as it was by miracle in the days of Peter. Let the numerous clergy in the U. S. of all denominations become truly wise, laborious in their functions, humble, self denied in their lives. Let them teach their people so to be, which they would do of course. This would draw public attention on them universally, it would excite wonder, it would silence opposition, it would produce exactly this conclusion, "these men are the great power of God," and thus men would be prepared by conviction for conversion as if they saw one rise from the dead. And more than all, this purification would give them union, so little known in the church. Not the union whose spirit is party and whose object is sect. But genuine union of doctrine, union of counsel, of feeling, of heart and of action in the great cause of the Redeemer. Union in any cause is strength. What its benefits would be in the cause of the gospel, Moses tells us. One of you shall chase a thousand, and two shall put ten thousand to flight. This is the proportion in which union gives effect to effort in the cause of Christ, one is equal to a thousand, and two is equal not to two but to ten thousand.

Let us further notice the effect of this ministerial purification on the church at large. Then shall the offering &c.

It is perfectly obvious that were the ministry of the church rendered wise, their sermons weighty in matter, and appropriate in manner; their efforts laborious and persevering from week to week and sabbath to sabbath; their lives humble and self denied; were they united in council, in heart and in action, the blissful change would soon tell on the church at large. Revivals would abound,

converts would multiply. The tone of Christian piety, and morality would rise, forbearance and love would prevail. The hearts of God's people would open, and wealth equal to all the necessities of the church would pour into the Lord's treasury. Missionaries, ministers, sabbath school teachers, and every species of labourers gifted and devoted to their work would be thrust forth into the Lord's harvest. Bible, tract, education societies and sabbath school unions would multiply and assume new vigour. The whole church would by and by be mustered as one man to the standard of her redeemer, and constitute an army under his banners terrible to her enemies. She would march on from victory to victory, until in the appointed time the last conquest would be achieved, when the kingdoms would have become kingdoms of the Lord and his Christ. Thus the offering &c.

III. How this purification will be effected. *He* will do it. How? By the agency of his spirit undoubtedly. An outpouring of the Holy Ghost similar to the day of Pentecost will take place. The disciples were forbid to enter at all on the work of evangelizing the nations until after they had received the Holy Spirit. This is a fundamental principle, that the work is the Lord's. Every item of ministerial qualification as well as of ministerial success, is not by might nor by power but by the spirit of Jehovah. But does this doctrine supercede the use of means, or does the divine spirit work without means? surely not. Even the gift of the spirit himself is obtained through the use of means. There is no blessing more explicitly promised in answer to prayer than this, "If ye then being evil, "know how to give good gifts unto your children, how much more shall your heavenly Father give the Holy Spirit to them that ask him." (Luke xi. 13.) And the Holy Spirit begins and carries on his work of ministerial qualification by appropriate means and these means are especially two. *Education and Discipline.*

1st. Education. Wisdom, industry, self denial, devotedness &c. are clearly to be learned under the influence of the Holy Ghost. They are not to be acquired by misrule, and if so, thorough preparation for the work of the ministry is to be expected from thorough education. This is so clearly the dictate of common sense, that it is surprising how any one who knows any thing of the arduous nature of ministerial duty, would fail to be an advocate for a full course of previous preparation under the very best instruction to be obtained. It is clearly the duty of the church to provide full means of instruction for her youth who are coming forward to minister in her service, and it is equally the duty of those who preside over admission to the ministerial office," until it is ascertained that he has attained to the necessary qualifications for the arduous work. Thanks to God for schools of divinity. They are I hope doing much for the succeeding generation. To cherish and perfect them ought to be a primary object with every friend of Zion. I say to perfect as well as cherish them. My belief is, that as society progresses such may be the improvements made in education, that nearly double acquirements may be made, to what are now made in the same length of time.

2d. The second means of effecting this purification is disci-

pline. Discipline is the operation of religious society upon its members promoting their advancement in all that belongs to duty, by their teaching, exhorting, admonishing, reproof and stirring up one another. Ministers are equally the subjects of this social operation, and need its salutary influence equally with others, and its great neglect is one leading cause of the low tone of ministerial morality. If brethren in the gospel felt towards each other as brethren ought, exercised a holy watchfulness over each other, "exhorting one another daily, and so much the more as we see the day approaching," the effect would be most happy. They who will not submit to this brotherly inspection; they who are such sons of Belial, that one may not speak to them on the subject of their duties and their deficiencies, are of the lineage of Nabal and ought not to be written in the genealogy of Zion; they ought to be cast out of the ministerial office. And this is a farther way in which faithful discipline duly exercised effects the purification of the ministerial order, excluding such as are found incompetent and unworthy. A bad man in the office of the ministry is in a situation of all others affording the greatest opportunity to do the most injury to society. To continue him there is on the part of his brethren to become partakers of the evils which grow out of his misconduct. It is awful indeed to sacrifice the credit of religion, the edification of the church, the sanctity of the ministerial office, the salvation of souls, to friendship or pity, to an unworthy brother, or yet mistaken kindness to his family.

Fathers and brethren, allow me to press upon you and myself the immense importance of fitness for and faithfulness in the high and holy office to which we have been called. This is of more importance towards hastening the millennial glory than any, I had almost said than all other means put together. Bible and Tract societies, sabbath schools &c. with all their value, sink into littleness in the enterprize. For it is wisdom, diligence and devotedness in those who minister in the sanctuary which gives to these blessed institutions, life and efficiency. Without ministerial fidelity they would soon languish and become nugatory. The purification of the text is wanted far more than numbers to introduce speedily the latter day glory. I do not hesitate to say that we have at this day, a host of ministers, who if we were such as we ought to be, and such as through grace we might be, are adequate in a comparatively short time to achieve under the captain of our salvation, the conquest of the whole world. Had we the spirit of Caleb, we would say, "let us go up at once, and possess the land for we are able." And I trust it will shortly be done. The spirit has begun to be poured out on the sons of Levi and on the congregations of the Lord's people. Your own feelings testify that it is so. God is saying to his church ye have sojourned long enough in this wilderness, now therefore arise, go over this Jordan into the land which I give unto the children of Israel. Let us my fathers and brethren arise and gird ourselves. A season of fearful conflict is approaching, and victories of which those of Joshua before whom the walls of Jericho fell down flat, are but the shadow of those about to be realized. Shall we not gird ourselves for the conflict that we may participate in them, and that in the closing hours of our warfare,

when we are putting off our armour, with our clay tabernacle, our ears may be gladdened with the fresh reports of them. We indeed shall fall long before the conflict is closed. We may see the commencement, but our children's children of future generations only will see the termination. But it will be enough for us to partake with Moses in the solace of his dying hour, to ascend the mount of vision and from Pisgah's top look over the length and breadth of that new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness, the sworn inheritance of our children's children for a thousand years. May the Lord grant it.

A NIGHT IN THE REFORMED HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FROM A TORY MEMBER TO A COUNTRY COUSIN.

I have a strong impression that your most unsuspecting rusticity is considerably misled as to the manner in which the public business is managed in what is most appropriately called, the *Lower House of Parliament*.

You read through, if you have patience, three or four yards of magnificent debate, abounding with professions of patriotism, and holding up the public safety as depending on the result of the division. At the end of the session you find some scores of new Acts engrafted on the overgrown and miscellaneous thing, known by the name of the Statute-book. Not unnaturally, you fancy that all these Acts have received the closest and most jealous attention. But in this you are egregiously mistaken.

Let us, therefore, that you may better understand the matter, take a day in the House of Commons as a fair specimen of the *modus operandi*.

The Speaker takes the chair a few minutes before four. A host of petitions are presented and read. Amidst the crackling of parchment, as Member after Member unfolds the fancied wishes and suppositious wants of his discontented constituents, the *titles* of few of these petitions are heard—the *prayer* of none of them.

The second reading of some railroad Bill is then moved. The House is thronged. The gallery is crowded, and the strangers' seats, right and left of the gangway to the bar, groan under the ponderosity of shareholders having a beneficial interest *in posse*, and directors and solicitors possessing the same advantage *in esse*. In the debate that ensues, it is proved to demonstration that nothing can promote the prosperity of the nation so much as converting the greensward of a gentleman's park into the long dingy track of an iron tram-way, or poisoning the pure air of the country with the filthy exhalations from coal and grease.

A division takes place; and the march of improvement triumphs in the success of the Bill.

Others of the same nature succeed, and the happy harpies who have carried their point, rush out in admired confusion, to arrange their farther victory for the next day's swindle in 'Change-alley.

The Members, however, still remain for the present, to see how the grand political debate of the evening is likely to proceed

Some Triton among the Minnows opens the business—Mr. Joseph Hume, perhaps, or that equally sagacious legislator, Mr. Henry George Ward. The Poulters, the Bowings, and the Warburtons follow, and successively call up the men of corresponding calibre on the other side. In the meantime the House is nearly empty, and Bellamy presents the converse of the proposition. It has become clear that the great guns will not be brought up till late in the evening, and "dinner" is the cry. The country gentlemen are smacking their lips, while bottle upon bottle of old port is resorted to, as the means of strengthening them for the coming exertion of giving their vote. The men about town indulge in the comparative prettiness of claret or iced hock; and the Irish Members solace themselves with tumblers of whisky-punch, varying in individual proportions from two to two dozen.

At length, about half-past nine, Lord John Russell condescends to enlighten the House. There is a dead silence. A *hem* or two is preceded by his little clear shrill voice, and the words, "Sar, I sartainly think, Sar," are the prelude to a lengthened array of pompous common-places and narcotic *niaiseries*. Cheers, of course, are not wanting—when were they ever wanting to an actual Minister?—and the roistering roar of Mr. Henry Grattan is heard above the rest.

When the noise has a little subsided Sir Robert Peel rises. He passes his finger and thumb once or twice down his nose, and placing his upper, at an angle of five-and-forty with his lower, extremities, and resting his right elbow upon the morocco box on the table, with his forefinger conspicuously protruded, he supports the skirts of his frock coat with his left arm, and proceeds. For some time he lays down his propositions with great clearness, and in a distinct and equable voice. Then he seems to warm with the subject, and raising himself to an erect position, he turns his back on the House, and pointedly addresses the Members of his own party. This sort of appeal is never unsuccessful. The greatest enthusiasm is excited, and Sir Robert, after a peroration, usually the most brilliant part of his speech, sits down, as the newspapers would say, amidst cheering that lasts for some minutes, and does an anti-climax that he would have scorned to *speak*, by refreshing himself with a couple of oranges which the ready carefulness of Mr. Charles Ross has provided for him.

Mr. O'Connell, in all probability, will be the next to *speak*. His big, burly, bulk, as he rises from the seat behind the Treasury bench, at once catches the eye. He folds his arms, then unfolds them, and giving a sharp twitch or two to his scratch wig, magnanimously passes by every thing approaching to argument, and bursts forth at once into a declamation, of which personal and gross abuse of his opponents, and the thrice-repeated war-cry of "Justice to Ireland," are the principal components. He is not a three hours' speaker. A threatening of disease in the vessels of the throat is sufficient to inculcate prudence on a man, who, whatever may be his desires on earth, feels "no *immortal* longings in him." Twenty or thirty common-looking, and for the most part ill-dressed, persons, applaud him till the very echo, and the bench once more creaks under the weight of the "Member for all Ireland."

Lord Stanley, usually the greatest object of Mr. O'Connell's abuse, rises, to punish him for his personalities—and no man in Parliament is so capable of doing it. The unwieldy creature writhes under the castigation, and, after pretending *nonchalance* while twisting his spectacles about in his hand, or turning over a bundle of papers, he can endure the infliction no longer, and some coarse and unparliamentary ejaculation escapes him.

Sir Henry Hardinge speaks to order, in a few words of honest and soldier-like indignation; his steady and resolute severity offering the most remarkable contrast with the wild violence that called him up.

A sentence or two is then mumbled by the Speaker, of which all that can be caught is something about a hope that Members will demean themselves decorously, and Lord Stanley proceeds with his speech.

To whichever cause attributable, whether to the extraordinary quickness of his retort, the happiness of his illustrations, the un-failing fluency of his language, or the withering glance of his eye, it would be difficult to say, but he makes an impression. And nothing less than the brilliancy of Mr. Sheil's peculiar eloquence is thought worthy to efface it.

This gentleman is well enough known by his printed speeches, but he must be seen, in order to give assurance of the careful manner in which he omits to "suit the action to the word." Of "the modesty of nature," apparently, he takes no heed except to "o'erstep" it at every convenient opportunity. At one moment bent nearly double, at the next thrown as far on his haunches as would inevitably destroy the *à plomb* of a rearing horse, his eloquence literally gushes from his mouth, in utter disregard of the grotesque attitudes by which he fancies he illustrates it. He abounds in a gingle of epithets, where none but an Irish jury or an English school girl could discover even an approach to unsophisticated taste. Perhaps the most favourable listener to Mr. Sheil's speeches could never with reason convict him of consecutive reasoning or logical inference. He is personally courteous to his opponents, but is nevertheless offensive in no small degree, from his too frequent allusion to sacred things and his continual invocation of the holiest name. Such a man may excite a momentary enthusiasm, but his qualities are lost for want of a proper direction. He closes his oration with some high-sounding climax, and throws himself on his seat with a momentum that demonstrates the usefulness of the oaken back with which it is furnished.

In an instant all eyes are directed to a Gentleman who, from one of the back benches on the left of the chair, and towards the lower end of the House, displays a figure in which latitude was successfully contended with longitude. A hundred voices vie with each other in their tumultuous exclamation of "Mr. Kearsley, Mr. Kearsley!" This Gentleman, one of the Members for Wigan, never fails to convulse the House when he feels in the humour for addressing it. His speeches are not long, but they are so full of unwelcome truth that, in any other dress than the facetious John Bullism in which he clothes them, they could hardly escape giving

offence. Mr. Kearsley, on the present occasion, warns the House and the country against being misled by the elegant nothings and rounding periods of Mr. Shiel, which he somewhat unceremoniously describes as "humbug, and nothing but humbug." He then wanders into an analysis of Mr. Hume's claims to popularity, and *more suo* pronounces him to be "an old fogie." Any further remarks are here checked by the sudden apparition of Mr. Paul Methuen, who from having once accidentally taken a lead during a moment of political confusion, still fancies himself a leader. Mr. Methuen appeals to the Speaker whether the Member for Wigan is not straying from the subject—whether has not gone quite *beside* the question?

Before the Speaker has had time to make up his mind on so momentous a matter, Mr. Kearsley, with considerable *vis comica*, both in voice and manner, apostrophises the Member for Wiltshire in some such words as—"Paul, thou art beside *thyself!*"

The measure of Mr. Kearsley's offence is now full—at least the Speaker raises himself from his recumbent position and his air-cushion, and gravely expresses his trust that the Hon. Member will see how exceedingly disorderly it is to allude to another Hon. Member by name.

"I've done, Sir," ejaculates Mr. Kearsley, and quitting his place, walks into the middle of the floor, when, kissing his hand thrice to the chair, in a familiar and even affectionate manner, he endeavours to find his way out of the door. The crowd, however, in the space below the bar—the "Fop's Alley" of the House—prevents his departure; and while he is returning to his seat a sudden love of "Order" seems to possess the Ministerial Members.

Mr. Charles Buller tries to look grave, Dr. Bowring jabbars in the first of his unknown tongues that he can think of; Mr. Aglionby *yaps* something which is inaudible in the general uproar; and Mr. Warburton says a few words that, but for the absence of any reference to religion, would make one fancy, from his serious tone and solemn appearance, that he was a resurrection of some Member of the Long Parliament.

This exuberance of decorum in a few minutes corrects *itself*, but not the thing of which it affected to complain. In spite of all that has been said, or left unsaid, nothing is extorted from Mr. Kearsley beyond a brief retraction of the *words* he used, accompanied by a declaration that it is not unparliamentary to *think*, and that he still thinks Mr. Shiel a "humbug" and Mr. Hume a "fogie."

See now that tall, manly-looking person, who rises nearly in the centre of the House, on the Opposition side. That is Mr. Frederick Shaw, the Recorder of Dublin, and Member for the University. He is a straightforward, uncompromising man, plain in his manner, but unbending in his purpose. Far from seeing any utility in the declaration of an abstract principle, he feels that it is calculated to afford a mischievous triumph to the enemies over the insulted friends of the Protestant interest in Ireland. This is an unpalatable proposition in certain quarters, and attempts are made to put him down by clamour. Mr. Shaw quietly suggests that Members will best suit their eventual convenience by allowing him to pro-

ceed, as he is in possession of the House, and entertains no disposition to give way to ruffianism or uproar.

The plan of attack, therefore, is altered. Discordant noises give place to the loud buzz of conversation; and amidst a crowd of talkative Irish Members below the bar you may see Mr. Finn, in his blue shirt and spectacles, and white waistcoat, and Mr. Henry Grattan flourishing what in Ireland may possibly be only a switch, though in England neither more nor less than a cudgel, as they alternately excited an approving grunt from the *belli-gerent* Major M'Namara, or the penetralia of the porcine person of Mr. Callaghan. In this colloquial confusion the cracked voice and horrible brogue of Dr. Baldwin may easily be distinguished; and Mr. Shaw at length resumes his seat, the purpose having been fully answered, of rendering his concluding observations entirely unintelligible—at least to me, in my modest retirement under the gallery.

Prepare yourself now for the best satisfied speaker of the evening. Mr. Thomas Spring Rice steps forward to the table with all the joyous jauntiness of a bantam cock on its first escape from the roost in a bracing autumnal morning. A sonorous voice and sesquipedalian style are admirably adapted to his habitual propensity of mentally mistaking windmills for giants. He reminds one of Horace Walpole's descriptions of George Selwyn, who was so accustomed to the contemplation of actual executions that he must do every thing *à tête tranchée*. When about to have the stump of a decayed tooth extracted, he gravely arranged with the operator to *drop his handkerchief* as a signal. In a smaller way, indeed, but in the same spirit, Mr. Rice breaks a butterfly on the wheel with as much earnestness and importance as if he were engaged in vindicating the majesty of the law on the person of Fieschi or Ali-beau. In his contracted conception, the most common-place trifle becomes a point on which "he will stake his OFFICIAL REPUTATION." He is precisely the man to quote the dictum of his "Noble Friend" or his "Right Hon. Colleague," while the Cabinet were employed in discussing some remedy for a smoky chimney in the room where they met. It is sufficient for him to remind his hearers that he has a seat *inside* the Council Chamber, rather than what would be the more probable guess with a stranger on the *outside*.

A sudden drop of the voice, from the "roar" to the murmur, of the "sucking dove" serves to carry the Chancellor of the Exchequer down to the point at which, with his prettiest simper, he thanks the House for its indulgent hearing; and retires from the table, his head vibrating from side to side, much after the fashion of a pendulum when a clock is going down, as he looks about him, in hopes of catching an approving glance, or of exciting an encouraging cheer.

A smaller man might serve the purpose; but, either to parade the intellectual strength of the party or to secure the advantage of the last word from an effective debater, Sergeant Jackson comes forward on the Tory side.

The Sergeant possesses a gentlemanlike and prepossessing exterior, always a good letter of introduction, but his higher qualifications are just what make him the most unpleasant possible au-

tagonist for a mere surface smatterer, like the one who has immediately preceded him. He abounds with facts, and opposes at least ten official and authentic returns to each vague statement or unsupported assertion that Mr. Rice delights to enunciate. Perhaps, he is a little too rapid in his manner, to secure a proper understanding, by his audience, of the details, for the admirable arrangement of which he is so remarkable.

This circumstance, it may be in conjunction with the lateness of the hour, will account for the growing impatience that interrupts the latter part of Sergeant Jackson's speech. A general cry of "question" and "divide," effectually deters from any further debate, and the House divides.

In the confusion of going out, you may hear all sorts of conjecture about the probable result. I am at a loss to ascertain the most prevalent opinion, for Sir G. Clerk, Sir Thomas Fremantle, and Mr. Ross are too busy at such a moment to admit of one's getting any information from them. A feeling of confidence, however, is excited by the exclamation of Col. Sibthorp—"I'll bet two to one in hundreds that we knock ten off the last majority against us." "Done with me," is the reply from some man whose face I can't catch, and I begin to fancy that the Colonel will win.

At length the tellers announce the numbers—

For the Ministerial proposition	270
Against it	245

"That's a new grey for Sibble's phaeton," says Lord Castlereagh.

In an instant the lobby becomes filled at the expense of the House. The debate has evidently been a drouthy one: for after the host of omnivorants has cleared away, and Sir Robert Inglis, in comparative solitude, is making a plate of sandwiches disappear in "double-quick," while I am swallowing my unpretending biscuit and glass of sherry, the young man at the counter informs me that he has disposed of no less than a gallon and a half of Stone's pale brandy and twenty-nine dozen of soda-water!

Of the 515 Members who divided, scarcely more than the odd fifteen now remain. It is true that by this time the night has well worn into the morning, and nothing has been done. There has been a grand field-day, certainly, but the real business is still untouched. That is embodied in what are technically called the "orders of the day," and fifteen Members are considered quite enough for actual work. A general rush, therefore, takes place, and in the midst of it, Mr. Brotherton rises, and with an insinuating smirk on his fat, good-humoured face, quietly says, "Really, Muster Speaker, a'am quoit against sitting oup laate o'noights, and therefore aa moove that we do naow adjourn."

From some cause, which I have never been able to make out, and which certainly did not exist in Mr. Manners Sutton's time, the Speaker seems to make a point of not taking the slightest notice of the Motion—for such it is—of the Member for Salford.

Perhaps, as a supererogatory piece of courtesy, Lord Morpeth turns round to Mr. Brotherton, and assures him that he wants only two or three Bills passed through Committee *pro formâ*, and that they will occupy but a few minutes.

The Speaker leaves the chair, and Mr. Pryme takes his place at the table as Chairman of the Committee. This gentleman, if not actually funny himself, is undoubtedly the cause of fun in others. He is, for what reason I cannot understand, a sort of butt for the grave and business-like Members of the "Reformed" House of Commons; and the greatest-gee seems always excited by getting him placed in his present situation as a conspicuous mark for senatorial jokes.

Somebody moves the committal of the *Murderers Execution Bill*. The title of it is indistinctly heard, and Colonel Perceval, with earnest gravity, inquires the name of the Bill before the Committee. While Mr. Pryme is endeavoring to furnish the required information, by looking at the printed copy he holds in his hand, a voice facetiously exclaims, "It is the Reform Bill for Ireland." A long, loud laugh follows, and before it has subsided, to the utter astonishment of persons not accustomed to the rapidity of this class of Parliamentary proceedings, Mr. Pryme quits the chair, amidst the usual and affectionate cries of "No, no," and reports the Bill to the House.

Lord Morpeth moves that some Irish Bill or other shall be committed. Again the Speaker pops out of the chair, but not this time to take a temporary seat on the Treasury bench. He retires to his own room; and Mr. Brotherton, alarmed at the omen, again says something about an adjournment. The Irish Secretary assures him that only a few clauses are meant to be proceeded with, and, under the presidency of the useful Mr. Pryme, the Committee once more set to work.

It is obvious that the Speaker was right in anticipating a prolonged relief from duty. What with continued interlocutory remarks from Dr. Lefroy, Colonel Perceval, Mr. Randall Plunkett, and Mr. Fitzstephen French on one side of the House—for, without reference to his political position, the last-named gentleman always on such occasions occupies Sir Robert Peel's seat, and seems to fancy himself, *virtuti loci*, a sort of leader *pro tem.*—and Mr. O'Loghlin, Mr. Smith O'Brien, Mr. Finn, and Dr. Baldwin, on the other, there is little chance of breaking up before breakfast time. If you add to this list the talkative Dr. Bowring, who thinks the measure *must* be good for Ireland, because something like it works well in France and Switzerland, every corner of which countries, he assures the Committee, he has personally explored—the chance of adjournment becomes still more hopeless.

At length, however, when matters seem at the worst, Lord Cole unfolds his two yards of stature, and declares that if the Chairman does not immediately report progress, he will move that the House be counted. This hint tells. The House resumes, and in the full belief that no more business can now be done, the benches are once more deserted.

This, however, is a mistake; for no sooner have the Tory Members fairly gone away, than, after a good deal of whispering, Mr. Charles Wood, the Secretary of the Admiralty, and a Ministerial whipper-in, leaves the house in haste. Eight or ten Members immediately afterwards drop in—of course by the merest accident.

Then out goes Mr. Fox Maule, another Aide-de-Camp, rolling like a porpoise rejoicing in a coming storm. With looks and complexions that bear evident marks not only of late hours, but of "potations pottle-deep," a dozen and a half or so of other Members find their way to the Government benches by twos and threes.

The mystery of all this movement is now unravelled. The Chancellor of the Exchequer, in his most insinuating manner, moves the third reading of that infidel infraction of the Christianity of the Constitution, the Bill for permitting Jews to sit in Parliament. There were some good men and true still left: and in case of a division, therefore, it was necessary to "make a House," no matter of what materials.

An Amendment is moved and seconded by Col. Sibthorp and Mr. Arthur Trevor, of both of whom, as I have not the honour of being personally intimate with them, I may say that two more honest, disinterested, and vigilant public men do not sit in the House of Commons.

The anticipated division takes place, and the numbers, including the tellers, are 36 for the Bill and 3 for the Amendment. The Bill is of course passed, and my only comfortable reflection on the matter is, that of the unsuccessful minority I form the third part in my own person.

The *finale*, at last, and after so many of what may be called "false starts," actually approaches.

It is by this time nearly half-past three o'clock, and the Speaker, as if between sleeping and waking, but nearer the former than the latter, puts the question, "That this House do now adjourn." The Sergeant-at-arms *trips* along the floor—I use the word advisedly, for in a man accustomed to wear a sword I never saw so much *gaucheté* in the management of one—and, placing the mace on his shoulder, precedes the Speaker to the door, which Messrs. Pratt and Williams, the indefatigable door-keepers, throw open, while they call out to an empty lobby, "Make way there for Mr. Speaker!"

CONTROVERSY IN THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH—GENERAL REFLECTIONS.

That a nation is always as its priests make it,—is an axiom, which has been received as true to a greater extent, and for a longer period than possibly, it deserved. In certain conditions of society,—as for example where ignorance and enthusiasm, form the basis of popular character, the influence of the ministers of a false religion might be indefinitely great. But in other conditions, even true religion might exert almost no control,—as where frivolity, and a skeptical cast of temper, lie at the foundation of national character,—and a false and superficial philosophy presides over national education.

It is undoubtedly true however that, a people and the ministers of its religion must sympathize profoundly—and must resemble each other closely. Whatever controls the people, controls their

priests also; and even where priests may not be able to control a people—those great events which decide the character of the instructors of a whole people—must also, decide that of the people themselves. A virtuous and enlightened people, can never perhaps exist while its religious teachers are ignorant and corrupt; for if by any chance the flocks of such shepherds should ever become better or wiser than their guides, their very first movement would be to change them. On the other hand, mankind in general must have a certain propriety of sentiment, and a certain bias towards sound doctrine, before their teachers can be considered firmly and permanently established on a safe elevation, in regard to the same sacred interests.

Perhaps it is in its religious institutions that the character of a people may be most clearly read; or if any choose to modify the proposition, it is by them, that men and communities are most deeply and permanently controlled and fashioned. The interests of eternity can never be entirely erased from the memory and conscience; and therefore the strong faculties of the soul, pent up every where else, must here dilate with resistless vigour. "Thou thoughtest I was altogether such an one as thyself"—is the stern rebuke of Jehovah to the ruined soul. The heart, if it knows not what *is* God, bows down to that it desires to be God—and adores as Lord, the personification of its own most controlling impulses. The licentious Greek, worshipped in Bacchus the *beau ideal* of his own pleasures: the Roman with his hands died in gore, and the world bleeding at his feet adored *wisdom* and *courage*, though he called them Mars and Minerva; and our Scandinavian ancestors when they bowed down to Thor—did in reality worship the embodied ideas of *rapine* and *cruelty*, which formed such terrible elements of their own fierce natures.

In the United States this great subject, like all the immense problems on whose solution the destiny of man depends—is presented in a light entirely novel. Here for the first time religion is absolutely free. It is neither allowed the power to oppress—nor the discipline of persecution. It is absolutely and in the most unqualified sense free. Its next, and not less striking peculiarity is, that the people amongst whom, it is here called to fulfil its sublime mission—differ from all others that ever existed, in precisely the very most important respects, in which the other absorbing interests of man might be supposed capable of affecting religion for good or ill. First, there exists here a larger portion of educated intellect than ever existed before in any community; a greater portion of independent power—disconnected from religion—and therefore available against as well as for it; a greater mass needful to be influenced, and when influenced either way, correspondingly powerful. And secondly, this unwonted mass of enlightened minds, all as a great whole—and each individual of it, as a separate person, is stimulated to a degree, that has never been witnessed in any age of the world, or amongst any people: insomuch that the whole nation in general, and every man in particular, seems to act and labour, as if the fate of the world depended on each single effort, which being intermitted for a moment, every thing would per-

ish—but which pushed ceaselessly must end in triumph and glory.

It is a great eulogy, that religion has held its place in such hearts, and retained its dominion over such minds. It is a singular proof of its strong hold on the human soul, that it has not been shaken loose from it, by the terrific agitations of the past and present ages. But this is an exceedingly imperfect statement of the truth, and men must admit that the Christian religion is more generally diffused here than in any other country—and that its most signal triumphs have been in the midst of our most enlightened communities. Religion has survived the midnight of the world: its last office is to preside over the noon of human grandeur. Well and nobly will she fulfil her destiny.

The first three centuries of the church, were centuries of comparative freedom, purity and consequent enlargement. Constantine the Great, united the state to the church, and for many ages kings and bishops, oppressed them both. Another development—a second downward step—cast all these fearful powers into a single hand—and the Pope became for centuries the absolute spiritual and temporal despot of the earth.—The glorious reformation, unbound liberty, washed the defiled garments of religion, and spread open the portals of heavenly light, to quicken a world that lay in darkness. New developments have again occurred. In the furious struggles for liberty in continental Europe—hatred and contempt for a corrupt worship made all men infidels; and God allowed it to be made manifest, that a state without a God, is as helpless in its bloody ignorance—as one with false Gods is hateful in its brutal stupidity. In the United States, at this moment, we are passing through a signal and before unknown development. Religious fanaticism, united to civil licentiousness, is spreading over the land—and unless thoroughly arrested, must degrade religion and subvert society.

Religion, consists of principles as well as sentiments: and a perfect Christian is one whose faith is intelligent, reasonable, clear and settled,—and whose happiness consists in the performance of those duties, which his enlightened creed enjoins. If sentiment predominates, enthusiasm is the result:—if cold intellection, a settled orthodoxy, is the best result that can ensue. Sentiment without defined principle is fanaticism; and it becomes excessive and absurd as the sentiment is excited and gross. Principle without sentiment is to true religion, what the chiselled marble, in its frozen beauty, is to the glorious majesty of the living Hercules.

We have, in such reflexions a clue to the anomalies which present themselves, in the character of private Christians, and even whole denominations—without the necessity of a more severe judgment. Besides this, it is to be remembered, that endless modifications exist, as to what is true in principle—and great differences of judgment in regard to what constitutes a just religious sentiment. And then again, after any given standard shall have been formed and established, perfect conformity to it, must be always difficult, and often impossible. Individual eccentricities, are dependent on the same principles as the general bent of sects: and

nothing is more to be expected, than that what was at first, one man's peculiarity—will presently be the characteristic of a body—and by and by of a nation, or a generation. The descent from Edwards, through Hopkins, Emmons, and Taylor to an antinomian perfectionism, as rank as the worst heresies of the Annabaptists—is clear and natural—though it grew sadly in deformity at every remove, from the first respectable parentage.

It must be observed too that the great truths of any system, will struggle to the light—amidst all the darkness inferior sectories can possibly cast over them. In the widest range of religious ideas, how immensely do ages and sects differ—who agree in the fundamental truth of all religion—namely the unity of the Godhead and of worship: and they who reject it, though they agree in almost nothing else—how constantly have they been one in their abject submission to the vilest superstition. So too, in a far narrower field indeed, but one not less important,—they who hold what are called the *doctrines of grace*—though they differ in name, and are often sundered by sharp contention,—yet how thoroughly are they agreed, in that evangelical system, which gives its vitality to all Christian effort, and lies at the basis of all human hope. Read the *Pilgrim's Progress*, the *Rise and Progress of Religion in the Soul*—the *Four Fold State*—the *Great Concern*—the *Call to the Unconverted*, or the *Saints' Everlasting Rest*, and tell if you can to what sects, Bunyan, Doddridge, Boston, Hallyburton, and Baxter belonged. Yet they did in fact belong to different—and often contending portions of the visible kingdom of Christ.—

The churches that sprung from the reformation, were as to their doctrine and order, most remarkably alike. That doctrine and that order, it is matter of established history—were generally and essentially Calvinistic and Presbyterian. The system was evangelical—the order was popular as regarded private Christians—equal as related to the ministry. And from that day to this, evangelical Christianity—has been at the foundation of all the regulated liberty, and social freedom, which the world possesses.

This is a most profoundly interesting fact. It ought to teach mankind the real nature of their obligations to Christianity. It should teach the ministers of religion, the true posture in which they should stand towards all the great interests of human society. It ought, at once and forever to break up the bond of sympathy, between false doctrine, and the real friends of human advancement: a sympathy which does so much injustice to godliness, and so much wrong to liberty. What erroneous sectaries ever did any thing to advance any great interest of man? None; and none ever will. What evangelical denomination ever did real injury to any? Not one: nor will such a contradiction ever occur. All that is most excellent in knowledge—most virtuous in practical life—most heroic in great trials—most faithful to the great interests of mankind, is written in the history of evangelical Christianity. Let this perverse generation read it: and blush for its credulous and ignorant prejudices.

But of all the branches of this great Christian family, not one has had a more remarkable history, than that, which holds to what are called the Westminster standards. The Long Parliament of

England was the real birth place of modern liberty. It was also the great representative of all the Protestant freedom and power of Europe, in that age of trial and darkness, What is Protestant Christianity?—was the demand of those heroic defenders of Protestant freedom. They put that question not to one or two sects: but they put it to the Protestant world. The answer to it, is found in the Westminster standards: and they are, and deserve to be, and will forever remain as they have been for generations—the bulwark of Protestant truth, rather than the narrow creed of a small sect. They constitute the solemn and well considered response of the combined learning, piety, and talent, of the Protestant world to the demand for a true exposition of protestant belief—by the great embodied head of protestant liberty. Cursed be the diabolical wisdom that shall ever avail to sever these sacred bonds!—

The doctrinal errors of popery, against which these standards were in one aspect, especially directed, formed the basis of the creed of that church, for ages before—and do so still. There are many doctrines of Popery peculiar to itself; but there are others common to it, with other systems of error. Some, for example it holds in common with heathenism; as the plurality of objects of divine worship.—Others it has in common with the Arian, Pelagian, and even Socinian heresies;—as the denial of the new birth.—The great doctrinal error of popery, in the plan she puts forth to save the souls of men, lies precisely at the foundation of every false system that ever existed—and is exactly the great error against which the system of the Westminster divines, directs its giant strength. The doctrine of God is, that man is indebted for salvation to his mere grace, and that faith in a crucified Saviour is the sole method of access to him. The universal theory of error is, that man can do, and must do something, more or less—which either as merit, condition, or occasion, shall secure his salvation. Here the systems part; and they meet no more. They are as widely sundered as God from man—and their issues take hold of no less than heaven or hell.

All the great doctrinal controversies in all ages—have either turned directly, or looked remotely, to this grand distinction. In settling it, he who reasons well, settles all. And he who will carefully examine the subject, with sufficient light to guide his steps, and enough of intellect to fathom its depths—will end his search, convinced, that between evangelical religion—and absolute and universal atheism, there is no resting place. Wandering from the simplicity of the gospel—the ultimate landing place, is total unbelief. By a happy inconsistency in man, many never reach the final goal; and multitudes feel and act better than they reason. But all such are indebted more to the weakness of their heads, than the strength of their cause: far more to the excellence of their tempers—than to the clearness of their views.

In our own days and country, we see this fully illustrated. All the controversies, which assume decided importance, have their point directly here. It must be admitted that a sort of straggling warfare is kept up on other subjects—and that wretched polemics are silly enough to write tracts and books, even at a time like this,

intended to persuade men that they are not baptised, if they be not *dipped*—that none are members of Christ's church, whose scalps have not been pressed by episcopal fingers—and other like trifles. But these are weak and occasional exceptions. In all the sects, the real controversy, is for the vitals of Christianity. Hicksism amongst the society of Friends, Campbellism amongst the Baptist churches—High churchism in the episcopal church—Taylorism in the congregational churches, and New schoolism in the Presbyterian church, do all, and all nearly equally, sap the foundations of the Christian's hope—take from the gospel its distinctive character—and threaten the total ruin of the church of God. It is a great defection from the bosom of protestantism—in which its erring children, have stepped back upon the fundamental principle of papal doctrine, and become unwitting instruments of the man of sin.—

In such a controversy, the sound portion of every denomination is the real ally of the corresponding part of every other; and all who love man or God, ought to be the steady friends of those, who are in fact contending for the best interests of one, and the great glory of the other. In such a controversy, it peculiarly appertains to such a periodical as this, to speak openly and freely; and so by God's grace, will it act, that the trumpet shall receive from us no uncertain sound.

Such are some of the general considerations which have occurred to us, in reflecting on the proceedings of the late General Assembly of the Presbyterian church. As one of the conductors of this Magazine, was called by Providence to act with the majority of that body—it is needless to say, that we heartily approve of its acts—and thank God for the wisdom which conceived, and the courage and fidelity which executed them. We have heard and seen much abuse of that assembly;—and we are not disposed to deny that many scenes which disfigured its sessions were calculated to wound deeply the hearts of Christians, and to astonish all others. But no candid person will deny that it was the leaders of the minority who were not only the responsible—but in fact, the active parties in such scenes. We shall return to this subject, with more particularity. In the mean time, we take leave to say, that the great bulk of that Assembly seemed to us, to conduct themselves in a manner worthy of the great interests they were called on to decide—and of the noble churches they were appointed to represent. Faithful and beloved men and brethren! We shall love our race better, henceforward—for having seen such specimens of human nature—and our church for having furnished forth such an array. Blessed is the communion, in which such men teach and rule.—Evil is the cause which such men reprobate. Certain and beneficent must be the triumph for which such men labour, pray and watch.

A FEW FACTS ABOUT ONE OF THE SEPARATED SYNODS.

The following letter will speak for itself. It was addressed to one of the conductors of this Magazine, but came to hand after the great reform it was intended to promote had been effected—and the body to which it was evidently meant to give material information had finally adjourned. We publish it without communicating with the writer, and therefore of course without express permission; but it will appear not to be inconsistent with his views in writing it—to use it in justifying that, which it was written to aid.

We cheerfully make ourselves responsible for the Christian character and perfect veracity of the writer. Let his statements be seriously pondered by any who entertain a doubt, if there be any true Christian in such a state of mind—as to the wisdom and necessity of the action of the late General Assembly of the Presbyterian church, in separating the synod spoken of, from its communion. The truth is, that the facts of the case have been sedulously concealed from our churches; and the only cause of self accusation will be, when we fully know them—that we have thro' a misplaced confidence too long neglected to ascertain and put an end to proceedings, which were equally dishonouring to God and hurtful to the souls of men. What are we to think of men, who pursue the conduct here exposed—and yet claim fellowship with our faith and order? What could be thought of us, if we knew and connived at such proceedings?

June 4th, 1837.

DEAR BROTHER—Since I left Philadelphia I have been informed that a motion, to declare the Synod of Utica to be no longer a part of the Presbyterian church would be made. As facts will be the basis of action on this point, I take the liberty to throw some together and transmit them to you. I think they will not be flatly denied by the opposition as they can be proved.

1st. In many of the churches of that synod, there are persons called *perfectionists*, compared with whom the Methodist perfectionists are very orthodox. They hold, that do what they may, they *cannot sin*; yea, that it is as impossible for them as for God himself. They break the Sabbath &c., on the ground that they have got *above* these things. They consider ministers *nuisances*, and churches *useless*, and that they ought to be torn down. In the church of Adams, Watertown Presbytery, they proceeded to acts of the grossest sensuality, on the principle, that they can do no wrong. Indeed some of their notions are blasphemous. They are the results of the doctrine of man's ability and new measures. The filth deposited, &c.

2d. When urged to condemn error, as in the case of Goodrich, who was at last found guilty but not punished, for asserting that children at birth have no moral character, the ministers said how can we go forward? In condemning him we condemn ourselves. The Presbytery of Oneida is the most corrupt in that synod, the strong hold of abolitionism and I think cannot be reformed. Green has great influence, and in his institute, the blacks and whites are sitting side by side at the dining table. However, this would excite combustion, and slavery had better be let alone. It is a fact, however, that immediate

abolitionism and new schoolism are nearly allied. Where one is you will find the other also. I heard a minister say in Presbytery, that since he became an abolitionist, he did not know where he was in theology. He was at sea—no compass to guide him.

3d. In the synod of Utica in 1834, a venerable elder who was trembling over the grave, rose in open synod and rebuked the ministers for their management and corruption. Formerly said he (I suppose he referred to the ministry of Dr. Carnahan,) clergymen were distinguished for whatever things are lovely, honest and true, but now they have degenerated into mere pettifoggers and double dealers. I can have no confidence in them.

4th. I have no hesitation in saying that the synod, but especially the Presbytery of Oneida, are in open rebellion as to the doctrines of our confession in their literal acceptation. Indeed, the old school doctrines are viewed very much as we would view the doctrine of transubstantiation. They abhor and despise them. Brother Barber an agent of the assembly's board was openly insulted in the synod of Utica in 1835: so much so as to excite indignation in the minds of some moderate men. He was not permitted to advocate his cause, or state to the Synod the principles on which the board acted. There is such a fanatical spirit that *many imagine*, that a mere novice, for instance a would be revival man, an exhorter or private member, or even an old woman or a new convert *knows* more of what piety is and true theology than fifty of the most experienced ministers in the church. With them the opinion of all the professors of all our seminaries would not weigh a feather.

5th. Many of the churches were once congregational, but how many came in on the accommodation plan I cannot say. The 1st church of Rome is congregational, unless it has come in within a year. The pastor was moderator of the Synod in 1835. Whether the deacons have a seat in Presbytery I know not. The 2d church of Rome altered its articles, that Baptists might become members. In the Presbytery of Watertown there are two or three congregational churches under the care of Presbytery. One has a Presbyterian supply—two or three Presbyterian churches are supplied by congregational ministers. The Presbytery and Black river Association have a joint committee under the home missionary and American Education Societies, to recommend candidates, &c.

6th. Ministers are often received into presbyteries from associations without adopting the confession of faith at all. I know an instance where a minister was received from Vermont without a dismissal from the association or recommendation to presbytery—but merely a certificate of good standing. Mr. Wilson of Sackett's harbor is the man. The presbytery offered to admit another but he declined. An elder was heard the other day teaching the children in the Sabbath school, that they had power enough to obey all God's commands—the orthodox idea is held up as absurd. When the new school eulogize the Confession of Faith they mean with their private interpretation of it. *Burchard*, (as he is called throughout N. York state,) is I presume you know, a member of the Oneida Presbytery.

7th. Creeds are formed and used as a substitute for the Confes-

sion of Faith. I know a minister who was broken up and driven from his parish because he would not ordain an elder unless he assented to the Confession of Faith.

Dear sir, I feel a deep anxiety for your success, I do hope, that before the members of the Assembly leave Philadelphia, that they may be enabled to say, *the church is free*. If these facts will aid in effecting this object they are at your service.

Your friend and brother,
E. H. S.

DOCUMENTARY HISTORY OF THE ASSEMBLY OF 1837.

No. I.

No ecclesiastical body has ever met in this country, more important in its influence and acts, than the recent General Assembly of the Presbyterian church. We desire to make our readers familiar, with its spirit and proceedings—and to preserve a record of its most important acts. Our last number contains the memorial of the convention of the Orthodox, which preceded the assembly; and upon which memorial most of the leading acts of the assembly were based. That paper was also a Testimony, of the real Presbyterian body, against the totally new principles of church order, and the terrible heresies which have been secretly introduced, and widely disseminated in that church. We proceed to give, the first set of a series of important papers, which were produced during the course of the Assembly—and which will very clearly exhibit, as we progress, the posture, and aim of the Presbyterian and Anti-Presbyterian parties.

The reader will be struck, in the perusal of the documents now published with several important points in the progress of this controversy. He will see that in the recorded judgment of all shades of opinion—there are too great differences in doctrine and too great mutual alienations, to allow a peaceful or profitable continuance of union in one body; and by reading the memorial and testimony spoken of above he will see the whole reasons thereof set forth. He will see that every demand of the minority, having any sort of reason in it was immediately assented to, by the majority—and that prompt and ample provision was tendered by them, for the equitable settlement of every matter not immediately disposed of on the most liberal, and Christian terms. He will see that the New School party, refused to be satisfied with any thing less, than the total annihilation of the church as now organized; and broke up the plan for a separation, mainly because the orthodox refused to destroy utterly, the church, which while they revered, the others cared so little for that their very first offer was, to give up even its name! He will perceive that every sort of shift was resorted to that time might be gained—in order that the Home Missionary Society with Dr. Peters's seven or eight hundred agents, pensioned over the land, and disseminating discontent—might operate the final ruin of the orthodox; to effect which object Dr. Peters had at his disposal \$100,000 per annum, which he spends without any sort of responsibility to any church tribunal whatever; and by a very easy arrange-

ment, might so transfer his agents, as to control the one half of our Presbyteries—even if no new ones were made; but nothing more was wanting than to follow out practices already extensively pursued, and by making numerous small Presbyteries—put the whole power of the church, into the hands of a small minority of the synods. He will be amazed to find, that even on the principles of the New School men, if the orthodox had embraced their proposals,—they might have been finally *unchurched* and lost every thing, after complete success, by three or four stubborn semi-pelagian Presbyteries, holding obstinately out, and claiming to be the only true Presbyterian body; and yet that persons professing Godliness could seriously propose such a scheme, as *fair and equal to brethren*. Finally, he will blush to see Christian gentlemen making a proposition which meant one thing to the eye, and a totally different thing to the intention (No. 4 of the minority;) a proposition which as explained by its authors could be either, only nonsense—or only a fixed purpose to entrap and deceive! We say this with deep sorrow, and sincere shame: but we say it frankly and decidedly. We are utterly unable to comprehend how a fair minded and upright man, could make such a proposition, with such a meaning, as the proposition No. 4 of the minority—with their explanation of it. And Dr. McAuley, Dr. Beman, Dr. Peters, Mr. Dickinson, and Mr. Jessup—will find it very hard to make the world believe they made a proposition, which they intended to be nonsensical. We *agree* and propose, say they, to ask the assembly, to decide a single point before submitting details; if they decide thus—our plan for *voluntary separation* shall “*be taken*,” but if otherwise then yours shall “*be taken*.” The committee of the majority considered all fair, and were in the act of assenting to the proposal. But as the other committee had already deceived them once before and retracted an ultimatum, after saying it was final—it was thought safest to ask, if they meant what they said—if they would be bound to execute in good faith the decision came to. The question was asked with hesitation, and only out of a sense of imperative duty. Its answer was heard in silent wonder! No; we will not execute, in good faith—nor do we consider you bound to do it!! Heaven preserve us from such diplomacy!

DIVISION OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH.

Tuesday Morning, May 30.

Dr. Alexander, from the committee of ten who had been appointed on the existing state of the church, stated that in conducting the business with which they were charged, the committee had agreed that the two portions of which it was composed should meet separately, interchange communications with each other, and each report to the Assembly in its own way. He farther stated that the two portions were agreed in opinion that a division of the church ought

to take place, and were also agreed respecting many details of the plan; but that as to the main point, to wit, when and how the division should be effected, they had been unable to come to any agreement. The reports of the respective portions of the committee would place the whole subject fully in possession of the Assembly.

Mr. Breckinridge, in behalf of the committee from the majority, read the following report:

The committee of the majority, from the united committee on the state of the church, beg leave to report:

That having been unable to agree with the minority's committee on any plan for the immediate and voluntary separation of the new and old school parties in the Presbyterian church, they lay before the General Assembly the papers which passed between the committees, and which contain all the important proceedings of both bodies.

These papers are marked 1 to 5 of the majority, and 1 to 4 of the minority. A careful examination of them will show that the two committees were agreed in the following matters, namely:

1. The propriety of a voluntary separation of the parties in our church; and their separate organization.

2. As to the corporate funds, the names to be held by each denomination, the records of the church, and its boards and institutions.

It will appear further, that the committees were entirely unable to agree, on the following points, namely:

1. As to the propriety of entering at once, by the Assembly, upon the division, or the sending down of the question to the Presbyteries.

2. As to the power of the Assembly to take effectual initiative steps, as proposed by the majority; or the necessity of obtaining a change in the constitution of the church.

3. As to the breaking up of the succession of this General Assembly, so that neither of the new Assemblies proposed to be constituted, *this* proper body continued; or that the body which should retain the name and institutions of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian church in the United States of America, should be held in fact and law, to be the true successors of *this* body.

While the committee of the majority were perfectly disposed to do all that the utmost liberality could demand, and to use in all cases such expressions as should be wholly unexceptionable; yet it appeared to us indispensable to take our final stand on these grounds.

For, *first*, we are convinced that if any thing tending towards a voluntary separation is done, it is absolutely necessary to do it effectually, and at once.

Secondly. As neither party professes any desire to alter any constitutional rule whatever, it seems to us not only needless, but absurd, to send down an overture to the Presbyteries on this subject. We believe, moreover, that full power exists in the Assembly, either by consent of parties, or in the way of discipline, to settle this, and all such cases; and that its speedy settlement is greatly to be desired.

Thirdly. In regard to the succession of the General Assem-

bly, this committee could not, in present circumstances, consent to any thing that should even imply the final dissolution of the Presbyterian church, as now organized in this country; which idea, it will be observed is at the basis of the plan of the minority; insomuch that even the body retaining the name and institutions should not be considered the successor of *this* body.

Finally. It will be observed from our 5th paper, as compared with the 4th paper of the minority's committee, that the final shape which their proposal assumed, was such, that it was impossible for the majority of the house to carry out its views and wishes, let the vote be as it might. For if the house should vote for the plan of the committee of the majority, the other committee would not consider itself, or its friends, bound thereby; and *voluntary* division would therefore be impossible, in that case. But if the house should vote for the minority's plan, then, the foregoing insuperable objections to that plan being supposed to be surmounted,—still the whole case would be put off, perhaps indefinitely.

A. ALEXANDER,
C. C. CUYLER,
J. WITHERSPOON,
N. EWING,
R. J. BRECKINRIDGE.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE then read paper No. 1, being a communication submitted by the committee from the majority to the committee from the minority.

No. 1 of Majority.

The portion of the committee which represents the majority, submit for consideration:

1. That the peace and prosperity of the Presbyterian church in the United States, require a separation of the portions called respectively the old and new school parties, and represented by the majority and minority in the present Assembly.

2. That the portion of the church represented by the majority in the General Assembly, ought to retain the name and the corporate property of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian church in the U. S. A.

3. That the two parties ought to form separate denominations under separate organizations; that to effect this with the least delay, the commissioners in the present General Assembly shall elect which body they will adhere to, and this election shall decide the position of their presbyteries respectively for the present; that every presbytery may reverse the decision of its present commissioners, and unite with the opposite body by the permission of that body properly expressed; that minorities of presbyteries, if large enough, or if not, then in connexion with neighboring minorities, may form new presbyteries, or attach themselves to existing presbyteries, in union with either body, as shall be agreed on: that synods ought to take order and make election on the general principles already stated; and minorities of synods should follow out the rules suggested for minorities of presbyteries, as far as they are applicable.

Mr. JESSUP read the following, being a paper submitted by the committee from the minority to the committee from the majority.

No. 1 of the Minority.

Whereas the experience of many years has proved that this body is too large to answer the purposes contemplated by the constitution, and there appears to be insuperable obstacles in the way of reducing the representation;

And whereas, in the extension of the church over so great a territory, embracing such a variety of people, differences of views in relation to important points of church policy and action, as well as theological opinion, are found to exist.

Now it is believed; a division of this body into two separate bodies, which shall act independently of each other, will be of vital importance to the best interests of the Redeemer's kingdom.

Therefore, resolved, That the following rules be sent down to the presbyteries for their adoption or rejection as constitutional rules to wit:

1. The General Assembly of the Presbyterian church shall be, and it hereby is, divided into two bodies: the one thereof to be called the General Assembly of the Presbyterian church in the United States of America, and the other, the General Assembly of the American Presbyterian Church.

2. That the confession of faith and form of government of the Presbyterian church of the United States of America, as it now exists, shall continue to be the confession of faith and form of government of both bodies, until it shall be constitutionally changed and altered by either, in the manner prescribed therein.

3. That in sending up their commissioners to the next General Assembly, each presbytery, after having, in making out their commissions, followed the form now prescribed, shall add thereto as follows: "That in case a majority of the presbyteries shall have voted to adopt the plan for organizing two General Assemblies, we direct our said commissioners to attend the meeting of the General Assembly of the 'Presbyterian church of the United States of America,' or 'the American Presbyterian church,' as the case may be." And after the opening of the next General Assembly, and before proceeding to other business than the usual preliminary organization, the said Assembly shall ascertain what is the vote of the presbyteries, and in case a majority of said presbyteries shall have adopted these rules, these two General Assemblies shall be constituted and organized in the manner now pointed out in the form of government, by the election of their respective moderators, stated clerks, and other officers.

4. The several presbyteries shall be deemed and taken to belong to that Assembly with which they shall direct their commissioners to meet, as stated in the preceding rule. And each General Assembly shall at their first meeting, as aforesaid, organize the presbyteries belonging to each into synods. In case any presbyteries shall fail to decide as aforesaid at that time, they may attach themselves within one year thereafter to the Assembly it shall prefer.

5. Churches and members of churches, as well as presbyteries, shall be at full liberty to decide to which of said Assemblies they will be attached, and in case the majority of male members in any church shall decide to belong to a presbytery connected with the

Assembly to which their presbytery is not attached, they shall certify the same to the stated clerk of the Presbytery which they wish to leave and the one with which they wish to unite, and they shall *ipso facto* be attached to such presbytery.

6. It shall be the duty of presbyteries, at their first meeting after the adoption of these rules, to grant certificates of dismissal to such ministers, licentiates and students, as may wish to unite with a presbytery attached to the other General Assembly.

7. It shall be the duty of church sessions to grant letters of dismissal to such of their members, being in regular standing, as may apply for the same within one year after the organization of said Assemblies under these rules, for the purpose of uniting with any church attached to a presbytery under the care of the other General Assembly; and if such session refuse so to dismiss, it shall be lawful for such members to unite with such other church in the same manner as if a certificate were given.

8. The Boards of Education and Missions shall continue their organizations as heretofore, until the next meeting of the Assembly; and in case the rules for the division of the Assembly be adopted, those Boards shall be, and hereby are, transferred to the General Assembly of the Presbyterian church in the United States, if that Assembly at its first meeting shall adopt the Boards as their organization; and the seats of any ministers or elders in those Boards, not belonging to that General Assembly, shall be deemed to be vacant.

9. The records of the Assembly shall remain in the hands of the present stated clerk, for the mutual use and benefit of both General Assemblies, until they, by such arrangement as they may adopt, appoint some other person to take charge of the same. And either Assembly, at their own expense, may cause such extracts and copies to be made thereof, as they may desire and direct.

10. The Princeton Seminary funds to be transferred to the Board of Trustees of the seminary, if it can be so done legally and without forfeiting the trusts upon which the grants were made; and if it cannot be done legally and according to the intention of the donors, then to remain with the present Board of Trustees until legislative authority be granted for such transfer. The supervision of said seminary, in the same manner in which it is now exercised by the General Assembly, to be transferred to and vested in the General Assembly of the Presbyterian church of the United States to be constituted. The other funds of the church to be divided equally between the two Assemblies.

Mr. Jessup farther read the following, being the reply of the committee from the minority to the first paper submitted to them.

No. 2. of Minority.

The committee of the minority, &c., make the following objections to the proposition of the majority.

1. To any recognition of the terms, "old and new schools," or "majority and minority" of the present Assembly, in any action upon the subject of division. The minority expect the division in every respect to be equal; no other would be satisfactory.

2. Insisting upon an equal division, we are willing that that portion of the church which shall choose to retain the present Boards shall have the present name of the Assembly. The corporate property which is susceptible of division to be divided, as the only fair and just course.

3. We object to the power of the commissioners to make any division at this time, and as individuals we cannot assume the responsibility.

Mr. Breckinridge read the following, being the reply of the committee from the majority to the first proposal submitted to them from the committee to the minority.

No. 2. Majority.

The committee of the majority, having considered the paper submitted by that of the minority observe:—

1. That they suppose the propriety and necessity of a division of the church may be considered as agreed on by both committees; but we think it not expedient to attempt giving reasons in a preamble; the preamble is therefore not agreed to.

2. So much of No. 1. of the plan of the committee of the Minority as relates to the proposed names of the new General Assemblies is agreed to.

3. Nos. 1 to 8 inclusive, except as above, are not agreed to, but our proposition, No. 3, in our first paper, is insisted on. But we agree to the proposal in regard to single churches, individual ministers, licentiates, students and private members.

4. In lieu of No. 9, we propose that the present stated clerk be directed to make out a copy of all our records at the joint expense of both the new bodies, and after causing the copy to be examined and certified, deliver it to the written order of the Moderator and stated clerk of the General Assembly of the American Presbyterian church.

5. We agree, in substance, to the proposal in No. 10, and offer the following as the form in which the proposition shall stand: that the corporate funds and property of the church, so far as they appertain to the Theological Seminary at Princeton, or relate to the professors' support or the education of beneficiaries there, shall remain the property of the body retaining the name of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian church of the United States of America; that all other funds shall be equally divided between the two bodies, so far as it can be done in conformity with intentions of the donors; and that all liabilities of the present Assembly shall be discharged in equal portions by them; that all questions relating to the future adjustment of this whole subject upon the principles now agreed on, shall be settled by committees appointed by the new Assemblies at their first meeting respectively; and if these committees cannot agree, then each committee shall select one arbitrator, and these two, a third, which arbitrators shall have full power finally to settle the whole case in all its parts; and that no person shall be appointed an arbitrator, who is a member of either church; it being distinctly understood that whatever difficulties may

arise in the construction of trusts, and all other questions of power, as well as right, legal and equitable, shall be finally decided by the committees or arbitrators, so as in all cases to prevent an appeal by either party to the legal tribunals of the country.

Mr. Breckinridge farther read the following, being paper No. 3, of the committee from the majority in answer to No. 2, of the committee from the minority.

No. 3 of Majority.

The committee of the majority, &c. in relation to paper No. 2, observe:

1. That the terms "old school and new school," "majority and minority," are meant as descriptive, and some description being necessary, we see neither impropriety nor unsuitableness in them.

2. Our previous paper No. 2, having, as we suppose, substantially acceded to the proposal of the minority in relation to the funds in their first paper, we deem any further statement on that subject unnecessary.

3. That we see no difficulty in the way of settling the matter at present, subject to the reversion of the presbyteries, as provided in our first paper under the 3d head; and as no "constitutional rules" are proposed in the way of altering any principles of our system, we see no constitutional obstacle to the execution of the proposal already made.—We therefore adhere to that plan as our final proposal. But if the commissioners of any presbytery should refuse to elect, or be equally divided, then the presbytery which they represent shall make such election at its first meeting after the adjournment of the present General Assembly.

Mr. Jessup read the following, being No. 3, of the committee from the minority, in answer to No. 2, of the committee from the majority.

No. 3 of Minority.

1. We accede to the proposition to have no preamble.

2. We accede to the proposition No. 4, modifying our proposition No. 9, in relation to the Records and copies of the Records. The copy to be made within one year after the division.

3. We assent to the modification of No. 10, by No. 5, of the propositions submitted, with a trifling alteration in the phraseology, striking out the words, "shall remain the property of the body retaining the name of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of the United States of America," and inserting the words, "shall be transferred to the Presbyterian Church, &c. hereby constituted."

4. We cannot assent to any division by the present commissioners of the Assembly, as it would in no wise be obligatory on any of the judicatories of the church, or any members of the church.—The only effect would be a disorderly dissolution of the present Assembly, and be of no binding force or effect upon any member who did not assent to it.

We propose a resolution to be appended to the Rules, and which we believe, if adopted by the Committee, would pass with great unanimity, urging in strong terms the adoption of the Rules

by the presbyteries and the members of the minority side of the Committee pledge themselves to use their influence to procure the adoption of the same by the presbyteries.

Mr. Jessup further read communication No. 4, of the committee from the minority, in answer to No. 3, of the committee from the majority.

No. 4 of Minority.

The committee of the minority, in reply to paper No. 4, of the majority, observe,

2. That they will unite in a report to the Assembly, stating that the committee have agreed that it is expedient that a division of the church be effected, and in general upon the principles upon which it is to be carried out, but they differ as to the manner of effecting it.

On one hand, it is asked that the division be made by the present Assembly at their present meeting; and on the other hand, that the plan of division, with the subsequent arrangement and organization, shall be submitted to the Presbyteries for their adoption or rejection. They will unite in asking the General Assembly to decide the above points previous to reporting the details, and in case the Assembly decide on immediate division, then the paper No. 1, of the majority, with the modifications agreed on, be taken as the basis of the report in detail.

If the Assembly decide to send to the Presbyteries, then No. 1, of the majority's papers, with the modifications agreed on, be taken as the basis of the report in detail.

The committee of the minority cannot agree to any other propositions than those already to be submitted, until the above be settled by the Assembly.

If the above propositions be not agreed to, or be modified and then agreed to, they desire that each *side* may make a report to the Assembly to-morrow morning.

Mr. Breckinridge read communication No. 4, of the committee from the majority, in answer to No. 3, of the committee from the minority.

No. 4 of Majority.

The committee of the majority, &c. in reply to No. 3, of the minority committee, simply refer to their own preceding papers, as containing their final propositions.

Mr. Breckinridge finally read No. 5, of the committee from the majority, in answer to No. 4, of the committee from the minority.

No. 5 of Majority.

The committee of the majority, &c. in answer to No. 4, &c. reply that understanding from the explanations of the committee of the minority, that the said committee would not consider either side bound by the vote of the Assembly, if it were against their views and wishes respectively on the point proposed to be submitted to its decisions in said paper, to carry out in good faith a scheme which in that case would not be approved by them; and under such circumstances a *voluntary* separation being manifestly impossible; this committee consider No. 4, of the minority as virtually a

waver of the whole subject. If nothing further remains to be proposed, they submit that the papers be laid before the Assembly, and that the United Committee be dissolved.

He stated that as the majority's committee did not entirely understand the exact purport of communication No. 4, from the other part of the committee, they had asked and obtained a brief conference with their brethren, to ascertain whether, if the Assembly should adopt the plan of the majority, the minority would feel themselves bound in good faith to vote in favor of it; and, vice versa, whether they would consider the majority bound; to which they replied that they could not pledge themselves, nor in the other case should they hold their brethren pledged. He observed, in conclusion, that as the majority's committee considered the minority committee's No. 4, as a waver of the whole proposition, he should, if nothing more was to be done, submit the papers which he had read to the Assembly, and move that the committee be discharged.

Mr. Jessup then read the following report of the committee from the minority.

Minority Report.

The subscribers, appointed members of the Committee of Ten on the state of the church, respectfully ask leave to report as follows:

It being understood that one object of the appointment of said committee was to consider the expediency of a voluntary division of the Presbyterian church, and to devise a plan for the same, they, in connexion with the other members of the committee, have had the subject under deliberation.

The subscribers had believed that no such imperious necessity for a division of the church existed, as some of their brethren supposed, and that the consequences of division would be greatly to be deprecated. Such necessity, however, being urged by many of our brethren, we have been induced to yield to their wishes and to admit the expediency of a division, provided the same could be accomplished in an amicable, equitable and proper manner. We have accordingly submitted the following propositions to our brethren on the other part of the same committee, who at the same time submitted to us their proposition, which is annexed to this report.

[Minority paper No. 1, and Majority paper No. 1. See above.]

Being informed by the other members of the committee that they had concluded not to discuss in committee the propositions which should be submitted, and that all propositions on both sides were to be in writing, and to be answered in writing, the following papers passed between the two parts of the committee:

- No. 2 Minority paper.
- 2 Majority "
- 3 Majority "
- 3 Minority "
- 4 Majority "
- 4 Minority "
- 5 Majority " [See above.]

From these papers it will be seen, that the only question of any importance upon which the committee differed, was that proposed to be submitted to the decision of the Assembly, as preliminary to

any action upon the details of either plan.—Therefore believing that the members of this Assembly have neither a constitutional nor moral right to adopt a plan for a division of the church in relation to which they are entirely uninstructed by the Presbyteries; believing that the course proposed by their brethren of the committee to be entirely inefficacious, and calculated to introduce confusion and discord into the whole church, and instead of mitigating, to enhance the evils which it proposes to remove; and regarding the plan proposed by themselves, with the modifications thereof as before stated, as presenting in general the only safe, certain and constitutional mode of division, the subscribers do respectfully present the same to the Assembly for their adoption or rejection.

THOS. MCAULEY,
N. S. S. BEMAN,
ABSALOM PETERS,
B. DICKINSON,
WM. JESSUP.

Mr. Breckinridge now moved that the committee on the state of the church be discharged, and that all the papers which they had submitted be printed in the minutes.

The committee was discharged accordingly.

MEMORANDA OF FOREIGN TRAVEL,

BY RO. J. BRECKINRIDGE.

British and Foreign Bible Society.—Lord Bexley.—Extent.—Income Operations.—Aim of the Society.—John Pye Smith.—Origin of the society.—Speakers.—Lord Glenelg.—National Manners.—Anecdotes.—Controversies.—Indifference of the clergy of the established church.—Devotion to rank.—Omission of prayer.—Meeting to welcome Dr. Philips.—Speech of a converted Hottentot chief in Exeter Hall.

On Wednesday the 4th of May, some time before the hour fixed for the 32d anniversary of the British and Foreign Bible, the great room in Exeter Hall was crowded to excess. When the moment for opening the meeting arrived, it was announced from the platform that a smaller hall in another part of the edifice was opened; and that Lord Teignmouth (son of the former President of the society)—would preside in a meeting to be there conducted, simultaneously with the one on which we were about to enter,—and relating to the same great interests.

The president of the society then came forward; a plain small man, considerably advanced in life,—and dressed in the simple fashion of our fathers. He seemed greatly embarrassed, tripped as he advanced to the railing,—and read in a low tone of voice and with a considerable lisp, a short address. What he said, was simple, affectionate and solemn; and the whole effect pleasing. It was Lord Bexley, formerly Mr. Van Sittart, and for some years

chancellor of the Exchequer. He was greeted with the universal clapping, by which these people express their applause.

Mr. Browne and Mr. Brandram, the former I think a dissenter, and the latter a churchman—then read alternately as secretaries of the society portions of its annual report. I gathered in substance that continued prosperity attended their operations, and that they were gradually extending their benefactions to every part of the globe. Nearly five hundred and sixty thousand copies of the whole, or considerable parts of the Bible distributed during the preceding year,—made, when added to what the foregoing thirty one years had effected a grand total of 9,751,792 copies put into circulation through their agency. The income from all sources, was stated at nearly £87,000; of which seem a little short of £46,000 had accrued from the sale of the Scriptures. The actual expenditures of the society, had been above £107,000, within the year,—and its existing engagements were stated at £34,000: but as I did not understand what had been the state of the treasury at the beginning of the year, it does not appear whether this excess, leaves a debt, or was provided for out of existing means: nor is it material. For the people of God are at length beginning to understand that, *theirs* as well as *they* are his; and a generation is forming which may comprehend the luxury, as well as the duty, of doing good.

The grandeur and the extent of the objects which are set before us for exertion, are not always allowed to exercise their just influence upon us. When we had heard recounted the great resources of this organization,—and the immense results of its efforts,—when we had listened to the names, of companies of strange and widely scattered nations, at whose feet it had already laid the treasures of eternal life, and heard the detail of its comprehensive and farsighted plans to cover the earth with light from heaven: it was with a sort of shock, that one would recall the declaration of the noble President, that the operations of this society during thirty years, extensive and magnificent as they appear in the aggregate, have yet but superficially touched the great body of mankind.

We are prone too, to depreciate the day of small things—and while we overlook the secret but adamant chain, which binds the tenderest beginnings, with the grandest results,—we commit the double error of despairing of the future which we might control,—and when we have commanded success, despising the past, which made us what we become. Amongst the speakers on this occasion, was Dr. John Pye Smith, of Homerton college; who had been present at the meeting which formed the society,—and who carried us back to that little gathering of doubting and hesitating men, seated around a single table,—and placed before us the touching and instructive scene. There sat Wilberforce—and there Granville Sharpe—sacred names!—and there was Owen, hardly a willing visitor—till what he heard from those around him—and what the letters of Steinkopff, Van de Roche, and Oberlin had to urge, fired his soul—and melted him into that mass, which he was destined so materially to shape.—Then the speaker by a happy transition, made mention of the commission which the Emperor Constantine, early in the fourth century had given to Eusebius to

cause fifty copies of the scriptures to be carefully and accurately transcribed, and deposited in as many of the most important churches of his empire, for the free use of his subjects; and then with his pale thin features beaming with joy, and his slight figure dilated with emotion, called upon us to remember that an equal number of volumes of the same sacred book, which had cost an Emperor so much labour and expense and time to prepare, had been distributed every hour for the last twenty two years, at small expense and without notice or pretension, from the depot of the society! If the past be a measure of what is to come, with what glories is the future big?

The meeting was addressed also by the Bishops of Winchester and Chester (who are brothers, and both considered evangelical men;—by lord Glenelg,—principal secretary for the colonies; the Rev. Mr. Shaw of whom I have spoken in a former chapter;—the Rev. M. Keuntze of Berlin, Josiah Foster Esq. a member of the society of Friends, and for a number of years a director of the society; the Rev. Mr. Ackworth, one of the society's agents; the Marquis of Cholmondeley; the Rev. Mr. Jackson from New York,—and myself.

Lord Glenelg (formerly Mr. Grant) is a very tall, bony man, with grey hair; though apparently under fifty. His enemies represent him as being of a peculiarly sluggish disposition; and he did not on this occasion strike me favourably as a public speaker. But I believe, he is admitted by all, to be a man of blameless character which is the case with few of his order; and I am happy to say, that his influence as a minister of the crown, has on several trying occasions, been thrown decidedly into the scale of humanity and justice. I add with pleasure also, that he seemed to me more of a gentleman—in the true sense of that word, than any other member of the privileged classes, with whom I had any intercourse in England;—except, the venerable and excellent Lord Bexley—who is a most interesting and unpretending man. It is however instructive to remark, that both these individuals were not originally lords.—

At this, as at other meetings, I had occasion to remark minute things that seemed to me characteristic. Mr. Foster, in his address—becoming, as the crowd seemed to think tedious,—was producing such a state of affairs, that an individual, rose from the platform, and coming behind him, whispered something in his ear,—which was understood to be, and which I have no doubt was, a hint to stop. It was I presume with the best intentions that this dreadful alternative was ventured on. But what shall we say of an audience, that renders such a proceeding necessary? Especially in the case of an old man, and a valuable officer, and above all, when that man was really talking in a sensible, simple and by no means heavy way, about the very things they came there to hear?—What added to the pain of the whole affair was—that the speaker embarrassed by the communication which was whispered to him—made a mistake; and in attempting to say he would detain them but a “few moments”—said “a few years,”—at which a loud laugh rang through the hall.—This same exhibition of a national trait, occurred again, when Mr. Ackworth related how, during his trav-

els in Italy, where the Bible being prohibited from circulation is generally taken by the authorities, especially in the papal states even from travellers,—his had been permitted to escape. In the same parcel with the Bible, as he said, and above it, lay Bunyan's *Pilgrim's Progress*. The officers of the customs, bungled at the name of good old John; but seeing what was the subject, of the book, passed the whole, as franked by one "which seemed to recommend pilgrimages."—At the recital of which we had another loud explosion of mirth.—

I had a very striking illustration at this meeting of another national trait. Exeter Hall, is fitted with seats, open at each end, and therefore easily accessible, except as prevented by the mass of people themselves. In all the instances in which I was in the hall, I never saw a young man leave his seat for an old one,—nor any man leave his seat for a lady—nor any body put themselves to the least trouble to show another any sort of accommodation. But it is all the other way, to such a degree, that I have known people with the most astonishing impudence ask others on whom they had no sort of claim, to give place to them; nay even make demonstrations towards crowding *others* out of their way. On this particular occasion, I had conducted two ladies who were very desirous of being present at this meeting, to the reserved seats for which they had tickets, and procured at an early hour good situations, as I thought. It so happened that one of them who was in delicate health, sat at the end of a bench, next to an aisle. The hall filled—the aisle filled;—a *gentleman* took his station against the end of the bench, turned himself quartering to the lady—and pretending to think he was leaning against the arm of the bench, in defiance of repeated requests of the lady, who had no protector at hand,—leaned on her for the greater part of four hours. The consequence was, a confinement to the house for several days. This it will be remembered was at a meeting where none were admitted, except by tickets; which are given only to persons deemed respectable. It was more; it was in the *reserved* seats, of such a meeting.—I am sorry to express what these and many other facts render too certain to be questioned by any candid observer of English manners: but in all their public assemblies, there is a most singular destitution of general, and in many respects, even of personal decorum.

The Bible society of all others should be the most decidedly Catholic in its composition; and of all other possible organizations would appear to be the least liable to sectarian objections.—Yet this society has had to pass through several hot ordeals. Some years ago, a violent controversy was carried on in Scotland, which originated in the practice which had been adopted of putting into circulation copies of the scriptures, under certain circumstances, which had the apocryphal books, printed in them. And though it is not to be questioned, nor is it perhaps now questioned, that the practice was improper; yet the controversy raged and its effects were continued, after the original occasion of it was removed. They who care to remember such things, can hardly have forgotten the publications of the late Dr. Thompson of Edinburgh—nor the

painful result of the matter in relation to the present Dr. Gray of that city, as well indeed, as upon the general interests of the society in Scotland.—More recently, the attempt to exclude persons of particular religious sentiments from membership in the society, after many struggles and much trouble resulted in the formation of the Trinitarian Bible Society; to which I understood the high toned members of the establishment, lend their countenance so far forth, as they deem it needful to countenance any plan for the conversion of the world. It was well said in the time of the Long Parliament,—by those who defended the people of the lower classes for preaching the gospel to each other; “the bakers and butchers, and tradesmen have all left their business, to do that of the bishops” said the royalists; “yes” it was replied “but the bishops, had first left their business, and gone to meddling in political and civil and sumptuary matters, that belong to others.” And so even yet, there is nothing they meddle with less than the Bible Society; to which the majority of high dignitaries openly refuse to show any favour; and in regard to which so little interest prevails even among many excellent men, in the establishment, that at this meeting, I heard with surprise De Longley recently appointed a Bishop, tell the audience in the course of a few words he uttered in seconding a motion, that he had never before been present on a similar occasion; though, as I knew, he had been for many years residing within a few hours ride of London.—It is possible that the hope of a better state of things, is cherished by the managers of the society; and for its sake, they felt justified in paying rather unusual respect to the church on the present occasion. At least I observed that the only four new vice presidents, whose names were announced, were all of the established church,—two being bishops, and the other two, titled persons.—It may however be only the same reverence for *place*, that pervades all English society.—I was both grieved and surprised, that a direct appeal to the God of the Bible formed no part of the services of the occasion;—that no formal and associated act of Christian worship, distinguished the meeting as one essentially—indeed pre-eminently religious.—For where more peculiarly than in the midst of the representatives of all evangelical sects—and most Christian nations—should the open and joyful acknowledgment of our great captain, and his spiritual kingdom,—be manifested in acts of praise and prayer? When, if not when the very word of life is the subject of our proceedings,—that which is the basis of all Christian action—the rule of all effort,—the standard of all excellence—the instrument of all attainment,—when if not at a moment like this,—should God’s people thank him for that word, which he has magnified above all his name?

A few months after the period of which I now write, a great meeting of the London missionary society, was held in this same place, for the purpose [of welcoming the Rev. Dr. Philip, who had about this time arrived from the Cape of Good Hope, accompanied by several native Christians from south Africa. Three of these, Jan Tzatzse, a Caffre chief, Audries Stoffles, a Hottentot, and Mr. Reed the youngest, a half-breed of the same race addressed the

public—in company with other individuals. The speech of Stoffles, recounted the effects of the Bible upon his own and neighbouring nations. The sentiments of that speech are so just and noble—and the style so eloquent and poetic—that my readers, would excuse me, for quoting the following extracts,—even if any one should consider them not so pertinent to the present occasion as they seem to me to be. But when we remember that the philosophers of our day, in the madness of their shallow vanity, have not only relied on the pretended ignorance and brutality of the Hottentot, as proof positive that the Mosaic cosmogeny is false, but have imagined that in him they had found the connecting link between their own vast powers, and those dim lights which guide the half reasoning Ourang-outang:—it will be the more interesting even to them, to hear—that the Bible is so irresistible for good, even upon these inferior beings.—And it may possibly induce them, in obedience to their common method of making second causes every thing, and first causes nothing—to appreciate it, in proportion as they degrade its author and his creatures. Let it be borne in mind, that these extracts form a small part of a long speech; that they are taken from a mere newspaper report; that they were not spoken in the vernacular language of the Hottentot, but in Dutch, and then rendered into English by the half bred (Mr. Reed)—having virtually passed through two translations;—let these things be considered,—and the most cultivated enemies of divine truth, may be challenged to surpass the tenderness and dignity of the half-human savage.

“God has done great things for Africa, for which we have reason to be glad. God has done great things for me, in that I am permitted to address you on this occasion.

“Dr. Vanderkemp and Mr. Reed told us that the English nation sent us the word of God. I wish to tell you what the Bible has done for Africa; the Bible which your ancestors sent to us, when the English nation understood the word of God, and when they felt the saving influence of that word. What would have become of the Hottentot nation, and every black man in south Africa, had you kept the word of God to yourselves! When you received the word of God, you thought of other nations who had not that word. When the Bible came amongst us, we were naked; we lived in caves, and on the tops of the mountains. When the Bible came amongst us, having no clothes, we painted our bodies with red paint. At first we were surprised to hear the truths of the Bible. The Bible charmed us out of our caves, and from the tops of the mountains. The Bible made us throw away all our old customs and practices, and we lived among civilized men. We are tame men now. Now we know there is a God: now we know we are accountable creatures before God. But what was our state before the Bible came? We knew none of these things, we knew nothing about heaven, we knew not who made heaven and earth. The Bible is the only light for every man that dwells on the face of the earth. I thank God in the name of every Hottentot, of all the Hottentots of south Africa, that I have seen the face of Englishmen. I have been looking whether another Hottentot found

his way to this meeting; but I have looked in vain; I am the only one.

"I have travelled with the missionaries in taking the Bible to the Bushman, and other nations. When the word of God has been preached, the Bushman has thrown away his bow and arrows. I have accompanied the Bible to the Caffre nation; and when the Bible spoke, the Caffre threw away his shield and his vain customs. I went to Lattakoo, and they threw away all their evil works—they threw away their assagais and became the children of God. The only way to reconcile man to man, is to instruct man in the truths of the Bible. I say again, the Bible is the light; and where the Bible comes, the minds of men are enlightened. Where the Bible is not, there is nothing but darkness.

"I thank you to day; I do nothing but thank you. Are there any of the old Englishmen here, who sent out the word of God? I give them my thanks. If there are not, I give it to their children!—

ILLUSTRATIONS OF THE PAPAL CHURCH ABROAD.

No. 1

Letter of the Rev. Michael Crotty, parish Priest of Birr, to the most Reverend Doctor Murray, titular Archbishop of Dublin.

MY LORD—The recent occurrence which has taken place in this town which deeply affects the interests of society, and which has excited a feeling of universal indignation, will, I trust, be deemed a sufficient apology for thus obtruding myself upon your lordship's notice. In the month of January, 1853, a Roman Catholic Priest of the name of O'Loughlin came to Birr, and waited on me and my cousin, the Rev. Wm. Crotty, to know would we not be glad to be reconciled with our Bishop? My cousin and I replied, that nothing would give us greater pleasure than to be reconciled to our spiritual superior, provided such reconciliation could be effected without the sacrifice of character, and without involving the interests of our flock. The Rev. Mr. O'Loughlin said, if my cousin and I would accompany him to Dublin, he would use every effort in his power to put an end to the unhappy quarrel between us and the Rev. Mr. Kennedy; and, as a necessary preliminary to a mutual reconciliation between us and our Bishop, he requested of us to draw up a memorial to that effect, and that he would present it to your Lordship and the other Roman Catholic Bishops, who hold their annual meeting in Dublin to consult about the affairs of the Irish Church.

My cousin and I, my Lord, yielded to the importunate entreaties of the Rev. Mr. O'Loughlin—went up to Dublin, and in the interview we had with the late Primate, Dr. Kelly, at your lordship's residence in Mountjoy-square, we stated to your Lordship, and the other assembled bishops that the spiritual interests of the Roman Catholic Parishioners of Birr, would be best advanced by the removal of all cause of dissention, and with that view, my Lord, we proposed the appointment of another pastor to that parish, and recommended the propriety of removing the Rev. Mr. Kennedy and ourselves, to other situations in the diocess. My cousin and I took the liberty of suggesting this measure to your lordship, and the other assembled bishops, as the most effectual means of restoring peace and tranquillity to the long distracted parish of Birr, and as the course which a Christian bishop, anxious for the spiritual welfare of a flock confided to his care, and

placed under his superintendence, should observe; as it was not to be expected, after the transactions which had occurred, and the angry feelings which had so long subsisted, that the great majority of the Roman Catholics of the parish of Birr, who are devoted to me and to my cousin, from an honest and conscientious feeling of the truth and justice of our common cause, could ever look up to the Rev. Mr. Kennedy, either as their spiritual and confidential instructor, or as their friend. To this proposition, which was dictated by the spirit of peace and of conciliation, your Lordship and the other assembled Bishops replied, that, indeed, you would endeavour to effect a mutual reconciliation between us and our Bishop, provided my cousin and I would sign a document to the following effect:—"Expressing our unconditional acknowledgment of submission to the PRESENT TITULAR OF KILLALOE, together with a declaration, THAT ALL THE MARRIAGES WE HAD SOLEMNIZED FOR THE LAST TEN YEARS WERE ABSOLUTELY INVALID; AND THAT OUR ABSOLUTIONS WERE NULL AND VOID."

I feel, my Lord, that there are many points on which you and I differ, and must for ever differ. But there is a neutral ground common to us both, the undoubted gift of an All-wise God, with which, I trust, we are both endowed and by which we can impartially judge on this subject;—what I mean to allude to, my Lord, is reason or common sense. There is also another point on which we can have no difference—namely, CHRISTIAN CHARITY—and I confess, that when I try this proposition of your Lordship by either test, I can hardly repress a feeling of honest indignation at even the conception of such an idea. What! my Lord, to demand from me and my cousin as a necessary preliminary to a mutual reconciliation between us and our spiritual superior—a declaration, which every well-informed person in our congregation—I might add, every person possessed of ordinary understanding or common sense, must know and feel, to be false—namely, that all the marriages which we had solemnized for the last ten years were absolutely invalid. What! my Lord, to demand from us a preliminary to a reconciliation with the present titular of Killaloe, a declaration which would stigmatize us as the vilest miscreants that ever disgraced human nature; which must forever stamp us as daring and lying hypocrites, and which could only have for its object to unhinge society, to separate husbands from their wives—to poison the fountains of domestic peace and happiness, to make orphans and widows without pity or remorse; to break all those ties, and snap asunder all those chains, which from our infancy we have been accustomed to regard as most hallowed and binding; and to afford, perhaps, some profligate, if any there should be in our parish, and there will be always some such characters in every parish, an opportunity of deserting their innocent victims, and their yet more innocent offspring. What! my lord, to require of us to sign our death warrant, to subscribe to our own infamy and degradation, to pollute our honour, to prostitute our dignity, to sin against our proper knowledge by such a declaration, when we know and feel, and are convinced, that it is not in the power of Omnipotence itself to alter the essential constitution of things; when high and venerable authorities lift up their heads in support of the contrary opinion; when the most eminent lights and most distinguished theologians of the Church of Rome maintain, that the contracting parties themselves, and not the priest, are the minister of the sacrament of matrimony; that the mutual consent of the parties themselves is the efficient cause, the very essence of marriage; and that it is not in the power of the Church, or of God himself, to destroy or annihilate the matter or substance of any sacrament.

You know, my Lord, that the grave and important controversy, whether the priests, or the parties themselves, be the minister of the sacrament of marriage, has never yet been defined by the infallible authority of a general council, that the Church has pronounced no opinion upon this subject, but has left it to the disputation of the schools. What! my Lord, to act the

part of hypocrites, to play the harlot, and to offer to recover at any price the friendship of the present titular of Killaloe; and to purchase a wretched morsel of bread, at the expence and sacrifice of every thing that ought to be dear to men of honour, and to sincere Christians.

What! my Lord, to have passed through good report and evil report, to have shared with the great majority of the Roman Catholics of Birr the calumnies and even the dangers that attended a just and honourable cause—to have borne persecution and imprisonment in defence of the liberty of conscience—to have instructed our flock in the sound maxims of the Gospel—to have made them look to CHRIST JESUS, as the only foundation whereon to build—to have inculcated upon the minds of our congregation the leading doctrines of the Gospel, which are—belief in a crucified Redeemer, and repentance for sin; “for in Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth any thing, nor uncircumcision—but a new creature.” Now, after ten years of unexampled toil and suffering, to belie the general tenor of our lives, by subscribing a declaration that must transmit our names with infamy and disgrace to the remotest posterity—to undo all the good we have done—to lead back our flock, now in full view of the promised land, through the hardships and privations of the desert, to the flesh pots of Egypt, and to feed them once more with the weak and beggarly elements of error and superstition; and do all this, my Lord, for the poor pleasure of recovering the friendship of the present titular of Killaloe! No, my Lord, my cousin and I will never do it; we will never prostitute our honour for the wages of iniquity; we will never renounce our liberties, and accept of despotism; we were born freemen—we will never die slaves. What! my Lord, to require of us, as a preliminary to a reconciliation with our spiritual superior, to declare, in the face of heaven and earth, “**THAT ALL OUR ABSOLUTIONS FOR THE LAST TEN YEARS were null and void; when we know and feel, and are convinced, that neither Pope, Priest or Bishop has the power of absolving any man from his sins: for, as St. John says, “THE BLOOD OF JESUS CHRIST CLEANSETH US FROM ALL SIN;” and that the commission, which the Saviour of the world gave to his Apostles in the following words—“whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven, and whatsoever ye loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven; whosoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whosoever sins ye retain, they are retained;”** yes my Lord, we know and are convinced that the commission given to the Apostles in these words was only a commission to preach the gospel to a world buried in sin and iniquity; to receive sinners into the church, and into a state of forgiveness, by baptism; and to administer to them the word of God and the holy sacrament, as means of grace; a commission and a power to denounce the wrath of God against a sinful world; to pronounce in his name, that he pardons and absolves all believing and repentant sinners; and that he will condemn all obstinate and hardened sinners, who will not believe and repent. That by virtue of this commission, my Lord, the Apostles possessed great and extensive powers, which did not descend to their successors; I mean, my Lord, the power of discerning by the spirit, and, therefore, of declaring who were penitent and pardoned, and who were not; the power of inflicting and continuing miraculous punishments on wicked and impenitent sinners, which is binding and retaining their sins; and of removing such punishments, which is loosing and remitting them, we willingly and readily admit. Thus my Lord, we read in the Acts of the Apostles, that St. Peter inflicted a miraculous punishment upon Ananias, and his wife Sapphira, for having kept back and concealed a part of the price of the land they sold, and for having lied to the Holy Ghost. I will no longer dwell on this painful subject, further than to express my unfeigned and sincere regret that you should have been the wretched and unhappy victim of those narrow prejudices and bigotry, which I imagine had been long since exploded and gone out of fashion, and which, I thought

had only characterized some of your unworthy colleagues of the Maynooth school, such as that vulgar clown, Priest Cantwell, of Meath, and that pert saucy fellow, Priest Abraham, of Waterford; but which I am sorry to find have been again revived and called into existence by your Lordship's dissemination of the destructive and pernicious principles of DEN'S THEOLOGY. I thought, my lord, that your foreign education, your intercourse with elegant and polished society, and your constant attendance at the levees of the Castle, had created a distinction in your favour, raised you above the vulgar level of your company, and given you a character of exemption from the ignorant prejudices and narrow bigotry of the Maynooth Priesthood. I shall no longer dwell, my Lord, upon this unpleasant topic, than merely to tell you how sincerely I lament that you and your compeers have not more accommodated yourselves to the enlightened spirit of the times in which we live. On your heads, therefore, my Lord, be the consequences. I thank heaven, that my cousin and I live in a country, where every man is allowed to worship God according to the dictates of his conscience. I praise the Lord, that my cousin and I live under the protection of the British constitution, and in a country where liberty has dislocated her genuine principles, and secured to herself an asylum against despotism on one hand, and popular licentiousness on the other. I give God thanks, that in this free country we are not governed by the decrees of Councils, nor by the bulls of Popes, nor by the grim and bloody maxims of a degraded superstition, nor by the damnable doctrine of DEN'S THEOLOGY of which you, my Lord, have unfortunately been the advocate and the propagator, but by the principles of a sound and rational liberty; and by the blessings of a constitution that is fitted to the nature and the wants of man, and which can easily accommodate itself to the changes and improvements that take place in the social system.

I have the honour to remain, my Lord, your Lordship's most obedient and humble servant,

MICHAEL CROTTY, P. P. of Birr.

PROPOSED REFORM OF THE ENGLISH UNIVERSITIES.

Lord Radnor having failed in his attempt to procure inquiry into the Colleges of Oxford and Cambridge by a Commission, has given notice of a motion for a Committee of the House of Lords for the same purpose. This course was recommended, on the occasion of the last debate, by the Bishop of Landaff; and it is to be presumed that the Right Rev. Prelate will not refuse support to that which was his own crochet. The Duke of Wellington, it is true, when the question was put to him point-blank by Lord Radnor, whether he would support such a Committee or not, at first refused an answer, and afterwards, when he had time to re-collect his ideas, reiterated his denial of the necessity of an inquiry at all.

The Colleges in the two Universities, founded and endowed at different times by private individuals for the national object of education, and as being endowed for a national object, amenable from the beginning to national superintendence, have, in the course of time, made themselves indispensable to the operation, and come to engross the government of the Universities themselves; and they thus operate now to a very much greater extent on national interests than when they existed as so many separate educational institutions. A national character, as we have said, they possessed from the beginning; and, from the beginning, they were, subject to

the interference of the national legislature. But, while they do not derive their national character from the adoption of the Universities into themselves, they have become thereby greatly more important in a national point of view; and now it is more necessary that the national superintendence to which from the beginning they have been subject, should be exercised. As things at present stand, no one can become a member of either University without entering himself on the boards of some particular College; all College tests and regulations thus necessarily affect the operation of the Universities; and further, the whole internal administration of the Universities is brought into the hand of the Colleges.

These colleges are governed, or rather, we would say, nominally governed by sets of statutes which were, speaking generally, enacted at the times at which they were endowed, and which are supposed to be in accordance with the wishes of the respective endowers. The distribution of their revenues (and they were stated by Lord Radnor to amount, in round numbers, to 200 000.£. a year) is regulated nominally by these statutes and the conditions annexed to the enjoyment of any part of these revenues are nominally those which the endowers wished to annex. We say nominally, because, as was shown by Lord Radnor, and as was admitted by the Bishop of Llandaff and others, who opposed Lord Radnor's bill, many regulations enjoined by these statutes have become obsolete, and others are disregarded to suit the convenience of those who enjoy the college revenues. Yet the observance of these statutes, simply and without qualification, is sworn to by all who are successively elected into the respective foundations.

Now the evils of this state of things are principally two: the first, that an oath is constantly taken which cannot be, and is not observed; the second, that education, the object of the endowers, is not so efficiently promoted by the partial adherence that prevails to sets of statutes framed in the olden time, and without respect of one another, as it might be, were sets of statutes framed now, and were another distribution of the college revenues ordered by the State. These are the two evils that Lord Radnor proposes to remove.

As regards the oath, the most important consideration seems to us to be, that so long as it is administered without there being any possibility of its being observed, it may always have the effect of excluding conscientious men from a participation in the college emoluments, whose intellectual and moral qualifications point them out as fit for such participation. It was only the other day that a scholar of Trinity College, Cambridge, resigned his scholarship on the ground of his being unable to obey the statutes in such manner as he had sworn to do. And within the last few years the same oath in the same college has had the effect of debarring a Quaker, of very high mathematical attainments, from an honour and emolument which others, who have no objection to swear (in a case where swearing is quite nugatory), are able to grasp.

As regards the comparative efficiency of the colleges for the purposes of education, under their present system of governance, it is objected to any attempt to make them more efficient: that, the colleges having been endowed by private individuals, the wishes of the endowers, who are represented by the present statutes, cannot be set aside. We observe first, that over all property directed to a national purpose the state is supreme, and that it is a matter of choice with the state whether they shall observe the wishes of the original donor or not; but as a general rule, the observance of such wishes in a general way is expedient. Secondly, so long as these revenues are retained for the purposes of education, and nothing beyond a different distribution and a different set of conditions of enjoyment is recommended, the wishes of the donors are in a general way observed. Indeed the Bishop of Llandaff was constrained to admit that the college authorities were guided by what they conceived to be the general spirit of

the founders' wishes, rather than a slavish adherence to the letter of their statutes, and in order to get at the general spirit they desiderated, were wont to commune with themselves as to what the founders would say and do, were they now alive. Now but one deviation from the founders' own particular means, and the principle is conceded. We only propose that, instead of allowing this general spirit to be got at, as the Bishop of Landaff would recommend, by the heads and visitors of different colleges, according to their respective caprices, the legislature should be instructed to seek after it; and when the Bishop goes on to say that these heads and visitors "act under the observation of the world," it strikes us not, that in this respect they enjoy any superiority over the Lords and Commons. Certainly, if the ugly stories about locking up their statutes, and swearing to secrecy, are true, it is not the superiority they covet.

LETTER OF MOLLARD LE FEVRE* GIVING HIS REASONS FOR RENOUNCING POPERY.

SIR:—You inquire what were the motives which actuated me in the step I have just taken, and why I attach so much importance to becoming a member of the Christian Reformed Church. I am ready to inform you, and to open my mind to you with the utmost candour. The gospel, my conscience, and my reason—these, in three words, have been my guides and advisers.

I know, by my own experience, that man is formed for religion: I felt the need of uniting myself to God by a true faith, and by worship; but I felt also that this faith and this worship, ought to have nothing in them contrary to the light, that reason, that consciousness of right and wrong, which God has implanted in us, and that every religion which should not accord with these grand principles, or should shrink from being examined upon them, could not be divine, since God cannot contradict himself, and his works cannot dread the light.

It became, therefore my wish to recur to the foundation of the Christian faith, by studying the Holy Scriptures in the love of truth; and from that moment, I may say, a new day broke upon me. I read also some of the writings of those Fathers of the church who lived nearest the time of the Apostles; and they accorded with the gospel, in convincing me; that the Christian Reformed Church, was the true church of Jesus Christ; since its faith and worship perfectly agreed with the doctrines of the founder of Christianity, and with those of the Apostles; and since I found nothing therein opposed to my natural light.

I thought from the first, that I ought to have recourse to the word of God alone, the divinity of which I acknowledge, and not to the opinions of men, frequently led astray by their own passions and interests; that I ought to look upon the Scriptures as infallible, and to read it myself; that it must be so clear as to enable me to understand whatever in it concerned my faith and practice, and that I ought not to seek the rule of that faith in human traditions. Scripture itself confirmed my opinion; for there I read, that "the law of the Lord is perfect;" (Ps. xix, 8;)[†] that it is inspired by God, to instruct, to rebuke, to correct, and to conduct to piety and righteousness; (2d Tim. iii, 16;) that Jesus Christ himself said to his disciples, "search the scriptures;"[‡] that he condemned traditions, saying of the scribes, "In vain do they worship me, teaching doctrines which are

*Mr. Lefevre, the author of the preceding letter, was a French merchant of Lyons who in 1825, published it as containing his reasons for renouncing the Popish and embracing the religion of the Reformed church of France. In 1826, he published a longer letter giving additional reasons for his change. This translation is from the *lon: Pro. Jour.* of 1831.

[†]See the version of the Bible, by Lemaistre de Sacy, published at Paris, 1769, with the royal approbation and privilege, by William Desprez, printer to the king and clergy of France.

only the commandments of men, for they leave the commandments of God, to follow the traditions of men;" (Mark vii, 7, 8;) that Paul anathematizes all religious instruction which is not drawn from the gospel: "there are some that trouble you, who would overturn the gospel of Jesus Christ; but should we ourselves, or should any angel from heaven, preach a gospel unto you different from that which we have preached, let him be accursed;" (Gal. i, 7, 9;) that the gospel is plain to those whom their passions blind not, as Paul also says, "If the gospel which we preach is yet veiled, it is to those who perish, that it is veiled; to those unbelievers whose minds the god of this world hath blinded, in order that they may not be enlightened by the light of the gospel of the glory of Jesus Christ, who is the image of God, (2 Cor. iv. 3, 4;) that St. Ambrose also says, "the Holy Scripture is useful to every one." St. Chrysostom says, again, "The reading of the Holy Scriptures is a strong bulwark against sin; and ignorance of the scriptures is a great precipice, a deep abyss." St. Basil also tells us, "all that is not included in the divinely inspired scripture, not being of faith, is sin."

I felt, therefore, that it was my duty to examine the scriptures alone, to seek therein what I ought to believe, and do. I perceived that it was the way pointed out by St. Paul himself, who far from forbidding this examination to the people, says, "prove all things, approve that which is good." (1 Thess. v. 21.)

I dared not assent to the opinion of any church, merely as a church, nor of any council, while Jesus Christ announced, "There shall arise false Christs, and false prophets, who shall do great signs and wonders, insomuch as to deceive, if it were possible the very elect." (Matt. xxiv. 24) St. John also says on this subject. "My well beloved, believe not every spirit; but try whether the spirits be of God, for many false prophets are risen in the world." (1 John iv. 1) The Abbe de Palerme himself admits "that a council may err; and that, in what regards faith, the conviction of an individual ought to be preferred to the opinion of the Pope himself." "I dread councils," says St. Gregory, of Nazianzen, and "I have never seen any which have not done more harm than good."

The principles of Scripture, and of the earliest Fathers, are those of the Reformed Church; and I remarked with pleasure, that she establishes her faith only, as God and our own understandings tell us that it ought to be established. I observed, that the Ministers of religion were in the gospel forbidden to seek temporal power, riches and honor, that charity, meekness, and humility were to be the characteristics of the Priests of Jesus Christ. Peter says to them, feed the flock of God with which you are charged, watching over its conduct, not by a forced necessity, but by a voluntary affection which should be according to God; not by a shameful desire of gain, but by a disinterested charity; not domineering over the Lord's heritage, but becoming examples to the flock, by a virtue which springs from the heart:" (1 Pet. v. 2, 3,) And Jesus Christ himself tells them, "trouble not yourselves concerning gold or silver, or other money in your purse." (Matt. x. 9.) He declares to them that if they act otherwise, they are but Scribes and Pharisees, whom he reproveth, saying, "they love salutation in the public places and to be called of men master; but as for you, desire not to be called master, because you have but one Master, and you are all brethren. Neither call any one on earth your father, because, you have but one Father which is in heaven; and be not called teacher, because you have but one teacher, and but one master, which is Christ. He who is great among you shall be your servant, for whosoever exalteth himself shall be abased, and whosoever abaseth himself shall be exalted. Woe unto you Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites, because under the pretence of your long prayers, you devour widows' houses. It is for this you shall receive a more rigorous judgment. Woe unto you, for you cleanse the outside of the cup and platter, and yet you are within full of rapine and uncleanness." (Matt. xxiii. 1, 7—11, 14, 25.)

I observed, likewise, that their marriage was approved of by the word of God; since it was not his will to make them of a separate caste, with interests inimical to those of society, and to prevent them from practising those numerous virtues to which the father of a family is called. St. Paul says. "Let them marry; for it is better to marry than to burn." (1 Cor. vii. 9.) In writing to Timothy: "The Bishop then must be blameless; he must have married but one wife; he must be sober, prudent, grave, and modest, loving hospitality, able to teach; he must not be given to wine, neither violent nor hasty to strike; but just and moderate, far from disputes; disinterested; he must govern well his own household, keeping his children in obedience, and in all propriety." (1 Tim. iii. 2, 4.) He says again: "Have we not power to lead about with us a wife, who may be our sister in Jesus Christ, as do the other apostles, and the brothers of our Lord, and Cephas?" (1 Cor. ix. 5.) And St. Clement of Alexandria says himself, "there are some who condemn the priests that marry, but will they not also condemn the Apostles? for Peter and Philip had children and the latter had his daughters married." (Strom 1.) The ministers of the Reformed Religion follow this principle, and the example of the Apostles; they are, like them, fathers of families, patterns to their flocks; they live in simplicity, making no vows contrary to human nature, the precepts of Scripture, purity of manners, and the good order of society.

I have embraced this communion, because in it there is no prostration before wood, or stone, or old relics of corpses to which corruption has paid no respect.

I have embraced this communion, because in it every thing is referred immediately to God the Saviour of men, and not to creatures like ourselves for, saith St. Paul, "there is but one God, and one Mediator between God and man, the man Christ Jesus." (1 Tim. ii. 5.) And St. John: "If any man sin, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ, who is righteous." (1 John ii, 1.) And consequently, Jesus Christ being here the only hope of believers, they are actively and uniformly Christians.

I have embraced this communion because it does not enjoin upon believers pompously to exhibit their piety in the streets and public places—a practice which Jesus Christ reproves, saying, "be not like the hypocrites, who affect to pray, standing in the synagogues, and at the corner of the streets, in order to be seen of men. Verily I say unto you, they have received their reward; but you, when you pray, enter into your closet, and the door being shut, pray unto your father in secret, and your father seeing what passeth in secret, will give you its reward. When you fast, be not sad like the hypocrites, for they affect to appear with a disfigured countenance, in order that men may know when they fast. Verily I say unto you, they have received their reward. But you, when you fast, anoint your head, and wash your face that it may not appear unto men that you fast, but to your father who is present in the most secret place; and your father who seeth that which passeth in secret, will give you its reward." (Matt. vi. 5, 6, 16—18.)

I have embraced this communion, because in it there is no assumption that he is a better man who eats fish, than he who eats beef; for I can never believe that it was the design of God, in creating an aliment always wholesome, to prohibit us from using it at certain periods, unless we purchase exemption. Jesus Christ speaks out in the following words: "it is not that which enters into the mouth which defiles the man; but it is that which comes out of the mouth of man, which defiles him." (Matt. xv. 11.) And St. Paul says. "Eat of all that is sold at the shambles, without asking whence it comes, for any scruple of conscience; for the earth is the Lords, and all that therein is." (1 cor. x. 25, 26.)

I have embraced this communion, because in its public service, every thing is understood, and comprehended by every individual; and, having

never learned Latin, I cannot believe it to be the will of God that ministers should edify me in Latin. The custom is condemned by St. Paul: "Also, my brethren, if I should come unto you speaking in unknown tongues, what usefulness should I bring unto you? I would rather speak in the church five words which I could understand, and which should instruct others, than repeat ten thousand in an unknown tongue." (1 Cor. xiv. 6, 19; read all the chapter.) Pope John VIII. was as much a Protestant as myself in this respect; for he said, "let the praises of God be sung in the native language;" and I really think if what is said to us is good, useful and edifying, it ought to be understood; and if on the contrary, it is something bad, it ought not to be said, in Latin, Greek, or Chinese.

I have embraced this communion, because it does not exclude from future happiness poor little children, on account of their parents' neglect in not having them baptized before their death. This doctrine has always appeared to me absurd, unjust, insulting to the divinity, and unauthorized by a single word of scripture.

I have embraced this communion, because in it the Lord's supper is wholly a spiritual ceremony, reminding us of the benefits which the Saviour came to confer upon humanity—a memorial of his death, in which the bread and wine represent only the body and blood of Jesus; for I never could allow that a God wholly spiritual, the Creator of the heavens and the earth,—that God, whose nature alone is infinity, *could be swallowed like a pill*. It has even appeared to me, that the idea which materialized the Creator was an insult offered by us to him, as it is an insult to reason itself.

Lastly, I have embraced the Christian Reform communion, and I have embraced it with faith, confidence and happiness, because it is not supported by the sword of the executioner; it does not place the scaffold and tortures of the inquisition beside the cross of him who came, not to destroy men, but to save them. I acknowledge that the violence with which some of its early members may have been reproached, arose from the remains of human prejudice, from a habit of domination and of double power, (ecclesiastical and civil) from which those men could not at once free themselves; but at the present day this church is mild and charitable; it needs not the *torquemada* to support it; it would not receive such aid; its precept is the precept of the Saviour; "you shall love the Lord your God, with all your heart, and with all your soul, and with all your mind; this is the greatest and first commandment; and this is the second which is like unto it: you shall love your neighbours as yourselves. In these two commandments are contained all the law and the prophets." (Matt. xxii, 37—40.)

In this communion I recognize the true church of Jesus Christ which was restored by the gospel at the time of the Reformation. I bless God for having given me thus to distinguish his divine light; my children will one day bless me for having acted the part of an honest man, which is to embrace the truth as soon as he perceives it without disquieting himself on account of the menaces and calumnies of those who shun the light, because their deeds are evil. If the step I have taken were yet to take, the prospect of tortures and of scaffolds would be vainly presented in order to stop me; truth is my motto, the approbation of God and of my conscience is my law. Numbers are deterred from imitating me by their indifference to the truth, and to religion, and because they fear rather to be censured in this world, than to be condemned in the other.

Such, Sir, are the motives which have actuated me. I believe you have a firm and upright mind, and I feel assured of your approbation. Accept the sentiments with which I remain sir, your very humble and devoted servant.

MOLLARD LEFEVRE:

THE
BALTIMORE LITERARY
AND
RELIGIOUS MAGAZINE.

VOL. III.

AUGUST 1837.

No. 8

MEMORANDA OF FOREIGN TRAVEL,

BY RO. J. BRECKINRIDGE.

Importance of the Religious Anniversaries, as illustrating national manners.--Jews, Society.—Movement amongst them.--Mr. Bickersteth.—Curious Fact of a Cardinal.—Prayer Book and Homily Society.—Professor Scholefield. School Society.—Speakers.—Curious Incident.—Lord Morpeth.—Dissenters' Society for the protection of Civil and Religious Liberty.--Bigotry and Oppression.—A regular Row.--Lord Ebrington.—General Influence of the London Anniversaries.—Spirit that is intruding into the great Benevolent Societies in Britain.—Difficulties of American Delegates in holding any profitable Inter-course with them.

If it were not for the personal traits,—and the more important general information, which we find always developed, on occasions like those of which I have been speaking so much; I should not have ventured to expect the attention of any reader, to be engaged so long on the meetings of the London societies. A sample of them at once full, and I think favourable has been presented to him; and what remains, will require less detail.—

At some of these anniversaries—I was only present to hear a particular speaker:—at others to spend an hour upon whatever chanced to be offered. It was in this way that I stepped into the annual meeting of the *Society for promoting Christianity amongst the Jews*, to hear a speech from the Rev. Edward Bickersteth, whose name has become so well known, of late years in the United States. His speech was not different from what a reader of his works, would have expected:—Sensible, rather more than common place,—much of it if not relevant to his subject, and the whole destitute of any thing either original or striking. His person is tall, and exceedingly emaciated,—and his complexion saturnine to an unpleasant degree. He stated several facts which are at once curious and profoundly interesting. A Cardinal at Rome, (he had personal reason to know, though denied the liberty of naming the individual) had applied for aid in circulating the old and new Testaments in the Hebrew language, amongst the Jews; and he

(Mr. B.) had lately sent him fifty copies granted by the British and Foreign Bible Society. He added that the Society on whose behalf he then spoke, felt authorized, to assure the public, that so great a movement actually existed, amongst the Jews, especially in Germany, that many in the absence of true light were giving up their scepticism in despair, and throwing themselves into the arms of the Roman Church: while, notwithstanding the feeble and almost faithless efforts of the Protestant world, to save the ancient people of God—more of them, have actually embraced Christianity in its pure form, within in the last twenty years—than in the preceding fifteen centuries! Reader, believest thou the prophets? Then what do such facts as these import, to thee, to this guilty world—and to the slumbering Church of which, it may be, thou art a useless member?

On another occasion an hour spent in the twenty fourth annual meeting of the *Prayer Book and Homily Society*, was not without its use. It seemed to be assumed on all hauds, that the book they were met to aid the circulation of, was the best in the world after the Bible and one quite indispensable for the spiritual good of the world; and yet as far as I could learn the state of their operations, their annual income, after a quarter of a century of exertions was not much above two thousand pounds. A sum which the gentlemen on the platform could have trippled by giving up only so much as they themselves derived from pluralities, and other preferments, for which they rendered no sort of service. It would be a curious balance sheet, to compare the amount forced out of dissenters, to keep the lawn of the established ministers clean,—with that paid by themselves to give the world forms of worship, and rules for ceremonies which they deem so vital to true peace of the soul rules.—That I present this subject in no exaggerated light, will be the more apparent when it is known that one of the speakers, asserted in the most unqualified terms, that missionaries, after translating the Bible into all languages, next translated the prayer book! “For when they went to visit the heathen, the first thing they did after making translations of the Bible—was to give them translations of our prayer book:” such were the words of the Rev. professor Scholefield, of one of the universities. And he added his authority; ‘this was attested by Dr. Morrison, by Dr. Cary, by the Rev. Mr. Yate, and by many Missionaries of the highest character.’—It was a most singular commentary of another speaker, on the same occasion, upon statements, which I will not venture to characterise,—who after praising the Homilies, nearly as extravagantly as Mr. S. had the prayer-book,—candidly confessed he had never read them! Whereupon the audience, instead of hanging their heads in ingenious shame,—burst into a laugh!

The British and Foreign School Society, had an exceedingly interesting meeting. The whole was conducted with peculiar propriety,—under the management of the excellent secretary, Mr. Dunn, who had exhibited sense and tact, in nothing more clearly, than in substituting a short and lucid statement—in the place of the tedious, and ill-read reports, which are the bane of these meetings. Would it not be better for the proper officers to make themselves masters of their business—and state in a short comprehen-

sive address,—what is diluted over an hour of restlessness and impatience on the part of every audience on whom I ever saw it insisted! Most of the speeches on this occasion too were excellent.—Sir Cullen Eardly Smith, a short, broad Irish member of parliament; the Rev. Mr. Robins, an evangelical minister in the establishment—the Rev. Mr. Hamilton of Leeds, the largest and the most hospitable man I saw in the three kingdoms; and the Rev. Mr. Smith of Sheffield, a professor in the dissenting college at Rotherham in that neighbourhood,—deserved, and some of them obtained the thanks of the audience, in the most boisterous manner, for a very pleasant and profitable entertainment. All of them however did not satisfy “a British audience;” which is a formulary their speakers always use, where one of another nation would say “a Christian audience”—or “an enlightened audience.”—The last named of these four gentlemen—was virtually applauded down; or at the least would have been in a few minutes more, if he had not broken off his speech in the midst. For the last two minutes of it, nobody could hear a word he said, for the clapping and stamping sometimes, in a sort of roll, like random shooting,—and then in a volley, like a whole line firing at once.

This was peculiarly edifying to me, as I was just on the eve of making a speech myself; the second one I had made in the realm, and just after I had seen the first one (made at the Bible society) so horridly reported,—that I was forced to report briefly what I had said, and send it to America, to keep my friends from supposing me capable of uttering the gross folly, adulation, and lies which I had been made to speak.—One of the speakers had made an allusion to Franklin; two of them had argued the question somewhat at large, and on opposite sides, as to the value of knowledge in itself considered. I seized the two suggestions to make a speech of ten minutes. The chairman of the meeting had admitted in his opening address, that “it is a just cause of reproach to England, that in the great work of the elementary education of the people, she lags behind cotemporary nations.”—I first compared the state of public instruction in America, very briefly with that in Britain; then pointed out the difference between public crimes in the two countries; then the difference between the actual means of preserving the public peace. On one side no system that deserves the name for general education: on the other, in many states every body educated, and almost gratuitously. On one side, hundreds of offences punished capitally; on the other, in all the states not above three or four,—in a few, one only,—namely deliberate murder. On one side a standing army of a hundred thousand men; on the other, a few half filled regiments, along thousands of miles of frontier. I then pointed out, that it is by the condition of the great mass of the people, that the power and happiness of a state and the utility of its institutions, are to be decided; quoting those noble lines of one of “their own poets:—

Princes and lords may flourish or may fade,
A breath can make them, for a breath has made:
But a bold yeomanry a country's pride,
When once destroyed can never be supplied!

Behold then, I added in that Benjamin Franklin—of whom you have heard, the epitome of his country; itself an emblem

of freedom, vigour, and enlightened common-sense! That Franklin whose epitaph is written in the earth, and upon the skies "*eripuit fulmen calo, sceptrumque tyrannis.*"—I think I should not have made the last allusion, if I had not had my "dander up"—as Major Downing says,—about their outrageous treatment to some of their public speakers. The result was curious—the speech was never reported, nor was it ever mentioned in any report I have ever seen of the meeting, that I had made a speech at all!

I had nearly forgotten to say that Lord Morpeth, secretary for Ireland, and a member of the House of Commons—presided, in a snuff coloured coat, almost without a body, and with skirts enough for two coats,—garnished as to his nether man, with pantaloons, the large black stripes of which ran round, instead of up the leg. He made a pretty good address—in a most affected tone; and I am not sure whether his speech was committed to memory—or whether he was followed by the best reporter in the world. I am certain it was reported verbatim. For a *born* nobleman, he is considered rather a clever young man;—and has a hard time of it, in so managing Irish affairs—as to concede the least that is possible to prevent the universal rising of the people of that unhappy country. I believe it enters into the head of no party in England to do any more; and Mr. O'Connell, himself, as his quondam friends Mr. Sharmon Crawford, and Mr. Daniel Whittle Harvey, (both members of parliament, both men of fortune and talents, and both radicals)—are beginning to make the world perceive—is actuated rather by an intense selfishness, than a great and capacious love of justice or of country, in all his agitations.

About the middle of May, the *Society for the protection of civil and religious liberty* held its twenty fifth anniversary,—in the city of London tavern, in Bishop's Gate street, towards the eastern side of the city,—and several miles from Exeter Hall. The Right Honourable Viscount Ebrington presided, and made a short speech both at the beginning and end of the meeting.—I believe there is not a single English peer, who is a protestant dissenter; and on this occasion the individual who presided, took care to let the meeting know, that there was no one more devoted to the interests of the establishment than himself,—and that he never could agree to some of their most fundamental principles, as for example the abolition of church rates! Then, I asked myself with amazement—why is he here? Or why have these people, so far forgotten, not only their principles but their prudence in their subserviency to the aristocracy, as to give this man the best point d'appui, to defeat their own most favourite and necessary projects?—The utter absurdity of such conduct, is obvious from the mere detail of the *heads* of the secretary's report. It is a society of Protestant dissenters, held together for the purpose of affording aid, advice and protection, to persons deprived of their liberties—by or in favour of the aristocracy or the established church. And yet an aristocrat and churchman—presides to hear details and indignant speeches, about Sunday tolls—unequal poor rates,—oppressive church-rates,—burdensome assessed taxes—vexatious and insulting per-

sonal wrongs to dissenting ministers—and fines and imprisonments inflicted on the people as trespassers and rioters, for worshipping God in the open air! Of the last named class, it was officially reported (by Roland Wilks, Esq. who read the report, in the absence of his father who is a member of Parliament)—that “in Wiltshire six men had been fined 2s each for trespass, and 5s 4d each, costs for having attended the preaching of the gospel on a piece of waste ground belonging to the marquis of Aylesbury: and in default of payment they had been committed to five week’s hard labour in the goal at Devizes.” In the last class of cases but one instance of the most intolerant and unfeeling bigotry were stated by nearly every speaker; and the report itself affirmed cases in which the established clergy “had refused to bury children, who had not been baptized, or who had been baptized by Wesleyan Methodists.”

During the course of the business, these staunch defenders of liberty, proved that they who could when occasion served, truckle to the great, could also, if need were, cruelly oppress their equals. A Mr. Russell who had been for seventeen years, a laborious member of the committees of the body, came forward to make one of the regular speeches. This gentleman, it seems had fallen under the suspicion of having embraced religious opinions, which were not deemed to be,—perhaps really were not,—evangelical; I forget what they were, nor is it important. Amongst other notions, he had become thoroughly imbued with the hatred of all religious creeds, which under the name of *tests*, it is the principal characteristic of English Congregationalism to abhor. Mr. Russell thought his former friends, for he was long a minister amongst them,—were not consistent with themselves on this important point, of what he deemed religious liberty; and seemed to consider this a fair occasion to enlighten them. There were two things which concurred to entrap him,—irresistibly to a course which possibly he had meditated before. For, in the first place, the speaker who preceded him (Mr. Lushington, an episcopal member of the House of Commons) had concluded an ordinary speech with the noble maxim of the great John Locke—“absolute liberty—just and true liberty—equal and impartial liberty—over all the world;”—which I suppose hit precisely upon his mood. And in the second place, repeated allusions had been made to the exclusion of dissenters from the universities,—as a piece of intolerable bigotry and injustice;—it so happening that Mr. R. had two sons now at Oxford. The temptation was irresistible: so he undertook to prove that the bigotry of Oxford, in forcing all its pupils to subscribe the xxxix articles—great and grievous as it certainly was; was not at all beyond the habit of the dissenters, to force assent, to certain dogmas of their own, before they would admit persons to their fellowship; and that although they nominally rejected all subscriptions, yet their practice, and especially their trust deeds, did in fact amount to so decided a *religious test*, that his sons would have more trouble on that very score in becoming Independent ministers, than Oxford graduates;—and that for his part, he thought they should correct their own errors—as well as denounce those of others.

Such was the drift of his speech so far as I could hear,—in the uproar which was raised, as soon as the audience perceived what he was at. I was at first amused, at his error in confounding church discipline and order for the preservation of truth, peace and unity,—with mere collegiate, or even civil regulations. But I remembered, that all the audience nearly coincided with him, in the fundamental mistake about subscription to systems of religious belief—which had betrayed him, into the false analogy, on which he was arguing; and then I became curious to hear some one answer him,—which I had no doubt would be the immediate result.—But they took quite another view of the thing. At first they called him to order; but the chairman said, “he could not think the remarks of the Rev. Gentleman beside the question of the resolution.”—This brought on the crisis. Some contradicted him—some mocked him—some hissed him—a few hollowed to him to go on—one or two shouted he is right—but the great bulk roared, off, off—off—off! They fairly and literally scouted him down from the stand!—I presume there were more people in the row at Ephesus—and doubtless they were engaged in a worse cause, and against better men. But I greatly question if they made more noise in proportion to their numbers while they were at it;—or if their proceedings involved a more radical breach of decency.

Not satisfied with this cruel insult, a more formal and pointed one was attempted afterwards. The Rev. Dr. Ross of Kidderminster, in offering, towards the close of the business a vote of thanks to the officers of the society, moved expressly to except the name of Mr. Russell: and a Mr. J. Green of Birmingham seconded the motion, and the exception; which the meeting received with cheers. It required a decided and generous speech from a Dr. Brown, a lawyer of eminence, and a leading man in this society; and two very pointed insinuations by the noble chairman that he should vacate the chair, if the thing were persisted in—before the mover or the meeting would agree to wave, the deliberate injury involving so mean a personal revenge, against an ancient and tried ally, whose only crime seemed to me to be—the making of a speech, which on their principles, they were puzzled to answer.—

These various societies are certainly of incalculable value, in enlightening, arousing, and concentrating public sentiment,—and in making it available in a degree otherwise wholly impossible. Whether the action thus powerful for good, is not sometimes turned to the support of objects, personal, selfish, insignificant, or even bad in themselves, need not be questioned. What is more to be considered—as being more under our control—is the best means, and the great importance of making them available at all times, and especially on occasions like those of which so much has been already said, of the largest amount of good. It was the result of all I witnessed in London, that there are immense defects on this vital point in most of the proceedings I had opportunity to attend. An absurd and almost criminal subserviency to rank, power and wealth, a subserviency which they abuse often in the most selfish, and often in the most silly way; a nearly universal want of preparation on the part of the speakers, and the consequent crude, superficial, and inappropri-

ate addresses, of which you hear such multitudes; the irreverent, and often indecorous conduct of the vast assemblies, which while they encourage each other by example in that which is wholly unsuitable to such occasions,—seduce the speakers, into a mode of discourse, which if it does no actual harm is certainly incapable of imparting lasting instruction, or creating deep and permanent emotion;—these are evils scarcely ever missed, at the English anniversaries. I have said enough surely, to make it obvious, that all is not thus: that much, very much, is nearly all that we should expect it to be. But when we look at the means,—such facts to communicate—such motives to present—such principles to discuss—such men to speak, such multitudes to hear, such a prolonged, varied, exalted occasion;—we are ready to say, now we have all the ancient sage demanded—here is the *dos pou sto*--and we will shake the world! The influence exerted, not only comes short, but is in fact unsuited to such a result. And while the profound and pervading spiritual unction, which is the soul of such occasions, is missed from the midst—their chief glory and power are shorn.—

There are other evils of a personal kind, which press heavily on many of those, who are the most important public supporters of these societies. Personal slights, pointed and humiliating; official incivilities, and indifference, slight perhaps, but constant; the passing away of the first spirit of love, and union and candour and humility and confidence and singleness of eye and heart to the great end—the passing way of this spirit, with those who founded and first sustained these mighty operations; and the gradual coming in behind it—of the spirit of a paid agency, a corps of placed subordinates: such things are, tho' not universal by any means, yet so grown already, that good and wise men in Britain, speak of them, as of things which they weep over, but cannot remedy.

I have already illustrated in my own personal treatment—something of this. I have no object but to record what is proper to be told, for the aid of all to whom it may be useful: and by my own case therefore, I still further elucidate my meaning.—Amongst the societies to which I had borne commissions as a Delegate from similar ones in America, where the *Reformation Society*: the *The Religious Tract Society*; and the *British and Foreign Temperance Society*. As soon as I was settled in London, I called at their respective offices, and left my credentials, my address, and at the first named, letters of introduction. Not a human being connected with either of them ever came near me! One of the secretaries of the first named Society, gave me a ticket which he said would admit me, to the platform, at the anniversary, and there ended that lesson. I had two commissions to this association, and a letter of introduction also, from one of its most active friends in England.—The intercourse with the second Society proceeded thus: when I called and left my credentials, a very civil young man who seemed to be attached to the book store, said the committee of the Tract Society, breakfasted together once a week: and he had no doubt they would be happy to receive me.—I got no confirmation of this hint; and as I was neither very well, nor very well invited, I missed the first, and the second, and the third weekly breakfast. Mean time I got a private note, from a proper quarter, desiring

my services at the approaching annual meeting. The day came; I went to Exeter Hall by the usual way to the platform;—and was refused admittance by a police-man,—who said it was thirty minutes too soon—and that my declaration that I was to take some part in the services, could hardly be true, or he supposed I should in that case be accompanied by some member of the committee or some one on their behalf. I was quite of his mind: and therefore loitered about, till the full time had come, and then on trial, found the platform filled with four or five hundred people;—and took myself to my lodgings.—I subsequently breakfasted with this committee, thirty or forty strong, on the invitation of a member, whom I casually met: and so terminated that deputation.—The intercourse with the Temperance Society had rather a sharper termination. At the period of its meeting I was recovering rather slowly from a short but severe indisposition; and on the solicitation of a mutual friend (for I had not had the honour of a note much less a visit from any person connected with the society)—had agreed to make a short speech, provided I could do so, early in the meeting. At the appointed hour, the Lord Bishop of Chester took the chair; the report was read, the right Hon. Lord Teignmouth, a handsome young man, made a speech which seemed to me to be in favour of moderate drinking; then followed a Mr. Montigue, who had lately returned from New South Wales,—where he had written a book in favour of temperance from which he read extracts,—in favour of *tetotalism*, against which the society it seemed was expressly committed—until he was privately asked to stop: then followed a capital speech from the Rev. Hugh Stowell, an evangelical churchman. It was my part to second his resolution, and make a speech: I held a copy of the resolution in my hand, and was racking my brain for the shortest possible speech; when just as Mr. S. closed, I was told that it had been concluded, to let a Mr. Evans follow him and that I could come afterwards. I demurred, but it was useless. When Mr. Evans was nearly done and I in a fever with another half digested speech; I was told again, that it had been concluded, to let “the Birmingham blacksmith,” follow Mr. Evans, and me follow him! The who? said I. The singular appellative was repeated—with the declaration that it must be so, as the bishop desired it. I of course surrendered the resolution to the secretary, only asking him to erase some private notes on the margin; which he tore off and handed to me. And the Birmingham blacksmith got up and made a strong sensible speech. By this time my body was exhausted, my thoughts scattered and my nerves ruffled. As the speaker drew towards a close, I told the secretary he must not permit my name to be announced, as I did not intend to speak. He said it was too late, he would announce me, and I must speak. I replied if he did force me to speak I would soon make him repent it; for I should tell what he had just done,—with such comments, as the case required. He then threatened to complain to the Bishop. I told him I had already caused the Bishop to be informed of what he had told me of him—and cautioned him against believing any thing that he might tell him of me. This put an end to our conference, which occurred immediately behind the chairman,—and began to attract the notice of those around us. I therefore left the platform,—and “Mr. G. Thompson

lately returned, from America"—spoke in my place; thus throwing into my very tracks, the man who of all others in Britain I had the worst opinion of, and with whom I was destined so soon to have a prolonged controversy—on a subject of such vast interest to America, and of such importance to all the Christians of it.

I suppose there were some subsequent explanations, perhaps difficulties, amongst the officers of the society; for I got besides several private notes from friends—-a letter from the Bishop of Chester and one from Mr. Copper, joint secretary, and one officially from the committee,—all explaining in part and apologising in part.—I replied to the first one only—simply to state the true facts of the case—and to express my sentiments regarding them; and refused afterwards to say or hear any thing on the subject.—I trust all future delegates from the United States, will have more reason to record acts of personal and official kindness from some of these institutions, and especially from the active agents of them, than most of their predecessors have been permitted to find.—

**THE ABDUCTION OF ELIZA BURNS—AN ORPHAN CHILD—BY PAPISTS
IN BALTIMORE.**

We have just been made acquainted with a story of great, and to us, painful interest in some of its parts, which we take the responsibility of laying before our readers, in the hope and with the design that an enlightened and informed public sentiment may come to the aid of the laws, in restraining the outrageous proceedings of some of the papal functionaries—institutions, and people in this city. We freely give names and facts—and hold ourselves responsible, for the general accuracy of the following statements.—

Some years ago, an Irishman by the name of Burns, who was perhaps originally a papist, married in this city, or at least in this section of the United States, a protestant Irish girl from Dublin, whose maiden name was Walker. About three years ago, the female died in Baltimore, leaving three infant children—all girls. In her last illness, she was repeatedly visited and greatly harassed by one or more of the Priests of this city; but she rejected all their attempts to proselyte her—and died in the faith of her fathers. Her dying injunctions—like her living precepts, were that her little girls should on no account be allowed to come under the influence of the popish religion, or its wily ministers.—In the house in which she died, lived an Irish protestant of advanced age, named Eliza Gifford, to whose care the children were left by their dying mother—and in whose care they remained till her own death—which occurred on the 21st day of June 1837.

The Burnses were poor; and Eliza Gifford had little else than a small annual stipend, of which more anon. After the death of Mrs. Burns, her husband who had before been a gardener, in the employment of various persons in and about Baltimore—removed near to Harpers' Ferry—where he took sick, and died about the latter part of the summer of 1836. He had allowed his little girls

to remain with Eliza Gifford constantly, since their mother's death; and had as he was able, discharged his duty as a father, kindly to them—contributing more or less towards their support. The little property of which he died possessed—came into the hands of Mrs. Gifford, and it and the children remained without question with her, till her death.

Mrs. Gifford, was a woman of good family in Ireland—had received a superior education—and been raised a lady. In consequence of the troubles in Ireland during the rebellion at the close of the last century, she was reduced to want—and deprived of all her relatives. She was compelled to stand by, and witness the death of her whole family—who were burned to death in their own house; a fate which they suffered in common, with multitudes of other protestants, at the hands of the priest ridden and fanatical mob of Irish papists, in that day of blood. Her state of mind, in regard to the papacy may be easily conceived; nor did she at any time conceal it. Her chief, if not only means of support of late years, has been an annuity of about \$75—which she regularly got from abroad through the house of Alexander Brown and Sons—and which there is some reason to suppose, was allowed her as a pension by the British government. This pittance she nobly shared, for above three years, with the little orphans, whom God had so strangely committed to her care; and was to them, as we know from the best source, all that a mother could be. During all this period, not a single papist in Baltimore, or elsewhere offered to render the least aid in supporting the children—nor did any of them manifest the slightest interest in their welfare—either before or after the death of their father.

Some short time ago, Mrs. Gifford took sick—and after an illness somewhat protracted, died. During her last sickness, she was visited by the Rev. Dr. Henshaw, and by various other benevolent individuals—and amongst the rest by Mrs. Keyworth. This lady, had already received into her family the eldest of the three orphans, who had been regularly bound to her husband, at the request of Mrs. Gifford; and it was the dying request of the latter, that she should take the charge of the other two little girls—obtain a suitable place for the second one—and place the youngest in the orphan school in Mulberry street (*which is not papal as yet*) until it was old enough to go to service, and then take it herself. Mrs. Keyworth and her husband are both members of the Methodist Episcopal church. These facts are proven by the lady herself—by all who had access to Mrs. Gifford in the last months of her life and by the eldest child, with whom we have freely conversed, and who is an intelligent girl of ten or twelve years of age. They are also abundantly confirmed by the following written statement of Dr. Henshaw, copied by us, from the original in the hands of the person to whom he gave it—for a purpose which will be stated presently.

Baltimore June 28, 1837.

Mrs. Eliza Gifford, who died yesterday, and has had charge of three orphan children by the name of Burns, called to me on her death bed that she wished the eldest child to remain with Mrs. Keyworth, and desired that a good place might be secured for the second child, and that

Elizabeth the youngest should be placed at the Baltimore Female Orphan Asylum in Mulberry street; and furthermore that they should be educated in the principles of the Protestant Episcopal church.

Signed. J. P. K. HENSHAW

Eliza Gifford paid the great debt of nature on the 21st of June—And about sunrise, on the next morning, a papist woman of the name of Hammond—who resides on Fell's Point—secretly stole away the two youngest children from the house in which the dead body, of their last earthly protector still lay unburied!—Through the persuasions of a papist woman living in the house, these two children had been permitted to remain during the night—with her; and when next morning they were called for, Dr. Henshaw, Mrs. Keyworth, and others—were informed, that this Mrs. Hammond, had come from the opposite end of the city, and claiming to be “god-mother”—as they called it—to the second child—took them both off. The second one she carried to her own house. The youngest one she so disposed of, that it was early that morning safely lodged in the papal orphan asylum, near the Cathedral—called we believe, St. Mary's orphan asylum,—into which it was thus privately introduced, as we have every reason to believe with the connivance, if not by the aid of Bishop Eccleston, a certain Miss Spaulding, and Mrs. Luke Tiernan.

Mr. and Mrs. Keyworth, accompanied by other friends, and in execution of the duty laid upon them by the oft expressed wishes, and dying injunction of Mrs. Gifford—set about ascertaining the fate of the two children—and if possible, recovering their persons. The eldest one, as before stated, was already in their charge. After some enquiry—the facts stated above, were ascertained,—and the papists whose names are given were each repeatedly visited during the course of the day on Saturday and Monday succeeding the death of Mrs. Gifford—by Mr. and Mrs. Keyworth, Mr. and Mrs. Thorps, Mr. Paul, and perhaps others. On Monday several of them went to the papist Mrs. Hammond—who after much difficulty,—partly by persuasion, partly by the openly expressed wishes of the child, but chiefly perhaps, by threats of a legal prosecution for carrying it off, or seducing it away from its rightful protectors—was reluctantly induced to give up the second child—which remains with its proper friends. Blessed be the God of the helpless orphan—who has raised up active and efficient friends—for those little ones, in a land of strangers, amongst whom there dwells not one individual, having a drop of their blood—and where, they find themselves suddenly environed by so great snares, dangers, and troubles.

Mr. Eccleston, Mrs. Tiernan, and Miss Spaulding—were made of other materials—than Mrs. Hammond. Again and again, were they each waited on, by the anxious friends of the little innocent, of six or seven years, whom sister Bridget, or perhaps sister Clotilda, had already safely deposited in the secret places of the asylum—and from which, a word from either of these persons named above, would have at once set her free. We cannot forget the dreadful story of *Mary Elizabeth Little*—which the name of sister Clotilda recalls—and which we beg the reader to examine—in the

No. of this Magazine for December 1835. The abduction of children is not a new business, with some of the papists of our city; but any regular attempt to reclaim them, when once carried off we believe is somewhat novel. Indeed we have the Bishop's word for this. For on being pressed for an order to the Asylum for the delivery of the child, he not only declared he had no power to give it (which nobody credited)—but most solemnly, and in the deep wonderment of ignorant innocence—declared he had never had such a request made of him before! Alack—adasey! to think that wicked protestants, should be so silly, as to suppose that nuns and priests, are not the “sovereignest remedy in the world” for all the evils of life: and that the secret recesses of their unexplored, and unexplorable man-traps, and woman-traps, the very seats of all the virtues! Alack-a-day! The silly wicked protestants!

Through the greater part of two whole days, the friends of these abducted children, went backwards and forwards—to Mr. Eccleston, Mrs. Tiernan, Miss Spaulding—and the orphan school—over which those individuals are understood to exercise control. We forbear to comment, on the evasions, the twistings, the petty meannesses of Mr. Eccleston, reported to us, by these worthy persons. We had hoped, that he had not utterly forgotten, in becoming a Jesuit, and a sworn vassal of the Pope—that he was once a gentleman, and a free American. Such also seems to have been the feelings of Dr. Henshaw in giving Mrs. Keyworth the note copied above; and upon the mere presentation of which to Mr. Eccleston, the Doctor believed, and thought doubtless he had reason to believe that the child Eliza Burns, would be immediately delivered to her friends.—But after all other shifts had been used in vain—all the heads of the school and the church—slipped their necks as far as possible adroitly out of the case, as responsible actors—and referred the applicants for justice—to a new and mighty power “behind the throne—greater than the throne itself.”

In our No. for May 1836, is an account of a Baltimore lawyer, who entered into a conspiracy with the famous Prince Hohenloe, to work a notable miracle—which unhappily failed. In our January, March, and November Nos. for 1835—are accounts of incidents in the lives of Priests De Barth and Deluol—in which are references, to the same remarkable personage—as the especial friend of the first named priest, in trying to extricate him from charges brought by a girl who had the night mare, and whom he persuaded to believe was ridden by her mother's ghost. The same March No. of 1835, contains another allusion to this illustrious person—as the lawyer on a certain occasion for one Priest Smith, of very famous memory in these parts as a burner of bibles and forger of wills, in his day. Now we have in this unhappy story—the same everlasting referee of all troubled priests, figuring as the grand master of ceremonies in the finale of the matter.

And who may this renowned advocate be? Ah! reader it would indeed argue yourself unknown—not to know Mr. John Scott. A gentleman who having been born and raised a protestant, was so fortunate as to discover, that the right of private judgment, was a burden and vexation, as well as a sinful figment—and so happy

as to find other persons, modest and competent enough to take this whole matter off his hands in all his intercourse with God. A gentleman so sagacious, that while the world was disputing whether the moon is made of green cheese or not—discovered by intuition that the Godhead abides, as an object of worship, under the aspect of a flour wafer! A gentleman so ripe in faith, that he risked his system of religion, on prince Hohenloe's power to work a miracle on his own body, at the distance of four thousand miles; and then when the prince failed, only remained the more thoroughly convinced of the truth of that which required no miracle to confirm it! A gentleman so consistent in his fidelity, that having espoused doctrines, which are incapable of belief, and which no man can believe—since they contradict reason, consciousness, common sense, and physical sense, to boot,—has yet the goodness to act as if he did really believe them—and thus voluntarily surrendering all the honours and advantages of a double apostasy, countenances by his great example, every thing that ordinary men might be ashamed to propound, backward to avow, or disposed to recant under the scorn of an incredulous world! Illustrious gentleman!—we treasure the honour which protestantism has won by giving birth to such a prodigy! *Rara avis in terris!*—which for the unlearned we render, "noble friend of Smith and De Barth!" *Nigroque similima signo!*—well translated, "immortalized in the case of the abduction of the child, Eliza Burns!"—

As soon as the name of this great lawyer was announced, the whole case took a new turn! "You must go to Mr. John Scott;" said Mr. Eccleston, "you must go to Mr. John Scott"—repeated in succession, Miss Spaulding, Mrs. Tiernan, and the ladies at the orphan school.—And doubtless—every utterance of that name,—*clarum—venerabile*—caused a tremor in the nerves, and a palpitation at the hearts, of Mr. and Mrs. Thorps, Mr. and Mrs. Keyworth—Mr. Paul, and all the rest who heard it. And to Mr. John Scott they did go. But before doing so, they went to obtain counsel, if any could be found bold enough to risk themselves against the Jupiter *tonans* of Baltimore. They went also, to ask redress of the legal tribunals of the commonwealth—who thank God, have not yet learned the lesson of "mother church"—that the temporal sword, is subject to the spiritual one, and that it is wielded only in subordination to it,—they were successful in both applications. Messrs R. Moale, E. L. Finley and H. D. Evans, readily agreed to advocate their righteous cause; and on the Monday following the death of Mrs. Gifford, the orphan's court, having heard the whole case, promptly, and to their great honour decided it. The second child which had been secretly carried to Fell's Point, by Mrs. Hammond,—and recovered as already stated, was allowed to remain in the possession of her friends, and bound to Mr. Paul. The youngest one, which Mrs. Hammond declared she had carried to St. Mary's Asylum, and which Mr. Eccleston, Mrs. Tiernan, Miss Spaulding, and the sisters at that asylum admitted to be there, and which the orphan's court was duly informed, was then retained by force, after having been abducted by fraud; this child, the court placed under the care of Mr. Paul, by appointing him its guardian.

Fortified by competent advice, and armed with legal power, Mr. Paul, demanded his young ward, again, from all the parties who seemed to have a hand in her detention—and again the answer was—“go to Mr. John Scott.” To Mr. John Scott, accordingly, did the friends of the poor child go. To Mr. John Scott, did they go—and exhibit the legal evidence that Mr. Paul was the guardian of the abducted orphan. But what was “Hecuba to him or he to Hecuba”—that Mr. John Scott should swerve from his accustomed mood, at such a case!—Gloriously did he demean himself in this new contest, for “holy mother church.”—What is law—what is justice—what are the bonds of social life—what are the orphan’s tears—or the dying prayers of parents and honoured benefactors? Trash—all trash—vanity and nothingness!—Mr. John Scott’s rule of conduct, is as the church dictates; he believes as she believes, and she believes as he believes, and both believe alike! Mr. John Scott therefore was hardly to blame, in being rude to his applicants, for restitution in so plain and affecting a case; nor even for open and contemptuous disregard of the decisions of one of the judicial tribunals of his country, in a case where his church deemed herself interested—and had at least deeply implicated her character. Mr. John Scott, positively refused, to cause, or allow the delivery of the abducted and secreted child, to its proper friends, and legal guardian; angrily announced his resolute purpose, to contest the matter to the farthest extremity—and by every possible means; and discharged the applicants for redress at his hands—with little less than contumely.

Here we pause for the present. When the cause has been decided by the proper tribunals—we shall record that decision, and detail so much of the intermediate process and facts, as may seem proper. Mean-time the case as already developed presents a subject of most serious consideration. Are the papists of this town, the masters of us all in such a sense that our children and wards can be stolen from their friends before our bodies are buried—and so secreted that those friends cannot recover them? Then it is high time, to look about for a remedy against such a despotism. Are the papal institutions—and functionaries both male and female, vested with authority to catch up people’s children wherever they can get access to them—and by right or against right retain them by fraud or violence, under their control? If so, it were well, to look heedfully after our little ones—and to have an eye to those pretended asylums which may be so readily converted into prisons.—Are the persons of free citizens, of whatever age, liable to be taken into custody; and there held under the secret control of Mr. Eccleston, and Mr. John Scott—until the tardy and uncertain steps of law shall find relief—or lagging far behind its vigilant despisers, fail of ever reaching the secret cell of the captive?—In such a case, we shall provide for our own freedom as well as safety; and those of us who are so often the objects of personal threats, must take care, that those who have this power to oppress, shall be held responsible in their own fashion, for its exercise. We say to Mr. Eccleston, and to Mr. John Scott, and to all the rest of the wire-workers, in this and similar cases that it were well for them to be careful of their pro-

eedings. We know the power of the priests over their own people; and the moment, it shall be manifest that the laws cannot protect us, from the tools of the ecclesiasticks—from that moment, we become our own protectors— and in caring for our liberty, our rights, and our safety—we shall hold those who really have the power to injure us, responsible for the acts of all their subordinate agents.—We begin to weary of hearing threats—which we are convinced nothing but a suitable opportunity is lacking, to see enforced. And we tell Mr. Eccleston fairly, that he will be held responsible, for whatever evil shall befall us, or our friends in the course of this controversy, from the hands, or by the procurement of his people. We fear them not, but we know them. We utter no threat against any man; but we understand fully our real posture, and such cases as the present, render it necessary to say to Mr. Eccleston, that we well understand his also.

(For the *Baltimore Literary and Religious Magazine.*)

THOUGHTS ON THE MORALITY OF THE ROMISH CHURCH.

THE Romish Church in order to be judged should be regarded in that condition in which she has been most independent and most powerful; in other words, if we would know what she is, we should contemplate her, not lamenting over revolted provinces, or compromising with the altered state of modern civilization, but when she was treading on the necks of Kings, and leading Europe in her triumphal progress. The period we mean is that which includes the termination of the middle age. It is our advantage here to find her testifying against herself: for the accusations under which she writes proceed from the mouths of her own historians. There were then no Protestants, whose acumen and vigilance could render it needful to falsify a record; and the poor Waldenses, Albigenses and other witnesses for truth, were not dreaded rivals, but the prey for her sword.

The principle is incontestible; and we insist on uncovering the putrescent sore, and sinking the probe, before its subject has spread over it a bandage and disguise. Especially do we insist on applying this rule of investigation to the *morals* of Rome. In revealing hideous facts evincing the godless audacity of her ecclesiastics we may chance to occasion a blush on many a Protestant cheek, and some of our brethren, may doubt the propriety of the disclosure; we appeal to their more considerate judgment; but, be it well remembered, let no Papist take exception to the introduction of evidence which was published to the world by men of his own communion; and relating to facts which were as notorious as the existence of Avignon, Constance, or Rome.

We sacrifice nothing when we avow our belief that the morals of the Romish church were not equally bad from the beginning; her progress was downwards; and we rejoice to think that there was

many a pope who would have sunk to the earth in dismay, if he could have foreseen the simony, uncleanness, incest, bestial monstrosity, and atheism of his successors. It would be easy to draw up, in chronological order, a list of testimonies, from accredited Catholic authors, many of these being churchmen; which without the alteration of a single word, would present such a gallery of pictures, as the art of man had never dared to feign, unless it be upon the obscene exterior of Hindoo temples. The earlier portraits in this series would be comparatively fair, but when they had reached to Paul II. and Sixtus IV. and Alexander VI. we should imagine ourselves in the city of the plain. Romish authorities know this full well, and however far their effrontery may reach, they will never accept a challenge; to demand those documents with which they are too accurately acquainted. Let us suggest one question to the candid Roman Catholic layman: Is there any *series* of Protestant ecclesiastics, who by their own writers, or by their worst enemies, have ever been even charged with the public perpetration of such enormities?

In the fifteenth century the impiety of several popes was such, as might well have given reason to expect rather a universal lapse into atheism, than a reformation. When we look at Paul, and Sixtus, and Alexander, as vicars of Christ, we are struck dumb with amazement, and can scarcely imagine a step between this assumption, and a similar claim on behalf of Satan. Hear how the second Paul addressed the celebrated *Platina*, whose words we cite: "Do you make appeal from us to any judges? (referring to the foregoing Abbreviatores) as if you knew not that all laws reside in the coffer of our breast. Here is my judgment; let all give place, and go whither they will; I regard them not. *I am Pontiff*, and mine it is, according to the decision of my own mind, both to rescind and to approve the acts of others."* Here was authority enough to exalt the Bishop of Rome above all criticism of his demeanour, whether private or political. Intrenched in such impregnable prerogative he might, if he chose, make his court a den of infamous orgies. Our facts and argument are such, that we can afford to be moderate, and we are even ready to assent to what one of the greatest historians of our day has said of John XXIII. "As to his morals, they were undoubtedly loose, like those of all his court; but it is not easy to believe that at Bologna alone he had two hundred mistresses, as Theodoric de Niem declares; (*Vita Johannis xxiii. p. 6:*) or that he seduced three hundred nuns, as is charged in one of the articles of accusation preferred against him."†

Nevertheless, till streams rise higher than their springs, we cannot hold a church pure whose supreme ruler is a satyr; nor accept any palliation from a community which forever brandishes in our face, as its capital weapon, the dogma of unity in one infallible head. The crimes of Sixtus IV. (A. D. 1471—1484) are precisely

* "Ita nos, inquit, ad judices revocas? Ac si nescires omnia jura in scrinio pectus nostri collocata esse? Sic stat sententia, inquit, loco cedant omnes, eant quo volant, nihil eos moror. Pontifex sum, mihi que licet pro arbitrio animi aliorum acta et rescindere et approbare."—*Platina de vitis Pontificum* (Basil 1529 fol. p. 29.)

† *Sismondi. Hist. des Rep. Italiques. Tom. viii. p. 243, ed. Paris 1819.*

those which we dare not name, though we are ready to produce not merely the mention of them, but the details, when desired so to do by any of the chaste brothers of the holy celibacy. And in order that such persons may have access to the very passage, we refer to the place: *Steph. Infessurae* Diarium Curiae Romae, in Jo. Ge. Eccardi Corpore historicorum mediæ ævi. tom. p. 1939—1942, Leipsic, 1723. The same author, his contemporary, writes thus, concerning the dying-day of Sixtus: "In which *most blessed* day Almighty God himself showed his power on the earth, and freed his Christian people from the hands of so impious and unrighteous a potentate." (ib. p. 1939.)

The republican Christians of America will find a useful study in the life of *Jerome Savonarola*, a Dominican of Florence, of the fifteenth century. His eyes were so far opened, that he became all but the Luther of Tuscany. The most eloquent orator of his age, and the dauntless champion of popular rights, he was a favourite with the Florentines, and employed his voice and pen to rebuke the iniquity and tyranny of the priesthood. Need we say what became of him? After undergoing indescribable refinements of torture, he was burned at the stake. It was at least "poetical justice" that a Dominican should fall into the jaws of the inquisition. But he being dead yet speaketh. Before Austria had trodden out the last sparks of liberty in northern Italy, the patriots republished some of his works. We trust they will yet prove holy and imperishable seed in beautiful Lombardy. The life of this man was published in 1835 at Hamburg; and Dr. Rudelbach, the learned author, has furnished the world with a selection of new evidence demonstrating the vileness and abandoned atrocity of the Romish prelates. We make a few gleanings from his introductory chapters. Let it not be said that those are ebullitions from American zeal against popery; they are results of transatlantic research. Of the pontificate of Juvencent viii. he says: "Scarcely a day passed in which some one was not murdered. The murderers went about unpunished, as soon as they had found favour at the door of some cardinal; and if any one was once seen to be hanged upon the Capitol, this occurred by night, without precedent trial, and without any one knowing the culprit's name." "When the pope's vicar, for the city and vicinity, had published an edict forbidding laymen and ecclesiastics to keep mistresses; the former under pain of excommunication, the latter under pain of suspension and loss of benefice, in case they persisted in this scandalous life; Innocent summoned the vicar, and took him severely to task, with an express order, that he should forthwith revoke the aforesaid edict, for said he, 'this is not forbidden, because such is the life of priests and courtiers, that scarcely can one be now found, qui concubinam non retineat, vel saltem meretricem, *ad laudem Dei et fidei Christianae*'"* It was of such a state of things that Savonarola cried out, in one of his sermons, printed at Venice in 1539: "O the voluptuousness of Rome, of Italy, of the priests, which is published through all the world, and whose stench has reached even to the heavens; insomuch that there are not a hundred prostitutes

* Rudelbach, p. 14

merely, nor yet two hundred, nor three hundred, nor a thousand, nor two thousand, nor four thousand, nor six thousand, but more than ten thousand.* It is with pain and grief and shame, not for the church only but for our common nature, that we allude to such enormities. Were our object the reformation of offenders, we should suppress them; but our aim is different, and demands another course, however distressing. We seek to shew, incontestibly, that in and after the middle age, during the "most high and palmy state of Rome," when the Romish church, if ever, was unincumbered, unvexed, free to act out its principles, there existed, among her sacerdotal leaders a state of open vice, such as the records of Greek and Roman priesthood cannot parallel. If such is the fact, it proves that the system lies under the curse of God. But the fact which shews this cannot, in good conscience, be withheld from the Christian public; and it cannot be made known, by any means which will not cause a blush in writer and reader. This expression of indignant shame is honourable and sacred; but it is not the growth of convents, and we cannot but proclaim an undeniable train of facts, even at a great expense of feeling. The policy of the Papists can be but one. Mark the whole course of their pretended defence and this will be apparent. They dare not join issue upon the evidence. They dare not summon witnesses. They dare not question the veracity of their own writers. They dare not justify the crimes, at least in our age and country. They are ruined for ever if the testimony come before the court of public free opinion. It is their one policy, their last resource—alas! too available among an unsuspecting people—to excite an outcry against the indelicacy of charging in a solemn indictment, crimes of popes and prelates, which shock every feeling of nature and religious modesty.

It would be easy to shew that such enormities naturally grow out of the system of constrained celibacy. Only let the reader forget for a moment the associations connected with the words "monk," "nun," "Catholic," "monastery," "convent" &c. and look independently at the naked hypothesis. A number of men arrive in America, for some obscure purpose; they erect buildings and provide costly arrangements. It is found to be their object to discourage matrimony. They persuade as many persons as they can to live single. They make them swear to live single. They make them swear to live single all their lives. They persuade them to this—not in mature life, when the tendencies of their nature and their sense of self control are duly unfolded—but, if possible in unsuspecting, inexperienced youth. Here then are gathered great households of young men, and young women, sworn to live in everlasting celibacy. Of holy wedlock, all hope is locked out, forever. Let us ask the reader to state any unfairness in this calm and chastened representation. Let us further ask him, on his conscience, to declare, what he judges would be the influence of such

* We dare not translate what follows; mark, it is from a *Last Sermon*, openly preached and afterwards published, at Venice. "E garzoni sono fatta femine. Non basta questo, il padre la figliuola, il fratello la sorella: non vi è distinzione di sesso né di cosa più alcuna."

a compulsory sequestration from the common liabilities of man, upon the passions and the will. Let philosophy, physiology, and history give the reply. We have it written in the unvarying annals of conventual life. We challenge the priests of India, or the chiefs of the Pacific isles, to invent a scheme, more fitted to inoculate human minds with the virus of unnatural craving; more fitted to exacerbate the ulcer, and inflame it to indomitable heats. May God save our sisters and daughters from the influence of such denaturalizing means. The sun—we bless God for it—has never shone on a race of purer women than those of America; pure, because they live in a social condition happily equidistant between the imprisoned hypocrisy of the Turks, and the lawless liberty of the French. By innocent and joyful intercourse they purify our young men. They are yet to learn to think of marriage as a less holy state than celibacy; to regard the malignant leer of a livid monkish face as purer than the frank affection of a friend; to condescend to crimes, that they may tell some sworn enemy of wedlock, the iniquities which their gentle souls have *not* admitted. But such are the teachings the American virgin is to receive from the foreign confessor.

[For the *Baltimore Literary and Religious Magazine.*]

ESSAYS ON JUSTIFICATION.

No. 1

THE doctrine of Justification, as taught in the scripture, was the mighty lever by which the reformers even threw over the papal power in many lands, and shook the entire fabric of Papal superstition among the nations. If Protestants will maintain their freedom from the galling yoke which their fathers broke, it will be by honestly holding fast and faithfully defending this doctrine in its evangelical purity. It is as Luther styled it—*articulus stantis vel cadentis ecclesie*. The church stands or falls as she maintains or corrupts this foundation doctrine.

It may serve to awaken attention, to recite more at large the sentiments of the noble German respecting this doctrine. "It is the head corner stone which supports, nay, gives existence and life to the church of God; so that without it the church cannot subsist for an hour." He calls it the "*only solid rock.*" "This Christian article," he writes, "can never be handled and inculcated enough. If this doctrine fall and perish, the knowledge of every truth in religion will fall and perish with it. On the contrary, if this do but flourish, all good things will also flourish, namely, true religion, the true worship of God, the glory of God, and a right knowledge of every thing which it becomes a Christian to know." Cramp p. 112.

A few quotations from "the decrees and canons of the Council of Trent," will expose the sentiments of the papal church upon

this all important doctrine. Chap. iv. of the Decree. "Justification—is a translation from that state in which man is born a child of the first Adam, into a state of grace and adoption of the children of God, by Jesus Christ our Saviour, the second Adam. Which translation, now that the gospel is published, cannot be accomplished without the laver of regeneration or the desire thereof."

Ch. vii. "Justification itself follows this disposition or preparation; and justification is not remission of sin merely, but *also sanctification*, and the renewal of the inner man by the voluntary reception of grace and divine gifts, so that he that was unrighteous is made righteous, and the enemy becomes a friend, and an heir according to the hope of eternal life. The sole formal cause is the righteousness of God; not that by which he himself is righteous, but that by which he makes us righteous; with which being endued by him, *we are renewed in the spirit of our mind, and are not only accounted righteous, but are properly called righteous, and are so, receiving righteousness in ourselves, each according to his measure, which the Holy Ghost bestows upon each as he wills, and according to our respective dispositions and co-operations.*"

Canon ii. Whoever shall affirm that men are justified solely by the *imputation* of the righteousness of Christ, or the remission of sin, to the exclusion of grace and charity, which is shed abroad in their hearts, and *inheres in them*; or that *the grace by which we are justified is only the favour of God*; let him be accursed." See also canons, 7, 9, 24, 30, 32.

It is not my intention to reason formally against these corrupt dogmas, but to exhibit the scriptural truth upon this precious subject adopting the principle of Bellarmine, that—"he who proves the affirmative, does at the same time refute all opposite errors." In doing this, however, the heresy of the Roman church will be sufficiently noticed. The following propositions, I trust, will be found to contain the truth upon the subject.

I. Justification is a *judicial act*, or declaration of a person righteous. Justification is a term borrowed from the courts of justice among men. An individual is arraigned before a human tribunal. His cause is tried, and by the verdict of a jury he is pronounced innocent. The judge upon the verdict given declares his innocence, pronounces him righteous, and he is openly absolved. Thus he is justified, being declared righteous, and acquitted of the guilt of the crime alleged against him. Of the same nature is the justification of the sinner. He is arraigned before the bar of God, and on account of the righteousness of Christ his surety to whom he is united by faith he is pronounced righteous. He is declared to be righteous as contemplated in Christ Jesus, "in whom Jehovah beholds no iniquity in Jacob." It is, therefore, an act of jurisdiction of God the just Judge upon his "throne of grace," and not as the papist assumes, an inward change of soul—or making a person righteous. This is evident from its being opposed to *condemnation*. When an individual is tried before a human court, and is condemned, his condemnation does not make him wicked, because sentence is passed upon him according to his wickedness displayed

in the crime of which he is proved guilty—he is condemned because he has acted wickedly. So on the other hand, when an individual is found innocent by a court, of the crime laid to his charge, he is not *made innocent*, but only *declared* to be so. He was innocent of the crime before the trial took place. The sinner, therefore, in his justification, is not made righteous any more than the man who is condemned is made wicked by his sentence of condemnation, or the innocent man is made innocent by the verdict of the jury in his favour. Justification is therefore a declaration of a person righteous, not the *infusing of righteousness unto him*. “He is said to be justified in the sight of God,” says Calvin, “who in the Divine judgment is reputed righteous, and accepted on account of his righteousness; for as iniquity is abominable to God, so no sinner can find favour in his sight so long as he is considered as such. Wherever sin is, therefore, it is accompanied with the wrath and vengeance of God. He is justified who is considered not as a sinner, but as a righteous person, and on that account stands in safety before the tribunal of God, where all sinners are confounded and ruined. As if an innocent man be brought under an accusation before the tribunal of a just judge, when judgment is passed according to his innocence, he is said to be justified, or acquitted before the judge; so he is justified before God, who not being numbered among sinners, has God for a witness and asserter of his righteousness.” The Scriptures also present this view of the subject. Is. 43, ch. 9, 24. “Let all the nations be gathered together, and let the people be assembled—let them bring forth their witnesses that they may be justified—declare thou that thou mayest be justified.” Here the nations are called upon to bring forth testimony of their innocence, which being advanced they will be declared righteous, or will be justified, “declare thou” meaning—“thy righteousness that thou mayest be justified. Men in their justification are contemplated as righteous by the divine Judge, and upon this consideration are declared to be such. They are not made righteous, by the infusion of righteousness into them, and on this account justified; but they are declared to be righteous, and are justified on account of the righteousness of their divine surety in whom they are considered.

II. Justification like the sentence of a judge is an act completed *at once*, and not like Sanctification a *progressive work*. This is an important consideration; for in confounding Justification and Sanctification lies the error of the Papists, and others who are treading in their footsteps. “They” says Calvin, “under the term Justification comprehend that renovation in which we are renewed by the spirit of God to an obedience to the law and so they describe the righteousness of the regenerate man as consisting in this: that a man after having been once reconciled to God through faith in Christ is accounted righteous with God on account of his good works, the merit of which is the cause of his acceptance.” This charge will be seen to be just, by any one who will take the trouble of examining the quotations from the decree and canons of the Council of Trent. When, however, Justification is considered, as it really is an act completed at once, a simple and single act like the sentence of a

judge we are able to detect the falacy of the Papal heresy. God in justifying the sinner contemplates him, as we have seen, as righteous, and declares him to be such. This is an act completed at once, while the sinner is arraigned before his tribunal, even as an individual who is tried before the bar of a just judge is acquitted or justified at once upon the manifestation of his innocence before he leaves the bar, and is so completely justified that he cannot be arraigned upon the same charge.

This mode of procedure is exhibited in Dent. 25th chap. 1 ver. "If there be a controversy between men, and they come unto judgment, that the judges may judge them; then they shall justify the righteous, and condemn the wicked." The justification of the righteous and the condemnation of the wicked here commanded, are acts performed at once upon the evidence of their innocence, or guilt, before the accused leave the bar of the judge. In like manner is the justification of the sinner an act completed at once. In the very moment in which the sinner is united to Christ the surety by the bond of the spirit and faith, and is viewed by the eternal judge as invested with the robe of his unspotted righteousness, in the same moment is his sentence of justification passed by the judge who will do right, and is recorded in the book of life. Here is the distinction between *Justification* and *Sanctification*. The former, is an act completed at once, whilst sanctification is a work of time. The latter commences, it is true, at the moment in which we are justified. Sanctification originates in our *regeneration*, at which moment the Holy Ghost implants *faith* by which we are united to Christ, and receive his righteousness the meritorious cause of our justification. The act of justification is performed by the judge in the glorious moment of our regeneration, in which is laid the foundation of our progressive sanctification, and eventual perfection in holiness, by the spirit that dwelleth in us. This sanctification however, does not, yea, cannot form a part of our justifying righteousness. Upon the principle that it does, our justification would not be completed in this life, as sanctification is never perfected until death. Then it is only perfected as it respects the soul. The body corrupts and moulders in the tomb and will not be perfected in holiness until reanimated at the last day. It cannot be and is not, then, a part of our justifying righteousness. If it is supposed to be, then the Christian could never attain in this life, to the full assurance of faith, and the stable foundation of his hope would be removed. For as our sanctification is incomplete in this life, and such is our state, that "when we would do good evil is present with us, and the good which we would we do not," our righteousness cannot be a *perfect righteousness*, and an imperfect righteousness, can never obtain a complete justification from that judge "whose judgment is according to truth." In human courts where justice is meted out, the man who is not found wholly innocent, is punished in proportion to his criminality. With more certainty may it be said of the decisions, of the Eternal Judge. "He rewardeth every man according to his works." If, therefore, our imperfect sanctification is made a part of our justifying righteousness we never can be justified in this life, and the foundation of our hope is destroyed.

But on the other hand, when our justification is viewed as an act completed at once, in the moment in which the sinner is united to Christ by the spirit and by faith, and is contemplated by the judge as invested with his righteousness, then the foundation of our hope is stable as the rock, and we can "rejoice in hope of the glory of God."

Justification then is an act completed at once. The sinner has his sins pardoned, and is accepted as righteous, in the same moment which he is united to Christ by "*the renewing of the Holy Ghost,*" irrespective of the good works which he is enabled to perform in the progress of his sanctification. The former is an act finished in a moment, the latter is a work of time. They are however "inseparable, as they are two blessings which we receive together in Christ who cannot be divided. Whomsoever God receives into his favour, he likewise gives them the spirit of adoption by whose power he renews them in his own image. But if the brightness of the sun be inseparable from his heat, shall we therefore say the earth is warmed by his light, and illuminated by his heat? Nothing can be more apposite to the present subject than this similitude. The beams of the sun quicken and fertilize the earth, his rays brighten and illuminate it. Here is a mutual and indivisible connection. Yet reason itself prohibits us to transfer to the one what is performed by the other." There is an equal absurdity in the doctrine of the papists, and all who "follow their pernicious ways," in this confusion of the two blessings of justification and sanctification. "For as God actually renews to the practice of righteousness, those whom he graciously accepts as righteous, they confound that gift of regeneration, with this gracious acceptance, and contend that they are one and the same thing. But the Scripture though it connects them together, yet enumerates them distinctly, that the manifold grace of God may be more evident to us. 1 Cor. i. 30. Christ is made unto us righteousness, and sanctification." God therefore justifies the sinner, not in a partial manner, but so completely and at once, that he may boldly appear in heaven as invested with the purity of Christ.

Abrogation of the plan of union.

IN the digest of the Assembly's acts, on pages 297-299 is printed the famous *plan of union*, whose abrogation by the last assembly, had so prominent a place in its acts, and will undoubtedly exert so great an influence on the future destinies of the Presbyterian church in the United States. We print the plan itself, that our observations on it may be more simple and intelligible.

Plan of Union between Presbyterians and Congregationalists in the new settlements adopted in 1801.

The report of a committee appointed to consider and digest a plan of government for the churches in the new settlements, was taken up and considered, and after mature deliberation on the same, approved, as follows:

Regulations adopted by the General Assembly of the Presbyterian church in America, and by the General Association of the State of Connecticut, (provided said Association agree to them,) with a view to prevent alienation and promote union and harmony, in those new settlements which are composed of inhabitants from these bodies.

1st. It is strictly enjoined on all their missionaries to the new settlements, to endeavour by all proper means to promote mutual forbearance and accommodation between those inhabitants of the new settlements who hold the Presbyterian and those who hold the Congregational form of church government.

2nd. If in the new settlements, any church of the Congregational order shall settle a minister of the Presbyterian order, that church, may if they choose, still conduct their discipline according to congregational principles, settling their difficulties among themselves or by a council mutually agreed upon for that purpose. But if any difficulty shall exist between the minister and the church or any member of it, it shall be referred to the Presbytery to which the minister shall belong, provided both parties agree to it; if not, to a council of an equal number of Presbyterians and Congregationalists agreed upon by both parties.

3d. If a Presbyterian church shall settle a minister of congregational principles, that church may still conduct their discipline according to Presbyterian principles; excepting that if a difficulty arise between him and his church, or any member of it, the cause shall be tried by the association, to which the said minister shall belong, provided both parties agree to it; otherwise by a council, one half Congregationalists and the other half Presbyterians, mutually agreed on by the parties.

4th. If any congregation consists partly of those who hold the congregational form of discipline, and partly of those who hold the Presbyterian form; we recommend to both parties, that this be no

obstruction to their uniting in one church and settling a minister; and that in this case, the church choose a standing committee, from the communicants of said church, whose business it shall be, to call to account every member of the church, who shall conduct himself inconsistently with the laws of Christianity, and to give judgment on such conduct; and if the person condemned by their judgment be a Presbyterian, he shall have liberty to appeal to the Presbytery; if a Congregationalist, he shall have liberty to appeal to the body of the male communicants of the church; in the former case the determination of the Presbytery shall be final, unless the Church consent to a further appeal to the Synod, or to the General Assembly; and in the latter case, if the party condemned shall wish for a trial by mutual council, the cause shall be referred to such council. And provided the said standing committee of any church shall depute one of themselves to attend the Presbytery, he may have the same right to sit and act in the Presbytery, as a ruling elder of the Presbyterian Church.

On motion, *Resolved*, That an attested copy of the above plan be made by the Stated Clerk, and put into the hands of the delegates of this Assembly to the General Association; to be by them laid before that body for their consideration; and that if it should be approved by them it go into immediate operation.—Vol. I. p. 261, 262.

SECT. 6. *Adopted by the Association.*

The Delegates to the last General Association of Connecticut, reported that they all attended the Association during the whole of their sessions and were received and treated with great cordiality and friendship:

That the regulations submitted by the last Assembly respecting the establishment of churches in the frontiers, consisting of members partly of the Presbyterian and partly of the Congregational denomination, were unanimously adopted by the Association.—Vol. I. p. 276.

One of the large business committees of the General Assembly of 1837 submitted a report, of which the following is a portion:

In regard to the relation existing between the Presbyterian, and Congregational churches; the committee recommend the adoption of the following resolutions, viz:

1. That between these two branches of the American church, there ought, in the judgment of this Assembly to be maintained sentiments of mutual respect and esteem, and for that purpose no reasonable efforts should be omitted to preserve a perfectly good understanding between those branches of the church of Christ.

2. That it is expedient to continue the plan of friendly intercourse between this Church and the Congregational churches of New England, as it now exists.

3. But as the "plan of union" adopted for the new settlements in 1801, was originally an unconstitutional act on the part of the Assembly, these important standing rules having never been submitted to the Presbyteries, and as they were totally destitute of author-

ity as proceeding from the General Association of Connecticut, which is invested with no power to legislate in such cases, and especially to enact laws to regulate churches not within her limits; and as much confusion and irregularity have arisen from the unnatural and unconstitutional system of union, therefore it is

Resolved, That the act of Assembly of 1801, entitled "A Plan of Union," be and the same is hereby abrogated.—(See Digest. pp. 297—299.)

4. That our delegates to the bodies representing the Congregational churches, be instructed to explain to them the reasonableness and even necessity of the foregoing measure.

On the 23d of May these resolutions were adopted by a vote of 143 to 110. It is the object of this paper to illustrate the justice, propriety and necessity of this vote.

They who will consider the past history of the Presbyterian and Congregational churches in this country, will see abundant reason for the close sympathy which has always united them to each other—and the cordial good understanding which has so long existed between them. Our sincere desire is, that our congregational brethren may not allow themselves to be hurried into measures in the present crisis, which shall have any tendency to break up this state of things. And that the sound Presbyterians of the present day, are actuated by no unfriendly feelings towards Congregationalism in itself considered—nor towards those who prefer that system, is abundantly manifest from the resolutions printed above. Let each party manage its own affairs in its own way; and let the other have the delicacy, to mind *only* its own affairs. And when such Congregationalists as those at New Haven, and those of the Evangelist, become hot partisans of an erroneous and evil spirited minority in our church, let them be discountenanced by all pious men in their sect, who do not wish to inflame the whole land by a controversy on the radical principles of the two denominations. Presbyterianism seeks no controversy with any branch of the true church of God: but it should be borne in mind, that she has and can have no cause on her own account, to fear any.

The Taylorite Congregationalists, and the New School Presbyterians are very bold in declaring themselves the true descendants of the Puritans. "*We are Smithfield men*"—was the repeated and most shameless boast of Dr. Peters and Dr. Breman—in the last Assembly. "*A Puritan therefore* (says Daniel Neal; History of the Puritans, vol. 1. p. vii, of the preface, to the London edition of 1822)—*a Puritan therefore was a man of severe morals, a Calvinist in doctrine, a non-conformist to the ceremonies and discipline of the church, though they did not totally separate from it.*" Now to which part of this description may the two classes we have named above honestly pretend? Are they men of "*severe morals*?" Yes; if it be so, to swear to a creed—which one does not believe. Yes; if it be so, to enter a church only to revolutionise it, and at the same moment swear to study its unity, purity and peace.—Are they "*Calvinists*?" Yes; if it be so to deny, revile, and studiously characterize some of the fundamental truths of Calvinism—and zealously contend for opposite and irreconcilable errors.—Are they "*non-conformists*" through conscience? Yes; if he is a non-conformist

through conscience—who conforms for convenience, from ambition—or through carnal self-seeking to one system, when he so decidedly prefers another—that even a bastard one, between the two, is precious as life, compared with the one to which he immorally conforms. When men sacrifice principle—there is little wonder if they give up sense and knowledge also.

The truth is however, that the Congregational denomination in this country, was much more really the descendants of the Puritans—than their Independent brethren in England; and therefore they were perhaps as nearly a kin to Presbyterianism as to Independency.

The church spoken of in the sentence above extracted from Neal—was the established Episcopal church of England; and the non-conformist party, was that which became the Presbyterian body of England, after the formation of the Westminster standards; was the same which carried England almost in solid phalanx for the league and covenant; the same which amidst the fiery trials which attended them before the rise of the English commonwealth, sent out many of those colonies, and ministers—who laid the foundation of the New England churches. These churches were indeed Puritan—non-conformists, Calvinistic, and severely moral. Their principles, in all essential respects, and their creed—almost in terms—were those that formed the basis of the Westminster standards. Hence, while the English independents to the present hour, are upon the mere and absolute Brownist or pure Congregational foundation, and universally reject all creeds—and authority above a church: the so called Congregationalist churches of this country—and especially those in Connecticut, (with whom the *plan* we are now discussing was formed)—became united under systems widely departing from the English model of the present day—and not only adhered to creeds, and for a long time to perfectly sound ones—but use them until now, with a profuseness unparalalled in the history of the church.

Whilst therefore many principles were common to us and the churches of New England, and our creed almost identical, it is not wonderful that good men in both churches, sought for closer union—and loved to get as near together as possible. In this spirit, the *plan of union* was formed; and we are inclined to think that if it had been executed in its own true intention—and with fidelity on the other side, it might possibly have continued for an indefinite period. But as we shall show the plan itself, at first not consistent with the real principles of either party—was speedily and entirely perverted in practice. The Congregational churches on their part, tended to change in two most important respects, either of which would have been fatal to the *plan of union*. They have gradually departed from the doctrines of their ancestors; and they have gradually inclined their systems more and more towards independency; in both respects, becoming more and more unlike to us, and us to them. A plan, which was hard to manage at the best,—became intolerable under these perversions;—and left the injured party no alternative but its abrogation. But let us go a little into detail.

1. It is perfectly clear to our minds on the mere perusal of the plan itself that it was meant only for *new settlements*, and *weak churches* there. It makes provision only for such. Therefore the

moment *frontier settlements* became thickly peopled—and churches permanently established, the plan should have ceased to operate in *that region*; and the churches there formed, become fully Presbyterian or fully Congregational. As long as *new and frontier settlements* existed, the plan would exist there. But it was never intended to be constant, in such a way as to erect a new sect, bastard between the two parents—and finally capable of destroying both.

2. It is equally evident that the plan never contemplated the formation of Synods out of churches absolutely heterogenous in at least four respects, set forth in the paper itself; still less was it ever supposed that these motley churches should be represented in the General Assembly by persons neither ministers nor elders; and least of all could it be imagined from the examination of the plan, that it could ever be made the ground of a system of organization, by means of which persons who never adopted our standards, and churches which did not believe them, should absolutely hold the balance of power in our entire body, and so use that influence as to threaten a total revolution in the doctrine and discipline of the church.

3. There is no evidence at all, that where a Presbyterian minister served a Congregational church, this should justify that church in calling itself Presbyterian, and sending some private person as an elder to our church courts; nor that when a Congregational minister served a Presbyterian church, that this should justify him in calling himself a Presbyterian and sitting in our tribunals: nor when a church consisted partly of Presbyterians and partly of Congregationalists, that any member of it should have the rights and privileges of a ruling elder, in all cases merely, because he was a standing committee man. None of these things were ever intended. Yet they were all done to the ruin of both Presbyterian and Congregational discipline and order.

We assert therefore that the plan itself was never executed according to its own obvious meaning; that the matters in which it was perverted and misapplied were entirely contrary to the principles and constitution of our church; and that the influence thus produced in our body illegally and contrary to the plan itself—was constantly evil and constantly increasing. But the plan itself in its own real and obvious intent was originally contrary to the constitution of the Presbyterian church; and even if it had been faithfully executed from the beginning, it never was and never could have been compatible with our standards. Moreover, the General Association of the state of Connecticut never had any, the *slightest* power to execute on its part, such a plan, in any of its parts. For:

1. Every Presbyterian minister has the right to be tried by his own presbytery, when any difficulty exists between him and his church, or any member thereof; and this right is most explicitly secured by our standards. But the second article of the plan, deprives him of this right, and directs such cases to be referred to a certain mixed commission, utterly unknown to our system.

2. Every private member of our churches, has the same right to have all his church difficulties examined by his session, as our ministers have to bring theirs before the Presbyteries. But the third

resolution of the plan deprives the members of purely Presbyterian churches of this important right inherent in all our people—and substitutes an association, or a mixed tribunal, both alike unknown to Presbyterianism, for the church session.

3. By our constitution every Presbyterian church must have a session composed of a board of elders. But resolution 4, abolishes this board, in certain cases. With us, none but ministers and elders can administer discipline in any case. But this 4th resolution appoints a standing committee, who are neither the one nor the other, to perform this important work. By our system every member of our church has a right to carry his case, by appeal up to our highest tribunal. But by this resolution, in certain cases, this clear right is abolished. By our constitution no human being but a ruling elder regularly ordained, can act as a ruling elder in any of our church courts. But by this monstrous resolution, in certain cases, a member of the standing committee of a mixed church—and who is as to us a mere private person is declared to “have the same right to sit and act in the Presbytery, as a ruling elder of the Presbyterian church.”

4. But the general Association of Connecticut never claimed any sort of authority over the private members of the churches of Connecticut even at home. Of course it never could have any over them, after they left the bounds of the association—which were no more extensive than Connecticut itself, even if it had any over them at home; which it had not. But above all, it had no shadow of right to bind church members from any of the other New England churches—even in Connecticut,—much less in their own native regions—and least of all, after they had emigrated into the *new settlements* of New York and Ohio.—

It has always appeared to us one of the most humiliating exhibitions of human weakness and inconsistency, ever made by men professing to act with reflection, and on principle—that the very same persons, who in the Assembly of 1836 argued that the body had transcended its powers in the case of the agreement with the Pittsburgh board of foreign missions, should assert that it had acted enough within them in the case of this plan of union. Our constitution expressly empowers the Assembly to conduct missions; the Assembly made a covenant with the Western Foreign Missionary Society, to appoint a board to carry on foreign missions, and to take its stations, &c. under its care. But these “*Smithfield men*” find out pretexts to refuse to execute the agreement, and forbade the Assembly, of which they and theirs were the majority, to do what it had covenanted, towards the world’s conversion. Yet these same “*Smithfield men*” —find other pretexts to declare the *plan of union*, which violates our constitution pointedly in six or seven particulars, to be good, wise, and *sufficiently* constitutional—and being a *covenant*, say they, unalterable without consent of parties,—and even after that, the sacred vested rights under it, intangible and unreachable by any human authority. How true it is, *that they who cannot turn, cannot spin!*—

Tho’ Presbyterianism and American Congregationalism agreed originally in many things—and do still agree in some; yet they also differ fundamentally in some very important respects. Dr. Alexander

observed on the floor of the General Assembly, that we had as much right and power to direct a part of our churches to be governed on the principles of diocesan episcopacy, as on those of this *plan of union*. Does not the remark commend itself fully to every man's conscience? Is there a particle more resemblance, if so much, between a Committee man and a ruling elder---than between a pastor of one of our churches, and a diocesan bishop? The plan is then, as far it is executed, upon its true intent, a thorough subversion of our whole system of church order; and it is no mitigation of its injury to us, that it departs from true Congregationalism about as far as from true Presbyterianism—and threatens it almost as seriously as it does us. The truth is, that the operation of the thing has been, to rear up a new system, which has not only constantly troubled both those which formed it; but has been a sort of hot bed out of which all sorts monstrous things have issued. Monster itself, from the hour of its birth,—its vigorous growth has only developed features which alarmed both its improvident parents—and the brood of its self-created progeny—has been mainly stamped with its own evil image and superscription; and like itself boasting for the most part a power “to dash wise counsels” to pervert good systems, and to educe from good the power to do hurt. Where did men learn, to be pelagians, from revivals of religion? Where, did the temperance cause, teach men to deny the use of wine in the sacrament? Where did the cause of human freedom degenerate into an agrarian and jacobinical crusade, for levelling and amalgamation? Where did high spiritual effort and excitement terminate in antimonianism perfectionism and licenciousness? Where reader—where but in the very churches and regions, where a most fatuitous *plan of union* between things which could not be thus united,—first grossly perverted itself, afterwards perverted portions of two Christian denominations, into the wildest, most erroneous, and most fanatical sect, that any portion of the church of Christ ever acknowledged to be Christian?

It is not wonderful then that multitudes in our church have long bewailed, and long striven to remedy this state of things. The writer of this article sat for the first time in the General Assembly in 1831. That Assembly, after full argument decided that a committee man, then present should take his seat in the body as a ruling elder. And he did so: and out of an Assembly of about two-hundred and thirty members, only about seventy,—or one member in three, could be induced to sign a testimony against this audacious violation of the constitution they had all sworn to support.—The following year the synod of the Western Reserve was directed to take order and report in regard to the alledged disuse of the office of ruling elder in its churches, and the prevalence of certain doctrinal errors in that region; and the next spring, that is in the Assembly of 1833, that Synod appeared by its delegates,—and partly by evading the subject, partly by uncandid statements and promises, and partly thro' the connivance of a New School majority, in the body itself, the whole matter was for that time hushed up. The following spring, (1834) the *Act and Testimony*, was issued,—and the Assembly of the next year, 1835, had become so thoroughly convinced of the evils of the

whole subject, that it forbade any new churches to be formed under the *plan of union*, and made an overture to the General Association of Connecticut for its abrogation. That association has remained profoundly silent on this subject, even to this very day. Even the act of the Assembly of 1837, now printed by us, has failed to make the oracle speak; and we are therefore obliged to wait still longer on its dumb and solemn meditation.

It appears to us to exhibit clearly the sense of weakness under which the minority of the last Assembly and their partizans every where have attempted to defend this plan of union—to hear them continually harping with cookoo note “it is a treaty—it is a covenant, it is a covenant, it is a treaty.”—We beg pardon of Mr. Elipha White of Massachusetts and South-Carolina—who did take a different ground in one part, of one of the almost frantic bodily exercises with which he entreated the Assembly. If we understood him, this was the syllabus of his argument: This plan is and always was clearly unconstitutional;—it has always given trouble, and may be always expected to do so;—(Ah! thought we, this is very good—when lo! the conclusion)—*therefore,—we ought to adhere to the plan for the sake of peace!!!* Truly a “new measure,” in “seeking—peace.”—

And what is a treaty—and what a covenant? Does either word occur in the whole course of this plan? Or is there one feature or element of either in it? Or is there in it any subject which could be the basis of either as between the acting parties? Or had those acting parties, any sort of power to make a treaty or covenant, about the matters and persons here involved? Surely there is no absurdity, of which men need any longer be ashamed;—nor any assertion too hardy to be made. But above all, that the very “*Smithfield men*,” who had, *on principle, broken the covenant and annulled the treaty*, about foreign missions, between the Assembly’s Committee of 1835, and the Board of Directors of the Western Foreign Missionary Society—should so soon discover, that the acts of the same body, with others, do in fact immediately become unalterable and sacred both as treaty and covenant, when an association takes the place of a Society, and Taylorism stands in the stead of missions—is a triumph of “new light”—which no one will dispute with Colonel Jessup, Dr. Beman, Dr. Peters, *et id omne Jesus*.—

But suppose it were both treaty and covenant—what then? Are all treaties eternal? Is there no equality, to be regarded, as between contracting parties? Is there no such thing as a failure of consideration? Is there no making void—that which was once good—but which becomes wholly viciated, by reason of fraud, deceit and perversion of articles—and consequent injury to an innocent party? Is there no redress, for things done thro’ mistake, or in ignorance? Is there no such thing, as a usurpation of power—and the doing of acts which one or both the parties contracting had been forbidden by competent authority to do? Or are all third parties, indissolubly and forever bound, by the unauthorized acts of those who pretend to have full power, and may have colourable authority to act for them?—Our New-School friends, incur much risk of public exposure and contempt, when they act hastily on the hypothesis that all men are as ignorant or as reckless in their statements, as themselves.

We will not enter at present into the question—of the effects which would lawfully or logically follow the abrogation of this plan. That whole subject will properly occupy our attention—in our next paper—when discussing the resolutions declaring the four Synods out of our communion. At present we will close, this disquisition by suggesting what seems to us, sufficient reasons why the plan of union should in any condition of things have been abrogated; and why under existing circumstances, the resolutions actually passed by the late Assembly, were both wise and necessary.

1. We have demonstrated, as it appears to us, that the plan of union, was at first improvidently made. It was evidently not wise—nor likely to be well executed. It was complex—it was uncalled for—it was a needless revolution in the habits of all the parties proposed to be benefitted by it, for those parties, could well have lived in harmony without it—and could hardly hope to escape trouble under it. It may have been a well meant—but was surely a most ill contrived affair.

2. It is as clear as any proposition ever can be made—that the General Association of Connecticut had no sort of power, to make such a plan; and that the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, were expressly forbidden to do, and solemnly sworn not to do, any of the material things herein complained of respecting it. The thing was, as to both sides wholly unconstitutional, and therefore both were bound, and we sworn never to make it—and having inconsiderately and illegally made it, to abrogate it, as soon as possible.

3. It was a source of constant trouble, confusion and disorder in our church. One party in the church considered those claiming rights under the plan, intruders; while they considered these opinions and feelings, hard and unjust. There could be, with us, no peace or harmony, while things remained as they were. All which is proved by the history of the seven last Assemblies.

4. The operation of the system, and the whole influence of the plan, rendered constant difficulties between our church and the Congregational churches, probable if not inevitable. It put great temptations in the way of the Congregational churches to interfere in our affairs. It seemed, to make it a sort of duty, on the part of the General Association of Connecticut, to exercise a protesting sort of regard for a portion of our churches. It held out or seemed to hold out improper inducements and facilities to Congregational ministers to enter another sect, without in fact changing their former principles—and indeed held the two denominations, in a sort of relation to each other, that in all periods of commotion and excitement—was extremely unpleasant, if not critical.

5. The churches formed on this plan, were neither wholly Presbyterian—nor wholly Congregational—nor wholly on the half and half system. As a whole they constituted a new sect; and yet their various parts constituted at the same time three or four new subordinate sects. The necessary result was, the rising up of a new and strange thing in the country, which neither Presbyterianism nor Congregationalism could justly be expected to foster: and which must always trouble both. And in the process of its formation, it would necess-

arily occur that, all sorts of new creeds and church covenants—(which are in their very essence and being, anti-Presbyterian) would be formed; and that not only great errors might creep in—but great truths creep out, of these little creeds. And precisely such results to a most deplorable extent have followed; yea, and all attempts on our part to get at the real extent and posture of these evils, have been constantly resisted: so that even now, no man knows the full state of these matters. Bad as we know the thing to be,—every new examination and developement has proven the thing to be worse and worse. Mr. Colton, admits that he himself, tho' no great dabster at such work, formed no less than *fourteen creeds*, in the region covered by this plan of union.

6. The growth and progress of these things, had already brought matters to such a pass that no man of common discernment, could see any alternative but for the Presbyterian church to cut loose and fall back on its own principles, or be totally revolutionized. It was already a mere question of life or death. Every thing strange, unsound and troublesome in all our borders, had made common cause with this plan of union sect,—and its spirit, pervaded the entire New School ranks. Not to have abolished that plan, would have been tantamount to a direct vote, for the total subversion of our church order—the entire perversion of our testimony—and the utter prostration of sound Presbyterianism, so far as the General Assembly was concerned.

7. This course so absolutely necessary for us—was hurtful to the interests of no one whatever, in any sort of way, that we should or could regard. It might injure error: but that was a reason why we should do it. It might disturb the disturbers of the earth; but should we go back on that account? Who does it injure? The cause of Chrĭst,—says one. We shall see that better by and by. The Presbyterian church—says another.—That also, the future will reveal.—Has any man a right to be a Presbyterian without believing our doctrines—adopting our standards—or holding to our system? But we are willing, and more than willing to receive all who will do these things. All others who seek to join us—are either knaves, or numskulls. If the churches in the separated Synods, wish to join our body—let them enter by the door; all who enter otherwise, Christ himself has denounced—If they wish to be Congregationalists,—there is no hindrance; let them do what seems good to them. Would they form a new sect? Who hinders them? Would they be as they are? So let them be. All that is asked of them—is, that they will be what they pretend to be—and nothing more or less.

Here then is the whole case. If the churches of Connecticut choose to find fault with the Assembly's, act of abrogation—let them speak; and doubtless they will find a prompt and respectful answer—the very reverse of their dumb dignity. If they are satisfied—who else has any right to complain?

ILLUSTRATIONS OF THE PAPAL CHURCH ABROAD.

No. 2.

Letter 1. of the Rev. William Crotty, Catholic Priest of Birr. To the Editor of the Freeman's Journal.

SIR—I am really at a loss how to account for the inconsistency of your conduct. Without the least cause, or the slightest personal provocation, you have commenced a most gross and wanton attack upon my friend and relative, the Rev. Mr. CROTTY, Parish Priest of Birr.

Instead of combatting his arguments, and refuting the doctrine put forward in his letter to the Titular Archbishop of Dublin, the patron and advocate of the un-Christian and anti-social principles of DEN'S THEOLOGY, you have only favoured us with a tissue of low and vulgar abuse; and, by misrepresenting his religious opinions, impotently endeavour to deprive the Rev. Gentleman of the confidence of his flock, and sacrifice him to the fury and fanaticism of a priest-ridden and besotted multitude. By that attack, Sir, you have given the public a fresh proof of the intolerant and persecuting spirit of the religion you profess; and like a dutiful son, you have stepped forward in defence of *Mother Church*, and basely assailed the character of the man of whom you were once the advocate and friend.

I tell you, Sir, that your attack does you little honour, and very little credit to the cause you endeavour to uphold. If the Reverend Gentleman's manly stand against tyranny and persecution—If the Gospel, purity of his doctrine, and his signal overthrow of error—if the enlightenment of his flock, and the emancipation of a poor benighted multitude from a most deplorable state of intellectual vassalage and mental darkness, in which they had been kept for ages by the Romish priesthood of Ireland, for the base and unhallowed purpose of filling their coffers and pandering to their luxuries—have excited your religious prejudices, and provoked your hostility against the Rev. Gentleman, the public must conclude that you are entirely bereft of principle, and that you combine in your character the malignity of the monk and the rancorous resentment of the fanatic. Your *Journal*, Sir, was once the advocate of civil and religious liberty; but, alas! it has fallen from its original character—and is now become the organ of a debasing superstition, and reduced to the degraded employment of forging chains to fetter freedom of opinion, and enslave the independence of the mind.

“*Hei mihi, qualis erat! quantum mutatus ab illo!*”

The Rev. Gentlemen, Sir, whom you have so basely traduced, has advanced nothing but the pure and genuine doctrine of the Gospel in his letter to the Titular Archbishop of Dublin. It is true the Rev. Gentleman has styled marriage a *sacrament*; but I beg to inform you that it is only a *civil contract*; and I defy the advocates of

DEN'S THEOLOGY to establish the contrary opinion without committing a pious fraud—that of translating *μωστηρι* *sacrament*, instead of *mystery*—which must appear, to any competent judge, a gross perversion and wilful misrepresentation of the Word of God. This is exactly of a piece with their impious attempt at upholding *idolatry*, by translating the following passage of Paul to the Hebrews, *και προσεκύματι επί τὸ ἄκρον τῆς ραβδου αὐτου*; “and he adored the top of his rod;” when any schoolboy must see, by referring to the parallel passage in 41st chap. 31st v. of Genesis, that it only means “and he worshipped *LEANING on the top of his staff.*” Now Sir, as to the Rev. Gentleman’s denial of the power of any Priest, Pope or Bishop to forgive sins, it is in perfect accordance with the religion of pure and unadulterated Christianity. I defy Doctor Murray, with an entire conference of the worthy disciples of *Peter Dens*, to establish the contrary position. Yes—I defy his Lordship, with all his tortuous casuistry and jesuitical dexterity, to prove that the Apostles themselves had ever such a power; and I assert that the commission, they received from their Divine Master was that of preaching the Gospel, and *and declaring sins forgiven*, upon the sole condition of faith and repentance on the part of the sinner. I would even go further, Sir, and I would say, with Mr. Crotty, that God himself cannot alter the constitution of things which he has established in his everlasting Word; and that his Divine Son Jesus (blessed for ever be that adorable name!) could not forgive sinners, unless on the Gospel conditions of faith and repentance. He could not for instance, consistently with his own covenant, have forgiven the *impenitent* thief, although he died within reach of his blood; nor Judas, because Judas died without repentance. Is it not deplorable, then, Sir, to think that a Romish priest should blasphemously arrogate to himself the privilege of doing what even the blessed Saviour and his Apostles, acting under the Gospel dispensation, were never able to effect? Is it not melancholy to think that a body of men, professing themselves the ministers of the Gospel of Christ, should put forward such an infernal and soul-destroying doctrine as that of *attrition*; and tell their poor benighted followers that this *attrition*, with the priest’s *absolution*, is sufficient for the remission of their sins? This *attrition* is defined *imperfect contrition*: and here is another proof of the absurdity of Romanism, and of its impiety in encouraging to sin, and maiming and deforming the Gospel of Jesus. No wonder, then, Sir, when such an abominable doctrine is advanced from the altar, that the fields of Ireland should be reddened with human blood; no wonder that the Roman Catholics of this country should become, under the baneful and withering influence of such an abominable and anti-Christian system, as ignorant and as ferocious as the tygers and hyenas in the wilds of Africa; no wonder that we find the great mass of them totally ignorant, and entirely bereft of every idea of God’s Word; no wonder that they are become, under the auspices of such spiritual guides, a putrifying and a noisome carcass—a collection of unregenerate men—the doers of every evil work—menslayers, bloodshedders, houghers of cattle; drunkards and blasphemers. To say, then, Sir, that a priest has the power of forgiving any man his sins, is a monstrous error,

and an impious delusion, generated by the arch-enemy of mankind and fostered and encouraged by the Romish priesthood of Ireland, for the purpose of picking the pockets and enslaving the minds of an ignorant and superstitious peasantry. The holy cheat first made its appearance in or about the time of Boniface III.; and from that very period, pure and genuine Christianity began to decline; the clergy became tyrants—and a seat of empire and spiritual dominion was established, to rule and tyrannise over the Church of God.

You now find sir, that you and your cause have gained little by your gross attack and furious invective, against the Rev. Mr. Crotty. In vain, Sir, has the hue-and-cry of superstition pursued, for the long period of *ten years*, the man whom you have so shamefully reviled, and impotently calumniated; in vain have the dogs of war, the bloodhounds of the Inquisition, been let loose upon him; in vain has a heartless mendicant come to Birr to preach a crusade against him, and endeavour to devote him to public execration, by representing him as an enemy to the faith of the people, and an impious opposer of *Mother Church*; in vain have a superstitious priesthood conspired his ruin, and reddened their altars with the blood of his murdered reputation; in vain have they proclaimed the infernal doctrine of *Dens* and *Bellarmino* from the pulpit; and exhausted the thunders of the Vatican, for the purpose of depriving the Rev. Gentleman of the confidence and attachment of a faithful people; in vain, then, have all the arts of jugglery and mummery and priestcraft been employed, and all the grim and bloody maxims of cruel superstition been put in requisition against him. The Rev. gentleman is still in Birr, triumphant and victorious, and enthroned in the hearts and affections of the great majority of the Roman Catholic parishioners, after *ten years'* hard fight against open enemies on the one hand, and many faithless friends on the other; and this proves that the Rev. Gentleman has little to fear from the impotent endeavours of such a puny adversary as the *Freeman's Journal*, and that it is in vain for man to attempt to destroy what God has determined to save.

“Irrita vaniloquus quid curas spicula lingus?
Latrantem curatne alta Diana canem?”

I have the honour to remain, Sir, your most obedient and humble servant,

WILLIAM CROTTY,
Catholic Priest.

Letter 2. Of the Rev. William Crotty, Catholic Priest of Birr, to the Editor of the Freeman's Journal.

SIR.—I have just read your reply to my last letter in this day's *Mail*, and congratulate you upon the discovery you have made, of my denouncing the *fundamental doctrines* of the *Catholic church*. I thank you for that discovery; it is an excellent specimen of your controversial powers, and it speaks volumes for the cause you endeavour to maintain. "The Catholic church teaches, and all Catholics must believe what the church teaches, that there are seven sacraments." Now, Sir, I beg to inform you, that the Catholic church teaches no such thing, and that your doctrine of seven sacraments only forms the peculiar creed of one particular church, commonly termed the *church of Rome*. If you but take the pains, Sir, of casting an eye over the *New Testament*, you will find that the apostles established many independent churches in many parts of the world; and yet that these independent churches communed with each other in matters of faith and doctrine, and were bound together in the bond of unity and brotherly love. You will also find, if you consult ecclesiastical history, that the apostles, or their immediate successors, formed a creed, commonly called the *Apostles' Creed*, in order to preserve this *oneness* or unity of the faith, and that every individual Christian was obliged to believe in the *communion of the saints*, or in the doctrines professed and taught by all the Christian Churches, which were then styled the Universal or *Catholic church* of Christ.

Now Sir, it happens very unfortunately for you and your cause, that the word *Roman* has been omitted in this creed. In vain does your church arrogate to herself the exclusive mark of Catholicity—in vain does she plead that Peter was the head of the Apostles—that he fixed his chair at Rome, and that he was empowered with jurisdiction over all the other particular churches. This is evidently a delusion of the Devil, and one of those "old wives' fables" generated by the arch enemy of mankind. This is the invention of *Lucifer*, the spirit of pride, and an impious tale not to be found in the eternal Word of God. Now, Sir, in the eighth chapter of the Acts of the Apostles we find that Peter and John were sent forth by the rest of the Apostles to preach the Gospel—and in the second chapter of Paul's Epistle to the Galatians he tells us that he withstood Peter to the face because he was a *dissimulator*!! Now from these two passages of God's Word, it is evident that Peter was sent to preach by the rest of the Apostles—and next, that he was corrected, and even severely rebuked by Paul; And I believe this ought to be quite sufficient to shew that Peter had no authority or jurisdiction whatever over the other apostles, nor over any of their particular churches. It is evident then, Sir, that your boasted supremacy and exclusive *Roman Catholicity*, is a doctrine not grounded upon the eternal Word of God. It must, therefore, be a holy cheat, and a yoke of despotism generated by clerical ambition, and fostered and encouraged by a blind, a dependent, and a superstitious priest-

hood—it is that *mystery of iniquity* foretold by St. Paul, in his second epistle to Timothy, and it is evidently that *captivity of God's people* mentioned by St. John, in his book of Revelations. It first made its appearance when the church of Rome became a temporal establishment under Constantine, and from that very period we may begin to date all the assassinations and conspiracies, all the impurities, and adulteries, and all the blood and horrid scenes of carnage and desolation that have stained the Papal annals, and have polluted, for centuries, the chair of St. Peter. The very instant the clergy were elevated to wealth and worldly grandeur, they forgot their primitive simplicity, and became immoral, cruel, insolent and domineering. “The worshippers of Idols (says Gregory, the Apostolic Bishop of Rome,) rage and rule daily to the death of the faithful, and yet the priests who ought to be weeping on the pavement and in ashes, seek for themselves names of vanity, and boast of *new and profane titles.*” And again—“all things which were predicted are coming to pass, the *King of Pride* is at hand, and, what is unlawful to mention, an *army of priests* is prepared for him. Here, Sir, I might appeal to the voice of history to shew, that what Gregory foretold actually came to pass. Here I might point to the *King of Pride*, who actually made his appearance in the seventh century in the person of Boniface III. when he became a temporal prince and *universal bishop*, under the Emperor Phocas; and from that very period to the present day, the *Man of Sin* has continued to enslave the consciences of a large portion of mankind, and to grind their most sacred and invaluable rights beneath the cloven foot of priestly tyranny and papal despotism. Pope Nicholas I. was not satisfied until he made Louis II. King of France, become his groom, by holding his stirrup, as he mounted his horse. Pope Clement V. got Dandolo, the Venetian ambassador, chained to his table like a dog; and Pope Gregory VII., the famous Hildebrand, excommunicated Henry IV., of Germany, absolved his subjects from their allegiance, and kept him three days at his gate, naked, or only covered with a piece of Blanket, while he was enjoying himself with the beautiful Matilda. I might also refer to the domineering insolence of Pope Innocent III., who attempted to deprive King John of his crown and kingdom. I might also refer to the impurities of Julius III., and to the horrible impiety of Alexander VI., who fell a victim to the poison he had prepared for his guests; but it is time to draw the veil, and I have only mentioned these few facts of papal delinquency, to show you and your deluded countrymen that they were the work of Antichrist, and the effects of that blind and foul superstition which you have impiously termed the *Catholic church.*

A Catholic church, Sir, is a church that has preserved the doctrine of the apostles pure and undefiled; and such a church, Sir, is not to be distinguished by the universality of its members, but by the truth of its doctrines and the purity of its faith. A Catholic church may consist of a few individuals, as it once did of Christ and his Apostles, and hence it is called “a little flock;” and a Catholic church may even lose its visibility, as it did under Decius and Dioclesian, and as foretold in St. John's Book of Revelations. Boast not, then, Sir, of Catholicity, until your church goes back to first

principles, and performs a lustration of all the filth and corruption with which she was inoculated during the long and dismal night of monkish ignorance and Papal darkness. Let her lop off the exuberance of her error, and cast away the superadded fables of her superstition. Let her reduce the number of her sacraments to two, and bring all her other doctrines to the test of the Gospel. Let her, for instance, translate her mass into the vernacular tongue, and let her offer that mass as a laudatory and not as a propitiary sacrifice. Let her give up her indulgences and works of supererogation. Let her acknowledge a purgatory, but let that purgatory be Christ's *blood*. Let her drop her *month's minds* and shameful trafficking in the merchandise of souls. In a word, Sir, let her reject all these ridiculous absurdities and nonsensical fooleries, and let her acknowledge Jesus Christ as an *only mediator* and an *only Saviour*, and then I shall admit her orthodoxy and never quarrel with you about the *Catholicity* of the Romish Church.

I have the honour to remain, Sir, your most obedient and humble servant,

WILLIAM CROTTY,

Catholic Priest.

Letter 3. Of the Rev. William Crotty, Catholic Priest of Birr, to the Editor of the Limerick Chronicle.

SIR,—Perhaps you would be kind enough to correct a statement put forward in your last publication. You have asserted, and the assertion seems to have been dictated by some interested individual, that “the Rev. T. Kennedy had married Ellen Connell, the wife of Rigney, to another husband, not deeming the first marriage valid, as Priest Crotty is under suspension.” Now Sir, it so happened that the first marriage was performed by me, and I beg to inform both you and the public, that I am not under suspension, nor any kind of Ecclesiastical censure. In the year 1829, I received at my *own request* a dimissory letter from my then Bishop, Dr. M’Mahon, of Killaloe, and this letter goes to shew that I am not under censure and no longer subject to the Episcopal authority. I therefore stand upon independent ground—totally unconnected with either Pope, or Bishop, and not very partial to Romanism, from what I have been made to know of that cruel and degrading superstition. The Rev. T. Kennedy, of course, is a true and orthodox son of Mother Church, and we may fairly view his late conduct in the second marriage transaction, as an outbreak of the principles inculcated by a lately celebrated Romish Theology. The Rev. Gentleman has attempted to set the machinery of the Inquisition to work—he has attempted to separate the husband from the wife—to—their children—and to deal out licence to his Majesty’s subjects to commit —. But the Rev. Gentleman forgot perhaps, in the fervour of

his zeal for Mother Church, that he was at a distance from the Papal Territories, and that he lived in a land of Liberty, where salutary laws would not suffer an obscure Monk to create such a complete subversion and general uprooting of society.

The Rev. Gentleman may proclaim from his altar to a besotted and superstitious multitude, that the discipline of his Church is not to be affected by the heretical laws of England; but I would tell the Rev. Gentleman in sober seriousness, that the laws must be respected, and that British subjects are not to be hunted down like wild beasts of the Forest, by an ignorant and superstitious priesthood.

I remain Mr. Editor

your humble and obedient servant,

WILLIAM CROTTY,

Catholic Priest, Birr.

BRITISH IDOLATRY IN INDIA.

THE speech which is published below, was delivered at the forty third anniversary of the London Missionary Society, in Exeter Hall, on the 11th of May last. We commend it the serious consideration of all those who have taken so much pains of late years to hold up the conduct of the British government, as a model for the world, and especially for America, to imitate.—We trust that the *Abolition party* in this country, in the excess of their zeal for inculcating the fanaticism of foreign radicals upon our people—will in turn, be candid enough to stir up Mr. Thompson, Dr. Wardlaw and their other British allies, to have some little pity on *a hundred and twenty millions of Asiatics*, whom their immaculate government teaches to be idolaters, as well as on the two millions of "*American slaves*"—whom both those parties teach to be rebels. We hope also, that if ever Dr. Wardlaw condescends to answer a civil letter addressed to him a year ago—he will not forget this part of the frightful case then, and now again, laid before him.

The Rev. E. CRISP, missionary from India, moved,—

"That whilst this meeting rejoices in the extending desire after divine truth now prevailing in India, it laments the continuance of the fearful evils resulting from the connexion between the Government and the idolatries of that country, is thankful that the subject has again recently shared the further attention of the Honourable East India Company, and would cherish the hope that effectual measures will be taken for maintaining the honour of the Christian name in the sight of the heathen, and for removing the obstructions which have been occasioned to the cordial reception of the Gospel."

It would have been much more congenial to the feelings of my heart to have been permitted to dwell upon the wants and claims of India, upon the pleasing prospects of extended usefulness, and upon the measure in which God has already borne testimony to the labours of his servants.

But in this case I feel there is a necessity laid upon me; and, I hope in no other spirit than the spirit of the Gospel, and with no other desire but that God may be glorified and every obstacle to the progress of Divine truth be removed,—I would direct the attention of this assembly to the particular point referred to in the motion I now hold in my hand. (Applause.) The political circumstances in which our missionaries are placed in India are, in many respects, much more favourable than they were at any former period. For two centuries after the British power had been established in that distant part of the world, there was no security for the entrance of the evangelist among that people, and in many instances where an attempt was made to introduce the Gospel, such was the jealous and fearful system of policy pursued, that those efforts were at once prohibited. In the year 1795, some distinguished individuals connected with this Society would gladly have gone forth to our eastern possessions, but they were forbidden. (Hear, hear.) We know well that Drs. Morrison and Ward wished to join Dr. Cary at his station there, to be assisted by him in printing the Gospels, but they were not permitted to do so. This was the state of things then existing. The Christian churches lifted up their voice; Christian senators joined in the general testimony; and we have the satisfaction of feeling that now, for more than twenty years past, there has been no legal impediment to our entering into that land, and, to the utmost of our ability, extending the Gospel. But even after political disabilities were so far removed, there was a strong feeling of jealousy with which the missionaries were regarded by persons high in office, and who frequently had it in their power to throw obstacles in our way. We are thankful to be able to declare that such is not now the case, but that every assistance that can be reasonably desired is uniformly afforded. (Cheers.) For all this we are and ought to be thankful; and when we consider the many and great benefits which we enjoy under the British power in that distant land—when we compare our circumstances of safety and of peace, with those in which our missionaries are placed in other parts of the world,—the effect upon the mind is rather to induce us to withhold the statement of those things which are of a contrary nature, than to advance them. But in this instance we must not allow the enjoyment of personal benefits to render us insensible to larger, more public, and more important claims. It is upon this ground, the precise position in which the British power in India now stands with regard to the idolatry of that country, that it is necessary and important that these statements should be brought before you. The public mind must be informed, the public conscience must be aroused: for it is not till the general state of the subject is fully known (that those who have it in their power here may touch that spring which may move the great machinery) that any thing effectual will really be accomplished. (applause.) But it may be said, “What is the precise nature of the connexion between the British Government and idolatry in India?” That is a point on which, if I fully enter, will appear at once to be most humiliating. All the temple services, the appointment of those who shall minister in the temple, the removal of them if they neglect their idolatrous duties, and in many instances the punishment of those who are thought to be wanting in the duty which they owe, may be pointed out for your consideration. What is the kind of superintendence which is exercised? Is it merely a general toleration of the evil? No, it descends to the minutest details. You are aware, for you have often heard, that there are persons connected with the temples who are called the wives of the gods—(Hear, hear)—but who are, in fact, unchaste females. The distinct appointment of every one of these emanates from the British functionary. A memorial which was lately presented to the governor of Madras, by a large number of truly excellent persons there, and which is an official document, will show that it is not merely a general superintendence, but that there is in it all that is revolting, and all that is contrary to the Gospel of Christ. If one woman is to be removed because

she is too old, and another is to be appointed in her stead because she is younger—this, and a number of other things, must all pass under the seal and signature of the British functionary. (Hear, hear.) The pilgrim tax is that to which attention has often been directed, and many persons, perhaps, imagine, that because the Government of this country have given positive directions for its being abandoned, therefore it is given up. But, such is not the case. A respected brother in the work told me, that on one occasion, as he was preaching in a town, he heard the loud sound of native music and other sounds, indicating that something peculiar was taking place. As he approached towards the public office there was a long train of carts coming from the country, defended by British seapoys and government pugs, and attended with national music, and every thing which could wear an air of triumph and joy. And what was it which this train of carts was conveying? The idolatrous offerings from a pagoda to the public treasury. (Hear, hear.) What must the natives think when they see such things as these—when they see, not merely the money received, but received with so many marks of distinction, and a strong disposition to encourage it, rather than otherwise? Again, returning to the pagodas, we find that all those engaged in the services are under the eye of the magistrate, and are amenable to him. In this same memorial occurs a request that a person might be appointed as a rice-boiler to the idol; and strange and monstrous as it may seem, the order must actually be issued that persons may be employed to boil rice for a senseless idol: and this is one of those orders which must proceed under official seal and signature! If a musician is wanted—what is called a *piper*—he must come to play for the gods; but his appointment must receive the same high sanction. A number of clothes had been given to adorn the idols at a particular temple: these were worn out. A petition, stating that fact, was presented to the British functionary, and soliciting for new ones; and these were issued, and paid for from the public treasury. (Hear, hear.) When we approach the pagodas, when we observe their architecture, and all the circumstances by which they are surrounded, it is always humiliating. When we see that the walls are built anew, and that thus the edifices of idolatry are maintained, it is a spectacle which the Christian missionary never can look upon but with deep regret. But if we know that these walls are built by British power—(Hear, hear.)—and the wall of the Seringham pagoda was rebuilt at an expense of 40,000 rupees—(Hear, hear.)—by British authority only a few years ago—how much deeper is the feeling of humiliation, and how much greater must be the regret. One instance occurred in Tinnevely, in which the repair of the pagoda was requisite, and it was necessary that an idol should be removed from its place. After the repairs had been completed, the Brahmis said, that, in order to the idol being restored to the spot which it previously occupied, various offerings must be presented, the cost of which must amount to 10,000 rupees: and they were paid, in order that the idol might be induced to return. (Loud cries of “Hear, hear.”) But one of the most painful circumstances connected with this system—and I enter into particulars because I believe they are not generally known—(Applause)—it is not from a simple desire to make exposures, but because our friends must be informed as to how the matter really stands—is the great car feasts. By whom is the car prepared? Is it by the spontaneous contributions of the natives? Is the power vested entirely in their hands of making all the arrangements which are intended to give an imposing effect to idolatry? No; when a feast is anticipated, a public document is sent into the presence, as it is called, that is, to the chief magistrate, stating that on such a day, and at such an hour, a particular feast is to be celebrated; and requesting that the money necessary may be granted, that bamboo canes and cocoa-nut trees, and other things required for the car, may by compulsion be supplied, and these are brought in by compulsion from vari-

ous districts. When so brought in, the person engaged in preparing the car for the feast is the local representative of the British Government—(Hear, hear)—and he it is who directs the workman what to do. The whole concern is regarded by the natives in good faith as really a Government work. When the car has been thus prepared, by whom, up to the present time, have the poor creatures been brought together to draw it? You would imagine, and many do suppose, that such is the zeal of the Hindoos for their idolatry, that when they come together to their great festivals they are all anxious to draw this car. But it is no such thing. (Loud cries of “Hear, hear.”) These cars have all been drawn by persons driven in by the whip. (Renewed cries of “Hear, hear.”) I testify to what I have seen. I have seen them pass by hundreds the gate of my residence. And what for? That they might be compelled to draw the idol car. And after they have laid hold of the cables, who have been the persons to urge them onward? The Government pugs, with long canes, which they applied to those who seemed dilatory. (Hear, hear.) It does, indeed, appear from the memorial, that in consequence of a lamentable disaster which occurred at the last Conjeveram feast the compulsory attendance of natives is no longer to be insisted upon; and if this be adhered to, most heartily shall we rejoice. But the system, up to the present time, has been that just described to you. The natives have often been detained in the open streets day after day; till the car was brought to the particular part of a quadrangle from which it started. But one part further must be mentioned, and it is this: not only has the idolatry of the people been regulated and superintended by those in authority, but on a great many occasions, offerings are presented to the idol in the name and on the behalf of the British Government. (Hear, hear.) In the neighbourhood of Trichinopoly is the island of Seringham; and it has been a custom, after the idol has been lifted from the car, and brought out amid the acclamations of the multitude, for the head servant, a European, to come in front and present a golden cloth with which it may be adorned. This memorial states that the same practice prevails at a town within 40 miles of Madras, and in Madras within a few months of my leaving, when a particular idol was taken round the town, offerings were presented to it on behalf of the government. Whatever may be the views taken as to the prejudices of the people, this is surely a species of sanction which no Christian principle can possibly justify. (Loud applause.) You know how dependent India is upon rain, and on several occasions when the usual heavy rains have failed, orders have been issued from the headquarters—(Hear, hear)—of the district that the Brahmins should be employed and paid to procure rain, with a proviso that, when the rain falls, it should be reported to those in authority. In one instance a young man, receiving these orders from his superior, felt that he could not comply with them, and I believe that he did not carry them into effect. A very short time only elapsed before he was removed from his situation, and it was generally believed that it was because he would not in this instance yield compliance to one whom he ought to have obeyed. But this still goes on, and it is said to prevail over a vast extent of territory. The feasts are in this manner directly and absolutely enforced by British authority, and it is of this that the gentlemen complain, whose names are affixed to the memorial in question. Let it not be said that this is a petty unworthy faction; no, here are the names of judges, of a large number of gentlemen employed in connexion with the revenue, a number of the Company’s own chaplains, and the Bishop of Madras at their head. (Cheers.) Let it not be said that these statements are brought forward from factious or unworthy motives. (Cheers) Here is the fact; and all I can wish is, that this pamphlet were printed and circulated through the length and breadth of the land. (Applause.) I will not enter into further detail. Let there be a full and candid inquiry. Let the truth come out. (Cheers.) I will only advert in conclusion, to the

effects of this system; and the first I will notice is, the most unhappy influence which it has on the minds of our young countrymen in making them infidels—I mean those who are engaged in the administration of all these concerns and in superintending them. Young men come out to India whose religious principles are very unsettled; they go into provinces where they are not only surrounded by idolatry, but are called to take a part in superintending the service. What must be the effect upon their minds? We see it. They soon begin to think that all religions are alike, and that none is best of all; and the consequence is, that they become alienated in their minds from that measure of Christianity which they had before received. I am not alone in the apprehension that this has done a great deal in demolishing those who hold these stations in British India. The longer the system continues, the more clearly will it be seen that this is its tendency. Another effect of this system is, that it keeps idolatry at a fixed standard. We should soon have fluctuations in these things, if the covetousness of the priests and the caprice of the people had full play. But when every thing is laid down by law, and when he who has the power to enforce every thing is on the spot, to see that nothing is wanting in the honours done to the idol, what must be the result? Although the people may have gained some light, and may have become partly ashamed of the observances of their forefathers, yet, while the system is thus maintained at a fixed standard by those who have the power to enforce it, it seems morally impossible that we should produce any great impression. At least, so far as means are concerned, whatever impressions are produced by the declaration of the Gospel, they are counteracted by this system. (Hear, hear.) Another effect is, the degree of celebrity it gives to their idolatry: all the gorgeous show and the splendour with which it is connected is derived from this source. Were this system abolished, it would be seen in a very short time that the natives would not be so persevering in the adorning of their cars, and in the carrying them out to their feasts. But while British power and British integrity are pledged to the maintaining of these things, there is no room for their retrograding. (Hear, hear.) There are many other respects in which this system operates on the minds of the natives, but I only notice one more—they themselves constantly refer to the fact. When we point out to them that idolatry is not the worship of God, that it is even contrary to his commandments and his word, they ask, “How can you say so? Who keeps our pagodas in repair? Who prepares the car, and brings the people to it to draw it? Do you not do it yourselves—(Hear, hear)—and identify us with the British power generally? If you do these things, where is the reasonableness and the propriety of saying idolatry is sinful?” I am not forming an argument, I am merely reciting words which have often been cast in our teeth. (Hear, hear.) And what are we to say to the people? We may say that it is only done to keep them in peace, only because they are so apt to be jealous. But this will not do. We may endeavour to meet their reasoning, but they have too high an idea of the British power to suppose that we should aid and abet them in wrong. When they see us thus proceed, this is the construction they unavoidably put upon it. (Hear, hear.) What is to be done? There is a movement in the public mind in India and in England, but there must be a greater movement. Information must be more generally diffused on the subject; we must carry the subject before those who have the power to redress the grievance; let us even go to the foot of the throne if it be necessary. (Loud applause.) But let us do all in the spirit of the Gospel. (Renewed cheers.) There is throughout this memorial a high tone of Christian feeling. Those persons by whom it is signed descend to none of those arts or artifices by which the evil passions of men might be engaged on their behalf. They stand upon the high footing of God’s own word, and they contend for a confessedly Christian movement upon Christian grounds. Let us thus go

forward, bearing the spirit and using the language of our Master, calling upon his power to break down every obstacle now in the way of the progress of his truth. I would only say, Let the evil be viewed in proportion to its greatness, and being thus viewed, let no proper means be unemployed until this stumbling-block is effectually taken out of the way. But while we say this, we would caution you from imagining for a moment that the mere withdrawal of the superintendence of idolatry would produce at once the conversion of the people of India. It is an obstacle, and obstacles must be removed. The means must be more largely employed; it is only by multiplying these that you can give the people correct views on religion, that you can prepare them for that change which must take place. Let us only go forward in a spirit of humble dependence on Him whose we are and whom we serve, looking up to Him, that every valley may be exalted, and every rough place made smooth, till the glory of the Lord shall be revealed and all flesh shall see it together.

(For the Baltimore Literary and Religious Magazine.)

A brief notice of Bishop Sherlock's "Plain Directions to unlearned Protestants, how to dispute with Roman Priests:" with an abstract of the method therein recommended.

THERE is a very remarkable difference between Papists and Protestants, as to their ability to exhibit and defend their respective systems of doctrine. Every Papist is a *polemic* and a *sophist* by education.—With them it is as much a duty to *know* the *common place arguments*, by which Popery is defended, as it is to be ignorant of the Bible, and of "*Protestant opinions*"—They are born as it were in the *camp*, especially since the days of Luther, and the little they do know, is at their *finger ends*, made ready to their hands by a *careful priesthood*.

With Protestants on the contrary controversy, is only incidental. Their great business, is to save the souls of men.—They differ from each other on points not fundamental, (I speak of course of *Evangelical Protestants*) and therefore, having general resemblances, as well as *specific differences* agreeing in most things, and most agreed in those most important war; is not their business, though often waged—and their peculiarities are the more readily borne by the one part or forborne by the other, as each admits the other to be essentially right and safe. There is another fact worthy of notice. The Papal controversy has but recently begun to be agitated in this country. The American people, naturally confiding, and generous, have heretofore seen nothing to fear in Popery, even the clergy save until very lately regarded the system at least in our land, as John Bunyan paints it, a toothless old man, chained in a den by the way side, who *growled* at the pilgrims as they passed, but could not *bite*.

This error however groundless, has tended to prevent the study, and exclude the discussion of the system. Things are most happily and remarkably changing. The eyes of men are beginning to be opened. The public mind is beginning to call for full discussion, and light on the whole subject. This is enough, let any subject be thrown up to the American view no matter what end foremost; let it be fully examined and fully understood, and we fear not for the result. Whatever shrinks from enquiry is self-condemned, and dies by the public voice as unfit to live by its own confession. "It is only what *cannot be shaken that will remain*." The rest must perish. It may fight long and die hard—but its destruction is certain, and for the most part soon.

In meeting the call of the plain substantial people of this country for knowledge on the Papal controversy, it has appeared to me that an abstract of the interesting work mentioned at the head of this article, must be both acceptable and useful to the public. I proceed therefore without farther preface to give it.—It must of course be imperfect, but it may furnish some valuable hints to persons desirous to be informed, who have little leisure and few books, and yet who like many of the Stallworth Protestants of Baltimore and other portions of the land, are surrounded by violent and subtle papists. Let them try the goodly tempered metal of the old Bishop, at the next rencountre, and if we be not deceived, they will not find it without its use.

The argument is given as much as possible in the language of the author. My business shall be to show:

(1.) *How Protestants may stop Papists at the beginning of a dispute.*

When you are assailed, ask them whether they will allow you to judge for yourselves in matters of religion? If they will not, why should you dispute? for the end of discussion is to convince, and you cannot be convinced unless you may judge for yourself? They would not dispute with a stone or a stray horse? As well this, as to dispute with a man who must not judge for himself! If they say, surely *you must and may* judge for yourself. Then ask them if it be the doctrine of the church that private men may judge for themselves?—which they say is the Protestant *heresy*, and the root of all our sects. If they open this gap, then what becomes of all the cant about *infallibility* of the church! Do papists expect to dispute us into their church, by convincing our private judgment? Then they disown *infallibility*; for it is owning that every man must and can judge for himself in matters of religion, according to the proofs that are offered to him. If he can do this, what need of infallibility? If he cannot, it is insulting him and is a mere trick to argue with him. For the fundamental principle of Popery is, *that we must take our faith on the authority of the church*, and of course private judgment is wrong and will always err.

If Papists should say Protestants will believe nothing *without a reason*, and therefore this is the only way for us to take with them; I answer, is not this an appeal to the private judgment of men, for men cannot change their opinions without using their private judgment or reason. But what difference is there whether we use this "*fallible guide*" to become *Papists*, or to *continue Protestants*? One religion may be false and the other true—but private judgment is private judgment still, and it cannot guide a man any better *towards* popery than *from* it. The truth then is that every *argument a papist* uses with a Protestant, good or bad, is giving up Popery for it is an appeal to private judgment, as to every man's own reason, which Popery renounced as a fallible guide in matters of religion, and calls for the infallibility, and authority of their church.

And why should I as a Protestant, listen to a man who professes that the arguments he uses with me are not a sufficient *reason of faith*?—Ask one of them, can any reasoning from Scripture, or any thing else be satisfactory proof of doctrine, without the authority of your infallible church? He will say *no!* Then why reason? since it is authority which you rest your faith on? And why insult me with reasons, which you confess have not the weight of a straw? Or if he says *yes!* then he is no papist. The question is settled. It is a very surprising thing for a Protestant to be *reasoned* into Popery; for the papist laughs in his sleeve at him while he does it—and the Protestant makes a fool of himself by renouncing the means of his conversion the moment he becomes a papist. He must use his own private judgment to become a papist, and as soon as he is turned to it, must declare private judgment to be a Protestant *heresy*—and entitled to no authority.—Yet if this judgment is not to be trusted, his conversion, which it led him to, cannot be trusted, or if his conversion is to be trusted, then the great protestant rule of private judgment is true, and popery is false.

But papists say, our own judgment is needed only to lead us to the *infallible guide*, that is the true church—after that we have no farther use for our own judgment—Even granting this to them, then the only ground left to argue on, must be an *infallible judge*. All other subjects are out of the question,—if then they will confess this, it would save a great deal of trouble both to us and them. But before they can proceed to argue with protestants, about an infallible judge, they must say whether the belief of an infallible judge must be resolved into every man's private judgment? Whether it be not necessary to believe this with a divine faith? And whether there can be a divine faith, without an infallible judge? Certainly if ever there be a necessity to be infallibly assured it is here, for on *this all the rest depends*. For though the judge be infallible, if I be not infallibly assured that he is so, I can never certainly arrive at infallibility. For I can never be more certain that what he says is infallible is infallible, than I am that he is infallible. But my only proof that he is infallible rests on my private judgment, which is fallible, therefore the papist can never be sure that his church is infallible, for he gets at the proof by a fallible guide.

Perhaps they will say it is hard to deny them the right of controversy—of reason! I answer, their claim is just and the conclusion absurd, but it is founded on their own premises and shews the absurdity of their system. If men will embrace a religion which will not admit of reasoning—it is their own and their religion's fault. Whatever opinion Protestants have of reason, Papists cannot pretend to it in proving their religion or in converting heretics.—It is impossible *by reason* to prove that men must not use their reason in matters of faith, which however is the papal *doctrine*.

The following dialogue between a recent convert to Popery, and a Protestant, will familiarly illustrate the grounds of the above remarks:

PROTESTANT.—Oh my old friend, I'm glad to see you! I have longed to know what a change you find in yourself since you became an infallible believer?

CONVERT.—I find sir what I expected, great ease of mind since I am freed from all troublesome disputes and doubts, by an infallible church which cannot err or deceive me.

PROTESTANT.—Ah! Pray tell me how you came to be so infallibly sure that the church of Rome is infallible?

CONVERT.—How? Why by the most powerful reasons, which I am very sure will convince you, if you will only think with candour.

PROTESTANT.—Powerful reasons! Have you got no farther than REASONS yet? Will reason ever make a man infallible? I have strong reasons for being a Protestant. But I thought you had something better in Rome?

CONVERT.—Do you take me for a knave, or one who changed his opinions for false ends, and without reasons?

PROTESTANT.—You know that best, but that was not my meaning. But the reason of my question was because you changed for an *infallible* faith. If you rely still on reason, I don't see how your faith is more infallible than mine; for I am as confident as you can be, that I have *better* reasons for my faith than you have for yours.

CONVERT.—I beg your pardon. I rely on the *authority of an infallible church; you trust to your private reason*.

PROTESTANT.—I beg pardon. I rely on the authority of the word of God, which is as infallible as your church.

CONVERT.—But you rely on your own reason for the authority, of those particular doctrines you draw from it.

PROTESTANT.—And you rely on *your own reason for the infallibility of your church*; and of course for all the doctrines of it. So that your assurance is just what ours is—and no more:—for your infallible faith rests on your fallible reason.—And the difference is not that your faith is infallible and ours fallible. But the question merely is whether your reason is better

than ours—both being fallible. There is one other difference; Protestants are as well assured of the truth of all their doctrines as you are of the infallibility of your church. For they have examined the Scripture for all of them, with the same helps you had to find out the infallible church, viz. private judgment. But if you be wrong as to the infallibility of your church, you are wrong about all your doctrines as all are taken on trust. So that we have double, triple assurance above Papists. But if you think you *had reasons* for turning Romanist, why did you think there was a want of certainty among Protestants?

CONVERT.—Because with them every man is left to his own private judgment, which produces such a variety of sects; and these show what an uncertain thing your reason is—that so few judge alike of the same reasons.

PROTESTANT.—But you have confessed that you too were left to your own reason, in finding out the infallible church—on which every thing else depends. Don't you know that men agree as little about your reasons for infallibility, as they do about any of the Protestant reasons? I know your reasons for being a papist and yet they do not remove our differences. They still differ about your reasons—And is it not as much a proof of the *uncertainty of the reasons* which make you a Papist, that they cannot make me a Papist, as the difference of Protestants one with another is of the uncertainty of Protestant reasons. Until you can be infallibly assured that your church is infallible, that is until you become infallible yourself, you must rest your judgment on *reason*, which yet you condemn as fallible, while you boast of the infallibility of your system. Then give up reasons for your guide or give up infallibility. B.

THE
BALTIMORE LITERARY
AND
RELIGIOUS MAGAZINE.

VOL. III.

SEPTEMBER 1837.

No. 9

MEMORANDA OF FOREIGN TRAVEL,

BY RO. J. BRECKINRIDGE.

Intercourse between American and Foreign Churches—Delegation to England—Meeting of the Congregational Union of England and Wales in 1836—Nature of the Union; its Sessions—Mr. Payne—Mr. Blackburn—Subjects of Discussion—Proceedings—Acts—Missions—Slavery—Political aspect of the Body.—Difficulties from this source, of holding intercourse with other Churches—General Character of the Congregational Dissenters.—

Most of those who will probably see these pages, know that the various religious sects in the United States have been for a number of years, desirous of promoting a more cordial sympathy, with the Christians of other countries, than had formerly existed; and that for this purpose, several of the more powerful of them, have occasionally corresponded by letter, and more rarely by commissioners, with several foreign churches. These feelings have in an equal degree influenced the Christians of other nations; and the followers of the Lord Jesus Christ, throughout the whole world, having begun to realise, that they are indeed but one great family,—have sought means to manifest and to cultivate the mutual sentiments which had been too long permitted to slumber. The Presbyterian church in the United States, in the exercise of that large and Catholic spirit which has always marked her conduct, had long ago perfected arrangements for stated intercourse, with every evangelical portion of the church of God, in that country which seemed disposed, to enter into them. In the exercise of the same policy, she had for some years corresponded with one section of the church in Scotland, with another in Ireland,—and had now for the third time elected a delegation to visit a third in England—having in the meantime received one from it. Constituting this commission, to the Congregational Union of England and Wales, I met that body, for the first time, on the evening of the 9th of May, in the Weigh house chapel, near the London bridge.—

I found my way with difficulty, accompanied by another stranger in London—from our lodgings several miles distant towards the opposite end of the town; and on my arrival, was ushered into a

very small apartment in the rear of the building,—which was one of several, crowded to excess, with gentlemen,—who were just finishing their evening repast, of tea and bread and butter.—In a little time we were conducted into the chapel,—where we found an audience, that did not fill the lower part of a moderate sized church, even after the addition of those who constituted more particularly the union itself. The Rev. Mr. Payne of Exeter, a very venerable man, presided;—and after appropriate religious services, a number of addresses were made—and resolutions suitable to the occasion past. The meeting seemed to be more devotional than otherwise in its purpose;—or perhaps intended to occupy in regard to the public—the same relation that the subsequent meetings held to the ministers of the Congregational churches. A representative from the Scotch union—a sort of informal one from Ireland—a minister resident in France who happened to be present and myself, were respectively introduced to the president and the meeting; made, each a statement, rather than a speech,—and were each first welcomed in a very cordial manner by the chairman, and after they had themselves concluded, were responded to, by some member of the body, selected for that purpose. The whole occupied perhaps two hours,—and was concluded with appropriate acts of worship. It was a simple, affectionate, appropriate service, such as one finds the heart profited by, as it transpires—and our best feelings touched when we afterwards recall it.

The next morning at an early hour, what was called “the usual business meeting of the union”—was held in the Congregational library, in Bloomfield street, quite in another part of the city. Here again I went alone,—and having some trouble to find the house, I was somewhat too late;—and not comprehending the forms required by the door keeper, had so much difficulty in gaining admission—that I had given up in despair and turned away, to leave the place; when he relented, and agreed to hand my address, to a friend within. On my entrance I found about two hundred gentlemen—or probably not so many, seated thickly on benches placed across a large rectangular room, which was what its name implied—a *library*—of considerable extent.

The same interesting old gentleman occupied the chair. The meeting was said to be the largest which had yet been convened during the six years of the existence of the union, which this anniversary completed. And altho’ the churches of the denomination, are by no means unanimous in support of this body,—and indeed a number of ministers, and some entire associations, still refuse to come into it; yet, all who have gone forward in the enterprise, rejoice with increasing confidence in its success, while every returning year, diminishes the number, and strenuousness of its opponents. To me the only surprise was, that a body of Christian churches and ministers should have been content to remain so long, without some outward and available bond of union.

The composition of this body, seems to be, in practice at least, as imperfect as its powers when it is organised, are feeble. Altho’ a delegation of an equal number of ministers and laymen from smaller associations seems to be contemplated; yet the number of these is

left entirely optional with those who appoint them; and while any ministers or churches of this sect are said in their plan to constitute a part of the union,—it is still further added “that at the annula meeting of delegates, every minister and officer connected with any association united in the general body shall be eligible to attend and vote.” In point of fact, many do so attend, on their own motion.

The order of proceeding was,—after religious exercises,—the reading of a report by the Secretary—the offering of various resolutions—and the reading of an address to the churches of their order.—Two sessions of four or five hours each, completed the whole business; and many seemed to consider it rather a hardship, that even a second session should be required. The debates to which various parts of the business gave rise,—were conducted in a spirit of kindness and candour; and were received by the meeting, tho’ composed almost entirely of church officers, and relating to subjects of much gravity, with the same uproar, of clapping, contradicting bawling, and loud laughing—which constitute so dreadful a characteristic of “*a British audience*” I shall best, display the character of the body itself, by mentioning some of the principal topics before it—with the disposition they made of them.—

The Rev. Mr. Blackburn, as senior secretary read a report of the proceedings of the standing committee of the body, for the year just ended. It spoke of a Congregational Hymn Book as ready for use—and as being one of the first fruits of the union, and certainly one of the most obvious importance; for nothing strikes the observer more forcibly in the present state of this sect, than the multiplicity of collections of this sort—and the consequent evils attending the want of a uniform standard and system, in this important and delightful part of public worship. It alluded to a history of their churches, prepared by a Mr. Hanbury, and now ready for the press; a large number of copies of which were immediately subscribed for by the persons present. It exhibited, a statement of the debts of their chapels, as far as they were ascertained—which were treated as an affair affecting the whole body—and arrangements for their gradual liquidation,—were spoken of as being under mature consideration.—It referred to certain efforts already made to spread their system in Canada; and urged most decidedly the taking up of the cause of domestic missions, by the union, in its distinctive character.—This last subject occasioned considerable discussion,—which resulted in the almost unanimous decision of the body, to take up the subject of missions, distinctly as a sect, upon strictly Congregational principles,—to prosecute the subject both at home, and in their colonies, and to begin at once with the colonies. In consequence of this determination, a public meeting, was held a few nights afterwards, and the necessary arrangements made, to prosecute the work of Foreign Missions in the colonies, through a committee of the union.—Preparatory to which the body appointed a treasurer, three secretaries, and a committee of fifteen persons, with power to increase their numbers,—to act during the ensuing year.

This proceeding struck me, not only as proper in itself and perfectly natural and praiseworthy; but as a new indication, of which so many have already been given, and new ones are furnished every day, that every church which really understands the great end of its existence, will not only take up in its organized character, the total subject of the world's conversion in its whole length and breadth; but will at length perceive that the moment one admits that there exists in its faith, order or practice, any thing which prevents this—it admits at the same time, its own unfitness to be any longer considered a church of Jesus Christ. To preserve and extend the truth, as it is in Jesus! for what other object does any church exist? And if they be not suited to these objects—of what use are they?

I rejoiced therefore, both in the act,—and in the mode of doing it, and the principles on which it was done. There might have been a little too much said, both in the union, and at the public meeting,—in a purely sectarian temper. I was very particularly struck with this, in the circular letter, which was read by Dr. Ross and directed to be printed and circulated. It was long, feeble, erroneous in statement,—and too sectarian to be in good taste, not to say in enlarged charity.—I may not do it justice; or those to whom it was committed may modify before printing it. I judge of it, only from hearing it read: but some of its statements, in regard to the necessary connexion between the Congregational form of church order, and a sound faith, and true piety, on one hand,—and the natural and constant tendency of all other forms to error and declension,—were so out of the way—that I regretted no opportunity was allowed me, to express pointedly my sentiments, in regard to such doctrines.

A committee was also appointed on the subject of slavery in America—which reported at the adjourned meeting of the body, a series of resolutions—which were modified and referred to the general committee and afterwards printed. I was prevented from being present, on that occasion, by severe indisposition. These resolutions embrace, an affectionate appeal to the Christians of the United States on the painful subject; and tho' evidently drawn up by persons, who lack information, and therefore hold some opinions, which they would modify—and use some expressions, which are foreign to the real state and difficulties of the question, and are calculated to give pain; yet on the whole—I have seen nothing emanating from any British source, more worthy of serious regard. This is to be considered no slight praise, when it is remembered, that the infusion of bitter, furious, and ignorant passion and prejudice, with which the abolition party in both countries, has been poisoning the public conscience—has diffused itself in England, as in America, chiefly among the Congregational churches.

The second meeting of the body, was perhaps nearly as much political as ecclesiastical. The subject of dissenters' grievances,—a theme of everlasting recurrence as well as eternal excitement—and particularly the matter of church rates, was taken up and the meeting pledged “to endeavour by petitioning, and every other lawful means, to obtain the removal of this odious impost.”—Nor can the charge of introducing extraneous matter, be now laid upon the

body. For in their primary address issued in 1834, they distinctly take up the whole subject of their grievances, as a matter which Christian duty calls them to enlist in, thoroughly and zealously; and this although in the same address the fear is expressed that such a course of excitement and contention would prove injurious to their spiritual interests. And in the minutes of the fifth annual meeting, in the year 1835—the plan published at the end declares that one of the direct objects of their union is “to assist in maturing and enlarging the civil rights of Protestant dissenters.”

It is not my part to say, whether it would not have been wiser, to have kept their religious profession and proceedings, wholly distinct from their civil contests: whether indeed it would not have been better, to suffer even greater evils than they were called on to endure, rather than mix the redress of them, not only with their religious principles and feelings—but really with their ecclesiastical organization. The effects of these measures on themselves, I may speak of in another place. But their having taken this ground, it seems to me, places them in circumstances of a very peculiar character—as it regards other denominations—and especially those who reside in foreign countries.

This union, is to a certain intent a political organization in its very nature and origin. Nor does it require any penetration to discover, that the changes at which it aims in the present constitution of the British realm, amount to the most fundamental revolution both in church and state. I am ready to admit the entire justice of all their claims. I am prepared as a freeman, and a republican, to bid them God’s speed—But I am not clear that I could say there is any *Christian necessity* for their success: for the Christian religion comport, on the part of the governed, with any sort of social condition.—Nor am I satisfied of the propriety, or duty, of the Presbyterian church in the United States, implicating itself directly or indirectly in projecting changes—of the civil polity of a foreign state.

It is possible there may be some ready to accuse me of refining too much in these suggestions. I would not push them to the extent of dissolving our connexion with this union. But I see in the facts on which they rest, grounds for caution and more mature reflection than the case has heretofore received. And when other causes which concur from various quarters are all considered—I am strongly inclined to the belief that the great objects contemplated by those who projected the existing intercourse, will be better secured by a correspondence by letter, than by delegates. The subject of slavery, little understood in England, is to be made, even more prominent than heretofore; promising nothing so certainly as continual heart burnings, and a final rupture between the churches of the two countries, if not between the countries themselves. Intrigues are already on foot in both countries to secure delegations of certain complexions on various subjects both practical and speculative. And while in point of fact, it seems absurd to send commissioners, across the Atlantic to attend on a body, whose annual sessions do not extend beyond a few hours; on the other hand, the history of our church in America, conduces to show, as a general truth, that it has been our habit to pay rather more than an equivalent, for sim-

ilar privileges. I have not made these observations without much hesitation: and after all nothing would be further from the fact, than for any one to infer, that I would favour any step, which did not seem to lead towards the most enlarged and intimate fellowship, amongst all the Christians on earth.—

The proceedings to which I have referred—the general character of the union itself—and its former publications—were matters of great importance, as well as profound interest to me—in their bearing upon questions affecting the position and prospects, as well as the distinctive character, of the great body of Congregational dissenters. As I shall be obliged to speak of them again, in connexion with the other religious denominations of Britain—I omit for the present, any particular account of the sect, represented in the union, whose objects, and one of whose meetings, I have now briefly described. It seems however not amiss to observe here, that the true character of this branch of the British church, appears to be very imperfectly understood, by their brethren, either at home or abroad: and that one great reason of this is, their own want of any homogenous religious character. Their want of any common creed—agreed modes of business and worship—general and fixed ideas in which they are united on many important subjects—and indeed of any effectual bond of union—must render them in ordinary times, an inefficient body,—and will explain why the public will always underrate them during such times. But in every period of excitement, commotion and effort—their propensities to independency yield to the pressing necessity for united action—that concert naturally takes place, in the very point of most intense activity:—their religious system being at all times deeply imbued with political ideas and aims, they enter with courage and preparation upon scenes from which other Christians shrink, for lack of taste or knowledge—and become more and more important and influential—as the crises becomes more and more severe. Such has undoubtedly been their past history; and such, unless I greatly err—will be their character in all future time. Men may yet see this sect—now little estimated,—decide the fate of England;—and perhaps bear upon their hardy shoulders—another Cromwell,—over the broken fragments of thrones, altars and armories to the Protectorate of another mighty Commonwealth! And who shall presume to censure them, if they shall see themselves shut up to galling servitude, or glorious victory! Who will say it is criminal in such as languish under hopeless oppression—to dictate law with enlightened and noble moderation!

DOCUMENTARY HISTORY OF THE ASSEMBLY OF 1837.

No. 3

The case of the Four Separated Synods.

On the 1st of June the Assembly passed the following resolution, by a vote of 182, to 105:

Resolved. That by the operation of the abrogation of the plan of union of 1801, the Synod of the Western Reserve is, and is hereby declared to be, no longer a part of the Presbyterian church, in the United States of America.

On the 5th of June the Assembly passed the four following resolutions; the *first* by a vote of 115, to 88 and 1 *non liquet*.—and the *three* last by a vote of 113 to 60.

Be it Resolved. By the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America:

1. That in consequence of the abrogation by this Assembly, of the Plan of Union of 1801, between it and the General Association, of Connecticut as utterly unconstitutional, and therefore null and void from the beginning; the Synods of Utica, Geneva and Genessee, which were formed and attached to this body, under and in execution of said plan of union, be and are hereby declared to be out of the ecclesiastical connexion of the Presbyterian church of the United States of America, and that they are not in form nor in fact an integral portion of said church.

2. That the solicitude of this Assembly on the whole subject, and its urgency for the immediate decision of it are greatly increased by reason of the gross disorders which are ascertained to have prevailed in those Synods, (as well as the Synod of the Western Reserve, against which a declarative resolution similar to the first of these has been passed during our present sessions,) it being made clear to us that even the Plan of Union itself was never consistently carried into effect by those professing to act under it.

3. That the General Assembly has no intention by these resolutions, (or by that passed in the case of the Synod of the Western Reserve,) to affect in any way the ministerial standing of any members of either of said Synods, nor to disturb the pastoral relation in any church, nor to interfere with the duties or relations of private Christians in their respective congregations; but only to declare and determine according to the truth and necessity of the case, and by virtue of the full authority existing in it for that purpose, the relation of all said Synods, and all their constituent facts to this body, and to the Presbyterian church in the United States.

4. That inasmuch as there are reported to be several churches and ministers, if not one or two Presbyteries, now in connexion with one or more of said Synods, which are strictly Presbyterian in doctrine and order: be it therefore further resolved, that all said churches and ministers who wish to unite with us, are hereby directed to apply for admission into those Presbyteries belonging to our connexion, which are most convenient to their respective locations, and that any such Presbytery as aforesaid, being strictly Presbyterian in doctrine and order, and now in connexion with either of said Synods, as may desire to unite with us, are hereby directed to make application, with a full statement of their cases, to the next General Assembly, which will take proper order thereon.

These various resolutions present a case of most unusual and thrilling interest. They exhibit a course of proceeding unparalleled for its firmness—decision and efficiency—in the churches of the United States, and rarely exceeded in the history of the church of God. Whether it was prompted by zeal for the truth and faithfulness to God—or by a base love of power, and a blind devotion to party,—this and coming generations will decide, according to their own views of the value of truth and purity,—and the necessity of obeying Christ, at all costs. But none can deny to the authors of these acts, the most resolute adherence to the principles they embraced—the most admirable candour in the full and unreserved avowal before earth and heaven of those principles, and the ends they aimed at by obeying them—and the most sagacious constancy in the patient and courageous following out of means calculated to attain their avowed objects.—

Surely it is a remarkable sight to behold a church—which has been for ages labouring to extend itself—suddenly stop short—and so act as to deprive itself of a fourth or fifth part of its apparent strength! It requires a blind faith indeed to believe, that a communion which had thrown open its doors for many years, with a confiding frankness before unknown—and allowed free entrance, nearly without question, should, *without reason*, against its whole habits of life, modes of action, and apparent interest, not only shut these doors abruptly, but as some say, force out of doors in doing it, so prodigious a portion, of those claiming to be lawfully within the house.—Men do not ordinarily allow their conduct, to be so glaringly in contrast with their interest—without some exceedingly weighty reason.—And while we fully admit, that reasons the most weighty are necessary to justify the conduct of the last Assembly in the matter now under review—we are convinced not only that a full justification can be made out for it—but that any less decided action would have been at once faithless, childish and futile, under the actual circumstances of the case.—We crave the reader's candid attention, while we attempt the proof of this declaration.

We have published in a former number of this periodical, the *Testimony and Memorial of the Convention of 1837*. There are set forth minutely and in order, the errors in doctrine, and the disorders in practice, of which the orthodox complain. Any man who now doubts that the errors there condemned are the errors of the New School party, only thereby proves his own ignorance of passing events. New School men, who deny that they hold the chief part of them, only show that they are unworthy of belief, in stating a fact. They are the root of the whole trouble not only in our church, but in all the churches: and if men do not hold them, why do they hold so tenaciously to all who do hold them? If men do not hold them—why do they refuse to give ample satisfaction to those who at first feared, and then were forced to believe they did hold them? Why do they allow the church to be convulsed—on account of non-existent figments?—It is too late now to discuss this matter as a question of fact, and he who requires it, gives just suspicion at once, of his sincerity and soundness.

Neither shall we now attempt to prove that these errors and disorders, are utterly intolerable, by any Christian church. No man who has experienced the saving grace of God—surely no man of evangelical views—and beyond dispute no sound Presbyterian, can possibly hesitate one moment on such a subject. The whole aspect of these heresies and irregularities—is utterly inconsistent with the gospel of God:—so clearly so, that even those who have published them, did in the late Assembly, when brought plumply up to assert or deny them, generally decline voting, or voted against them.

The third step in the case brings up the question before us. The wide extent of these errors—has nearly proved fatal to our church. They have rent the body of Friends; they have split up the Congregational churches; they have *deluged* the Baptist church; they have infected all bodies of professing Christians. But a few years ago, excellent and wise men in our church did indeed believe that *very few*—perhaps not above a few dozen Presbyterian ministers actually held them. If such views were then correct—how sadly have these few dozens multiplied since? For in 1836, the majority of the Assembly voted in substance, that the chief part of these errors, were solemn truths—by rejecting the resolution of Dr. Miller in regard to Mr. Barns's notes on the Epistle to the Romans: and Dr. Peters, Dr. Skinner and all the leaders of the New School party in that body, are reported by their own friends and, in friendly prints to have declared openly their adhesion to Mr. Barns's sentiments. Nor is this all; for repeatedly in the last Assembly, did the various speakers of that party assert that they had the majority of our church—and that our majority in that Assembly was merely accidental.

Here then is the state of the case.—Fatal errors and disorders prevail in the church. They who hold them believe themselves to be the majority of the whole body,—and need only carry out their plans for usurping power, by making small presbyteries, to give them the rule, even if they were considerably the smaller portion. These persons by the full and unqualified admission of all interests, are too much unlike the other portion of the church to enable them to continue—a union, profitable or pleasant to either side. The orthodox had proposed terms of voluntary separation which were not only just and liberal—but most generous; and these were rejected, after equivocation, and uncanded chicanery and amid boasts of future power and majorities—sneers at our *accidental majority*—and unmeasured abuse of our leading men, our best measures—and our general policy. The plan of union had been abrogated;—and that abrogation was pronounced to be high handed,—unconstitutional—void, and so on; and would of course be undone, when these “Smithfield men”—with the price of slaves in the pocket of one abolition leader,—and we know not how many shaven bills, in the pocket of that other leader whose taste and instinct led him to do the abuse of his party, should return to power. The plan of citation had been proposed—and was hardly passed by a small majority, under the scouts and derision of the New School party, with open assertions that it could never be executed, and should never be obeyed!

Thus stood the case. And if ever a party was shut up by the hand of God, to do what his grace and providence required, we

were.—We remember that the committee of citation met on the adjournment of the Assembly one Saturday afternoon—and after a painful session, and much diversity of opinion—adjourned without seeing their way clear. The same afternoon the committee for voluntary division met, and after several adjournments, finally failed of doing any thing!. And so we stood on reporting the issue to the Assembly. We well remember, the anguish of our own spirit, at this juncture; and the trembling of heart with which we looked first towards what seemed to us the impending ruin of the church—and then, humbly for the appearing of the Lord to succour us. And never shall we cease to bless the great shepherd of Israel, for his glorious coming to our deliverance.

Our own conviction had long been that the Presbyterian church was solemnly bound, and that all its tribunals had full power to separate from her communion, all such as having intruded into it—should be found on full consideration, and in the judgment of charity, unsuitable or unworthy members. We contended in short for *Christian discipline*; and we always considered this a complete remedy for all our troubles. In this mind the writer of this article, ventured to suggest to the General Assembly, that as we had failed of voluntary separation, our plain duty was to separate as many members as should be found unsound in the way of discipline; and that we should commence at once, by ordering Presbyteries to try unsound members,—Synods to arraign unsound Presbyteries—and for the Assembly, to act at once and promptly on the Synods, by citing such as it should appear necessary to cite, and separating from our communion forthwith, such as the necessity and justice of the case required. Well do we remember the scowl of derision, and the laugh of open scorn, with which the "*Smithfield men*"—received this statement. And long shall we be cheered by the lesson which the issue gave us, that an honest and manful course is not only the most creditable one to our Christian character, and the most comfortable one to our consciences—but is also the only one that promises at last, certain and permanent success.

There is another episode to tell. Dr. Baxter of Va. was a member of the citation committee.—And here we may be excused for expressing our deep sense of the obligations which the whole church owe, to the delegates of that ancient Commonwealth, both in the Convention, and in the Assembly. Well and nobly have they redeemed the character of the Virginia churches. At the head of this admirable delegation, was the fine old gentleman, whose name I have just written.—It is to him I think that the Assembly was indebted for the suggestion which led it, as by a fine but strong cord thro' the mazes and contentions, and pressing difficulties of the case—and brought it out clear and free from the vast incubus of a bastrad congregationalism, steeped in all the errors and disorders, which had so fearfully harrassed and beset us. *If, said he, the Plan of Union be unconstitutional, it was from the beginning null and void; because nothing contrary to the fundamental law which is the constitution—can have any legal force. But if the Plan of Union never had any legal or binding operation in the Presbyterian church—then of course the churches formed under it, on it, or by virtue of it, never were in our connexion;—and we need only pass a declarative act to that effect.*

We find ourselves then arrived at the two great lines of argument by which the resolutions of the Assembly now printed, are to be defended.

I. THAT THE ASSEMBLY HAD FULL POWER TO DO WHAT IT DID IN THE CASE OF THE FOUR SYNODS, IN THE WAY OF DISCIPLINE.

II. THAT IT WAS OBLIGED, BY THE VERY CONSTITUTION OF THE BODY ITSELF, TO DO WHAT IT DID, EVEN IF THE CASE HAD NOT REQUIRED DISCIPLINE AT ALL. These two propositions we shall briefly illustrate and enforce. And in order to simplify the subject, we will present in two separate and successive series, such arguments and considerations as appear to us perfectly conclusive of the whole subject.

The Argument from the nature and duty of Discipline.

I. The right of any person to be a private member, a Ruling Elder, or a Minister in the Presbyterian church, is by no means a perfect and absolute right—It is on the other hand, a right qualified by many conditions, and dependent on a variety of contingent facts principles and circumstances. So also of the right of churches, to be under the watch of our Presbyteries, of the latter to be attached to Synods, and of these to be under the care of the General Assembly. The conditions laid down in our standards, are in every case conditions precedent; and the moment these conditions are violated, that moment, in the eye of God, of morality and of logic—the resulting rights are gone. Thus no man has a right, of any kind or sort, to be a Pelagian, and at the same time a Presbyterian Minister; nor has any association of Congregational churches any sort of right to call itself a Presbytery and claim the rights of one.—As to the methods of proving, and determining such questions—that is another matter, which is merely of form and detail—and will be spoken of presently: but the substance of the case is not in the form—nor in the view of reason necessarily dependent on it. Therefore, the outcry of the separated Synods about violated rights, is mere humbug; for the very question at issue is, as to their ever having had any sort of right, in the very matter in hand. Nay more, if the conditions on which the resulting rights depend, be broken in fact but nominally and formally adhered to—it is a case of gross and deliberate fraud which it is impossible to conceive that a true child of God could commit. And if this fraud be perpetrated under oath—it is premeditated, and wicked, false swearing, in the most awful matters of faith! The whole case is one over which every *pretended* Presbyterian should shudder, rather than bawl in popular meetings, and roar through party presses, about being deprived of sacred rights, vested in him by the wicked commission of deliberate wrongs!

II. If it were even admitted that the constitution of the Presbyterian church had provided no adequate remedy for the enforcement of commanded duties or the redress of forbidden evils,—still nothing is clearer than that in such a case, it would be the duty and the right of its constitutional tribunals to create the necessary forms and methods of trial, redress, or cure, as the case might be. This is a

principle of universal application, in every form of organized society—and is indispensable to the existence of any kind of community; because no human wisdom can foresee, or provide for, all possible contingencies. *Deficiente remedio justitia defecerit*, is a maxim of the common law; and the court of King's bench in England—the highest source of administrative justice in that country, was always bound to fix a remedy for the enforcement of rights, not otherwise sufficiently enforceable. But in our church this principle, is from the very nature of our church order, whose model and whole rule of action we assert to be divine—of most peculiar application.—And most manifestly in acting upon it, we should keep in view the general rules already settled; as for example, the application of a sound discipline, to purify the church of intruders—being a settled principle,—the use of a new remedy if one were needful, in applying such a rule—to purge the church of forbidden heresies—is a high and most binding duty on every church court. Therefore the cry of the excluded Synods that even if they were heretical, there was no adequate remedy against an unsound Synod—and that the remedy applied was unconstitutional because unprecedented—is mere sophistical ignorance, even if the facts were all true.

III. We go still further. It is absurd to suppose that any system should provide for a case involving its own radical corruption. Every system provides for making its own parts, come back into order when disordered;—and no more. But if the spreading corruption of the parts has already proceeded so far, that cure is no longer possible to them, then the only alternative is to stand by and see the gradual and certain ruin of the system itself, or to fall back on the perfectly clear principles stated in the 1st head above—and declare and enforce, in an extraordinary way, those truths and duties, which the very existing corruptions render difficult, or impossible to be defined and maintained in ordinary ways. The principles on which all constitutions rest, if true, are so before and independently of their creation or existence: and when constitutions are so perverted as to defeat in practice their own ends, then they who enforce the principles of the constitution, even in an extraordinary way—and not they who transgress both those original principles, and the positive enactments which define them—are the true friends and conservators of the constitution itself. Such a state of things is extraordinary;—but when it really occurs, men faithful to truth, to God, and to his church, will never shrink from the duties it imposes, upon all who prefer self-preservation in righteousness, to self-immolation for the advancement of wicked and deceitful error.—

IV. The real case, that did exist—bad as it was, had however sufficient provision made for it. For it is an undisputed and universal principle in the interpretation of all instruments, that they must be so interpreted as to be consistent with themselves, and so as not to defeat the end of their formation. This principle applied to written constitutions, necessarily gives birth to a second—which is itself of universal acceptance; namely—that where a specific power is vested, all powers necessary to enforce that, are also vested; and that the right to decide when and to what extent these resulting powers arise must abide in some tribunal created by the instrument

itself—if not otherwise expressly provided for. Now no man in his senses will deny that the standards of the Presbyterian church had a definite object in view; nor that the errors and disorders, alleged, yea, and proved to be widely disseminated in the four Synods—are totally contrary to that definite object, and the whole scope of those standards.—Then all powers necessary to expel these errors, are by the very force of the proposition—vested in the bodies directed to expel them. And as this direction is explicit—in regard to every one of our tribunals, every one in its respective sphere would possess all necessary power to do the thing ordered, even in default of specific provisions. And so, as the Assembly is the only tribunal above the Synods, and therefore the only one that can act with authority over them, it follows that the Assembly has power, of whatever spiritual kind, may be necessary to preserve our doctrine and order, against corrupt Synods. And in the exercise of this power, the Assembly might if necessity were laid on it, proceed to the excision of an indefinite number of Synods; for the preservation of our standards is the fundamental duty of the Assembly.

V. This is not a new case at all, in this particular aspect of it: but on the contrary, every principle of it here contended for has already and long ago been settled by the General Assembly, and acquiesced in by the whole church. Early in this century what was called a great revival of religion occurred in portions of Kentucky and Tennessee. False teachers arose—disorders followed—trouble came—and discipline supervened. The Presbytery of Cumberland belonging to the Synod of Kentucky—became peculiarly obnoxious—and like the New School men of our days, multiplied its ministers and its heresies, in equal ratio, until there was much reason to fear, that its unsound and incompetent members, would treat the Synod, just as the Assembly has been in eminent danger of being treated. The Synod took up the case in earnest—and after such an examination of it as satisfied them—declared the Presbytery of Cumberland to be no longer in its communion. After some delay, the Assembly fully approved this act, and even thanked the Synod for its conduct.—Now let any one find any more authority in our standards for a Synod to cut off an unsound Presbytery—than for the Assembly to cut off an unsound Synod—and he will do a grand service to his New school brethren. Chapter XI. of our Form of Government treats of Synods: Chapter XII. of the General Assembly. Let the reader study them together—and we boldly assert there is just as much power vested by the latter, for the Assembly to separate from it a heretical Synod—as by the former for a Synod to separate from it an unsound Presbytery. By the one, Synods are directed “to take effectual care that the Presbyteries observe the constitution of the church.” (Chap. XI Sec. 4.)—And on this, which is the largest grant of power in the chapter, the Synod of Kentucky cut off the Presbytery of Cumberland, which would not “observe the Constitution of the church;” and all the church thanked the Synod for it! But by the other, the Assembly, is declared to possess “the power of suppressing schismatical contentions and disputations;” as well as that of “attempting reformation of manners, and the pro-

motion of charity, truth and holiness;"—(Chap. XII Sec. 5.) and upon this grant alone, upon the principles of the former decision—the four contentious, disputations, schismatical Synods, might righteously have been cut off—and thereby, manners would have been, and will be reformed; and clarity, truth, and holiness promoted: yea, and we doubt not, the parallel will be complete, in the bestowal of the hearty thanks of the whole true Presbyterian church, in this as in the former case, upon wise, faithful, and consistent men, who have, humanly speaking, saved the body from destruction.

In these cases the parallel in doctrine, was as complete, as that of the principles involved and the conduct of the respective parties. It has fallen to our lot to know somewhat intimately the material facts, and many of the principal actors in both cases: and we think ourselves permitted to devote a paragraph, to show, that if ever any thing was fully established by human testimony, then it is certain, that the doctrinal errors of the Cumberland Presbytery—and the four Synods, are essentially the same. Let us state the nature of the proof.

1. Joshua L. Wilson D. D. of Ohio, and James Blythe D. D. of Indiana—were both well acquainted with all the Cumberland controversy, and all the steps thro' which the matter passed. They then stood firm for the truth; they have now again passed thro' the New School controversy. They both yet live to testify that the doctrinal errors of the two eras and parties, are essentially the same. Often have we conversed with the last named of the two—and heard him say, these errors of the New School are the very errors, which convulsed the church in Kentucky above thirty years ago. And to the same purport, was the open and public testimony, of Archibald Cameron, lately fallen asleep in Jesus—and who left behind him, but few ministers equal to himself, either in learning, talents, or honesty.

2. The Rev. Robert Marshall, had been carried away with the new opinions, in his younger days. He was a most powerful speaker—and one of the strongest men on that side. In after life he returned to a sound faith and the Presbyterian church. We heard and saw him, in the West Lexington Presbytery, at Georgetown in Kentucky, about the year 1831 or 2, take in his hand, the "*Faith according to common sense*" of Frederick A. Ross of Tennessee, then recently published in the Calvinistic Magazine—and solemnly warn the churches, against its contents, and against the New Theology in general, as the very essence of the opinions, by which he had fallen, and from which by the grace of God—he had been restored.

3. The Rev. Barton W. Stone, the founder of the sect which is called the Christian body—or New Lights, was a Presbyterian minister—embraced the New opinions, between 1800—and 1810—and from that time until now, if he still lives—actively as consistently, and we add for the benefit of our New Lights, *honestly* advocated them. This Christian body in Kentucky is now united with the Campbellite Baptists,—and we have known ministers of the two sects go down into the water together, and alternately dip their converts. This Mr. Stone, has publicly declared, that many of the

opinions of the New School—are those for which he has all along contended: and where they differ we believe it is because his opinions are the more reasonable and philosophical of the two.

4. The present sect of Cumberland Presbyterians, was formed some time after the excision of that Presbytery by three members of it—who tho' not perhaps cordially Presbyterians—when not New Lights in doctrine. We are not intimately acquainted with their present condition; but our impression is, that it is a tolerably sound little body—which considers itself standing on the crack between Calvinism and Arminianism. And this we venture to predict, will be the precise result with the better sort of half-breeds, embraced in the four Synods.

5. The more rampant of the Cumberland hereticks, ran into Shaking Quakerism; Mr. Macnama, and Mr. Dunlevy, who were both Presbyterian Preachers—being amongst the founders of that fanatical society in the West. And already, multitudes of New School men have become Perfectionists, and even nominal Presbyterian ministers have been found, to teach a fanaticism, worse than Shakerism.

VI. The only remaining question on this branch of the subject is, did the *facts of the case*, as to the real state of the region embraced in the four Synods—justify the Assembly to proceed to extremities, as in a case of Discipline.—For ourselves we are ready to say that at the time we were called on to decide this question we not only considered the case fully made out for decisive action, and ourselves shut up to the clear necessity of deciding as we did; but the more we reflect on the whole matter, the more firmly do we remain convinced, that what was done was right, and that the hand of God was most visibly in the whole business, and conducted us to the blessed result, to which we came. Here also we will be a little specific.

1. The presumption of reason and law is that the four Synods, and the churches composing them, are precisely as the plan of union on which they are formed, would make them. No man's title can be better than his patent. No man's religion is purer, than his Bible. Here is the plan on which these churches are formed; in the absence of all proof we are obliged to believe that the churches are just what they ought to be—taking the plan as the model. If the model is perverted, so much the worse; as the inference is then still stronger against the churches. But by the model,—out of every seven cases provided for, six would be directly at war with the standards of our church; as any one may see on perusing the plan of union. Then if the preservation of our standards be a good reason for the exercise of discipline—here was an imperative presumption, against all these Synods.

2. This presumption of law and reason, was rendered a certainty by the records of the Synods, and the facts touching these records.—In the first place these records concealed material facts, which they ought to have recorded, and which not having recorded, the evident fact and necessary presumption is—would have been against them if recorded. Thus in regard to the proportion of Elders, and of Congregational churches;—in relation to cases of discipline, espe-

cially where they embraced doctrinal questions; and generally, in all such matters as would, if fully recorded, exhibit the real state of the region,—material parts of their records were deficient. But secondly these records as far as they went, showed that the plan of union was in full and complete operation; that persons not ordained, sat in all those Synods as Ruling Elders; and that the order of our church was, in many fundamental respects violated habitually. All this, was at the end, of a six years' discussion of the questions at issue, and after one of the four Synods--(Western Reserve,) had been once called to the bar of the Assembly.

3. The *testimony* actually before the Assembly was such as to satisfy every reasonable man—that this whole region, was deeply infected with all the errors and disorders which had threatened the ruin of our church. This testimony is in great part before the public, in a multitude of forms—such as books, pamphlets, periodical reviews, newspapers, and controversial tracts—Much of it, has been stated from year to year, for the last six years on the floor of the General Assembly—by persons from the infected region, and that round about. Many members personally knew a multitude of facts. Members from the region, and especially from the Western Reserve stated, in order to defend their conduct, facts which convinced many, that things were worse than could as yet be ascertained: while members from the other Synods, and other members also were prevented from making more full developements, by the cries and uproar for order, on the part of the New School party. Many official papers such as letters from stated clerks of Presbyteries and Synods were before the Assembly.—The past acts of the Members from these Synods in the Assembly in former years, confirmed all this mass of proof; and showed that really the question had finally become as stated by Dr. Peters in the Assembly of 1836—whether the orthodox should any longer be tolerated.—In addition to this, many delegates from the three New York Synods—after seeing the turn matters took in relation to the Western Reserve—refused to testify at all—and remained dumb, when candour and interest both required them to speak; and this they did by concert with their party, as is since fully proved, although they have tried to make the world believe they had a desire to speak fully out—and were refused opportunity. The whole case was fully before the Assembly, in all its merits, and fully justified the temperate and candid statement, contained in the 2nd and 3rd of the series of resolutions, in relation to the three New York Synods.—But if any portion of the four Synods, is indeed sound, ample provision is made in the 4th resolution for its reunion with the church. And still further, let every Presbytery according to our book of discipline, go over the whole subject with its delegates, and make them explain, as the case may require, either why they did, or did not vote for the resolutions now under discussion. Truth and orthodoxy have every thing to gain by such a course; and we apprehend there are far more who will find it difficult to excuse themselves for not favouring, than for having supported this glorious reform.

The Argument from Constitutional power and duty.

I. We have demonstrated in a former paper that the *plan of union* was utterly unconstitutional. If so, the necessary result is, that it was always absolutely void and without any force whatever. For the Constitution is the fundamental law; and no subsequent resolution of an Assembly can make that inoperative, by virtue of which the Assembly itself exists. But if a law be unconstitutional and void, every act performed under it is null—every interest founded on it is void—and every thing issuing out of it, is as completely inoperative as to any legal validity—as if the law itself never had existed.—When the competent authority once ascertains the unconstitutionality of the act—the same decision which settles that point, draws after it all the consequences stated above. This is the long settled and undeniable law of the case;—and all argument is idle on either side—as to this point.

II. It is no relief to say that these Synods were formed, not in virtue of the plan itself fairly understood—but in some other manner consequent on its perversion. Still the case is harder; for they so perverted it, as has been already shown—as to make it more grossly unconstitutional in its *construed*, than in its real character. Nor is it any mitigation to say that the Assembly itself formed the Synod, without regard to the plan. For the Assembly had no shadow of power to form any but *Presbyterian Synods*, and if it attempted to gather Congregational churches, and mixed churches, into a Synod,—the act was as thoroughly illegal, as if it had gathered Baptist and Methodist churches into one. Let the thing be done by whom it might—or upon what pretext soever—it was always a gross assumption of power never vested—and the act was utterly void.

III. Some have said, that the Assembly could not declare its own past acts unconstitutional, even if they were so. But this is a mere sophism. In every written constitution, there must be some tribunal to act as the conservator of the system; or force and revolution must decide every thing. In the Presbyterian church, we profess to believe that no human tribunal has any power to make any *new laws*, for God's church; but only that our tribunals may expound and declare the true intent of the divine laws already promulgated by our Lord—and enforce them by spiritual means only. In this case such a rule as the one stated above, would either claim for our church infallibility—which is papism: or it would render it impossible for us ever to rectify any thing erroneous—which is madness.—But what possible difference can it make, in reason, whether there be two or three tribunals, and you call one *Congress*, and another a Court; or whether you were to unite the powers of all in one, and call it Assembly? The New School people may if they chose, call our church order *bad*; but it is rather too much to say that it is, as to many indispensable functions a non-entity.—We remember that Col. Jessup, who passes for a good lawyer, took exception to the phraseology of the resolution in the case of the Western Reserve; "*Is and is hereby declared to be no longer a part of the Presbyterian church*" &c.—were the words of the resolution. But said Col. Jessup—this is

a falsehood;—for it is, now a part, whatever it may hereafter? And to our utter amazement a large part of a speech against the resolution—was built on this idea—which even more than the one combated above emasculates the Assembly, by denying it power even to state its propositions, before voting on them. We say in a deed “have bargained and sold, and do by these presents bargain sell and convey;” we say in a law, “the said act *shall be*, and hereby is repealed;” the like in every paper that was ever artificially drawn. But we apprehend that Col. Jessup takes good care not to expose himself, by making such arguments, either in a court of law, or a legislative chamber.

IV. It is also pretended that, the Assembly committed suicide by the declarative resolution against the four Synods,—and thereby annihilated itself.—If this were true, it is not easy to see what could make the four Synods thenceforward the true and only Presbyterian church—as some contend,—unless on the principle, of *lucus, a non lucendo*. But if the Assembly ruined itself—how should that impair the right of the Presbyteries to elect a new one? Suppose every member of the body had been swept off in a night—it would only have required another delegation of members from the Presbyteries; and no man in his senses would say the church was dissolved, or that the Assembly had ceased to exist. How then shall the separation of a comparatively small part of its nominal members from it—produce such mighty effects? The case is that of Esop’s fly,—who got on the wheel of a coach, and exclaimed in ecstasy, what a dust we raise!—But if it be indeed true that the Assembly was extinct after the passage of the resolution against the Synod of the Western Reserve—then two insuperable difficulties, beset the New School. First, why did they continue to sit and act till the end of the session; and why make such a fuss about the violated rights of the excluded delegates; and why did those delegates behave so outrageously, in attempts to force their way into a dead body, of mere private persons? And secondly, how can any New School Presbytery delegate members, to the next Assembly, which will meet under the order, by the appointment, and be constituted by commissioners *only* from those Presbyteries, of which the dead one was composed after its suicide! It is a sensible maxim of our Indians, *that a man who has two tongues can only speak to one person at a time!*

V. Much commotion is threatened about suits;—and notices were given to the clerk of the trustees of the General Assembly, by the commissioners from all the separated Synods, not to pay any funds, on any orders from the Assembly, after the passage of the resolutions affecting them. If these notices were obeyed the effect would be only to rob some scores of laborious missionaries of bread—turn some dozens of pious beneficiaries out of our theological seminaries—and reduce our venerable professors to want;—and all this by the act of persons, and churches, who never paid a farthing in the dollar of the funds now claimed;—and who have set themselves up, by way of example to all men, as the most active, and benevolent of Christians. We say nothing of the spirit of litigiousness thus manifested; for the same sort of people, have always shown the very

same temper.—But what seems to us remarkable is, that they should have at once so little delicacy and so much love of money. The Orthodox offered the New School, *half* the funds of the church, as far as they had power to give them; tho' both parties knew they were on no ground whatever entitled to a tenth. Nay say the four Synods—we alone, tho' only a part, of a part—and that the part that gave little, must have all!! Well gentlemen, if you get it, what then? We will tell you what. As to yourselves it will do you no good—for the curse of fraud, dishonour, and broken vows will be on it. As to us, it will do us no harm; for our churches would, any time these seven years, have given twice as much, to be purged of the leaven of your doctrines.—But the truth is, that this threat is all an after thought; it is ridiculous in itself; it will never be carried into execution; and if it should be, will only seal the ruin of the party, who, under such circumstances, should make the attempt. Sue indeed! Sue who? And for what? Shall a man sue a church session who will not let him come illegally, and stay improperly in the communion of a church? Shall a man sue a minister because he objects to his pew, which he rented under pretence of worshipping God—being converted into a cake-shop on Sunday?—It is all sheer nonsense. There is we venture to say, nothing to sue about, nobody to sue, no tribunal in which any action can be maintained—nor a party on earth to maintain the suit. Still further we assert, that if these things were otherwise—there can be no question—that the particular act of the Assembly now under discussion—would be sustained whenever and by whosoever fairly tested.—

We have protracted this discussion to so considerable a length—that we omit much that we had intended to say, and close the article with a single reflection, which seems to us very important. No one can now entertain the least hope, of any future union of the two parties in the Presbyterian church.—If the next Assembly were to undo all the important acts of the last, and amongst other things, restore the four separated Synods, no one can doubt, but that a violent rupture of the church would immediately ensue. What then is to be gained by such an issue? Or why should men pretending to the least particle of Orthodoxy, countenance operations, which must end in their own defeat—or in the ruin of the cause they profess to love? For ourselves, we consider the time for parley, as well as that for neutrality entirely passed: and we are fully convinced that every man who will not cordially sustain the acts of the last Assembly, ought to be considered an enemy to the Presbyterian church—and a New School man in disguise. A little firmness will now put this hated controversy at rest, during this generation at least; and therefore all who love God, in our church, should put themselves at once in the forefront of a contest, which cannot be lost, without deep injury and lasting dishonour—and which may be won by one vigorous and well concerted effort. Blessed be God, we hope in the future, with the same confidence that we rejoice in the past.—

(For the Baltimore Literary and Religious Magazine.)

ESSAYS ON JUSTIFICATION.

No. 2.

JUSTIFICATION is of God's free grace. The Lord Jesus Christ by a life of spotless obedience, and by the suffering of death, fully discharged the debt of all who are justified, and made a real and perfect satisfaction to divine justice in their behalf. Rom. v. 6, 8. "For when we were without strength, in due time Christ died for the ungodly, and God commendeth his love towards us, in that while we were yet sinners Christ died for us." Yet, notwithstanding the law must be obeyed by the surety, and an adequate satisfaction rendered to Divine justice, the justification of the sinner is wholly an act of God's free grace.

It is an act of God's free grace, inasmuch as Christ was freely given by the Father for those who are redeemed. Rom. viii. 32. "He that spared not his own Son but delivered him up for us all, how shall he not with him also freely give us all things." The gift of Christ proceeds entirely from the free and sovereign love of God. For "God so *loved* the world that he *gave* his only begotten son." It is further an act of free grace, inasmuch as Christ's obedience and satisfaction are *in stead* of the redeemed, and freely accepted by the Father by whom he is given. II. Cor. v. 21. "For he hath made him to be sin for us who knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him:" and Eph. v. 2. "Christ gave himself for us an offering and a sacrifice to God, a *sweet smelling savour*." Christ being freely given, and his satisfaction and obedience being freely accepted by the Father; and he himself having cheerfully undertaken the work of the sinner's redemption, and having accomplished this great work—the sinner's justification is entirely an act of God's free grace, and not on account of any thing in the sinner himself, or done by him. "It is not of works lest any man should boast,—by the deeds of the law shall no flesh living be justified." "Being justified freely by the grace of God through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus, whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood." It is thus free because the redemption that is in Christ is the channel through which justifying grace flows freely unto us, the obedience and death of Christ having removed every obstacle which prevented the free manifestation of God's love towards sinners. In the application of salvation to us by the agency of the Spirit in order to our actual justification, we have a further manifestation of the free grace of God. Lit. v. 7. "*Not by works of righteousness which we have done but according to his mercy* hath he saved us by the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost, which he shed on us abundantly through Jesus Christ our Saviour, that *being justified by his grace*, we should be made heirs according to the hope of eternal life." We are thus freely justified that both the exact justice and

rich grace of God might be glorified in the justification of the sinner. Rom. iii. 26. "To declare I say at this time his righteousness, that God might be just, and the justifier of him that believeth in Jesus." Eph. ii. 6, 7. "God—hath raised us up together, and made us sit together in heavenly places in Christ Jesus. That in the ages to come he might show *the exceeding riches of his grace in his kindness towards us through Jesus Christ.*" Justification is therefore "an act of God's free grace."

How remarkably is this scriptural view in contrast with the canon of the Roman church as quoted above. "Whoever shall affirm—that *the grace* by which we are justified is *only the favour of God*—let him be accursed." According to the preceding clause of the canon we are to believe that "grace and charity, which is shed abroad in the heart" is a part of the meritorious cause of our justification. Yea in the 32d canon we are accursed—if we refuse to believe "that a man is justified by his good works, which are wrought by him through the grace of God, and the merits of Jesus Christ, of whom he is a living member," and that these good works "do really deserve increase of grace, eternal life, the enjoyment of that eternal life if he dies in a state of grace, and even an increase of glory." Cardinal Bellarmine in the true spirit of this canon, teaches that the phrase "*by his grace*" in Rom. iii. 24, "does not signify his (God's) favour, but something else, namely, *the effects thereof.*"—De just. Lib. ii C. 3. Grace infused or "inherent righteousness," is made evidently, a great part of the ground of our justification, although there is some merit ascribed to the redemption of Christ: but this, as is justly remarked—"not because thereby *solely* we are accepted before God—this is denied in the 11th Canon—(as quoted above) but because it gives efficacy to *our* righteousness; so that according to the Roman Catholic scheme, *salvation is of works*"—But the Scriptures affirm—It is "not of works:" and when grace is used in reference to our justification before God, it invariably signifies his *favour*, or according to the passage quoted above from Ephesians.—"*The exceeding riches of grace in his kindness towards us through Jesus Christ.*" This "*kindness*" as displayed in Christ, is the grace by which we are justified, and not *that* which is infused into the soul as we have become the living members of the body of Christ. This in its fruits in our lives, is an *evidence* of our union to Christ, and our justification before God—and not any part of its meritorious cause. We are enemies to the grace of God—if we hold not that justification is an act of God's free, rich, and sovereign grace, or favour, which flows abundantly through no other channel—than "the redemption that is in Christ Jesus."

IV. One of the constituent parts of justification is pardon of sin. This consists in God's absolving the sinner from the condemnation of the law on account of the satisfaction of Christ. Rom. viii. 1. "There is therefore now no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus." When the sinner is justified, he is viewed as invested with the righteousness of Christ "who delivered himself for him that he might redeem him from all iniquity." On account of this perfect righteousness the sentence of condemnation, written against him on account of sin, is erased; Christ having "nailed the hand-writing

to his cross," when, "bearing the sins of his people in his own body."

That this pardon of sin is a constituent part of justification, is plain from Romans iv. 6. 8.—where the blessedness of a man is described as consisting in the forgiveness of his sins. "Even as David also describeth the blessedness of the man unto whom the Lord imputeth righteousness without works, saying, Blessed are they whose iniquities are forgiven, and whose sins are covered. Blessed is the man to whom the Lord will not impute sin." The blessedness of such consists in the pardon or non imputation of sin, on account of righteousness, imputed without works. This, as will be shown more fully in its place, is the righteousness of the Lord Jesus Christ, "who was made sin for us who knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him." He was "made sin for us" as "the Lord laid upon him, the iniquity of us all," that he might "bear" the burden of our guilt "in his own body on the tree," and render complete satisfaction for it to the law and justice of God. This satisfaction being transferred to the sinner for whom it was rendered, he is discharged from the debt which his sins had contracted. Being "found in Christ," united to him, and one with him by a living faith, "there is therefore now no condemnation for him." He is purged from his sins—his iniquities are forgiven him, by his glorious Redeemer, "who is exalted a prince and a saviour to give repentance to Israel, and remission of sins." Pardon of sin therefore, is a part of our justification at the bar of God. It must be so, for unless our sins are pardoned, we can receive no other spiritual blessing. If the hand-writing written against us, our sentence of eternal condemnation, is not erased, we can have no claim to the kingdom of heaven, but must forever "perish in our sins." But happily, Christ was "delivered for our offences, and raised again for our justification." Being for this end "delivered" he made ample atonement for our sins, and he arose from the dead, and is exalted, in order to the justification of those for whom he paid the ransom, by the application of his blood "which cleanses from all sin." "The Lord is merciful to their unrighteousness, and their sins and iniquities he remembers no more."

In pardon, the *guilt* of sin is removed, which is our actual obligation or liability to eternal wrath. Eph. ii. 3. We "were by nature the children of wrath." Romans v. 18. "By the offence of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation." But this guilt rendering us liable to condemnation and wrath, is taken away in pardon as a constituent of justification. It is entirely removed, and can never recur. "For there is therefore now no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus—who hath delivered us from the wrath to come." "It is God that justifieth, who is he that condemneth?" And who shall lay any thing to the charge of God's elect?"

After sins will not remove this pardon, and restore the sentence of condemnation, which has been erased—"for the gifts and calling of God are without repentance." Moreover in this pardon all our sins are remitted—*past present and future sins*. Who forgiveth all thine iniquities, "Ps. ciii. 3 Sins past and present are formally remitted, Ps. xxxii. 1. I acknowledged my sin unto thee, and mine

iniquity have I not hid; I said I will confess my transgressions unto the Lord, and thou forgavest the iniquity of my sin."—Rom. III. 25 —"Whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past through the forbearance of God."

Future sins are pardoned, by securing the non-imputation of them as to the guilt of eternal wrath; because a great part of the blessedness of a justified person consists in this, that he is one "to whom the Lord will not impute sin" Rom. iv. 8. However great his after transgressions—being once Justified there is "no condemnation" to him—for all his sins are pardoned through the blood of Christ.

The prayer of the believer for the pardon of future sins, when committed, forms no objection to this consolatory doctrine, in as much as he prays for the pardon of these sins—that the guilt which renders him liable to *fatherly displeasure* may be removed. His prayer is, "restore to me the joys of thy salvation; uphold me by thy free spirit;" and that he may enjoy a *sense* of forgiveness. Nor is this doctrine any encouragement to the commission of sin. Rom. vi. 1. 2. "What shall we say then? Shall we continue in sin that grace may abound? God forbid. How shall we who are dead to sin live any longer therein?" Besides, we are the workmanship of God created anew in Christ Jesus *unto good works*," and the predominant disposition of the justified is, to *hate sin* as "the abominable thing which God hates;" and hence they are "careful to maintain good works" as the evidences of their gracious pardon.

Popery is the enemy of the grace of God, and the peace and consolation of the Christian. Is justification assigns the victims of its "all deceivableness" to excruciating tortures, for what it terms "*venial*," or pardonable offences. Read the horrible Canon, 30 *on Justi*. "Whoever shall affirm that when the grace of justification is received, the offence of the penitent sinner is *so forgiven*, and the sentence of eternal punishment reversed, that there remains no temporal punishment to be endured, before his entrance into the kingdom of heaven, either in this world, or *in the future state*, in purgatory: let him be accursed." To pass by the ridiculous nonsense presented in the idea of *temporal* punishment endured in a *future state*, this canon militates against the scriptural, and consolatory doctrine illustrated—that in our justification by faith in Christ, God "*forgiveth all our iniquities*:" The distinction of *mortal* and *venial* sins is not recognized in the scriptures. They represent all sins as mortal. "*The wages of sin is death*." This is their awful representation, calculated to awaken conscience, and produce an abhorrence of *all sin*. To the purgatorial fire of ancient Platonism, we are not to look for the purgation of any, even the least stain of sin. The blood of Jesus Christ "*cleanseth us from all sin*" he having "*by himself purged our sins*" forever "sat down on the right hand of the majesty on high," that he might "through" the efficacy of his own "death" "*present us holy, and unblameable, and unreprouceable in his sight*." Affliction, chastisements, the justified endure in this life, but this endurance of these ills, possesses not the nature of atonement, or expiation, but is altogether disciplinary; and only as accompa-

nied by the grace of the Holy Spirit, do chastisements take away sin, and make us "partakers of his holiness." It is to the blood of Christ we are to look as the grand purifier; and we can rejoice, undismayed by the most appalling descriptions of papal purgatory which a venial priesthood in their craftiness present to alarm their degraded devotees—and lash them into a brutish subjection—we can rejoice, I repeat it with exultation, in the apostolic declaration *Be it known unto you, men and brethren, that through this man is preached unto you the forgiveness of sins; and by him all that believe are justified from all things from which they could not be justified by the law of Moses.*" Acts xiii. 38. 39. Blessed be God "*we have redemption through his blood even the forgiveness of sins.*"

V. A second constituent of justification is *acceptance* or reception as righteous, into the divine favour. When God pardons the sinner, he accepts his person as righteous, and receives him into perpetual favour. Rom. v. 8. 10. But God commendeth his love towards us, in that while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us. Much more then being now *justified by his blood*, we shall be saved from wrath through him. For if when we were enemies we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son, much more being reconciled we shall be saved by his life." In this passage we are instructed that Christ died for sinners, that they are justified by his blood, and thus saved from *wrath*, and reconciled to God by his death." This reconciliation involves, acceptance, or admission into the divine favour. Sinners by nature are enemies to God, and God is their enemy. But the death of Christ by which full satisfaction has been rendered for their sins hath reconciled God to them; and when his death is applied to their hearts by the efficiency of his spirit, they are reconciled to God. "You hath he reconciled." We beseech you in Christ's stead—be ye reconciled to God—He hath made peace by the blood of his cross"—When God is thus reconciled to them, and they to God by embracing the righteousness of Christ, they are "justified by his blood," which evidently involves their admission into the favour of God, who is reconciled, and who hath reconciled them to himself, by applying to them "the atonement or reconciliation"—which they "have received." In one word, will not God who is now actually their friend, and they at friendship with him, benevolently manifest to them his loving kindness, and admit them to fellowship with himself? Does he not "love the righteous?" are they not now "found in Christ having on his righteousness, and will he not receive them cordially into his special favour, as invested with that "righteousness, with which he is well pleased?" Yea "They are accepted as righteous in his sight," and are "no longer strangers and foreigners, but fellow citizens with the saints, and of the household of God."

There is implied in this reception into favour, the conferring of a title to life. "Being justified by his blood, they are made heirs according to the hope of eternal life." Tit. iii. 7. They become "heirs of God and joint heirs with Christ." Eternal life with its immeasurable blessedness, and glory, is conferred upon them. "The gift of God is eternal life," and "this life is in his son." As "joint heirs" with him they inherit this life for he hath said—"he that be-

lieveth on me hath everlasting life." Freed from the sentence of death, they have awarded to them eternal life. "The wages of sin is death—but the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord;" "AND GRACE REIGNETH THROUGH RIGHTEOUSNESS UNTO ETERNAL LIFE:" and praise be to the "*glory of his grace wherein he hath made us* ACCEPTED IN THE BELOVED.

[For the Baltimore Literary and Religious Magazine.]

PAPAL DOMINATION IN SPAIN.

THE following facts respecting the relations of Spain to the Court of Rome for thirty years past, are extracted from the Foreign Review of March, 1828.—The article is attributed to Robert Southey whose acquaintance with Spanish History, is as extensive and accurate as perhaps any man's living.

The Spanish bishops had been deprived of many of their rights, and were required to take the feudal oath of vassalage to the Pope. This oath is not in the canons, but has been inserted in the Romish Pontifical and is used for the same purpose for which it was invented—that as, to convert the subjects of other potentates into creatures of the Pope. It is true that Dr. Curtis, Archbishop of Armagh, and Dr. Doyle, Bishop of Kildare declared upon oath to the Committee of parliament, that the Romish bishops took no other than the oath prescribed in the canons, of spiritual obedience; yet it is equally true, that every bishop takes the identical oath which King John of England swore, to Innocent III.—No General Council ever established the oath in question, but it stands in the Pontifical and is universally binding on every Romish prelate throughout the world.

By the Concordat of 1753, the Pope gave to the King, the right of presentation to the Bishoprics, although this right belonged to the chapters: and the king in return gave to the Pope the right of confirming his appointments, though this belonged to the Metropolitans. Thus the temporary nuncios from Rome became perpetual ambassadors and spies,—they were paid by the Spanish nation and they acted as the representatives of a foreign prince.

The bull, "*Auctorem fidei*" which confirmed the reprobation of the articles of the Gallican church, was withholden by the Royal Council of Spain from 1794 to 1800;—the first article condemned, was, that the Pope had no temporal power directly or indirectly over princes, and that he had no power to absolve subjects from their allegiance. Naples, Venice and Milan rejected this Bull up to 1820. (See Gregoire's Liberties of the church.) Butler says it was universally adopted in all things concerning faith and the essential discipline of the church;—but not until 1800, did Cassoni obtain the king's *placet* for its promulgation in Spain.—He obtained it surreptitiously, and the king issued from San Lorenzo in December,

1800 a decree ordering all to receive it and commanding the Inquisition to prohibit all books against it and to proceed against all persons who contravened its enactments. It was by means of the infamous Godoy, the criminal favourite of the Queen, that this decree was obtained, and for this good work the Pope proclaimed Godoy DEFENDER OF THE FAITH.

About the same time, (1800) the Pope took from the clergy one ninth of the tithes, and gave them to the king;—this he did, by virtue of his assumed prerogative as administrator of all the temporal wealth of the church. Cassoni however delayed the execution of the brief until he could form a junta at Madrid, of monks and nuns, under whose sanction the tithes were to be collected and applied; and a yearly account was to be demanded of the king relative to the application of the tithes, and to be sent to the Pope. The king, on knowing this, commanded the nuncio to delegate his powers in the matter to the Collector of ecclesiastical property on pain of banishment and the sequestration of his revenues. In 1796, Charles 4th, was requested to *protect* the edition of the canons by which the Spanish church had been governed from the establishment of the Gothic monarchy to the 15th century. The Royal library undertook the collection, and having completed it, learned that the Jesuit, Andries Burriel, had previously done it, and that his manuscript was at Brussels. It was procured, but Charles was deterred from publishing it by the outcry, *that the canons militated against the pretensions of the crown*. He therefore ordered the Marquis Cavallero to examine what was of this nature, that it might be destroyed. It was replied that the publicity of the canons was such, having been so often referred to by the historians and the apologists of canonical liberty, that if any part were suppressed, it would be a despicable and faithless work. The canons were not published till 1813.—It ought never to be forgotten that Dr. Cortois afterwards Archbishop of Armagh and the other Irish monks at that time in Spain, were the bitter and determined enemies of the publication of the canons;—their reason was, that the canons established the independence of the national church, on the Romish See, and because it was only by means of the suppression of them, that the triumph of the false decretals, (forged for the aggrandizement of the papal power) was secured. The canons were presented to the Cortes in 1820, *the native ecclesiastics patriotically desiring that the church might again be governed by them*,

O'Connel censures the cortes, and charges them and their adherents with persecution; but this was their crime; they abolished the inquisition and the tax of St. Jago, and limited the amount to be sent to Rome to 1800 pounds sterling per annum.

The restoration of the Royal family placed the yoke of papal bondage on the neck of the Spaniard. The present struggle is for the liberties of the church as well as of the nation.

MAN—WOMANRY: ABOLITIONISM IN THE FEMININE GENDER.

SOME unknown individual has sent us through the Post Office, a Pamphlet of 23 pages, containing the "*Proceedings of the Anti-Slavery Convention of American Women, held in the city of New York, —May 9th, 10th, 11th, and 12th, 1837.*" It appears that 71 Delegates in pettycoats and 103 honoraryists, during these four days' proceedings, passed more than fifty resolutions of various kinds—made speeches without number, prepared divers appeals, addresses, and circulars, and decided abundant principles of moral and religious duty and seem to have made as good a mimicry of the lords of creation, as could reasonably be expected, on a first attempt. We sincerely hope, that these excellent individuals, have been safely restored to their homes, their housewifery and their proper cares: and that having done enough for glory, they will hereafter be content, to abide in the sphere which God has appointed for them. And as they have discovered and asserted that "*the right of petition is natural and inalienable, derived immediately from God*"—we venture to petition, as many of them as are "*younger women*"—that they "*marry, bear children, guide the house, give none occasion to the adversary to speak reproachfully, I. Timothy v. 14:*" the "*younger widows*" we petition to beware of "*learning idleness, of wandering about, of becoming tattlers and busy-bodies, and speaking things which they ought not. I. Timothy v. 11-13:*" the "*young women who have husbands, we petition, "to be sober, to love their husbands, to love their children, to be discreet, chaste, keepers at home, good, obedient to their own husbands, that the word of God be not blasphemed. Titus ii. 4-5:*" "*the aged women likewise*" we petition, that they be in behaviour as becometh holiness, not *false accusers*, not given to much wine, teachers of good things; Titus ii. 23;"—and *all who will hearken to us, we petition, to remember that their highest ornament is "a meek and quiet spirit I. Peter iii. 4;*" that their sex was first in the transgression, and therefore they are forbidden "*to teach or to usurp authority over the man*"—but are required to "*bear in silence with all subjection, I. Timothy 4. 9. 15:*" and seeing that God has commanded them in express terms to keep silence and be under obedience in the churches and has pronounced every attempt at public speaking on their part shameful—and this both under the law and under the gospel, that their proper place is not that of public teachers of mankind—but that of private learners at home, of their lawful and natural protectors. (1 Cor. xiv. 33. 36.)

But the whole scope and drift of the doings of these deluded females, are as marvelous, as the mode of procedure, was indelicate—unwomanly, and unscriptural. What however can be expected, when females forget the modesty of their nature and condition, and usurp the province of the stouter sex in marshalling public sentiment, and contending fiercely and rudely about the most exciting political questions of the age,—but that they should be betrayed into every sort of error, and exhibit a degree of folly, corresponding to the

excess of their impudence, and the impropriety of their behaviour. We have taken some pains to analyze the pamphlet before us, and are grieved to be obliged to say, we consider it altogether the most mischievous in principle which has lately fallen under our eyes. That our readers may see the justice of this opinion, as well as be better enabled to judge of the nature of *abolitionism* itself, and of the character of the instruments, by which it acts, we proceed to lay before them in a condensed and rational form the substance of the scattered principles contained in it.

1. The fundamental principle of the pamphlet, and of the gathering whose proceedings it records, is that the women of the world have, and should exert, in a *public and concentrated form*, a vast if not an overruling influence over human affairs, of all kinds—and especially over, the whole subject of slavery in the world. Coupled with these pretensions, are repeated expressions of opinion that heretofore, women have not occupied their proper place in society, and assurances that they are about to take matters into their own hands, and set them right. The writings of Mrs. Woolstonecraft, the mistress of Godwin, contain nothing on this subject more absurd and subversive of society than several of the resolutions and letters printed in this pamphlet. We observe therefore that nothing less seems to be intended, than to produce a total revolution in human society, in regard to the condition, the duties and the rights of women. Thus on page 8 of the pamphlet, it is resolved on the motion of A. E. Grimke “that the women of America are solemnly called on by the spirit of the age, and the signs of the times fully to discuss the subject of slavery, that they may be prepared to meet the approaching emergency, and be qualified to act as women and as Christians on this all important subject.” In favour of this motion the mover and Lucretia Mott made speeches; and immediately on its passage the same “woman” (the word *lady* seems, by a singular coincidence of fact with form to have been dropped by common consent) moved “that the time has come for woman to move in the sphere which providence has assigned her, and no longer remain satisfied in the circumscribed limits with which corrupt custom, and a perverted application of scripture have encircled her:” &c. &c. Here again Lucretia Mott backed the mover; and after the unreported amendments of Mary Grew and A. L. Cox had “called forth an animated and interesting debate respecting the rights and duties of women”—the conventionesses resolved on the necessity of the proposed revolution, from pettycoats to pantaloons!—If this grand change were only domestic, less might require to be said; and perhaps, really in that department, these personages have more reason to complain, than their neighbours. If so, we sincerely pity them,—and as sincerely regret the necessity of making their private griefs public. But the truth is, succeeding resolutions, commit the party to a total revolution, in the *female department*, in trade, literature, church, and state: as the resolutions of the said “A. E. Grimke”—on pages 8 and 12; that of Martha Staggs on page 13, and most of the letters in the appendix prove.—We assert therefore in the most positive manner, that this pamphlet, exhibits a scheme for a total revolution in society, as to the whole subject of female duties and

rights; and that proof positive exists on the face of the proceedings that the 174 females constituting the convention, have already in a great degree emancipated themselves from the rules of delicacy, modesty, and decorum, prescribed by the gospel and by all polite and virtuous nations for the conduct of women—and signalized in their own persons, the benefits of the revolting change of manners, they have to propose to our fair countrywomen.

2. The principles set forth by these disciples of Mrs Woolstonecraft's *man-womanry*, amount also to a thorough social, civil and political revolution, in the states, and in the general government.-- S. M. Grimke on page 8, moves and the convention adopt, a denunciation of intermarriages, between slave holders and others. On the same page, is a resolution passed on the motion of S. M. Child, recommending "*women*" in certain states, to petition for the change of laws, which are supposed to act unfavourably in the cases of runaway and transient slaves, held or reclaimed by their owners. On page 13 Lucretia Mott, obtained the passage of a resolution, going to break up all trade and commerce with slave states, or in products of slave labour. On page 8, are three resolutions offered by the everlasting A. E. Grimke which if they have any meaning at all—pledge all "*American women*" favourable to this frantic movement, to labour for the dissolution of the union, and the ruin of the states now composing it—by political means, which the parties here acting,—have thank God, no direct power to bring about,—seeing that *as yet* they neither vote, bear arms, nor hold office; tho' how soon they may do all three, will depend entirely on the progress of their party;—and we may once more be permitted to see "*women*," ride with one foot on each side of their horses. In the first of these three resolutions it is asserted "that the political, commercial, and domestic relations" now existing between the North and South—and the interests thereby produced—are "*the true but hidden case*"—of all the opposition heretofore made to abolitionism. The inference of course, is that these "*relations*"—should cease,—as thereby, the resulting interests which now thwart abolitionism and man-womanism would come to an end—and the glory of radicalism and fanaticism be consummated. The second resolution applies the general principle of the first to a special case—and points out the method of dissolving the union, and producing ceaseless border wars between the states: namely, by refusing to deliver up fugitives from service in one state,—when they have escaped into another. It must be manifest to the capacity even of these illuminatæ, that such a state of things as they advocate would make good neighbourhood impossible between any adjoining states—and would put every difficulty to the arbitrament of the sword. And yet they profess principles of peace, as they tell us on page 12; tho' they are careful to explain that what they mean to express is a special abhorrence of that war, in which the nation might by possibility be obliged to engage in order to put down a servile insurrection which these *Christian* females, are so likely to enflame. And then with a knowledge of scripture nearly equal to their conformity of temper and behaviour to its dictates—they quote the command of God to Israel not to deliver to his master the servant who might

flee to them for refuge. Two things we would crave of these worthy "women:" 1st, Was this law given as between one tribe and another;—or only as between all the tribes, forming one nation, and the surrounding heathen nations? 2nd, Are the states of this union related to each other, as parts of one nation, like the tribes of Israel to each other; or is each state a foreign and hostile nation, as regards all the rest?—At present this precept of the law, has no application between our states; but if things move on, as of late—it may soon become binding; and when ever it does, it is to be hoped, these delicate makers of resolutions, will not shrink back from the fore front of the bloodshed and horror, which their *peace* principles will have entailed on their children, whether white, black, or yellow;—for we find the convention was like Joseph's coat, of many colours.—Of this more, by and by. The third resolution of the series now referred to, calls on "every woman in the United States"—to come forward, and begin the work, whose first act is that set forth in the second resolution—and whose finished work, is intimated in the first—by a united crusade against the congress of the United States, in the shape of petitions, to abolish slavery, in the district of Columbia and Florida, and put a stop to what they call "the interstate, slave trade:" these points being of small moment of themselves, and only important, as methods of excitement, and means of agitating the nation,—whose division and ruin form the subjects of the two preceding resolutions. A second edition of these resolutions, in an abbreviated form, is repeated at the instance of the same intermirable A. E. Grimkie, on page 11.

3. The whole department of benevolent effort—embracing the present condition of the churches and the true principles of church organization—with the whole subject of learning, and collegiate education especially—form jointly another department, in the grand circle of these new-born legislators in aprons. In this department *L. M. Child*, proved herself, we were going to say, *a man*. On page 10 she is represented to have offered three resolutions—which passed—and of which the purport follows.—The *first* asserts the principle that slave-holders ought not to be allowed to contribute to any benevolent object—because all they possess is the price of blood; and the great benevolent societies are rebuked for allowing such an iniquity.—The *second*, denounces the present plans, and measures of the American church, for evangelizing the world.—The *third* recommends to all *Christians* to set about, a grand revolution in these matters.—On page 14, A. E. Grimkie again takes up the song, and raising loud notes of praise to the *Oneida Institute* the *Western Reserve College*, and the *Oberlin Collegiate Institute*, for abolishing all distinctions on account of colour, and admitting and treating coloured and white, lads and lasses (for the Oberlin bumbug is hermaphrodite)—on precisely equal terms, and to the same halls, tables, classes, and beds, as we doubt not—respect being had to sex.—And to the same general intent, there is much more in the precious pamphlet. It is worthy of special note, that all three of these institutions, are seated in the bounds of some one or other of the four Synods, separated from the communion of the Presbyterian church by the last General Assembly; and that all three of them, were in-

debted for almost their entire support, to the regions embraced by the Synods themselves—with some parts of New England, and the city of New York superadded. We commend this startling fact to Mr. Converse, now that he has fairly taken off the mask that had nearly grown to his face—and to the good people in Virginia and North Carolina who read his Telegraph.

There is another aspect of this pamphlet in which it is of some value. It is not always an easy matter to discover what are the true principles of certain Abolitionists; because in argument the moment one is pressed with a difficulty he will renounce the opinions of all his fellows: and the most emphatic written declarations, are declared to be binding only on their authors. This little *bitter* book is therefore valuable as testimony, to show the opinions, as well as the principles and aims of the party to which those, whose acts it records, belong. We have seen what terrible results are contemplated—and by the action of what horrible principles those results are expected to be achieved. We now proceed to show, what are the specific opinions on the grand subject at the bottom of all these doings—and for the sake of which, all the other parts of the plan were formed. It is an Anti-Slavery Convention—very large,—regularly delegated—composed of the wives, daughters and admirers, of many of the chief persons of that party in the Northern states; it met in the city of New York (though in what particular place is concealed)—under the eye of all the chief initiated—and may on all accounts be considered a fair and faithful testimony as to the opinions, as well as of the spirit, manners, and aim of the whole party. It is the *female half* of the famous Anti-Slavery declaration issued by a national convention of whites, blacks and mulattoes which met in Philadelphia in 1833: and contains all the indisputable marks of a paternity—which no other party that ever existed in our country would acknowledge or could feign.

Gathered from this, as from the former document, the great principles of Abolitionism are three. We state them as follows.

1. The sinfulness of all that exists under the name of slavery, in any part of the United States; and that in such a sense, that it should be immediately repented of before God—and immediately put an end to, irrespective of all sorts of consequences, either to the master, the slave, or all other persons. It is presumed none any longer doubt as to the fact of this being the fundamental principle of modern abolitionism. If any do, they will perhaps be convinced on reading Lydia M. Child's second resolution on page 7, A. E. Grimkie's second resolution on page 8, J. M. Child's three resolutions on page 10—and indeed nearly all in the pamphlet.

2. The second great principle of abolitionism is settled hostility to the whole subject of African colonization; thus depriving that continent of its best hopes, and chief means of being enlightened, civilized and Christianized—and throwing insuperable obstacles in the way of all action on the subject of gradual emancipation in the slave states;—and if the opposition succeeded, reducing those states to the necessity of continuing slave states forever—in which there should only be an alternation of bloody revolutions, and a succession of black and white servitude without end. The Anti-slavery party,

assert the universal right of all men to be citizens, in the spot where they chance to be born, and advocate upon that whole subject a political fanaticism, more rude and wild, than that of the agrarians of ancient Rome—or the Jacobins of modern France. On the 13th page of this pamphlet is a resolution offered by A. W. Weston, and carried,—which denounces the American Colonization society in the most unmeasured terms—as only evil itself—and the cause of nothing but evil to the black man.—So far, so good. It is at least high time that we fully understood each other.—

3. The third and crowning principle of this sect of fanatics, is the doctrine of universal levelling—pushed to amalgamation. The doctrine, namely, that all prejudice against colour is sinful, that, every human being should be treated as a man, as a Christian, and as a citizen, in such a way as his personal merit required—without any sort of reference to other matters. Now we have this matter repeatedly set forth, in the proceedings of this convention in the clearest light. On page 17, we have a resolution offered by L. M. Child, pledging the Convention “as Abolitionists” to use all their influence in having white and coloured persons, sit promiscuously in religious meetings, and declaring that until this object could be effected—all the conventionists, would take seats with the blacks, in churches disgraced by distinctions. The resolutions of A. E. Grimke on page 14, assert the same principles in regard to schools and colleges, as asserted here in regard to churches. On page 13 in speaking of the effects produced in the body itself by the resolution already described, against colonization, it is said it “elicited much-expression of opinion, *and some touching appeals from THE COLOURED MEMBERS OF THE CONVENTION.*” And immediately following this sentence, is the following most explicit, and revolting resolution passed at the instance of the oft-cited A. E. Grimke. “Resolved that this convention do firmly believe, that the existence of an unnatural prejudice against our coloured population, is one of the chief pillars of American slavery—*therefore that the more we mingle with our oppressed brethren and sisters, the more deeply are we convinced of the sinfulness of that anti-Christian prejudice which is crushing them to the earth in our nominally free country—sealing up the fountains of knowledge from their panting spirits, and driving them into infidelity; and that we deem it A SOLEMN DUTY FOR EVERY WOMAN, to pray to be delivered from such an unholy feeling, AND TO ACT out the principles of Christian equality by associating with them as though the colour of the skin was of no more consequence, than that of the hair or eyes*”—Now we pray these worthy “women”—to reflect, whether any mortal ever objected to *marrying* man or woman, on account of the colour of his or her eyes? If not—are we not bound to believe, that A. E. Grimke, would by her own words consider it a sin to refuse to marry a man because he was black? And have not all this convention of 174 women sanctioned this principle?—Then we have only to say—first, that the abolition party, clearly aim at, amalgamation; secondly,⁹ that our laws in the slave states forbid this; thirdly, that our tastes, feelings, principles and religion are in accordance with our laws; and finally, that we abhor their distinctive opinions, as cordially as we detest their principles of action—and

revolt at the ferocious spirit of this band of mad-men, and men-women.—

Now let it be constantly borne in mind, that nothing whatever can be done to liberate the slaves in a single one of our slave states—but through the governments, and population in those states respectively; and that in every one of these states, the moral power of the community, if not the political, is to a very great, perhaps a controlling extent, in the hands of slave-holders: let this be remembered—and then let any sane man, consider the effect of such proceedings, and principles, in securing the *immediate* liberation of a single slave!—We will suppose a man inclined to liberate his slaves—convinced that justice and humanity—require this at his hands—and that God will greatly approve of it. He has had great doubts and difficulties, but finally begins to see his way pretty clear. It was a great pecuniary sacrifice—and he was not well able to make it; but still, on the whole, had concluded it would be best to do it. Now in this state of mind, abolitionism comes to him and tells him—it will be in vain to make the required sacrifice, unless he does it *instantly*;—it will be in vain to give his slave freedom, unless he is willing also to make a citizen of him; it will be mere hypocrisy to say he sets him free from conscientious motives, unless he is willing to let him marry his daughter if he is clever—and then if he is very capable, make him a judge or a member of the legislature. If this were all done in a kind and respectful manner, it would only end in convincing the slave-holder that the abolitionist was a fool, or that he looked on him as one. But done as it generally is, with insult, and bitterness, interlarded with gross falsehoods and insupportable insolence—its natural and inevitable effect is to enrage the slave-holder, rivet the chains of slavery—and engender the most cordial abhorrence of the persons, principles, and proceedings of the abolitionists.

If any thing could ever have made us defend slavery, and take part against the black race—it would have been the profound disgust, with which the abolition party has penetrated our spirits—by their ferocity, their vulgarity, their systematic disregard of truth and decency—their ignorance, their self-conceit, their fanaticism; their revolutionary violence and the utter absurdity and impracticability of their principles. We speak now however only of the *male* portion of the party. The *female* part we commend to our friend *Miss Lucy Kenny* of Fredericksburg; and hope she will deal with them in love, in her next pamphlet.

[For the Baltimore Literary and Religious Magazine.]

THE BIBLE DOCTRINE OF SLAVERY.

No. 1.

MESSRS. EDITORS;—It is my intention to furnish for your columns a few essays on the deeply interesting subject of slavery. They will be penned in a spirit of kindness and love. But as they are intended specially for Christians, great plainness of speech will be used, in conformity with Bible examples.

It has come to pass in these times that men of great reputation conceive themselves called upon to come forth publicly in defence of slavery. They insist upon it, that it is a divine institution; established by the fiat of the Almighty in the Old Testament times, and sanctioned by Christ and his Apostles. True; some of them, almost in the same breath, declare themselves opposed to slavery. But such declaration is so manifestly at variance with submission to the will of God, that others of them perceive the inconsistency, and press the doctrine to its proper results. With these men of whatever name or character, we have a controversy: verily believing that a greater calamity could not befall this land, than that its inhabitants generally should embrace their creed. It is calculated we think to dishonour God, bring his sacred word into contempt, and multiply infidels all around.

Let us bear in mind that we have nothing to do in this discussion with slavery in the abstract, of which we hear so often and so little to the purpose; nor with any *utopian*, or imaginary systems of slavery; such as writers frequently descant upon 'till their readers get bewildered, "in wandering mazes lost." Our business is with slavery as it is established by law in one half of the states of this union; and also with members of the church whose example supports the system and who by word or conduct favour its indefinite connection with the church of the living God. It is not a political question merely; as many professors of religion assert, but one connected with morals and religion to a vital extent. Hence the propriety of testing its claims to righteousness by the unerring principles of God's word.

A slave is defined, in the Louisiana code, to be "one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. The master may sell him, dispose of his person, his industry, his labour; he can do nothing, possess nothing, nor acquire any thing *but which must belong to his master.*" The laws of South Carolina "deem, take, repute, and adjudge slaves to be *chattles personal* in the hands of their masters, to all intents and purposes whatsoever." In short, all the states concerned agree in the main point, viz.—in reducing the slave to be the real *bonafide* property of his master. In other words they put the master in the place of God: for "all souls are mine saith the Lord." Now it is granted that God may delegate very high authority over human beings, even to some of their own number; but those

who claim the exercise of this authority must show their commission from heaven—and that too in no doubtful terms. If they fail in this, it follows that their authority is usurped, and rests for support on physical force alone. No wonder, then, that we see such a determination, in certain quarters, to enlist the Bible in favour of slavery; for if we justify the relation, on the ground that we have power to enforce it, then it fairly follows, that whenever the power changes hands, not only has the slave the right to make himself free, but absolutely to reduce his master to his own former condition. Every one, however, can see the absurdity of referring to power, or force, as a justification of slaveholding, and leave the resort to the Bible, (for there is really no middle ground,) and the ready abandonment of former professions respecting the sinfulness of slavery. This change proves that the subject is now *studied*, and that the consciences of Christians compel them to flee to the horns of the altar for support; and so soon as they are convinced that it is no city of refuge for them, undoubtedly they will be obliged, as honest men, to abandon the system. For my own part, I verily believe that this *assumed right of property in man* is the *proton scudos* or fundamental falsehood of the whole system of slavery: that the grant of it was never given by the Almighty to masters: that being wrong in itself, the exercise of it leads to the most disastrous results: and were it not that our moral vision is injured by custom, by prejudice, or by false reasoning, common sense would cry out against the claim as an assault upon human rights and human happiness. This, however, is but the opinion of an individual. It becomes us therefore to appeal to the sacred word of God.

In giving a distinct Bible argument, we will arrive at the truth most satisfactorily, by ascertaining the *general scope* of holy writ on the subject. Whatever is in accordance with the whole tenor and spirit of God's word, must be the mind of the spirit: and those who cleave to technical phrases, to the setting of this aside, deceive themselves and may mislead others.

The prophecy of Noah respecting *Canaan*, that he should be "a servant of servants to his brethren," has been urged in justification of holding *colored* men in bondage. It is a poor argument, however, for it has never been proved that they are the descendants of Canaan. And if it could be proved it would avail nothing, for prophecy is not the rule of duty. It was foretold to Abraham that his descendants should be *evil entreated* in Egypt, yet God punished the oppressors whose conduct fulfilled the prediction. It was foretold also that the Messiah should be put to death; yet his executioners did it with *wicked hands*; and sore judgments fell on the Jews for this sin. Equally irrelevant and inconclusive is the assertion that *Abraham* was a real slaveholder and sold hundreds of his fellow creatures as his property. We know that he had more wives than one, and practised deception more than once, and consequently was not a perfect example for us to follow. But the circumstances of the case utterly forbid the idea that his servants were in the same situation as our slaves. Where was the civil power greater than his own to enable him to retain his slaves? There was no such power; yet Abraham armed 318 of them, to pursue the enemy.

Had their servitude been *involuntary*, they could have made themselves free at any moment. Is this the case with slaves in the South? But it is said that he had servants "born in his house." Very true; he was a prince, or nobleman, and had no doubt a large household. It is a fact with respect to many noblemen of the present day, that numbers of their servants were born in their houses; for the children of servants often live with the same family, as domestics, for many generations. It is a voluntary arrangement, however, for there are no slave laws compelling them to remain. As it respects the phrase "bought with money," we shall meet with it in treating of Jewish servitude. Other considerations might be added, which go to show that there is hardly a feature in common between the service of the Patriarch and the slavery which exists in this land; but it is certainly unnecessary, as our opponents never use this case, so far as I know, as their scriptural warrant for slavery in America. It appears to be thrown into the scale at times, to make up in number, what ever may be lacking in weight.

Let us attend next to the oft repeated assertion that slavery is a *divine institution*, being authorized and regulated by the *Mosaic law*. It is stated in the Biblical Repertory of 1836, that "Moses finding this institution among the Hebrews and all surrounding nations, did not abolish it. He enacted laws directing how slaves should be treated, &c." It is a fact that slavery existed in Egypt, and other heathen nations—the Israelites knew this to their cost. Moses however had no authority to legislate for surrounding nations. God himself abolished slavery in Egypt; and in such a remarkable manner, too, that no Hebrew could fail to see his utter abhorrence of the system. This whole transaction will stand as a memorial of God against slavery, as long as the Bible shall endure. What are we to think however, of the assertion that Moses found it established among the Hebrews? Did they not receive the law in less than fifty days after their own manumission? And is any one so credulous as to believe that during this period they found time to institute slavery. Yet professor Hodge gravely asserts it as a fact, that it was found among them, and says that Moses did not abolish it!! The law, be it remembered, emanated from Jehovah—not from Moses—and to present him as licensing his own people to make slaves of men and hold them in bondage, just after the terrible overthrow of Pharaoh for similar conduct, is certainly an awkward way to exact his justice, and bring honor to his name among the nations. The service which an Israelite was authorized to receive *from his brother* was voluntary in its nature. It was also limited in duration, and so hedged round with wholesome regulations as to make it a real blessing to the poor Jew. We need not dwell upon it, as none but the wilfully blind can confound it with slavery, as it exists among us. Let us turn our attention then specially, to the nature of that service which God directed the children of Israel to receive *from the heathen round about*; for this is the chosen ground of our opponents, and if they cannot make a successful stand here, their cause must be abandoned.

The law which regulates this servitude is found in Lev. xxv. 44. 46.—where we are told that the children of Israel might "buy

bondmen and bondmaids of the heathen round about, &c.”—“Ye shall take them as an inheritance for your children after you, to inherit them for a possession; they shall be your bondmen forever.”

The expression *bondmen* in this case has a powerful influence with many in fixing the meaning of the passage; yet there is no word for it in the original, save that which is elsewhere and properly rendered *servants*. *Obed* is applied to Jesus Christ, Is. 42: 1, It is applied also to Ziba. He is called Obed, yet he had twenty Obeds himself; of course he was no slave. The word is in fact applied to all persons who do *service* for others of any kind. Its use therefore makes nothing in favour of slavery. In reply to those who assert that the above passage sanctions slavery, it is common to use language of the following import—“It is often pleaded that in the Old Testament, God himself expressly permitted his people to enslave the Canaanites. True; for God may punish any of the children of sin as he sees fit—He has a right to do so, and *he alone has a right*. He may commission winds, or waves, or pestilence, or their fellow men to work his purpose of vengeance upon any people. But man has no right to arrogate the prerogative of the Almighty—he has no right *uncommissioned by his maker*, either to enslave or destroy his fellow. God commissioned Saul to exterminate the Amalekites—could we plead this an excuse for the massacre of an Indian tribe? &c.”*—This is certainly a valid argument on the ground assumed by both parties, viz, that God authorized the Jews to hold the heathen in slavery. It was a peculiar dispensation, and if any one pleads it in justification of slavery in this land, he is bound to show that the cases are parallel. He must furnish the instrument, stamped with divine authority, which designates the colored race as the proper subjects of punishment, and the whites as the chosen agents of God to execute his vengeance. This can never be done, for under the gospel dispensation all men are brethren. But notwithstanding the acknowledged force of this argument to *silence* the advocate of slavery, it rests we believe on a false interpretation of the word of God; an interpretation depending for its support on a misunderstanding of the technical terms mentioned above, and so misapplied as to lead to a conclusion totally at variance with the whole spirit and intention of the passage, when taken in its entire connection. Now it is evident that this position will be fully sustained by proving the two following facts—first, that the servitude of the heathen in Israel, so far from being intended as a punishment was really designed by the Almighty as a signal blessing to those of them who chose to avail themselves of the privilege. And second,—that this servitude, so far from being similar to the slavery in America, was in direct contrast with it; the one having a tendency to produce injurious results both in time and eternity, while the other was directly adapted to secure all proper spiritual privileges, and consequently made provision for happiness beyond the grave, as well as in this life. If these two points can be fairly established, no candid man will say that slavery in this land finds its sanction in Jewish servitude. As it regards the *benevolence* of Jew.

*Address of the Committee of the Synod of Kentucky.—p. 19.

ish servitude to the heathen, if we look carefully at the laws regulating it, it will be seen that provision was made for the following privileges.—1. The heathen servants were brought into covenant with God; which included in its proper seasons of rest for the body and religious instruction to benefit the soul. They received circumcision, must eat the passover, attend to all the feasts, and become so identified with the household that the directions for religious training, applied to them equally with the other members of the family. “Ye shall have one manner of law, as well for the stranger, as for one of your own country; for I am the Lord your God.” Lev. 24 22.—See also Deut. 29: 10. 13. Exodus, 12:43. 44. Deut. 12: 12. 18. and 16: 10. 16. and 31: 10. 13. Josiah, 8: 33. 35. 2d The servant was protected by law in his life person, property, &c. as other men. See Deut. 1: 16. 17. Lev. 21: 22. Numbers, 15: 29. 3rd. The Mosaic system commanded the Israelites to exercise the greatest kindness to servants, heathen as well as Jewish. “Thou shalt neither vex a stranger nor oppress him:” Why? “For ye were strangers in the land of Egypt.” Exodus, 22: 21. 22. Ye were in real slavery there, put no stranger in a similar predicament. See also Deut. 10: 17. 19. Lev. 19: 34. We may add to the above that the heathen servants became such *voluntarily*; for by doing so he abjured idolatry, and became a proselyte to the Jewish religion. *Maimonides* the Jewish commentator informs us, that if the servant was unwilling to enter into covenant with God, his master was to bear with him and try to win him by his kindness and instruction, but failing in this, he must *at the end of a year* send him back to the strangers whence he came; for God would accept none but *willing* worshippers. Had he been a slave, a little stubbornness would have secured his freedom! Many other considerations might be added to the above, all tending to the same result. And what is worthy of notice, these privileges and blessings did not depend on the caprice of a master, but were secured by divine statute. How different is all this, and how benevolent, compared with the slave laws of the Southern states.

Again; it is acknowledged by almost all writers on the subject, that slavery in this country has proved a curse to the white population, as well as to the black. Its tendency to injure the temper, the revolting licentiousness to which it affords such facilities, the idleness engendered by it, and which is the fruitful source of a numerous progeny of ills, have all been depicted by *Jefferson* and others with a masterly hand. These things need not be repeated, for it is presumed that but few are so blinded as to deny its adaptedness to injure any community wherever it exists, in a great variety of ways. The question then arises, is it at all probable that God would establish an institution (real slavery such as ours) intended for the benefit of the Israelites at least, but which naturally and evidently leads not only to jealousy and hatred between the two races, but the many and sore evils ever inflicted by it upon the masters and their families themselves. That God should solemnly leave such a legacy to the Jews *as a blessing*; while all experience, under his providential dealings with men, proves it to be a curse, is an assertion too strong for any thinking mind. Grant that it was right in him

to punish the heathen for their crime. Would he do it however in such a way as to carry mortal desolation among his chosen people? Such a supposition is in fact an impeachment both of the wisdom and goodness of God. Let the laws regulating this service be examined with unprejudiced minds, and instead of seeing in them a system of oppression, intended to operate as a punishment, we behold a wise provision for extending spiritual blessings to such heathen as might desire to fall in with the worshippers of the true God. They could not own the soil in Judea, but it would not do for them to be idle, hence God, in this way, kindly prepared them a home where they might, in return for assisting the Israelite to cultivate the soil; become incorporated with his family, and have a right to many of the privileges of God's house. This whole transaction on which many build the divine right of slavery, was really a type and pledge of the calling and admission of the Gentiles, under the new dispensation, to the church of Christ. Of the high standing of many servants in ancient times, and the respect paid to them, we may refer to such passages as the 24th Chapter of Genesis, 1 Samuel, ix. 22, and 1 Chronicles, ii. 34. 35. In short, the Mosaic law has no feature more remarkable than the studied manner in which it enjoins the manifestation of kindness and affection to the heathen, or stranger in Judea; and the strictness with which it guards him against cruelty and oppression. In all this it is directly the reverse of our system, which places the slave at the very foot of the master, leaving him at his mercy without a restraint worthy of the name. Indeed, the single fact that the heathen servant must be circumcised, and become a member of the church of God, is wholly irreconcilable with the assumption that his situation was appointed as a punishment for crime; and this fact makes it also as a system of benevolence, directly the opposite of that which prevails in this land.

Other arguments, which we deem still more conclusive on the subject, will appear in the next number.

A PRESBYTERIAN.

PENANCE—INDULGENCE—WORSHIPPING OF RELICS.

Extracts from the speech of the Rev. H. Beamish, at the annual meeting of the Irish Society of London, on the 17th of May 1837.

It was well known, that the Roman Catholics in many parts of the country were in the habit of doing what they called penances—going round their stations—that was, going on their knees so many times round a place of supposed sanctity. This was done as self-imposed penance on themselves, or penance by their priests, or done with a view of helping the souls of their friends out of purgatory. The instance which he was about to mention was one of these, and if it were not so well attested, one could scarcely believe, that in the nineteenth century men with the alledged edu-

cation and scientific acquirements, which, according to Mr. O'Connell, were possessed by the clergy—it would, he repeated, be scarcely believed, if not well attested, that such men could give their sanction to such degrading and debasing superstitions as the one he was about to notice. The authority to which he referred thus stated the circumstances:—

“On Monday, 15th of May inst., early in the morning, I visited Struel, with the intention of seeing a young man who had travelled barefoot from the county of Galway, to perform what he terms stations. The following is the substance of a conversation that took place between us, at the foot of the mount called Struel, in a little cabin, after he had done his first station for the day:—

“What is your name?—John Lalley.

“Where are you from?—The county of Galway.

“What induced you to come so far to do stations at this place?—Last November, a spirit in the shape of a man, appeared to me every night for three weeks, near the house in which I lived in the county of Galway, and one night I took courage and spoke to it, saying, ‘In the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, do me no harm nor any one belonging to me, and tell me what it is that troubles you?’ The spirit then replied, ‘I am glad you spoke, for this is the last night I would have appeared to you. I have been dead these nineteen years, and you were but three years and a half old when I departed. Before my death I promised to do stations at Struel, but never performed my vow, and because I did not do them I cannot rest.’

“Did you inquire what was his name?—Yes; his name was Paddy Brady.

“Where did he say he lived when he promised to do the stations?—In the neighbourhood of Downpatrick, near Struel.

“What was his calling when living?—A carpenter.

“Have you made inquiry since you came to this county, if ever such a person lived about Struel?—Yes; but no one recollects him, some labourers, indeed, who are working at Down gaol, to whom I was speaking last Friday, thought that they had some recollection of him.

“Is it not strange that no people about this neighbourhood remember him, when he is only nineteen years dead?—No; he was a harmless boy, but neglected to do his stations, and therefore could not be at rest.

“Where did he say his spirit had been for the last nineteen years?—For the last five years he was up to his neck in water, under a bridge in this county; and for the last fourteen years he has been in a sand-pit in the county Galway.

“Are you certain that no person ever attempted to impose upon you in this affair; were you ever inclined to doubt about it?—No, never; for the night he was going away he took hold of my hand, and left a black mark on it, and went off in a flash of light.

“Have you been in a bad state of health lately?—No.

“Have you felt your head uneasy or in pain?—Never in my life.

“Where do you believe that the spirit is now?—In purgatory.

“And was he in purgatory all the time he was under the bridge, and in the sand-pit?—Yes.

“Why did you not come sooner to the stations?—Because he told me that the proper time to do them would be from May to Mid-summer.

“Have you ever spoke to your parish priest respecting this strange affair?—Yes, I have.

“What did he advise you to do?—He advised me to do the stations?

“What is your parish priest’s name?—(Hear, hear.)—Coyne.

“Has the Bishop of Galway ever heard of the matter?—Mr. Coyne is the under bishop of the diocese.

“Were there any masses said for the soul of this man after he died?—Yes; his mother got two masses celebrated for him, for which she paid.

“And could not the masses get him out of purgatory?—The masses will hold good, and if he had not promised to do the stations, they would have fully answered.

“Have you seen the priest of this parish since you came?—I have.

“Have you told him all about the matter?—Yes.

“Did he say any thing against your doing these stations?—Oh, no.

“Did he say he would write to your priest about you?—Yes.

“Has he done so?—Not yet.

“Have you brought any letter from your parish priest to the priest of this parish?—No.

“How long have you been here?—To-morrow will be the tenth day.

“What time do you begin to do your stations?—About six o’clock in the morning; and I do six stations before I break my fast. I have not done until seven o’clock in the evening.

“I see you are taking a smoke; do you ever take a drink of water through the day?—No; neither bit nor sup till the six stations are finished.

“Do you believe that you will get any benefit for your own soul in consequence of your doing these stations for the spirit you supposed you have seen?—Yes, I do; for the spirit told me if I would do this for him, that he would do five hundred times as much for me when he would be happy.

“If you had not engaged to do these stations what do you think would have been the consequence?—The spirit said that if I would not consent to do this for him now, he would have to remain in the sand-pit fifty-five years longer.

“Could he get no one but you to do the stations for him?—I was the person fixed on since I was three years and a half old.

“Have you made any agreement to see the spirit when you go back?—No; for as soon as I am done he will be happy.

“Do you believe that he is now in pain?—I bless my Lord that he is not now in pain, but he is in total darkness.

“Do you think that the Lord Jesus Christ could have saved him without either the masses or the stations?—To this he made no reply, but, in a hesitating manner, expressed a persuasion that the masses and stations were really necessary.

“Can you read?—No.

To show that Popery was unchanged in its doctrine of the worship of relics and saints, he would lay before the Meeting, an account of a new relic; which has lately been imported into Dublin,—the body of St. Valentine. The announcement of it and the accompanying documents, were from *Kennedy’s British and Irish Catholic Magazine*. No. 3, December 1836:—

“The present venerable Pontiff, Gregory XVI., wishing to bestow a mark of respect on the Rev. J. Spratt, whilst lately in Rome, commanded the Bishop of Sabina to give him the blessed body of St. Valentinus, martyr, out of the cemetery of St. Hyppolytus. The venerable remains having lately arrived in Dublin, Thursday, November 10, 1836, was the day appointed for depositing them in a suitable place near the altar, in the church of the Carmelites, Whitefriar street, Dublin. At eleven o’clock the grand ceremony commenced. The clergymen, with capes, and about forty other

priests in surplices, walked in solemn procession to the great gate of the church, where they received the body of the blessed martyr Valentinus, whilst the litany of the saints were sung. The Very Rev. John Spratt, the Rev. Thomas Coleman, Rev. William Cinsella, and the Rev. R. Colgan, carried the venerable remains in a suitable vase to the High Altar, and placed them on an elevation designed for the purpose. After this the Very Rev. John Spratt ascended the pulpit, and announced to the congregation the indulgence to be obtained by the gracious grant of his Holiness, on visiting the church where the body of the blessed martyr is exposed. He also read suitable extracts from the authentic documents, a translation of which we subjoin.

"The grand solemn high mass then commenced, the Right Rev. Dr. Murray presiding in his pontificals (this Dr. Murray being one of the new Board of Education in Ireland); High Priest, Rev. Andrew Day; Deacon Rev. M. J. Tomlin; Sub-Deacon, Rev. W. Withers; Master of the Ceremonies (what an officer for a church calling itself Christian! Hear), Rev. J. Murphy, of Adam and Eve Chapel. The choir of St. Andrew's church Westland row, performed the music, and sung with great effect.

"A most respectable and numerous congregation attended, greatly edified and delighted."

He would now read a translation of the original Latin documents relative to the body of St Valentinus, martyr:—

"We, Charles, by the Divine mercy, Bishop of Sabina, of the Holy Roman Church, Cardinal Odescalchi, Archbishop of the sacred Libernian Basilick, Vicar-General of our Most Holy Father the Pope, and Judge in ordinary of the Roman Curia, and of its district, &c., &c.

"To all and every one who shall inspect these our present letters, we certify and attest, that for the greater glory of the omnipotent God and the veneration of his saints, we have freely given to the Very Rev. Father, John Spratt, Master of Sacred Theology, of the order of Calced Carmelites, of the Convent of that order at Dublin, in Ireland, the blessed body of St Valentinus, martyr, which we ourselves, by the command of our Most Holy Father, Pope Gregory XVI. on the 27th day of December, 1835, have taken out of the cemetery of St. Hyppolytus, on the Tiburtine-way together with a small vessel tinged with his blood, and have deposited them in a wooden case, covered with painted paper, well closed, tied with a red silk ribbon, and sealed with our seals; and we have so delivered and consigned to him, and we have granted unto him power in the Lord, to the end that he may retain to himself, give to others, transmit beyond the city (Rome), and in any church, oratory, or chapel, to expose and place the said blessed body for the public veneration of the faithful; without, however, an office and mass, conformably to the decree of the Sacred Congregation of Rites, promulgated the 11th day of August, 1691.

"In testimony whereof, these letters testimonial, subscribed with our hand, and sealed with our seal, we have directed to be expedited by the undersigned keeper of the Sacred Relics."

"Rome; from our Palace, the 29th day of the month of January, 1836.

"C., CARDINAL VICAR.

"Registered, Tom. 3, page 291.

Gratis throughout.

"PHILIP LODOVICI, Pro-Custos

(Seal.)

"Translation of the petition to his Holiness, Pope Gregory XVI., for a grant of indulgences to be annexed to the veneration of the blessed Valentinus, martyr:—

"Most holy father,—The Rev. John Spratt, of the order of the Blessed Virgin of Mount Carmel, most humbly entreats your Holiness to grant a particular indulgence of forty days in favour of those who pray before the body of St Valentinus, martyr, and a plenary indulgence on the day of the

translation and anniversary of the exposition of the said body for public veneration, in one of the churches of the city of Dublin.

“ And &c., &c.

THE ANSWER.

(From an audience of his Holiness.)

“Our most holy Father, Pope Gregory XVI., to all the Christian faithful of either sex, who being truly penitent, and having confessed and received the holy communion, shall visit the church (in the above mentioned city ‘Dublin’) which shall be appointed once and finally by the ordinary for the exposition of the body of the blessed Valentinus, martyr, of whom mention is made in the above Petition, of one day within the year for his festival, has graciously granted a plenary indulgence, commencing at the *first vespers* and continuing until *sunset of said day*; and an indulgence of *forty days*, if before his glorious body, (his glorious body!) placed in said church they shall with contrite heart devoutly recite daily three times *Pater, Ave, and Glory be to the Father, &c.*, in honour of St. Valentinus, and according to the pious intention of his Holiness; the present grant to be perpetual, and without the issuing of a brief, and with the privilege of applying those indulgences by way of suffrage to the faithful departed. (Here the profitable doctrine of purgatory came in again.)

“ Given at Rome, in the palace of the Sacred Congregation, the 20th of April, 1836.

(Seal.)

“ C. CARDINAL CASTRACANI, Pref.”

ILLUSTRATIONS OF THE PAPAL CHURCH ABROAD.

No. 3.

Letter of the Rev. Michael Crotty, Parish Priest of Birr, to the Most Rev. Dr. Murray, Titular Archbishop of Dublin.

“I charge thee before God and the Lord Jesus Christ, and the elect angels, that thou observe these things, without preferring one before another, doing nothing by partiality. Lay hands suddenly on no man, neither be partaker of other men’s sins—keep thyself pure.”—Paul to Timothy, 5th chap. 21st and 22 verses.

MY LORD,

If this salutary advice of Paul to Timothy had been generally followed by men in power and authority, we would not so often behold vice and hypocrisy, ignorance and brute stupidity, raised and preferred to the highest offices and dignities both in Church and State; whilst virtue, and worth, and talent are left to pine in indigence, and languish in obscurity. If this wholesome advice of the Apostle had been generally followed, we would not see the Church of God disgraced by so many melancholy instances of clerical profligacy; we would not have beheld in the diocese of Killaloe, an unfortunate Priest of the name of Corbet, tempted to the commission of a crime by which he brought ruin and destruction on himself; nor would the unhappy Priest Stenson have died of a broken heart, the victim of the tyrannical policy of the Church of Rome. If my Lord, the advice of the

Apostle Paul had been followed, the Church of Rome would not have denied to her Clergy the pure, holy and sanctified enjoyments of matrimony, which Patriarchs and Prophets have used in bygone days, which harmonizes the different shades of life, and calls forth the noblest sentiments of our nature; and the unfortunate Priests, Corbet and Stenson, would, in all probability, be at this moment ornamental members of society, and fathers of numerous, happy, and respectable families. If marriage, my Lord, be the dictate of nature, and the institute of Heaven, and if, according to the doctrine of your Church, it be a sacrament, and confers grace, why are not your Priests allowed to receive it; or why, in opposition to the laws of God and nature, has the unchristian and anti-social policy of the Church of Rome imposed on her Clergy, the intolerable yoke of celibacy? If the Clergy of your Church, my Lord, were allowed to marry, we would not behold the unsuspecting confidence of female innocence so often betrayed; nor the peace and happiness of private families so often broken, nor the tribunal of confession converted into a snare and a stumbling block, for the ruin and destruction of souls. If the Clergy of your Church, my Lord, were allowed to marry, we would not see Popish Convents and Monasteries filled with countless swarms of the drones of idleness, and the votaries of superstition—nor would the world be so often shocked and terrified by the monstrous vices that are committed in those receptacles of lazy piety, and indolent devotion. The Apostle St. Paul tells us, "it is better to marry than to burn," and commands "every man to have his own wife, to avoid the horrible and damnable sin of fornication;" and who but Anti-Christ, forbids to marry and to abstain from meats which "God hath created to be received with thanksgiving of those which believe and know the truth." St. Paul says, "marriage is honourable in all; that a Bishop ought to be blameless, and the husband of one wife;"—who says the contrary, but the Church of Rome, who has made a gospel of her own, in direct opposition to the Word of God, and the primitive and original gospel of Jesus Christ, and his apostles!

Have not the great majority of the Roman Catholic inhabitants of Birr, who are attached to me and to my cousin from honest and conscientious convictions of the truth and justice of our cause:—have they not, I say, witnessed the frightful clerical abuses that have disgraced the parish of Birr, and made a certain diocese proverbial for its iniquities? In vain, my Lord, are the people sought to be impressed with a belief that the Chapels of certain Priests are holy ground, or to regard their Churches as the temples of the Divinity. To the people they appear as the temples of Idols and false oracles. Are not some of the Priests worse than those of Baal and Moloch? May they not be justly compared to Jewish sepulchres, white without, and full of rottenness, and corruption within? And has not, therefore, the fire of the people's wrath almost consumed them? The lightning of offended Heaven, has pierced their sanctuaries and rent the veils of their temples from the top even unto the bottom!—Nothing is sound, nothing is whole—the tables of the law are shattered and splintered—the ark of the covenant is lost, and passed into the hands of the uncircumcised.

When your Lordship shall arrive in Birr, as it is reported, you are about to do you will have an opportunity of ascertaining the strength of my congregation

You say I ought to obey the spiritual authorities of my Church: yes, but do you forget the terms you required of me and of my cousin, as the necessary and *sine qua non* condition of a mutual reconciliation between us and the Titular of Killaloe? Do you forget that you required of us to sign our own condemnation, to seal our own death-warrant, by subscribing a declaration to the following effect—namely—"that all the marriages we had solemnized for the last ten years were invalid, and that all our absolutions during that period were null and void." Can it be said, my Lord, that such an infamous declaration as that, is to be expected at the hands

of any man in the nineteenth century, professing to be a Minister of Christ? Did I or my cousin ever make a vow of *blind* and *passive obedience* to any human being upon this earth? Gracious God! are we to be expected to revive the exploded and antiquated doctrine of *passive obedience*? Are we to be expected to renounce the light and blessings of the gospel, for the traditions of corrupt and fallible man—the errors and superstitions of Popery? Are we to be expected to unlearn the lessons we have been taught by history and experience, and to plunge back into the dark night of monkish ignorance and papal superstition? We know, and are convinced, my Lord, that you, and the Titular of Killaloe, and the whole Papal hierarchy of Ireland, would be extremely glad, that the same qualifications, which formerly made a good Monk, should also be the distinguishing characteristics of a modern Popish Priest—“*Tria faciunt Monachum—Bene loqui de superiore—legere Breviarum taliter qualiter—et sinere res vadere ut vadunt*”—that is, my Lord, speak well of the Bishop—read the lessons he sets you, *taliter qualiter*—and let his Lordship do and govern his diocese as he pleases—“*et sine res vadere ut vadunt.*” These, my Lord, are the first and most essential recommendations of a Popish Priest—ability, integrity, honesty, firmness, an opinion and a judgment of our own,—but why do we talk of such antiquated accomplishments, these and a thousand other perfections—nay, all the perfections and virtues, all the light and talent, that are required in a modern Romish Priest, are all summed up in these two words—“*passive obedience!*”

You, my Lord, and the Titular of Killaloe, would require of me and of my cousin, and of the great majority of the Roman Catholics of Birr, who are devoted to us from an honest and conscientious feeling of the truth and justice of our common cause, an absolute and a blind obedience to your authority! The Titular of Killaloe, and the whole Papal hierarchy of Ireland, would have me and my friends in Birr, see with *their eyes*—tread in *their steps*—and submit our reason and our understanding to *their sole* guidance and direction. So did the Church of Rome, my Lord, require from the magnanimous fathers of the Reformation, a blind and absolute obedience to her authority. But, the illustrious authors of that glorious and immortal revolution would not, against the voice of conscience and of duty, sacrifice the honest conviction of their minds at the shrine of Popery, nor submit their reason and understanding to the arbitrary mandates of the corrupt and fallible Prelates of that church. No, my Lord, they did not voluntarily shut their eyes that they might see only with the eyes of the Church of Rome, as the Priests, and the deluded Roman Catholics of this unhappy country do: they did not yield a blind and absolute obedience to the Prelates of that Church, but they instituted a strict enquiry and examination into the lives and doctrines of her rulers and teachers. They consulted the oracles of the Divine and unerring wisdom, in compliance with the orders of their heavenly Lord and Master; and they judged of the piety of the Prelates of that Church, and the soundness of their doctrines, by the infallible rule of the original and primitive Gospel of Jesus Christ and his Apostles. They did not place an implicit and unlimited confidence in the inventions and traditions of corrupt and fallacious men, but they mounted up to the source of all purity and sanctity, and traced from the apostolic times, the law, “clear and unpolluted, along the stream of time, and the silent lapse of ages.”

You have charged me with having opposed, when a student in Maynooth College, the authorities of that house. Yes, I denounced in terms of honest indignation, the vicious, narrow and ruinous system of education pursued in that house—which is the *hot bed* of bigotry, intolerance and superstition;—where hypocrisy is religion; and knavery is morality. Yea, I joined issue with the *Courier* newspaper, and publicly and openly declared that the College of Maynooth has never yet produced a gentleman or a scholar,—

and that there never was an establishment that stands more in need of a speedy reformation than that house, where four hundred Popish Priests are fed and educated by the liberality of a Protestant Government, and who are let loose upon the world to disseminate the unchristian and anti-social doctrines and principles of bigotry and intolerance, which they are taught in that house. To these Priests, who are the busy and active agents of Mr. O'Connell, may be imputed the pernicious system of agitation and other numberless calamities that now distract and afflict this unfortunate country. To these bigots may be imputed the calumnies that are every day heaped upon the Protestant Establishment, and to whose violent and inflammatory language from their altars may be ascribed the hatred and the murder of the Protestant Clergy of Ireland!!!

You have charged me with having opposed in Birr the spiritual authority of my Bishop—I deny the charge, and state the facts of the case:—

In the year 1826, a contest arose among the Roman Catholics of the Parish of Birr, regarding the alleged embezzlement of the chapel funds, by a certain committee in that town. In the month of May, 1826, a deputation from the great majority of the Roman Catholics of the Parish of Birr waited on Dr. O'Shaughnessy, the then Titular of Killaloe, to request of him to come to Birr, to accommodate this difference between the parishioners and the chapel committee. Dr. O'Shaughnessy being then in a delicate state of health, deputed his coadjutor, the present Titular of Killaloe, with full power and authority to make up the unhappy quarrel. The coadjutor Bishop accordingly arrived in Birr, but, instead of listening to the voice of the parishioners, whom he designated *a ruffianly mob*, and redressing their grievances and complaints, regarding the alleged peculation of the chapel monies by the aforesaid committee, (as in all justice he should have done,) he bowed obedience to the arbitrary fiat of the said committee, and their partizans the Priests—condemned the parishioners without a hearing or trial, and without waiting the investigation of the chapel accounts—of which, he said, he knew nothing, and wished to know nothing—the coadjutor Bishop, laid the parish of Birr under an interdict, and with the plenitude, and with more than the boldness of the papal deposing power in its meridian fervour of the twelfth century, put the whole Roman Catholic population of the town and parish of Birr, with the exception of the chapel committee and their adherents, into one sweeping clause of *bau* and *anathema*; and proclaimed them rebels and usurpers, by whole circles of latitude and longitude.

I opposed, my Lord, in conjunction with the great majority of the Roman Catholics of Birr, (who unanimously elected me their Parish Priest,) the present Titular of Killaloe; because, when Priest Kennedy suggested to the Titular of Killaloe the injudicious and anti-Christian policy of applying for the use of the military, to force himself upon the Roman Catholics of Birr, at the point of the bayonet, the Titular of Killaloe should have told this Priest, that the Church of Christ, though it be called militant, knows and authorizes no other arms, than prayer and the Word of God; that nothing was more opposed to the spirit of the gospel, than force, violence and bloodshed; that the Saviour of mankind left those instruments of destruction, to fanatics and imposters; that the sword of the Spirit, the shield of faith, and the armour of righteousness, were the only weapons he made use of for the propagation of his gospel; for the establishment of his religion, and for the conversion and spiritual regeneration of a world buried in sin and iniquity. Yes, my Lord, I did oppose, in conjunction with the great majority of the Roman Catholics of Birr, the present Titular of Killaloe, because he should have told this Priest, that it was not with the aid of the bayonet he was resolved to govern this diocese; that it was not by brute force and lawless violence he intended to subdue the independent spirit that now prevails in Birr, and that embarrasses and distracts his

administration; that it was not by an appeal to the sword he was determined to enforce obedience and submission to his authority in Birr, but by the moral force of opinion, by the mild spirit of the gospel, and by the vigour and energy of the spiritual canons and sacred ordinances of his Church. Yes my Lord, the Roman Catholics of the Parish of Birr, and I, have opposed the present Titular of Killaloe, because he should have declared that he could not give his sanction to one of his clergy, to prosecute his brother Priest in the criminal court, and before a lay tribunal, without infinite scandal to the faithful—without a gross and palpable violation of the established rules and discipline of his Church, which requires, under the heavy penalty, not only of *suspension and excommunication* but of *degradation ipso facto* from the exercise of all spiritual functions, that all differences among her clergy should be amicably adjusted before an ecclesiastical tribunal.—We did, my Lord, oppose the present Titular of Killaloe, because he should have told Priest Kennedy, that he did not know how to draw up a bill of indictment against an entire parish, and that he could not give permission to any of his Priests to do so, without doing a serious injury to his immortal soul, and committing a deep and deadly sin against God, and his holy religion.

We did oppose, my Lord, the present Titular of Killaloe, because he was ignorant, or had forgotten, that all power, whether spiritual or temporal, lay or ecclesiastical, is derived from God, and held in trust only for the benefit of mankind; and that he received his episcopal consecration for the good of religion, and the spiritual welfare of the people, and not for the purposes of persecution and oppression.—We did oppose, my Lord, the present Titular of Killaloe, because he was ignorant, or had forgotten, that he is the auxiliary of the faithful, and not their cruel and merciless task-master; their fellow labourer in the same vineyard, not lording it over their rights, but a helper of their weakness. In a word, my Lord, the great majority of the Roman Catholics of Birr, and I, did oppose the Titular of Killaloe, because he should have learned from the history of his country, and from experience, that persecution always served to attach the Irish Roman Catholics with the grasp of a dying convulsion to their religion and their Priests; and that the use of military force would only create a schism among the Roman Catholics of this parish, and would end in the total annihilation of his authority in Birr. What now is become of the charge of schism against me? Who is now the *schismatic*, the Titular of Killaloe or I? am I not justified, my Lord, to say to the unhappy Titular of Killaloe, as Fermilian said to Stephen Bishop of Rome, *excidiati te ipsum, noli te fallere*—"Do not deceive yourself, you have cut yourself off from the church; for he is truly a *schismatic*, who has made himself an apostate from the communion of ecclesiastical unity; for while you think you can excommunicate all other churches from you, you have only excommunicated yourself from them." *Dum enim putas Omnes à te, Abstineri posse, te ipsum Abscivisti.* (Cyprian Ep. 75. p. 228, Edit. Oxon.)

My cousin and I have resisted and withstood the encroachments of Pre-rogative; we have combated in defence of the people's rights; we have battled in the cause of pure and genuine Christianity; we have struggled against the in-roads of opulent oppression, and opposed the exercise of Popish tyranny and despotism; we have abolished the worship of saints and images, and the abominable superstitions of the scapular; we have put an end to the anti-christian system of the *clay money*, which was a gross imposition on the simplicity and credulity of the multitude—an absurd perversion of religion and common sense; we have exploded a most nefarious custom, which was generated by Clerical avarice, and perpetuated by the tyranny and despotism of the Priests; we have scourged the clerical abominations of the diocese of Killaloe upon the vicarious back of a drivelling and incapable administration; we have kept our ground in Birr during

ten years of the most unrelenting persecution that ever was recorded in the annals of either ancient or modern history, against the power and influence of the Papal hierarchy, against the persecution of the late Government; we have enlarged the views, liberalized the minds, expanded the ideas, and elevated the character of the Roman Catholics of the town and parish of Birr, and rescued them from the dregs of Popery and superstition; we have scouted and put to flight the damned and anti-christian doctrine of *exclusive salvation*, which among her many other usurpations, the Church of Rome has impiously arrogated to herself, and which is refuted in every page of the Gospel of a crucified Redeemer.

These, my Lord, are the happy fruits of the spirit and power of God, who has chosen me and my cousin as humble instruments to bring about a long-wished-for reformation. We hope, that God, in mercy to his creatures, and in pity of the poor, ignorant, benighted Roman Catholics of this Country, will inspire other Priests with a knowledge of true religion, and with firmness and resolution to preach the Gospel boldly, and to rescue their flocks from the thralldom and superstitions of Popery. Let the blessings of education be diffused among the poor, let the Word of God get a wide and extensive circulation, and then, and not until then, will the lower orders be emancipated from the baneful and demoralizing influence of the Priests; then will the people see the unchristian traffic and merchandise that are daily made of their souls, by *masses* and *purgatory*, which are the inciters of clerical avarice and opposed to the Word of God: and then will they be convinced, that true religion consists in the simple belief of a crucified Redeemer, and in a life of piety, sanctity and holiness, without which, no soul shall ever see God.

The times in which we live, my Lord, are big with portentous events. There is, my Lord, a spirit of inquiry abroad—another light is bursting on the land—the march of intellect is progressive—the Priests are beginning to see the errors of Popery, and are heartily tired and sick of the working of the system. Let the Church of Rome abandon the errors and superstitions she has ingrafted upon pure and genuine Christianity: let her cast away from her with a generous scorn, and a holy inspiration, all those *adulterous trinkets*, which and the pledges of her alienation, from Christ and his Gospel, and the monuments of her shame; then, and not until then, will she return once more into the bosom of the Catholic Church; and to the original purity and simplicity of faith, which she preached when Paul addressed his Epistle to her; then will all jars, and jealousies, and heart-burnings cease, in this unhappy Country; then will Protestants and Roman Catholics be united in the bond of one common Christianity, and then, and not until then, will, or can Ireland be called

“ Great, glorious and free,
First flower of the earth
And first gem of the sea.”

I have the honour, to remain, my Lord, your most obedient and humble servant,

MICHAEL CROTTY.

THE
BALTIMORE LITERARY
AND
RELIGIOUS MAGAZINE.

VOL. III.

OCTOBER 1837.

No. 10

CHRISTIAN ASSURANCE.

A Sermon by Samuel Miller D. D.—Princeton, New-Jersey.

II. TIMOTHY I. 12.—Nevertheless I am not ashamed, for I know whom I have believed; and am persuaded that he is able to keep that which I have committed unto him against that day.

THE trials of the pious, in all ages, have been made productive of great and lasting benefits both to themselves and others—perhaps we may say, it is generally under the pressure of adversity that grace is found with the brightest lustre. It is generally in the vale of affliction that believers are most conversant with God, and experience the largest share of the *light of his countenance*, and the *joys of his salvation*. And it is commonly in seasons like this, that they not only enjoy most comfort themselves, but are also enabled to display to those around them the power of religion to the praise of the glory of divine grace. Hence the illustrious reformer *Luther*, was accustomed to speak of *afflictions* as among the things which were necessary to the training of a minister of the gospel, and to fit him to be a guide and a comforter to others.

The pious, the heavenly-minded *Paul* was a constantly and deeply afflicted man. The sufferings which he underwent for the sake of the gospel were many and great. It might be almost literally said, that from the hour of his conversion to the hour of his death, some of the heaviest trials constantly awaited him:—cold, hunger, neglect, stripes, imprisonments, ship-wrecks—what a catalogue of sufferings! Indeed this was so uniformly his lot, that, when he was going up to *Jerusalem* on a certain occasion, he told the Elders of *Ephesus*, that he did not know what was about to befall him there; *save that the Holy Ghost witnesseth in every city, saying, that bonds and afflictions abide me.* When he penned the words of our text, he was confined in a prison at *Rome*, and expected in a little while to be called, as we have reason to believe he actually was, to lay down his life for the faith. But in these trying circumstances, he speaks the heroic language of our text:—*Nevertheless, I am not*

ashamed, for I know whom I have believed, and am persuaded that he is able to keep that which I have committed unto him against that day.

My dear friends, the assured confidence in his Saviour which the apostle *Paul* here expresses was not confined to the early ages of the church—It was not an appendage to his office as an apostle; but a part of his experience as a humble follower of the Lord Jesus Christ. It is a confidence which lies equally open to us. We have reason to believe, indeed, that such assured confidence was more common in the days of the apostles, and for some time afterwards, than at the present day. But probably the chief reason of this was, that the piety of that period was of a higher order than is prevalent now. But is there any necessity that this should be the case? Certainly not. We have the same gospel; the same promises, the same power of the Holy Spirit that blessed the church in those early days. It is a confidence, then, to which we may and ought all of us to aspire. But what is this confidence? Let us inquire a little into its NATURE—the FOUNDATION on which it rests;—and its beneficial effects.—And may he who alone can bless his own word, make our meditations on this interesting subject truly profitable to us all!

I. Let us begin with examining, for a moment, the *nature of this confidence*. This inquiry is the more important, because there are those who deny that any such confidence as the apostle here expresses, can now be expected or enjoyed. They imagine that it was a blessing confined to the primitive church; to the days of miracle, and of extraordinary communication. They suppose, indeed, that believers may now cherish a trembling hope that the Saviour is theirs, and that they shall live and reign with him forever. But that they can ever be *assured* of this; that they can even venture to say that they *know it*, as the apostle does, they utterly deny, nay, some are even disposed to deride this assurance, whenever, it is claimed, as the offspring of either spiritual pride, or fanatical delusion. But, my dear brethren, this is manifestly an error. Is it pride to believe in God? Is it arrogance or presumption to be ready to trust his word,—to be assured that he will really accomplish what he has promised? No, brethren, it is no pride; it is no arrogance: it is only embracing and honoring Jehovah's promise.

Accordingly, we find this assurance cherished, in the highest degree, by the most humble, devoted and spiritual believers. We find holy *Job*; the devout *Psalmist*; the apostle *Paul*, and many others, speaking repeatedly and strongly in the confident language of our text; declaring that they *know* they are the children of God, and that a crown of glory is laid up for them. And more than this, we are solemnly exhorted in that blessed volume which is given us as *a light unto our feet, and a lamp unto our path*, in every age;—we are solemnly exhorted and enjoined to seek after this assurance, and to maintain it with sacred care. *Give all diligence to make your calling and election sure*,—and again, *give all diligence to the full assurance of hope unto the end*.

This blessed assurance of our personal interest in the Saviour, is by no means, indeed, essential to saving faith, or to the Christian character. In other words, a person may be a sincere believer in

Christ; a real practical Christian; and of course, in a state of salvation, and yet not be able, with confidence, to adopt the language of our text. To *be* a Christian is one thing:—to *know* that we are such,—that is, that we *have* believed in Christ, and are united to him, as the branch is united to the vine, is another. And although the latter is highly desirable, and ought to be earnestly sought after by all; yet it is not actually attained by every Christian; nor is it equally enjoyed at all times alike by those who have attained it. Saving faith is an expression which denotes that exercise of mind by which we receive and rest upon Jesus Christ alone for Salvation. and it always, I apprehend, involves an appropriating act;—in other words, in all cases, it implies not only a firm, practical belief that Christ is a divine and all sufficient Saviour, but also an humble, practical reliance upon him as the hope and the *only* hope of the soul. But the assurance of our personal interest in him, is a firm persuasion, derived from inspecting the word of God in our hearts, and from the *witness of the Holy Spirit with our spirits* that we are the children of God by a holy regeneration and a gracious adoption, and shall finally be saved.

The assured confidence of which we speak, is a very different thing from that blind, superstitious confidence which takes for granted without inquiry, that all is right, and that salvation is certain. Genuine Christian assurance is enlightened. It is always preceded by serious and honest self-examination. It rests on evidence and on evidence derived from the Holy Scriptures. It delights, and it much abounds in comparing its evidences with the word of God: and it cherishes a holy jealousy over itself. It is also a very different thing from that Antinomian confidence which professes to be a stranger to all doubts and fears, while the life is careless or corrupt. The assurance which is genuine is as inseparably connected with the love of holiness as it is with meekness and humility. *He that hath this hope in him purifieth himself even as he is pure.*

It is common on this subject, and I think correct, to distinguish between the *assurance of faith*, and the *assurance of hope*. The *assurance of faith* is a firm persuasion of the reality and glory of spiritual objects.—It is a firm, assured persuasion that the gospel, the Saviour whom it proclaims, and its precious promises, have all that reality and glory which the holy Scriptures ascribe to them. But the *assurance of hope* goes further, and is confidently persuaded of a *personal interest* in this Saviour, and in these promises. It is an assured hope that we shall be found in Christ and shall live and reign with him forever. In short, the assurance of faith is an assurance that Christ is, in fact, an almighty, an all sufficient, and most precious Saviour. The assurance of hope, is a firm, unwavering confidence that he is our Saviour, and will be ours forever.

The former of these may be enjoyed without the latter; and is, indeed, a very common attainment among real Christians. The latter is not so common; is never engaged without the former; and wherever it exists, assumes the former as its unfailling basis.

If you ask me, whether it is the *assurance of faith*, or the *assurance of hope* which the apostle here expresses? I answer, it is *both* most distinctly combined. A firm persuasion of the reality

and glory and blessedness of the great foundation of hope, is explicitly mentioned as the basis on which all his confidence of personal salvation rested.—

Such brethren, is the assured confidence which the apostle here expresses. It is an humble, enlightened persuasion that the Saviour and his salvation are great realities; and that they are ours:—a persuasion flowing from scriptural evidence, that we possess the marks of Christian sanctification:—a persuasion which commonly is, and always *ought* to be *proportioned* to that evidence,—a persuasion which, according to its strength, is always accompanied with a holy temper, and a holy practice. But, II. What was the *ground* on which this confidence of the apostle rested, and on which our confidence *ought* to rest, and *must* rest if it be genuine.

One of the most illustrious literary characters of the eighteenth century, the celebrated *Dr. Johnson*, was accustomed strongly to reject the claim of Christian assurance, as an attainment beyond the reach of Christians at the present day. He maintained that no man was warranted in meeting death with entire confidence; “for how,” said he, “can any man be *certain* that he has completely fulfilled the conditions of acceptance with God?” Alas! my dear brethren if our confidence toward God had no other ground to rest upon, than a consciousness of having completely “fulfilled the conditions” according to the apparent understanding of this respected writer, “of our acceptance with God,” we might well sit down in despair. And we might well pronounce the confidence of the venerable apostle before us—who, with one breath confessed himself to be a miserable sinner, and with the next, expressed a strong and assured hope of divine acceptance;—we might well pronounce such confidence to be inconsistent and vain.

But, forever blessed be a God of infinite mercy! there is a firmer and a safer ground of confidence than any thing in ourselves can furnish. There is a better righteousness than our own provided, in the atoning sacrifice and perfect obedience of our great substitute and Redeemer. On this ground it is plain that the penitent and believing sinner—nay, even the chief of sinners, who is deeply conscious that he has not complied with the demands of God’s righteous law, nay, who is conscious that he has broken it in ten thousand aggravated instances:—yet if he believe and embrace the gospel of Christ; if he humbly receive and rest on the Saviour for salvation;—on that precious blood which cleanseth from all sin, and if he be conscious that he *has* thus received and rested upon him, and is doing it;—even *he* unworthy as he feels himself to be—utterly unworthy as he must and certainly will feel himself to be,—may join with the apostle in saying, *I know in whom I have believed, and am persuaded that he is able to keep that which I have committed unto him against that day.*

As a confirmation of these remarks, let us look, for a moment, at the ground of the apostle’s confidence. Here we find that great Christian champion, the apostle *Paul*, at the close of a long, laborious, and exemplary life, giving an account, to a dear and intimate young friend, of the hope that was in him. Perhaps no man had ever more reason than *Paul*, to found his hopes on his own attain-

ments and performances. He had been favoured far beyond most of the children of men by the abundance both of his gifts and graces. He had had extraordinary revelations made to him. He had been *caught up to the third heavens, and there heard unspeakable words which it was not lawful for a man to utter.*

His services, too, in the cause of Christ had been pre-eminent. He had *laboured more abundantly than all the rest of the apostles.* He had preached the gospel, and gathered churches through a very large part of the Roman Empire. He had, perhaps; been the means of converting more souls to the knowledge and love of the truth, than any other man that ever preached the gospel. I repeat it—perhaps no man had ever more reason than *Paul* to found his hopes on his own attainments and performances, and yet, when this man so illustrious for his gifts and graces and labours, comes to speak of the ground of his hope toward God, he says not one word of any of these things, or of any meritorious performance of his own; but rests his whole confidence on that grand foundation which was common to him with all believers, *I know whom I have believed, and am persuaded that he is able to keep that which I have committed unto him against that day.*

As if he had said—“Amidst all my sufferings and infirmities, I am neither intimidated nor discouraged. I have a confidence towards God which raises me above them all. My confidence, however, is founded, not on any qualification or attainment which I find in myself; for I am a poor, polluted, miserable sinner; but on the atoning sacrifice and perfect righteousness of my blessed Saviour. I know him, I know that in him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily. I know that he is *able and willing to save unto the uttermost all that come unto God through him*—I know that he has declared, that *whomsoever cometh unto him he will in no wise cast out.* I am conscious of having humbly complied with this invitation, I am conscious of having embraced him as my Saviour, and of having committed my soul, with all its precious interests, into his hands—the *Holy Spirit witnesseth with my spirit* that he is my only hope and trust. I know that *my Beloved is mine, and that I am his.* Here, therefore, I rest—assured that he is able to keep, and that he will keep, that which I have committed to him. To this as to an *anchor of the soul,* in prosperity and adversity, in sorrow and in joy, I cleave, and *rejoice in hope of the glory of God.*”

And on the same ground may every real Christian, whose faith is strong, and whose evidences of Christian character are bright; who is conscious that he has embraced, and is resting on the Saviour;—on the same ground may he cherish the same blessed confidence which the apostle here expresses. Though he may be humbled under a sense of multiplied transgressions; though he may feel that he deserves to die; and that if a holy God should mark iniquities against him, he could never stand:—though he may feel that his heart is a fountain of iniquity, which, if left to itself, must be his destruction; yet if, like the apostle, he “*knows Christ;*” if the Saviour has been *revealed in him the hope of glory;* if he has cordially repented of all his sins, and has been enabled sincerely to receive and rest on Christ as his righteousness and strength; and if he be assured—

ly conscious that he has, by faith, committed all his most precious interests into his hands;—why may he not adopt;—nay, what can prevent him from adopting the language of the apostle? What can prevent him from *rejoicing in the Lord and joying in the God of his salvation*? What can prevent him from adopting the triumphant language of the same apostle on another occasion—*who shall separate me from the love of Christ? Shall tribulation, or distress, or persecution, or famine, or nakedness, or peril, or sword? Nay, in all these things we are more than conquerors through him that loved us. For I am persuaded that neither death, nor life, nor angels nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature, shall ever be able to separate me from the love of God which is in Christ Jesus my Lord.* Romans, viii. 35—39.

III. But what are the *benefits* of this assurance? I know that these benefits are seriously doubted by many. Is not this plenary confidence of our good estate, some will ask—adapted to make those who enjoy it proud, arrogant and presumptuous? Nay is not, the persuasion, when firmly fixed in the mind of any man, that he is in a state of grace and salvation, and that his eternal happiness is secure, calculated to make him relax in spiritual diligence, and even to indulge in licentiousness of life? I answer by asking in my turn, was this assurance ever enjoyed, by any man, in a higher degree than by the apostle *Paul*? But did it make *him* proud and presumptuous? Did it make *Paul* careless or licentious in his practice? No, it is notorious that its influence in him was directly the reverse: It was connected with humble diligence and universal holiness.—As his assurance increased, his sanctification, in the same proportion, gained strength. It raised him above the world; above the fear of man; above the fear of death. It supported him in his trials; it sweetened his labours; it enabled him to rejoice even in tribulation; nay, amidst all that was adapted to discourage, to terrify, and to depress, it enabled him to *rejoice with joy unspeakable and full of glory.*

And such is the native influence of this assurance, when it is genuine, in all ages. I know that a false and presumptuous confidence is mischievous in its effects.—I know that those who are building their hopes on vain dreams of self-righteousness who say, *peace, peace, when there is no peace*, are always puffed up with spiritual pride, and are apt to be negligent of those very works on which they found their confidence, for, of all persons in the world, those who ascribe most merit to their own works, have the fewest of them to show. But that scriptural assurance which is founded on the finished work of an all sufficient Saviour; which looks forward to a holy heaven as its dwelling place and its home; and which cannot legitimately exist but with growing evidence of sanctification.—such an assurance is demonstrably fitted to animate in duty; to support under trials; to quicken obedience; and to bring down into the soul more of the spirit as well as more of the enjoyment of heaven.

And, accordingly, how often have we seen this blessed assurance of hope, supporting the weak; comforting the feeble minded; displaying its consoling power in the beggar's cottage; in the prison-

er's dungeon; amidst the chains of slavery; under the weakness and pain of disease? and above all, on the bed of death. Nay, how often has it borne the martyr above the fear of death in its most terrifying forms, and enabled him to take up songs of praise even in the midst of the flames!

And well may the assured Christian feel and act thus. When he feels confident that the great interest is secured, how or why should he be deeply anxious about any thing else? What matter is it to *him*, whether he is full or hungry; whether he abounds or suffers need; whether he is loaded with honours, or neglected and forgotten;—nay, whether he suffers a few hours torture or not, when he can, with unwavering confidence call his own *an incorruptible crown—an undefiled inheritance an exceeding and eternal weight of glory?*

The view of this subject which has been given suggests a variety of important lessons. To some of them allow me, before I close, to request your attention. And, 1st. We learn, from what has been said, *the infinite importance of our entertaining just thoughts of Christ.* Some have supposed that it is a matter of comparatively small moment what opinions we entertain concerning the person and character of the blessed Redeemer, whether we consider him as a mere man; or as the most exalted of all creatures; or as Jehovah equal with the Father;—are questions as they imagine, of small moment indeed as scarcely worth the trouble of inquiry or of controversy. And so they think of the great question concerning his atonement, and his imputed righteousness as all speculative matters, of little practical importance. But, my dear brethren, can it be that the question whether my Saviour, to whom I commit my soul, and all my most precious interests, for time and eternity, is a mere man like myself or the true God? Can it be, that the question, whether the captain of salvation, who has promised to *give eternal life to as many as are given him*, is almighty, or a mere feeble creature? Can it be, that the question, whether I am to be justified by my own righteousness, or solely by the atoning blood, and perfect righteousness of a divine Redeemer, is a question of mere speculative indifference? No, brethren the inspired man who penned the words of our text thought otherwise. To “know Christ” as an all sufficient Saviour, was, in his view; all in all, and, O, my friends, if we ever enjoy the comforts of a genuine assurance similar to that which *Paul* enjoyed, it must be connected with a similar estimate of Christ, and rest upon the same precious foundation. Men may, indeed, be calm and tranquil in resting on a Socinian Saviour; but it is the calmness of delusion; it is the tranquillity of death. No, my dear friends, *other foundation can no man lay than that is laid which is Jesus Christ.* 1 Corinthians iii. 11.

2. From what has been said, we learn, in *what manner the happy assurance of which we have been speaking, is to be sought, and also how it is to be maintained after being once enjoyed.* We are to seek this assurance, my friends, not by extraordinary revelations; not by mysterious impulses; not by visions or voices from heaven; but by the ordinary means of God's appointment:—by serious and impartial self-examination; by humble, constant, persevering.

prayer; by searching the Scriptures with a particular view to learning from them our own character; by direct views of the blessed Redeemer's character, sufferings and obedience as the only foundation of hope; and by studying to maintain a holy walk with God, and daily to grow in grace. How was it, my beloved friends, that the apostle *Paul*, and other primitive Christians, were able to decide with so much confidence that Christ and his great salvation were theirs? How did they *know* it, as they say with so much frequency and decision they did? Hear their own language. *We know that we are of God, because we love God and keep his commandments: and again; we know that he abideth in us by the spirit which he hath given us.* And again; *We know that we have passed from death unto life, because we love the brethren.* And again; *In this the children of God are manifest, he that doeth not righteousness is not of God, neither he that loveth not his brother.* Are there any, then, now feeble, languid and doubting in regard to their good estate; ready to ask, how shall we gain assurance? I answer—get more religion. Strive to live nearer to God.—Be more conversant with the Bible, and the throne of grace—pray without ceasing, for more of the spirit of Christ. For, rely upon it, my dear friends, all that assurance which does not flow from *growing evidence of sanctification* is unscriptural and vain.

3. We may see from what has been said that it is *very possible for some who ought to have the comfort of assurance, to deny themselves that comfort.* Some have, no doubt, had all their spiritual hopes clouded by *bodily disease.* They have been so much under the influence of nervous or hypocondrical disorders as to give a melancholly cast to all their mental exercises. There are others who enjoy not the comfort of assurance from an entire missapprehension of the nature of that evidence on which assurance ought to rest. They seem to think, that there must be some voice; some light from Heaven; some sensible impulse, something, in short, addressed to the external senses, and thus banishing all doubt. But, nothing of this kind is taught in Scripture. Doubting, trembling soul! are you satisfied that you are sincerely and habitually resting on the merits of the Saviour as your only hope? Are you conscious of unfeigned love to him? Are you conscious that his cause and kingdom are dear to you "above your chief joy?" Are you certain that sin is your grief and your burden; and that it is your unfeigned desire to be delivered from its pollution as well as from its guilt? Can you say, that you have no doubt of any of these things? Then you ought to have no doubt that Christ and his salvation are yours, and will be yours forever.

4. But are there not some who, instead of being able to adopt the language of our text;—instead of *knowing* that "they are of God"—have rather reason to conclude with a confidence amounting to a dreadful assurance, that they are still *aliens from the commonwealth of Israel and strangers to the covenant of promise.* They are conscious, perhaps, that they believe in the reality of religion, and that they respect it; but they are conscious, at the same time, that they are strangers to its sanctifying and consoling power. To such, if there be any of this character present, I would faithfully and affect-

tionately speak My dear fellow mortals! if the conviction that this is your situation presses upon your minds, reject it not, turn not away from it, but dark and awful as the conclusion is, look at it often, solemnly, and with earnest crying to God for mercy. Recollect the consequence of living and dying in this state. Remember those tremendous words of our Saviour—*if ye believe not that I am he, ye shall die in your sins*. And, O my friends, what is it to die *in your sins*? It is to die with all your sins unpardoned; with all your corrupt nature un sanctified; under the power of that fleshly mind which is the essence of alienation from God; and which, if it be not removed, will inevitably press down your spirits to the prison of endless despair. Are you conscious, then, of living in a state in which, if you die, all this must be the consequence? And are you at ease in this awful condition? Is there no anxiety in contemplating it? Is there no falling tear; no heaving sigh; no secret groan; no crying to God over such a condition as this? O how great is the infatuation of men! May the Lord have mercy upon you, and open your eyes, and pluck you as *brands out of the burning*, and prepare you for the joys of his presence! Amen.

LITERARY HISTORY OF THE PAPAL CONTROVERSY.

No. I.

GENTLEMEN,

It is matter for devout gratitude to God that he has been pleased within a very few years past—and not a little through your labors to awaken the attention of the American people, to the nature and evil designs of Popery.

This is under God, the *great point*. Let honest enquiry have a free course,—and there is nothing to fear.

But still there are difficulties to be removed, though no obstacles that cannot be surmounted. One of the chief difficulties is the want of access to the proper *sources* of knowledge. The books are often not to be had—and indeed when they are, but few persons know which are able; which accredited; and which not. Such information is a great desideratum among us at this time. It is my purpose to attempt in some manner (through your pages) to supply their want, by pointing out the *proper books*, and *giving some account of their character and contents*. For the better distinction and recollection, we shall name six classes of books relating to the popish controversy, which is important to know something of, in order fully to understand it.

I. The first class consists of the *accredited standards of Romanism*—such as the Decrees of Councils, Bulls of Popes, authorized Catechisms, books of Devotion, &c. &c. These are avowedly infallible—on these the church rests her faith.*

*Books and Documents of a peculiar character which have all the sanction necessary to constitute *Papal infallibility*, and which enter into the essence of their system—and yet of which Papists are sufficiently ashamed to distinguish between this and the former class.—These are the *Taxae*, the *Indexes*, the *Lives of the Saints*, the provincial *formularies*, various legends, scattered traditions, books of devotion, books of discipline, &c. &c.

II. Standard writers of that communion, who though not *inerrable*, are endorsed by the universal, or *very general* approval of the church; such as Bellarmine, Thomas Aquinas, Dens, Baromies, &c.

III. Impartial writers of that faith, "Honest Romans," who have dared to speak the truth—though devoted to the system; and have been denounced and blazoned in the index of the Pope, (as might have been expected) without mercy or measure.—These are such as the author of *Onus Ecclesiae*, (the noble Bishop of Saltzburg.) Pascal, Dupin, Thuanus (De Thou) Father Paul, (the historian of the Council of Trent) and a great number of the French Roman Catholics, who stood up for ages, for the *liberties of the Gallican church* against the encroachments of the Italian party, for treason, as it is to say it, *there are parties in the Church of Rome!*

IV. The whole tribe of Protestant writers, great without number, and without measure various in their points of attack, and degrees of merit.

VI. Writers incidentally illustrating the subject; often as much opposed to Protestantism, as to Popery—sinters in history—as Gibbon,—Hume,—*on politics*—antiquity—*criticism*, &c. &c. whom it would be tedious to mention—and superfluous to say, often give very important evidence and illustration.

It will at once appear from the extent of this classification, that no one man can be expected to peruse all the books comprehended in it. The quintessence of the subject may be gotten from a very small number under each class. Every minister of the gospel ought to possess a compendious circle of works on this great controversy making a *system*, and embracing the substance of the matter. The laity may be supplied with all the essential works in a still smaller compass. If some enterprising publisher in our country, would throw into circulation, some twenty or thirty small, cheap volumes in the form of a *Protestant Library*, the good done would in all probability be immense. Most of the books are already prepared, and have been for ages;—the rest would chiefly need only some abridgement—and at most two or three original works, adapting the controversy to the present age, and to the American people, would be abundantly sufficient.—We sincerely hope that the growing demand for works on this subject, will force such a publication forth, in the *course of trade*, if not from the power of a public spirit among our publishers. It is in order to supply in some degree the lack of such a work, that we have now began a series of brief articles, in which we design to examine a few works under the several heads, and in the order mentioned above.

The first work which I shall present to your readers is the *Catechism of the Council of Trent*.—(Catechismus ad Parochas ex Decreto sacrosancti concilii Tredentini.)

The Council of Trent in its 24th session, passed the following decree:—(as I give a translation by a Papal author, the Latin need "not be repeated)—"That the faithful may approach the Sacraments "with greater reverence and devotion, the Holy Council commands "all Bishops not only to explain in a manner accommodated to the "capacity of the receivers, the nature and use of the sacraments

“when they are to be received themselves, *but also to see that every Pastor* piously and prudently do the same, in the vernacular tongue, “should it be necessary and convenient. This exposition is to accord with a form to be prescribed by the holy council, for the administration of all the sacraments *IN A CATECHISM which the Bishops will take care to have faithfully translated into the vernacular language and expounded to the people by all Pastors.*”

In the preface to this catechism, the compilers have said of the Reformers—“besides those voluminous works by which they sought the subversion of the Catholic faith they also composed innumerable smaller books; which veiling their errors under the semblance of piety, *deceived with incredible facility*, the simple and the incautious.” To remedy this evil which as they confess, was keenly felt, the *Holy Fathers* ordered this catechism to be compiled on the basis of the doctrine, set forth by the council, for the *Parish Priests*—that they might instruct the people.

The result was this catechism. It was laboriously and ably compiled by a few distinguished prelates—(four in number) and revised, and finally fitted for the press by the celebrated *Poggiano*. It appeared in the year 1566—under the pontifical sanction of Pius V. It is written of course, in the Latin language, but was very soon translated into the Italian, and several other languages—; and in 1687 into *English* by *John Bromley*. In 1829, the Rev. Jeremiah Donovan, professor of Rhetorick in the Roman Catholic College of Maynooth, issued a new translation, (it has recently been republished in this country with the sanction of the Catholic priesthood) which for bare faced and innumerable frauds, has perhaps no parallel in this or any other age.

Though called a *Catechism*, yet being addressed to the *Parish Priests*, it was designed to *teach the teachers*, and is the best compend of the papal system now extant.—Though guarded in its terrors and skilfully adapted to the circumstances of the age in which it appeared, it yet furnishes in a *portable form*, a summary of the essential errors of Popery.—It ought therefore to be in the hands of every minister of the gospel, in the original if possible, if not in translation. In the latter form it may be purchased for a few shillings, in any *Roman Catholic bookstore*.

Our object is not a minute review, and still less, any attempt at refutation. It is rather as historians than as critics or polemics that we now write, and even in this we must confine ourselves within very narrow limits.

This work (after a preface giving an account of the intention of the council, of the object and authority of the production, and its use and end) divides the whole subject matter, into four parts—the Apostle’s creed, the Sacraments, the Decalogue, and the Lord’s Prayer. Under these is comprehended the whole *Papal system*, not indeed without some forcing.

A few specimens of the character of the whole may suffice. On page 65 (for example)—in the edition of 1802, 1st part, chap. 10, sec. 9th, is the following decisive article “*Haeratici vero atque schismatici, quia ab ecclesia desciverunt: neque enim illi magis ad ecclesiam spectant, quam transfeugae, ad exercitum pertineant, atquo defecerum*

Non regandum, tamen, quin in Ecclesiae, protestate sint ut qui ab ea in iudicium vocentur puniantur, et anathema te dam nentur,—“Heretics and Schismatics, because they have separated from the church, and belong to her only as deserters, belong to the army from which they deserted. It is not however to be denied that they are still in the power of the church, as those who are liable to be called into judgment by her, to be punished, and to be denounced with anathema.”

This is strong food for an American stomach;—bold claims to be promulgated in a free land. *All heretics and schismatics are deserters from the church of Rome—and may still be tried and punished, and cursed.* What is meant by these terms is clearly seen by the scripture proofs cited in the margin.—Among others Rom. xiii. ch. 4 v. “*For he beareth not the sword in vain, for he is the minister of God, a revenger to execute the wrath of God against him that doeth evil.*” Protestants apply this to the civil magistrate, who alone has the power of life and death. Papists say, as we see above, that *sword* is in the hands of the church. Again, Deuteronomy 17 ch. 21 v. “*And the man that will do presumptuously, and that will not hearken unto the priest that standeth to minister there before the Lord thy God, or unto the judge, even that man shall die.*”—That is, they claim as a church the same right over life, that was exercised under the Jewish theocracy by priest or judge!

We have said above that *Donovan's translation* of this catechism, in use in this country, and recommended by the priests, was unparalleled for its frauds. Now for the proof. He translates the above passage, as follows: “*It is not however to be denied that they are still subject to the jurisdiction of the church in as much as they are liable to have judgment passed on (their opinions) to be visited with (spiritual) punishments, and denounced with anathema.*” The words marked in brackets are *fraudulently interpolated*, as any Latin scholar will see they do not belong to the sentence—and the *scripture proofs* cited in the books, expressly declare that it is not *spiritual only, but the sword*, and not for *opinions only*, but for disobeying the priest!

From the above we learn three important lessons—

I. Forgeries and frauds for the good of the church are not sinful—the American Catholic priests who have recommended this author of course think so, for besides their recommendation, they have been fully told of this and other frauds in the discussion between Messrs. Hughes and Breckinridge—yet neither Mr. Hughes nor any other priest or prelate has confessed it or denounced it, though two years have passed.

II. We learn that the church of Rome is on principle, a persecuting church; that she avows—openly, and orders *all her priests* to teach this doctrine to all her people.

III. We learn from the above case that they are *ashamed* of this doctrine, and by *fraud*, conceal their true *system*. How can such men be trusted? How can we ever confide in their accounts of their doctrines and books? They say *hear us*, we hear them! and lo! they deliberately commit fraud on their own standards. Let us then hear their standards.

My next example shall be from the 1st part CONCERNING THE EUCHARIST:—chap iv. sec 33.

Jam vero hoc loco a Pastoribus explicandum est, non solum verum Christi corpus et quidquid ad veram corporis rationem pertinent, VELUT OSSA ET NERVOS, sed etiam totum Christum in hoc sacramento contineri. Docere autem oportet Christum nomen esse Dei et hominis unius scilicet personæ in qua divina et humana natura conjuncta sit. QUARE UTRAMQUE SUBSTANTIAM ET QUÆ UTRIVSQUE SUBSTANTIÆ CONSEQUENTIA SUNT DIVINITATEM ET TOTAM HUMANAM NATURAM, QUAE EX UMINA ET OMNIBUS CORPORIS PARTIBUS—ET SANGUINE ETIAM CONSTAT COMPLECTITUR. QUAE OMNIA IN SACRAMENTO ESSE CREDENDUM EST. *Nam cum in Coelo tota humanitas divinitati in unapersona et hypostasi conjuncta sit, nefas est suspicari, coepus quod in sacramento inest, ab eadem divinitate sejunctum esse.*

TRANSLATION.

"In this place also, the pastor will explain that in this Sacrament are contained not only the true body of Christ, and all that constitutes a true body (SUCH AS THE BONES AND SI-NEWS,) but also Christ, whole and entire. It is also to be taught, that the word Christ designates the man of God, that is to say one person in whom are united the divine and human natures. *Wherefore it is evident that the holy Eucharist contains both and whatever is included in the idea of both, the divinity and humanity whole and entire, the soul, the body and the blood of Christ, with all their component parts, all of which faith teaches, are contained in it. For as in Heaven, the whole humanity is united to the divinity in one hypothesis and person, it were impious to suppose that the body of Christ which is contained in the Sacrament, is separated from the divinity.*"

This is truly terrific, teaching—

(I.) The priest makes his God man—and then the people feed upon him—body, bones, blood, godhead and all.

(II.) It is *impious* to deny this. Poor Protestants! We must be *cannibals*—or *blasphemers*;—eat the God that a man made; or be *destroyed by him* for not believing an infinite *absurdity*!—

(III.) Our *faithful* translation again appears, in the holy *work of corrupting* the text! In the former example, we saw him *putting in words* to alter the sense of a *persecuting doctrine*. Now we see him *putting them out*, to make this terrific doctrine palatable. The words BONES and SINEWS marked in brackets, are wholly dropped in the translation. No wonder he is *ashamed* of them. But he ought to have been still *more* ashamed of *fraud*. Yet we ought not to be surprised at the *fraud*, when the writings of the *fathers*, and even the *word of God* has been designedly corrupted by the church of Rome, and when "*pious frauds*," are legalized and rewarded as a part of the system of Popery!—

Perhaps this language may seem too strong. But it is a *strong* case. And we may here as well as any where give an example from this same translation which leaves no possible room for *error*; and can be charged on *design alone*. It is on the 67th page of the original—part 1st. chap. 10, sec. 12—and in the translation (James Myres' edition—*of your own city*, 1833) 97th page. In the original

there are *thirteen lines* quoted from St. *Ambrose* in this section. But the veritable translation! These *thirteen lines are expunged*, and *twelve other and different lines* composed by the council of Trent, 1200 years after *Ambrose* died, are put into his mouth; and he is made to speak like a true *papist*—whereas in what is quoted from *Ambrose* by the council, *all Christ's apostles are made equal sharers in peculiar titles claimed for Peter alone, by Catholics*. This is the basest fraud I ever knew in this department.

The last example I shall give is in a few sentences from different portions of the *catechism*, in regard to the *priesthood*. For want of space I give the extracts from *Donovan's translation*, omitting the *Latin*. He will hardly be suspected of doing *injustice* to Popery, after the above examples. Page 342, it is thus written:

"In the minister of God who sits in the tribunal of penance, as his legitimate judge, he (the penitent) venerates the power and person of our Lord Jesus Christ? Is this less than blasphemy? Again page 283. "They (the priests) hold the power and place and authority of God on earth." Again, page same, "The power of consecrating and offering the body and blood of our Lord, and of remitting sins, with which the priesthood of the new law is invested; is such as cannot be comprehended by the human mind. Still less can it be equalled by, or assimilated to any thing on earth." The above will prepare the reader for the following—from page 94—5. "And of this the faithful are frequently to be reminded, in order to be convinced that were even the lives of her ministers debased by crime, they are still within her pale, and therefore lose no part of the power with which her ministry invests them." It is no wonder with such doctrines, that the *priests* are *deified*. This is as prophecy foretells, "Sitting as God in the temple of God." Hence if a papal priest is a drunkard, no matter; is he incontinent, no matter still; he is God to the people. "Though debased by crime" he "has lost no part of the power with which her ministry invests him"—he is as was said of the Pope, "a God on earth," though "a Devil in the flesh."

Such are a few specimens of the *Catechism* of the *Council of Trent* one of the *infallible standards* of the Catholic faith, and such is the character of the translation adapted to all people speaking the English language, and approved by the *priesthood* and *prelacy* of Popery in England, Scotland, Ireland, and the United States.

B.

Lafayette College, July 15. 1837.

MESSRS. EDITORS,

In compliance with your request, that I would furnish *something* for the pages of your Magazine, I propose to prepare a series of papers on the fundamental doctrine of Christianity—the doctrine of Justification. And that you and your readers may judge of the matter before you hear it—at least as far as to have an idea of what is coming, and whether it may be worthy an insertion and a perusal, allow me to offer a remark or two explanatory.

1. The doctrine of justification cannot be understood without a knowledge of the fundamental principles of morals, and should therefore be preceded by a clear exhibition of the nature of moral government.

2. It has always appeared to me, that the severance of morality from religion, as if distinct and separate not only as to our intellectual apprehension, but as to their essential nature and bearing upon the practical interests of human society in the present and in the future state, is an “iniquity to be punished by the judges”—a violation of all that is sound in philosophy and true in fact—a vain and wicked attempt to undo ties which God has created to endure forever. Partial but temporary will be the success. In the end, religion—that is—the knowledge of the relations we sustain to God and the practice of the duties which to them pertain—will assert her claim, to the pre-eminence and clearly demonstrate that she embodies the elements of all moral government and teaches and enforces the sum of all human duties. I therefore hope in the progress, to make it appear, that the great principles involved in the doctrine in question, lie equally at the basis of all human governments which secure the interests of man and the honor of his maker; and at the foundation of all that divine government which sways the hearts of sinners here and saints in an endless heaven.

3. It will be at once seen, that, whilst the leading characteristic of the forthcoming papers will be didactic, yet frequently they must assume the argumentative and sometimes even the polemic style. A man who teaches truth must unteach error, if he will do the whole of his work. He must put the mind into her strong holds and shew it how to wield the sword of the spirit in defence of her gates and bulwarks.

Permit me only to add. It may perhaps occur through multitude of avocations, that I cannot meet my engagement; if so I will let you know in due time to prevent improper delay.

Wishing your useful Magazine abundant success, I remain
your friend and brother,

GEORGE JUNKIN.

Chapter I.

ON THE MORAL GOVERNMENT OF GOD IN GENERAL.

The Creator absolutely supreme.

Sec. 1. By an original law of our being we are led to infer causes from their effects. Changes are constantly occurring around us. We observe them. We look for their causes among the events of the past. We look for their effects among the contingencies of the future. We reason from the one to the other and the thought rarely occurs to our minds, that perhaps after all there is no such connexion as is implied in the terms *cause* and *effect*. The one event indeed follows the other in almost uniform succession, but who can show a reason for it? Who can reveal then the chain and display to our view the links of connexion? Can the wise men of this world unveil the mysteries of nature? Can Newton with all his philosophy tell us why a stone projected upwards descends to the earth? If then human wisdom utterly fails, in the simplest operations of nature, if man with all his boasted wisdom, cannot explain the nature of cause and effect, and shew in what it lies, what then? Will he deny all causation? Will he refuse to act on the belief that certain things do always succeed certain other things? Will he refuse to reason and thereby to acquire knowledge? Because he cannot dive to the bottom and bring up from the unfathomable stores of nature, all her pearls and gold, will he refuse to pick up the beautiful pebbles on the strand? No, despite of all his pride he is constrained to reason from effects to causes and from causes to effects. Assuming the existence of a connexion, yet ignorant of what it is and how it operates, he proceeds to reason, and does reason as correctly perhaps as if he knew the whole mystery, and rests in his conclusions with perfect confidence. On this very process of reasoning depend all our conclusions in reference to the business of this life. The farmer sows his grain, the merchant freights his ships, the manufacturer purchases his materials and his machinery—all because they believe causes and effects are connected together, and will continue to follow each other over the busy field of human employment.

Thus it is we trace back effects to their causes, and these again to their causes, and these again to theirs, and so at last reach the conclusion that a great first cause there must be, "of causes mighty cause uncaused" "whose kingdom ruleth over all" and "is an everlasting kingdom, and thy dominion endureth throughout all generations.—The eyes of all wait upon thee; and thou givest them their meat in due season." This grand argument in proof of the divine existence, depends for its whole force upon that law of our minds, by which we are irresistibly impelled to believe that every effect must have a cause. This argument is accounted irrefragably conclusive. All men admit its force: to have stated it clearly has enrolled a great scholar among the benefactors of the human race.

But now if the argument which following up the dependance of material effects upon their causes brings us to such a satisfactory conclusion; much more shall not that which begins with the dependance of mind upon mind, lead to results most perfectly satisfactory? If matter could not create itself, could spirit? Ignorant of a cause adequate to the production of matter, the ancient heathen philosophers assumed its eternity. How much more reasonably might the inference be deduced that spirit is eternal? Our souls have existed from eternity, or they have been created by ourselves, or by some other being. For the belief of their eternal existence we have no evidence. For the belief of their self-creation we have not capacity: the very thought is absurd. For the belief of their creation by an uncreated First Cause, we have capacity and evidence adapted to it. The belief that spirit is the result of creating power is as full and perfect as that matter was created. God is the father of our spirits in a sense far higher than that in which the term is or can be applied to signify our relation to man. He formed us, and the same power which produced us out of nothing, sustains the existence it commenced. In him we live and move and exist.

Let the reader mark narrowly the emotions of his own mind when the question is asked, has God a right of absolute control over all the creatures of his hand? What is the result? Does not your heart recoil at the thought—the right of God—who is this that talks about rights? The creature! and dare he interrogate the Creator on a question of boundary? Can he without impiety agitate the subject of territorial limits? Will he venture to enquire whether God's rights over him and all are uncontrolled and absolute! Has not the potter power over the clay? Surely if any truth commends itself as it were intuitively to the heart and conscience of man, it is the absoluteness of divine right, authority, power over all created existence.

The Creature absolutely dependant.

Sec. II. This is but the counter-part of the preceding—a different way of expressing the same thought. If he that formeth the spirit of man within him, sustaineth that spirit and the body which it controls, both are dependant for being and its continuance. In reference to our bodies we have no self-sustaining power. Is his hand withdrawn? we return to dust. Equally dependant upon the sustaining power of God, is the soul of man. Its immortality is not a matter of physical but only of moral necessity. It can no more exist without God than the body can. If any man ask *how* God keeps us in being; the answer must be, we know not. The fact only is known. Modes of existence are among the secret things that belong unto the Lord our God. And therefore perhaps even the enquiry whether the mode of dependance of rational nature and of material substance, is the same, may be improper, certainly at least wisdom and piety both dictate the exercise of great prudence and humility in the prosecution of it.

We are in the constant habit of describing the government of God over material things under the notion of laws of matter; and sometimes we even think that when we have given names to the different operations and orders of things, we have explained them. The

the truth however is far otherwise. The names are a cover of our ignorance, and are useful only as arbitrary signs of the things or the general order of their occurrence. They explain nothing. Now if this be so in reference to material things how much more may we expect difficulty in forming our conceptions and communicating our thoughts about the laws by which God governs the spiritual world, or even our own nature consisting of both? To this form of the divine administration we apply to the name of *Moral Government*: and altho' much remains inexplicable, yet the dependence of all intelligent creatures upon God, is no doubt as real as that of the brute creation and of inert matter. To point out some leading facts and principles is what we propose in this chapter: and the first shall be in answer to the question, what is the ground of moral obligation?

The will of God is the foundation of moral obligation

Sec. III. The first proof offered of this is the strong presumption arising from the universal practice of human legislation. Under all forms of government among men, from the most perfect aristocracy to the purest democracy, the *will*, of the legislature—the law-making power is authority is law. So fully have men adopted this principle that they very often forget that there is a *will* superior to theirs, by which they are bound, and beyond which they cannot legislate with the hope of binding the human conscience. And this is farther evident from the fact that the interpreters of written law always enquire what was the will of the legislature? What did they intend by this language? If that can be ascertained there is an end of controversy: the law is settled and it must be obeyed, in other words, the citizen is bound by it.

That the will of God is the basis of moral obligation, may be argued from the difficulty—the impossibility of establishing any other. If men are not *bound* to do the will of God *because* it is his will, what then is the true reason for obedience? The happiness of man say some. Whatever will promote human enjoyment upon the whole and in the highest degree is right and *ought* to be done. To this there are several serious objections. First, it makes the creature's happiness the supreme end of his creation, contrary to the testimonies of God on this subject. "Even every one that is called by name, for I have created him for my glory" (Isaiah, 43, 7.) "All things were created by him and for him." (Col. 1. 16.) Thou hast created all things, and for thy pleasure they are and were created." (Rev. 4. 11.) A second objection is found in the fact, that man, short-sighted and imperfect in knowledge, could never be certain whether he was bound to do a particular act or not. For if the *obligation* rests in its adaptation to promote his happiness, upon the whole he must know whether it will so operate before he can feel the *obligation*. But *can* man in one case out of a hundred determine whether the measure proposed will in the end be beneficial to him? Can he run down the consequences of an act into eternity and weigh all its results? Must he not feel himself bound until he knows the certainty that the act proposed will promote his good

upon the whole! Of must he take his first and hasty opinion for a guide? In that case it is manifest he can never be certain that he is right. In this he is the mere creature of blind passion. Whatever he may from selfish feeling think best for him, he is obliged to do.

A third objection therefore is that this account of moral obligation runs into absolute selfishness. The immediate tendency and the remote consequences are to carry away the heart from God, and concentrate its affections in self. The facility with which the sabbath breaker, the profane swearer, the drunkard, the debauchee, can engraft his favourite rule upon this stalk, ought to ensure its exercise. What then is the basis of obligation.

The eternal fitness of things, say others. But to this the above reasoning is in part applicable, and a sufficient reply. Who is to judge whether a given act be or be not agreeable to the eternal fitness of things? Must man be released from moral obligation, until after he perceives in a proposed action its adaptation to the eternal fitness of things? Who then of finite mortals, will ever feel the bonds of duty.

We are thrown back upon the will of God as the only ground of moral obligation. Man is bound to do what God commands, and to abstain from what he forbids, simply *because* he commands and forbids. Beyond and above this there is no reason. Direct reference to this reason is essential to moral virtue. Here again appeal is made to the general sense of mankind. We always estimate the worth of our action by the measure of its regard to this standard. God's will was that Israel should suffer most distressing calamities at the hand of the Assyrian—"Against the people of my wrath will I give him a charge, to take the spoil and to take the prey, and to tread them down like the mire of the streets." But we award no virtue to the Assyrian for the obvious reason that he had no regard at all to the divine will in all that he did. "Howbeit he meaneth not so neither doth his heart think so." (Isa. 10. 6.) When an action is done regardless of God's will, no honour is shown to him, and the practical judgment of mankind refuses the award of virtue.

Such finally is the doctrine of the Bible. It knows no foundation of right or wrong—no obligation but God's will—but as the same passages may often establish the two points, viz. the *obligation* and the *rule* of action let us take them in connexion.

The Will of God Revealed is the rule of Duty.

Sec. IV. It is self evident that it cannot rule, direct and govern us unless it is applied. Accordingly it has been made known in divers manners, and at sundry times. Let us keep our eye upon the position, that the rule and its obligations are the will of God made known. Multitudes of passages might be quoted—a sample follows—"Thou shalt not eat of it for in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." (Gen. 2. 17.) "Make thee an ark of Gopher wood," &c. (6. 19.) "He doeth according to his will in the army of heaven and among the inhabitants of the earth." (Dan. 4. 35.) "I will have mercy on whom I will have mercy, and I will have

compassion on whom I will have compassion." (Rom. 9. 15.) "I seek not to do mine own will but the will of the Father which hath sent me." (John, 5. 30.) "My meat is to do the will of him that sent me and to finish his work." (John 4. 34. 6. 38.) "I delight to do thy will O my God—yea thy law is within in my heart." (Ps. 40. 8.) "Whosoever shall do the will of God, the same is my brother and sister and mother." Mark. 3. 35.

From these passages no man can well avoid seeing that, 1st God's own rule of action is his own will—higher and holier there can be none.

2. To the will of God, Jesus the Saviour of men, uniformly referred as containing the *obligation* and the *rule* of his own action. Even when the desires of his perishable nature—his animal body—were for escape yet his soul felt the binding obligation of the divine will—"not as I will but as thou wilt." Reader, does not this settle the question? If the Son of God looked no higher—no lower—no farther, why should you?

3. To man compliance with the will of God, *because* it is the will of God—is the perfection of moral virtue. He who does so comply is a son of God, a brother of the Lord of Glory, the man of Calvary. No higher motive can draw—no stronger obligation can bind us. A loftier aim exceeds our conception—a lower falls short of God's requirement and our high destinies.

It remains only to enquire how this will is made known to us, and to this the answer is prompt—viz. In his two books—the book of providence and the book of Revelation.

In God's book of providence he is daily displaying his will. All that occurs around us, whatever be the agency, is according to his will. Whether prosperity or adversity be our lot, we are called upon to acquiesce without a murmur. In his book of revelation he has recorded the great principles of his government, both preceptively and practically. He prescribes rules of faith, and rules of duty. He addresses his law and his gospel, his precepts and his promises—and his examples to be shunned or to be imitated, to the proper faculties of our nature, which constitute us rational and accountable beings.

In addition to the above the reader's attention is invited to a striking fact, viz., that whenever the heart of man is pierced, and his soul bowed down before the majesty of heaven—whenever he begins to feel in the deep consciousness of his agitated bosom that his accountabilities are fearful and must be met, he enquires according to the doctrine we advocate—"What *will* thou have me to do?" Does not any man who has been taught of God, know this to be true? Is there not therefore a recorded testimony in every sanctified heart, to the correctness of the rule and the reality of its obligation? Unquestionably this is the very principle of Christian fortitude and Christian heroism. Under its general influences the renewed man has only one inquiry in reference to any proposed enterprise—is it *the will of God*? Satisfied of this his heart tells him it must be done. Difficulties, dangers, peril, death, privations, hardships, persecution, rack, torture, burning—all present no obstacle—onward he presses in the path marked out for him by the will of his Father, obedience to *that* is his only responsibility.

Rational Intelligence necessary to moral agency.

Sec. V. In all that has been said about the obligation and rule of action, it has been assumed thus far that for every talent he possesses man is accountable—nor shall any attempt now be made to prove the correctness of the assumption. It shall still be assumed that where God has given he will require, and this in proportion to the amount of the gift. This truth is so fully and so plainly set forth in the parable of the talents, that it seems utterly useless to delay for the purpose of either illustration or proof.

The position here presented is simply this—that if man (or any other creature) has not reason—if he has no capacity to compare ideas, to make their agreement or difference, and draw conclusions, and infer results of conduct, he would not be moral: that is, he would not be under a law revealed and liable to punishment for its violation, or to reward for its obedience. We never think of treating idiots or infants or brutes as subjects of moral law. Let the evidence be presented which shall convince a bench of judges that the prisoner before them, on a charge of murder was devoid of reason at the time the deed was perpetrated, and they immediately and without hesitation decide that it is not murder. It may be in evidence that the deed was voluntary, the result of design, still in the absence of reason they will not pronounce him guilty of murder. Such is the common sense of mankind; such the doctrine of Scripture, the unhappy demoniac is pitied, but not censured.

On this point there is no controversy. But whether rational intelligence is *all* that is necessary to moral accountability is a different question, and one involved in some difficulty and not without some importance to our future inquiries. Yet this question is not raised here with a view to its full discussion, and the hope of its satisfactory solution but simply to give occasion to a remark or two preparatory to our next position.

The first remark is that a process of reasoning may occur to which in itself we can ascribe no moral character. What are the moral features of a mathematical demonstration? Using the terms in a moral sense, can you say it is right or wrong? Thus it would seem that *as mere reasoning*, it is devoid of moral attributes. This is probably the reason why Edwards reckons the understanding a natural faculty. He describes natural inability as existing “when we cannot do a thing if we will, because what is most commonly called *nature*, does not allow of it, or because of some impeding defect, or obstacle that is extrinsic to the will; either in the faculty of understanding, constitution of body, or external objects.” Mark ii. 35. Here it is manifest he places the understanding, that is the rational faculty, as contra-distinguished from the moral powers; among the natural powers.

Hence it has been argued that brutes reason, and the case of the dog who scented his master's footsteps has been adduced as proof, when he came to the triple fork in the road and had scented along two of the branches, and perceiving no cent in either, he instantly took the third without smelling it at all. The process is simple,

one of the three the master took—but he did not take the right, nor the middle, therefore he did take the left. But if brutes reason are they moral? Men do not so account it—they have never proceeded on the belief of it. May we not infer that something more than simply a capacity to reason, is included in our idea of moral agency.

DOCUMENTARY HISTORY OF THE ASSEMBLY OF 1837;

No. 4.

Corruption of the Church through foreign interference. The case of the voluntary societies. Resolution against the AMERICAN HOME MISSIONARY AND EDUCATION SOCIETIES, and their branches.

It has been assumed as true in those operations for benevolent objects, which have been conducted by the union of several denominations of Christians, for some years past—that the only principle on which such an action can take place—is what is called the *voluntary principle*. That is, that all organized churches as such must surrender their control over the object in question, into the hands of persons who are virtually self appointed—and whose agents are utterly irresponsible to any church, or tribunal—and who perpetuating themselves from generation to generation—must in time engross all the rights, all the power, and all the duties of all the churches subjected to their control.

We do not intend at this time to discuss the whole question covered by this so called voluntary principle, nor to call in doubt the applicability of the principle itself to a few very important cases. It may however be questioned, and in our opinion, will before many years, be obliged to be investigated—whether there is not some feasible method by which the church of God can exercise a general supervision and control, over all the great benevolent societies; and some way in which the various Christian denominations, by means of their regular tribunals, may act, or delegate their members to act with each other, in the great interests which require united effort;—rather than trust such vast movements to accident; or the possibility of falling, as they too often have done, into utterly unsuitable hands.

No sober man will at present deny, that very great abuses have already grown up under the sanction of this principle; abuses so gross and flagrant, that all denominations have been obliged to cast about them, in order to discover how many parts of the grand Christian scheme, there are which can be as well managed without, as with united action, and thus, in how many points they can be safe from foreign intrusion, and hurtful interference.—There is hardly a commandment of God to his church, enforcing effort for the conversion of the world—that has not been made the ground and pretext, for the formation of some voluntary society; and there is no duty of the church so specific and clear, as to exclude the unauthorized intrusion of that zeal which is not according to knowledge.

In short, it is undeniable that many subjects which required no such aid, and which were either trifling or private; and many others which such societies had no sort of business with, have been brought under the action of their favourite principle; and that the evil has grown to a magnitude which requires immediate and vigorous remedies to remove it.

Nor is this all. These societies have afforded means of employment to many persons, who would have found it difficult to sustain themselves otherwise as nominal ministers of the gospel, and thus have offered a constantly increasing temptation to improper persons to turn their thoughts towards the ministry, from improper motives. — They have moreover afforded too great facilities, to dissatisfied and discontented persons to break up relations which might otherwise have been stable; nothing more being necessary for a person who wished for change, than to get employment, as one of the hundreds of agents of one of the scores of societies with which the country abounds; or if he encountered any difficulty in doing so, to form some new society of his own, and getting three women and two boys to compose it, call it *American Home or Foreign*, something or other, and set out on his travels, as its general agent. Nor does the evil end even here. These societies thus formed, consider themselves obliged to excite a commotion and organize public sentiment, each in favor of its peculiar views and principles; and they all, and all their agents are ready to think hard and to speak evil, of any pastor whose house, pulpit, and congregation, are not all open at their bidding. We speak from considerable personal experience, when we assert, in general, that a pastor is to be considered fortunate, who escapes serious trouble, from the agents of the voluntary societies of the day.

But beyond all these, there are evils of a general kind which must be arrested, or we must all sit down, willing subjects at the feet of the executive committees of these bodies. At this moment the abolition societies, are attempting to dictate the laws of Christian morals to all the churches of God; and the last General Assembly is reviled over the whole land, because it did not see fit, at their bidding, to take up the subject of slavery and reverse its whole current of wise and just decisions on that subject. It is but lately, that a portion of the Temperance societies undertook to discuss, settle, and dictate to the churches, the proper mode and elements, in the administration of the Lord's Supper. For ten years, the Home Missionary and Education societies, have been contending with us, about the right of educating our ministers and then locating them. In 1836 the friends and the influence of the principles of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions — effected a deliberate refusal to the General Assembly of our church, of liberty or power, to conduct Foreign Missions at all! And that the influence of every one of these voluntary societies—yes, every one that has acted in our church, without any exception—has for the last six years been thrown decidedly against the cause of orthodoxy, and decidedly in favor of the cause of error—is a fact perfectly notorious in the whole length and breadth of the church, and capable of proof against leading agents, of every one of them.

These things are intolerable; and there is no doubt that *all who* regard the order of God's house, the soundness of the ministry, the purity of a preached gospel, and the necessity of organized opposition to organized evils—will set their faces like flints against all these societies whatever may be their names or pretended objects, so long as they set themselves against the peace of Jerusalem.—There must therefore be a radical reform on this subject. Those societies that appear to be really necessary and useful—must put their affairs in such a posture, as not to interfere with us, in our pastoral and ecclesiastical rights and duties—nor above all with sound doctrine in our churches. As to all the rest with their secretaries and agents, they had better follow the advice of Frederick the Great to the lawyers of his kingdom. Sire, said they—your majesty's reform of the courts will ruin us all: what are we to do? Do! Said Frederick: why, as many of you as are five feet six—may enlist in my dragoons: the rest may beat the drum.—And so, let as many of those who are trooping about the land on useless errands, as are competent, preach the gospel; let the rest go to some useful secular employment.

Amongst all the acts of the Convention which preceded the Assembly, there was not one more just and pertinent than those which called upon these great benevolent societies to use very great caution—in conducting their operations, in the bosom of our church, and expressed the necessity for excluding two of them with their branches from our churches. And amongst the decisions of the Assembly, few were of more practical importance than the following resolution, which was adopted by a vote of 124 yeas, to 86 nays, —against the same institutions.

Resolved, That while we desire that no body of Christian men of other denominations should be prevented from choosing their own plans of doing good, and while we claim no right to complain, should they exceed us in energy and zeal; we believe that facts too familiar to need repetition here, warrant us in affirming that the organization and operations of the so called American Home Missionary Society, and American Education Society, and its branches of whatever name, are exceedingly injurious to the peace and purity of the Presbyterian church:—we recommend accordingly, that they should cease to operate within any of our churches.

The object of the present article is especially to illustrate and defend this resolution; and to put in a clear light, the character of the two societies against which it warns our churches, and the nature of the evils we have experienced, and without this testimony against them, would to a still greater degree, have suffered by their means. As heretofore, we will throw into a few separate paragraphs, the leading facts and arguments of the case.

I. We find the following abstract of the eleventh annual *Report of the American Home Missionary Society*, in the New York Evangelist of the 20th May, and doubt not that it was furnished by some one in the confidence of the society. A pretty fair idea will be gathered from it, of the extent of that society, and its operations for the two years, ending in May, 1836 and 1837.

The last Annual Report brought the history of this Society, down to the 11th of May, 1836. There had then been employed, during the whole or some portions of the preceding year, in the United States, and the adjoining territories and provinces, 755 missionaries, to which were added 17 pastors and evangelists in France, towards whose support this society had contributed important aid, making the whole number reported at that time, 772. During the year which has since elapsed, the Committee have aided in the support of 810 missionaries and agents, of whom 764 have been employed in the United States and territories, 22 in the Provinces of Upper and Lower Canada, and 24 in France, in co-operation with the French Evangelical Societies of Paris and Geneva.

Receipts from each State, and Missionaries employed in each, during the whole or part of the year.

STATES.	RECEIPTS.	NO. OF MISS.		
1. Maine	\$7,498 36	107		
2. New-Hampshire	7,211 55	63		
3. Vermont	4,579 67	50		
4. Massachusetts	18,157 55	74		
5. Rhode Island	501 48			
6. Connecticut	9,173 07	37		
7. New York	24,624 27	186		
8. New Jersey	2,684 38	6		
9. Pennsylvania	4,756 41	34		
10. Delaware	311 6	1		
11. Maryland	71 775	1		
12. Virginia	10 00	5		
13. North Carolina		1		
14. South Carolina	107 00			
15. Georgia	33 00	1		
16. Alabama	50 00			
17. Mississippi		3		
18. Louisiana				
19. Arkansas Territory		1		
20. Tennessee	} 3,452 58	} 12		
21. Kentucky			} 72	
22. Ohio				} 7
23. Indiana				
24. Illinois	1,457 25	1		
25. Missouri	5 00	39		
26. Missouri Territory		2		
27. Wisconsin Territory	30 00	1		
28. Michigan	363 00	29		
29. Upper Canada	38 00	6		
30. Lower Canada		16		
31. France		24		
32. Unknown	52 50			
		810		

RECAPITULATION.

Of the missionaries and agents enumerated in the preceding table, including 17 in France, 578 were in commission at the commencement of the year, a large proportion of whom have been re-appointed, and are still in the service of the Society, and 232 new appointments have been made, making the whole number aided within the last year, including 24 in

France, under the care of the evangelical societies of Paris and Geneva, 810.

Of these, 525 are settled as pastors, or are employed as stated supplies in single congregations, and 191 extend their labors, either as pastors or stated supplies, to two or three congregations each, and 24, including agents, are employed on larger fields.

The number of congregations, missionary districts, and fields of agency thus supplied, in whole or part, during the year has been 1,025, and the amount of ministerial labor performed under commissions from this society, since the date of our last report, has been 554 years.

Of the whole 810 agents and missionaries, it appears that 517 were employed in New York and the New England States, 247 in the 19 other states or territories of the union—and the remaining 46 in what may be called foreign parts. The report computes in 1836 "17 pastors and evangelists in France"—amongst its missionaries; and in 1837 it includes "24 in France, under the care of the evangelical societies of Paris and Geneva." We had been informed both in this country and in Europe, that Dr. Peters had furnished aid to some extent, and to some one or more of the benevolent societies of the continent, acting with special reference to the evangelization of the French population of Europe: but we never imagined for a moment, that the individuals to whom this assistance should ultimately come, could be called in any fair, honest or ordinary sense, the "agents or missionaries" of this society. Having strong reasons, both general and personal to suppose that this statement was merely intended to swell the list of this society—and that it was injurious to the cause of the Christians of France, and a fraud on those of the United States,—we distinctly called the attention of Dr. Peters to the subject on the floor of the last General Assembly; and he in reply to our questions asserted in the most positive manner, that his society had 24 missionaries in France.—We can only say, that since this statement was made we have received the number of the *Archives Du Christianisme*, (the principal Religious Journal of France) issued on the 13th May last, containing pretty full accounts of the "*Assemblees generales et annueles a Paris*," that amongst others, a report occupying two pages and a half of the newspaper (which is about the size of a folio book) is given of the fourth annual meeting of the *Evangelical Society of France*, which occurred on the 19th of April last; and that in this report not one word occurs to confirm Dr. Peters's statement,—but much to throw suspicion on it—if not positively to disprove its truth. We call upon him, to place the subject in such a light as will save his own character and that of his society.

But to return to the argument; we find that of these 810 agents and missionaries, 595 are pastors, and above 1000 congregations, and districts are embraced in the entire operations of the society.—We discover that above 400 of these individuals, are acting in the bounds of the Presbyterian church, and that they annually gather, in its bounds about \$38,000; and throughout the whole land about \$100,000; which is spent by Dr. Peters and his committee, year by year.

Now we assert in the broadest terms, that this is a power enormous and unparalleled,—and that nothing but confusion and ruin

can be expected, as long as it is allowed to remain in the hands of persons, utterly irresponsible for its exercise. Can the General Assembly, or any Synod, or any Presbytery, call on Dr. Peters to render a full and just account of this enormous influence, and of these vast sums of money? He may if he chooses use it to corrupt our doctrine, as he has been long and loudly charged with having done. And in answer to all these repeated accusations, we look in vain for any satisfactory defence or explanation.—Nor can he be ignorant, that rumors are afloat, and uncontradicted by his friends, not only that he has largely partaken of the mania for speculation in real estate, which surely ministers of the gospel, and agents who control moneys, should avoid, but that his notes, with the name of the General agent of the American Education society on them, were offered freely, in the New York note market? *We have this fact, directly from one of the most respectable men, merchants and Christians, on earth.* And we ask Dr. Peters, to remember the pains he took some years ago, to throw suspicion over the accounts and reports of the Assembly's board of Missions; and we ask Dr. Patten, to remember the efforts so recently made, to produce false and injurious impressions against the late and the present management of the Assembly's board of Education, and then to consider whether, their own cases do not require greater circumspection!

The power of Dr. Peters is greater than that of all the Papal Bishops in the United States. It is twice as great as that of all the Episcopal Bishops. Eight hundred agents—and \$100,000 per annum!! and no responsibility,—except such as the grand Turk, and the Zar, owe with him—to public opinion!! Let us try this *on paper*, in regard to our own church. We had in the year corresponding to the year 1837 of the Home Missionary, 128 Presbyteries, and 1972 ministers. This would be about 15 ministers to each Presbytery, on an average. Now take Dr. Peters's 404 agents and missionaries, and distribute them equally by eight in each presbytery, and you find that he has the actual majority in 50 of our Presbyteries, under his pay.—and so far the means of placing on the floor of our Assembly about 100 members.—But this is supposing that his society has no friends, who are not in its pay—which is very far from the fact. Indeed it is rather surprising that with such tremendous means the whole church has not been long ago at his feet; and one has only to examine the facts of the case, to see that he had much reason to suppose himself out of the reach of his despised opponents, and therefore much temptation to assume the uncompromising, bitter and violent tone, which has of late years, characterized all his proceedings—and especially his conduct in the Assembly of 1836, and the temper exhibited in the malignant little book published to defend his course there.

II. Let us now turn our attention for a moment, to the nature, operations and extent of the other institution mentioned in the resolution of the General Assembly. The American Education Society has been in existence about as long as the Home Missionary Society, and the principles of its organization and action, are precisely similar to those of the other. It is its part to take the poor and pious youth, who has the gospel ministry in view—and educate him thoroughly; then when licensed to preach the gospel he falls

into the hands of the Home Missionary Society with an average debt of three or four hundred dollars—due to the other society, for which it has his bonds. These bonds are free from interest for three or four years; at the end of which time, interest begins to run and the Home Missionary Society, will at once take the licensed beneficiary under its care, guarantee to him \$400 a year, and send him forth, to vacancies or fields already provided, in a way of which we will speak presently,—to ask the largest amount possible of this sum, from the people of his charge. He is thus enabled in a few years to pay the first society—and becomes the almoner of the second, both of which thus operate into each other's hands—and control at once the churches and their ministers. Nor is this the whole. For the American Education Society, having above eleven hundred beneficiaries under its care—exercises a power direct and indirect over all the institutions of learning in the country, very similar to that exercised in another form by its sister society, over the church courts. And the two unitedly, subsidise an amount of the educated intellect of the country, which it is fearful to contemplate—and already dangerous to a man's reputation to resist.—

The annexed table reveals results over which every patriot and christian should tremble. The principle openly avowed by the agents of this Education Society from the very beginning, and from the highest to the lowest—has been *that every pious young man, ought to preach the gospel, unless there be special reasons to the contrary.* This single, tremendous, and utterly unsound principle; would be enough to account for the fact, that an enormous proportion of the beneficiaries of this society, should be unfit in all respects for the gospel ministry—and imbued with every sort of new opinion. But we mention it now only to show the frightful facility with which the principles of the following table, may be carried into practical operation. It will at once appear that it was meant to be *secret*, and was confided only to those supposed to be friendly to the cause. We take it from the Presbyterian of October 22, 1835—for which it was furnished by an individual, who received it from the chairman of one of the society's examining committees,—and who left the original for public inspection, with the editor. It is only necessary to say in addition that this society, more effectually to de-lude our churches, established a branch which it called the *Presbyterian Education Society*, and that it carried on the unworthy and deceptive trick, until public ridicule and contempt, forced it to change the name, a few months back.

“(NOT PUBLISHED.)

“The following Table is designed to show the probable results of a Scholarship given to the American Education Society, upon its present system; allowing that, on an average, one minister should be educated upon the foundation in seven years; and that one half of what is now loaned to beneficiaries in colleges should be refunded, which would double each scholarship in twenty-eight years.—The calculation is made for a period of one hundred and five years.

flected on the subject. Such is the estimate for a single century. What then would it be for centuries to come? The increase of our population, great as it is, does not advance in a more rapid ratio.

"The sum of one thousand dollars, if given for immediate use, or to be used in portions as called for, would upon the same general suppositions as before, educate in seven years two ministers; in seven years more one minister; and at the end of another term of seven years a fractional part would be left, which, together with all subsequent repayments in the same way might amount to a sum equal to what is expended in educating one minister.—Total 4 ministers."

III. It can never be pretended by any candid man, that the whole organization of these institutions is not directly the reverse of Presbyterian. They do not embody in them the principle of representation, which is fundamental in our whole system. They reject all notion of responsibility direct or indirect to any body but their own subscribers; and the only remedy allowed them, is to subscribe no more. The idea of supervision, control, and direction in any way whatever, by the churches, is carefully excluded. It is in short, a mere temporary, and half-organized union of a few persons—whose whole use seems to be, to appoint Dr. Peters, Dr. Patten, or somebody else—and then to remain dormant, like one of the seven sleepers, until a new appointment is to be made. But in the mean time, their agents and secretaries, and committees—superintend the education of the future ministry of the church—commission, send out, and locate evangelists and pastors, and perform, not even jointly with the church, but to the careful exclusion of its authority, many of the most important functions which God has devolved upon it. This may be a good or bad system; but to call it the Christian, or Presbyterian system, is a gross perversion of terms.

The power thus usurped over our churches, was at the same moment usurped over several other denominations—and the design of subjugating most others, openly avowed. The Education Society was bound to receive youth, from all other churches, as freely as from ours; and the Missionary Society to send forth any that might come to hand. Neither Society claimed any power to look beyond the mere *fact of good standing*, in the particular denomination to which the beneficiary, or missionary belonged.—Hence it necessarily resulted, that they formed a grand circulating system, by which all good and all evil, in any particular denomination, would necessarily flow into all the rest; and by means of which, all would at length be deprived of all things peculiar to them, and melted down into one new, and mighty sect—which would have been from the nature of the case, modelled after the weakest of all in church order, and the least evangelical of all, in doctrine.

Here surely was a bright prospect for sound Presbyterianism, even in the most favourable circumstances, and when the Christian world was in its usual state. But this certainty of final ruin began to draw very nigh in the actual state of affairs. By the abstract of the Missionary Report for 1837 published above, it appears, as already stated, that Dr. Peters had in New York and New England 517 agents; and in all the rest of the nation 217. It is therefore mathematically certain, that the chances of all the rest of the nation

influencing New York and New England—were not quite as 1 to 2 that they would influence them. Or in other words, the probability was as 2 to 1 and more—that the Presbyterian church would through the agency of Dr. Peters and Dr. Patten (now aided by a Mr. Labbaree) be made Taylorite, or Abolitionist, or Perfectionist, or any other *ite, ism, or ist*, that might spring up in that region most fertile in inventions, and thence circulate into the very vitals of our body.

That the management of both these societies were fully sensible of this tendency of things, and fully disposed to use their vast powers, to remodel the Presbyterian church to *a certain extent*, is manifest, from many public and notorious facts. That they had both thoroughly identified themselves with the New School party, and the errors and disorders of its leaders, is capable of being demonstrated. That both had firmly resolved to occupy the whole ground in our church, to the ruin and exclusion of our own boards, is abundantly manifest. So that in point of fact, the Presbyterian church had before it, a struggle for life or death, with these two societies;—and to have failed of doing what the last Assembly did, would have been an act at once of folly, of cowardice and of faithlessness, well rewarded by what would have inevitably followed, the ruin of the church. Here let us briefly illustrate these positions by a few facts.

In the Assembly of 1831 a compromise between the old and new school parties, resulted in the call of a convention on the subject of Home missions at Cincinnati. This convention, which embodied the opinions of all our Presbyteries in the Mississippi valley—decided by an immense majority, for our own board, and against Dr. Peters and his. And yet instead of regarding this decision, as he was bound to have done, both by honor and by covenant—he sent only the more agents into that field, and made only the more earnest efforts to occupy the whole region.

About the same time (in the fall of 1831) the Synod of Kentucky took up the whole subject of the education of young men for the ministry; and the agents of both boards being present—namely, Dr. John Breckinridge, and Mr. F. Y. Vail—both were heard in full, upon the whole subject; and then although the full and fair understanding was that *only one board* should act in the field; *nothing* of the sort was ever done by the Education Society.

If any one will take the trouble to trace the gradual development of these societies, in any particular region of the church, he will find that wherever they have operated most in our bounds—*there* has been most irregularity, disorder and heresy. If he will examine the schools and colleges which their beneficiaries most frequent—he will find them in many cases such as have both experienced most trouble from the rampart fanaticism of the times—and fallen most under public suspicion, for errors in doctrine. If he will consider the party votes in our General Assembly for seven years, he will find the friends, beneficiaries, and agents of these societies, almost without exception, ranged against orthodoxy and order. In the four Synods separated from our communion, more than a fourth

part of all the ministers appear to have been up to the present time in the same condition. Of the 69 ministerial votes against Dr. Miller's resolution, in regard to Barnes's Notes on Romans, in the Assembly of 1836, 20 were given by persons connected with the Home Missionary Society; and 24 of the minority of the Assembly of 1837, or about one third of the ministers, were in the same situation.

The agents of both these societies have always taken the ground that *but one board ought to exist*, for the purposes contemplated by each of theirs; and of course that the boards of our church ought to cease to exist. The Assembly of 1836, (a warm New School body) went so far as strike out of the annual report of its own board of Education, a masterly correspondence, which put Dr. Patten in the wrong and to silence on this subject. And Dr. Peters, from the beginning of his career, has laboured steadily, for the total suppression of our board. He and his particular friends in the Assembly of 1836 made a movement to a elect New School direction for our boards; and according to the testimony both of Dr. Witherspoon and Dr. John McDowell, given before the last Assembly, the settled opposition of Dr. Peters, to the Assembly's board of Home Missions, was the main reason why the difficulties in the Assembly of 1836 in regard to the subject of Foreign Missions, could not be composed, and why the disgraceful action of that body on that subject took place. All who witnessed, will never be able to forget the humiliating spectacle presented by Dr. Peters, when convicted by the gentleman already mentioned, and by his own repeated written and printed declarations—of the most uncompromising hostility to any ecclesiastical organization for missions; but which, for his own purposes, he was ready to explain away, and did deny in the last Assembly. The writer of this article, was told by an intimate friend of Dr. Peters in Europe, that he had written to him after the adjournment of the Assembly of 1836, that he, Dr. Peters, would rather see the Presbyterian church divided than see the Assembly engage in conducting Foreign Missions! And when we offered to make the statement on the floor of the Assembly, at the time of the flat contradiction, as to a matter of fact between Dr. Witherspoon and Dr. Peters; Col. Jessup, an intimate friend of Dr. Peters, who had got the floor, refused to allow us to make any statement—though told publicly that we had providentially come to the knowledge of a fact, that directly elucidated the point in controversy!!

IV. Finally, it appears to us to have been an act of naked justice to our own churches, to the young men educated and sent out by these societies, and to their numerous friends, who are not in their secret policy, that the Assembly should have passed the resolution we are now considering.

The General Assembly had often recommended these societies to the churches under its care. Multitudes of the best men in our communion had given them the sanction of their names. Unsparring pains had been taken by these associations, to hoodwink and cajole all that could be won, and to break down and degrade all whose sturdy obstinacy was too obtuse to be enlightened, and too dull to be seduced. But here as in all such cases, the deception

which hid part of its motives and part of its end, began to find itself exposed by its very success. Neither our church, nor our fathers in it, had ever intended to aid in the prostration of our standards, and the subversion of our order. It was therefore a most peculiar duty, on the part of the Assembly and those brethren, who had so often given countenance to these societies—now that their true character and designs can be no longer doubted—to speak out their present convictions—and warn those whom their former recommendations had misled—that they had seen abundant reason to change their sentiments and opinions. In this, as in all things beside, it needs only an inspection of the resolution actually passed, to be convinced that the moderation of the Assembly, was as signal as its courage and wisdom.

Nor Can there be the least doubt, that in this, as in other parts of the great reform so gloriously commenced, the whole church will respond to the voice of the faithful men, who by God's grace have done so great things for his name and cause. Sound men will withdraw their countenance from these bodies, and unite in support of their own boards who for years past have furnished a more efficient, and more orderly mode of doing all the good that these could effect—and have been proportionately, far more blessed in the avowed objects of their mutual labours, than their more boastful opponents. This will be considered rather strange by many—when they remember first that orthodoxy is always represented by the New School as being at once averse to effort, and when compelled to work, incapable of success, and unworthy of God's smiles; and secondly, that the widest possible difference exists in the minds of the two parties, as to what really constitutes success—and that every point of this difference, would tell favourably *on paper*, for the anti-presbyterian party.

Nay, there is much reason to hope, that the influence of this vote of the Assembly will reach far beyond our own church. It may induce the Dutch reformed church which is ready to be engulfed by Drs. Peters and Patten—and the Lutheran and German Reformed churches which are being prepared for the next conquest—to pause and look carefully before they are enslaved past redemption, and bound hand and foot, by men who are unworthy of their confidence—and by principles which must undermine and remodel, if not subvert their whole doctrine and order. The congregational churches find in the principles on which these bodies are organized, their own views and opinions, set in action; and it must amuse as well as astonish them to see the gullibility of the other churches, in swallowing their distinctive doctrines, merely because, a new label was printed on the parcel. But it is fully to be expected, first, that the evangelical portion of these churches, will never consent to be identified with the men and measures of these societies; and 2ndly, that even those of a looser kind, will hardly agree to forfeit all hope of success, by adhering to men and courses, *that have been found out*. Nor is it unreasonable to presume that the hundreds of young men in the Congregational churches who are looking to the ministry, will consider their future usefulness of more consequence, than to adhere obstinately to societies which in their present condition,

and with their present management and principles are shunned, and dreaded, by nine tenths of those churches, and the great mass of that population, amongst which they expect to seek future settlements.

Upon the whole therefore, we are fully persuaded, that the wise and firm conduct of the Assembly, in this particular—will purge our church of a most dangerous and extended evil influence and give increased efficiency to our own operations, and increased unity to our whole body: that it will awaken other churches founded upon principles similar to ours—to a proper sense of their condition, on this whole subject; that it will oblige the Congregational churches, who must naturally use some such bodies, to look more carefully after them, and organise them under proper persons, and on less aggressive principles; that the whole rising band of young ministers, who need to be aided in some form,—will be encouraged to exercise greater caution in putting themselves into the hands of those who will use them for evil and party purposes; and that these societies, will be eventually remodelled and placed on bearable grounds, and in proper hands—or they will both be forsaken by all Evangelical men, of every name and shade of doctrine. Our prayer to God is that kindred institutions may be induced in due season, to profit by the example of their career and fate.

BISHOPS FULL, *versus*, BISHOPS EMPTY.

We are informed by Tacitus that it was a custom of the ancient Germans to decide all important questions twice; once namely, when *sober* and once afterwards when *drunk*. By this means they supposed they were sure to get at the true end of each difficult subject; for if both the *drunk* and *sober* decision was the same, it might be safely followed; if they were different—either might be followed; if opposite, a medium might be observed.

The conduct of the dignitaries of the papal church in this country very often reminds us of this habit of our ancestors; and we know not that a more notable instance of it has lately occurred than is furnished by *Bishop England*—as his sayings and doings are reported, in the *Baltimore American*—from the *Norfolk Beacon*—on the occasion of a fourth of July dinner at Charleston, South Carolina.

We do not by any means insinuate, that this bishop—any more than the rest of his brethren,—is more than a tolerable judge of good drink; far from it; for *Bishop England's* remarkably robust, ruddy, and plethoric habit, is proof enough of the fidelity with which he observes the generous fasts of a church, whose lent is kept on the richest productions of nature; and most clearly establishes, the excellence of her religious observances as dietetic rules. Heartily do we wish him long life—many refreshing lents—and many feasts on returning anniversaries of our national independence.

Considering that so large a part of the religion of the papal church consists in "meats and drinks"—it is not to be wondered at,—that the dignitaries of that sect, should be so prompt to eat and to drink, to the honour and glory of all unusual subjects. We ob-

serve that *Mr. Eccleston*, has been down to Georgetown, to feast to the success of the Jesuit college there, on the occasion of its late anniversary,—as well as that of the *Nuns'* school for girls, in the same place.—*Mr. Eccleston* is doubtless aware that his immediate predecessor in the *See* of Baltimore, was a superb host and most admirable feaster; and it were to be regretted—that the fame of our good city, or of the people, should suffer in a matter so important.

It is curious to observe that whether feasting or fasting, these gentlemen never for a moment lose sight of the great object for which they live,—namely, the advancement of the interests of the papacy.—At the feast at Georgetown, *Mr. Eccleston*—attended as *Arch-bishop*, and in his robes officially conferred on the young gentlemen and ladies of the two institutions there—the honours and rewards, won in their previous course of study. Observe this, reader: whatever papists and their protestant friends may say to the contrary—every institution of learning, in which priests and nuns teach, is a place meant and used for the grand if not the sole purpose of proselyting: and is as real a part of the papal sect as one of their churches is; and all the degrees and honours there conferred, are papal, far more than they are literary. When these people are erecting their schools and obtaining patronage from credulous protestants, by false statements about their spirit, intent and compass, they remind us of the Germans when sober; but when we find all the officers of the college at Georgetown, and divers other priests—with their *Archbishop*—in his robes at their head, openly feasting and distributing rewards, *en papist*, we have then a picture of the other and honester, if not so decorous consultation.

We learn from a description of the college exercises and the priests' feast at Georgetown—that a number of protestant gentlemen of some distinction attended both: and the friendly hand, which prepared this account for the *National Intelligencer*—appears to have exerted himself especially to do justice to the excellent manner, in which these guests as well as the regular body, performed their parts in the eating and drinking. *Mr. Eccleston* made a speech over his wine; *Mr. Muledy* the president of the college another; *Mr. GEORGE WASHINGTON Parke Custis*, delivered a very good one—rather long: *Mr. Seaton* of the *Intelligencer*, did himself justice in his address: and *Major General McComb*—with a point and brevity peculiarly military, and that dignity and pathos, so eminently characteristic of a great dramatist, honoured the company both with a speech and toast.—During all the while, the marine band, belonging to the United States, and stationed at the navy yard in Washington—regaled the company with excellent music: and the young gentlemen who had figured on the stage before dinner, not only partook of the good cheer, but did a portion of the regular toasts and speeches.

It is sufficiently humiliating to see any of the institutions of learning in the country prostituted to the superstitious and selfish ends, of the most ignorant and corrupt body of ecclesiastics that can be found in the nation. It is shameful enough to behold these men, seizing occasions of such solemn and overpowering interest

to the young persons under their charge—to set before them examples of “wine bibbing”—in circumstances of great public notoriety if not indecency. It is woful enough to behold the priests of a system calling itself religious, with their Arch-bishop at their head, feasting, drinking, toasting and spouting, with military music, on public occasions;—and without the least show of compunction, getting up scenes, which are utterly unbecoming the occasion, and the professed character of all the parties. It is truly humiliating to see that such scenes and persons, are publicly praised in one of our leading political newspapers—that pretends to be, and perhaps is, on most subjects regardful of public morals and propriety. But there is to be found in these public revels something still more calculated to alarm and astonish every true friend of the country and of truth and liberty.

General McComb after being toasted—made a speech, and drank “*the health of the Pope, and prosperity to the Catholic religion.*”

Mr. Seaton, after having been toasted, and after listening to a high panegyric on his journal—made a speech in reply—in which, he bestowed unmeasured praises on the papal institutions at Georgetown—and wound up by toasting the Jesuits!! An order—devoted (said he, in substance) for three centuries to religion and learning!—

Now what are we to expect next?—The highest judicial officer of the national government is a papist. The highest military officer, in our army, comes out on a public occasion—over his wine cups, as the guest of revelling priests—and drinks prosperity to the *Catholic* religion,—whose success necessarily involves the ruin of the country and the murder of all heretics. The leading opposition journalist at the seat of government, praises the Jesuits in a speech—and then insults the nation, by proposing as a sentiment, a society which has been polluted by every crime, convicted of ever enormity—and whose very name, the synonyme of all that is atrocious, he did not dare to utter! At the same moment, the head of this superstition is present, officially to receive these adhesions; and the whole conspiracy, is steeped in alcohol and baptised in strong drink!

These revelations over their wine-cups, are important, as they are fearful; and the whole case goes to show, that not only the public press is to a shameful and dangerous extent, under the influence of the papists of this country, but that the men who are in high places, and those who are seeking to reach them, are under the same, all grasping control, to a degree—which they themselves do not confess, except in the fulsomness of subservient flattery, or in the honest garrillity of a half-done revel. It is manifest besides, that the papists not only clearly understand the secret of their influence—but that they begin to make open show of that influence itself which they have won, at first by the perfect concert with which they have all acted together, on all occasions—and with reference to every subject; and now they still further mature and extend it, by showing in these public forms that they really possess it.

There is no alternative but for Protestants to resist the pressing dangers which threaten us, by a similar concert amongst ourselves, and an enlightened devotion to our own principles. If Mr. Seaton

does really wish to see the Jesuits restored to all their ancient powers, and to behold the earth cursed again by their crimes and cruelties; it is good, that the readers of the *Intelligencer* have found it out. If General McComb, really desires to see the papal superstition extend over the land and blight all that is fair and excellent in it; it is fortunate for that deceived country that he has revealed his true and secret inclinations. Let true protestants note these declarations, as signs of the evil days which are coming upon the land. Let them begin in time to resist an influence so seductive, so fatal, and already so extended. We have no fears for the final result; for this terrible superstition is destined to absolute and no distant destruction. But we mourn over the growth of error; we bewail the defection of the weakest of our brethren; we prefer that evil should be resisted in the beginning, and so put down at once and without commotion or bloodshed: we pray to God, and we labour earnestly, that the Protestants may see in time where things are tending—and not permit them to run on, till in mere self-defence they will be obliged to take arms in their hands and put down by force, what can now be so easily extirpated by moral means.—Between the use of one or other of these means, and the final extinction of liberty and protestantism in this country, there is no choice. The papal sect, first crawls at the feet, and licks the dust, if need require; it then stands up, and carefully steals abroad under the cover of twi-light; after that it revels in open day—and celebrates its debauches on the house-tops: then it tramples into the dust the bleeding members of its first credulous friends—and raves in madness over the moral desert it has created: then human nature reacts under insupportable sufferings, and the victim reeks his vengeance on his pitiless tyrants: then for a brief space liberty and reason and truth reign; and then the fearful round again commences. Thus has it been for long ages.—Thus has the career of this bloody system heretofore progressed amongst us, up to its present posture, and at this moment, it is as easy to indicate its position, and its next acts, as to read on the dial the sun's degree.—

But let us return to the other case of a *full* against an *empty* Bishop—furnished by Mr. England. The American Newspaper, as well as most of the others in our city, are very shy of saying any thing in favour of protestants, and not less prompt to say all that can be culled in favour of papists. For ten years past, every protestant in Baltimore has known this; and yet there is no daily paper here, that is really protestant. The *American* is right in publishing this toast, and the speech of Mr. England, at the Charleston dinner; and we are glad of it. But why did it refuse to publish when repeatedly solicited by old subscribers, and by as respectable men, as any in the city, the letter to *Dr. Wardlaw*, written from Paris a year ago, by one of the conductors of this Magazine? a letter as purely and thoroughly national, as could be prompted by a heart, out-and-out, American. The proprietors of the *American* fear the papists more than they love the character of their country, —and therefore they did not dare to publish a document, which altho' the country hailed it,—the papists hated! If they had published it they would perhaps have lost all their papal subscribers

and patrons; while by refusing to publish it, they probably gained papal, and lost no protestant patronage. Here lies the radical difference between the policy of these parties, and as long as things stand so, every man that prefers his interest to his duty and his principles, will either openly oppose protestantism—or stand neutral in the struggle.—

“At one of the celebrations of the fourth of July in the city of Charleston” some one gave as a toast, “the health of Bishop England”—with the usual addition of blarney—which as usual was, *vox et præterea nihil*. It is not stated at *what* celebration, this occurred; and for aught that appears, it may have been one got up by the papists, or even the priests of that city. It cannot be denied however that not only Charleston, but all South Carolina is much indebted to Mr. England. In that whole state, we have his own word for saying, there are only *about five thousand* papists; of whom nearly half are black, and there are not less than a dozen priests, besides nuns—to give spiritual instruction to this handful of the faithful. It is clear therefore, that the Bishop and his helpers, have directed their principal efforts to the work of proselyting the poor deluded protestants of his diocese;—and for this surely they ought to be abundantly grateful. And for our parts, we are not able to see that Mr. England is not just as much bound to eat and drink to the conversion of heretics in Carolina, and to give toasts and make speeches in aid of his mission; as Mr. Eccleston is, to undertake the same severe and painful labours at Georgetown. Nor do we perceive any more reason why the one rather than the other should be restricted of his liberty to say one thing at a feast *when full*, and quite another thing, in conclave *when empty*. In our attempt therefore to elucidate the sentiments of Bishop England of Charleston’s dinner and speech, by his previous and official oaths—we assure him we do not consider his conduct at all uncanonical—or even peculiar in his sect; but on the contrary we fully admit that a papal Bishop, is no more bound to exhibit his true principles, in his public speeches—than a sober German was bound by his drunken judgments. The ancients had a God, that was blessed with two faces; he was a sort of God of time, and stood at the point where their years began and ended, with one face looking back into the past, and another gazing before him into futurity. On one countenance age was depicted with gravity, solemnity, and thoughtfulness—as if the closing year had not been lost in its many lessons of wisdom;—on the other was painted youth full of watchfulness, alacrity, and decision,—showing how the future must be encountered. As it regards the *duplicity* of this figure, we have mused on it as a most striking emblem of Rome: an emblem on whose brows the faithful chroniclers should write,—on the one JANUS—and turning the head about, on the other also JANUS—with ineffaceable characters.

But let us do the Bishop full justice, and hear him state his own sentiments and principles. We give in full, both the speech and the toast which called it into being.

The health of Bishop England.—In the state a patriot—In the Church a living evidence of the wisdom of those institutions which tolerate all religions and legalize none.

This toast having been received with acclamations, Bishop ENGLAND addressed the President substantially thus:

SIR—I acknowledge myself to be very deeply affected by the very kind and unexpected manner in which my name has been introduced to this company, by a friend, to whom I owe very many obligations for repeated acts of friendship, and several manifestations of esteem; but sir, the favour has been greatly enhanced by the more than flattering way in which his proposition has been received by so highly respectable a society of my fellow citizens, upon whose bounty I cannot pretend to any claim.

Allow me, whilst I express my gratitude, to assure them that I at least respond to their sentiment. My kind friend has said that I was a patriot in the State. I should be one—I came to South Carolina a stranger, unknown, unproved—she took me to her bosom, she enrolled me amongst her sons, she protected me. I pledged to her my allegiance—I could not be recreant nor ungrateful. From many of her children in various parts of the State, under a variety of circumstances, I have received strong proofs of respect and of attachment; from her legislators, I have, on various occasions, experienced flattering attention and ample justice. I have no merit, therefore, in striving to cherish within me that love for Carolina which has been inspired by her own kindness in my regard.

I came to Carolina to promulgate a religion of which she had but little knowledge; I should more properly say, concerning which she made great mistakes. She had little opportunity of knowing what it is—that is no fault of hers; she was not to be blamed for not being acquainted with tenets which she had no opportunity of learning. She had been told, and led to believe that they were what they are not; but though labouring under this serious disadvantage, she extended to me her indulgence. I obtained every common right for which I found it necessary to ask—I was entitled to no privilege, and did not look for any. And when I draw the contrast between the conduct of this State and that of others upon this topic, I am more strongly impelled to the love of our southern section. We stand here in glorious relief as contrasted with others.

I believe that my friend used one expression which I would correct. Did he not speak of religious toleration, or toleration of religion? The meaning of that phrase cannot be his sentiment; I know him too well to suspect such to be the case. I am a Carolinian. I grant no toleration to him who differs from me, because he possesses the right as fully as I do. It would not only be treason to our Constitution, but a traitorous folly in our own regard to talk of toleration!

And whilst I am prepared to defend my own right to the profession and the practice of the religion to which I adhere, I am ready to protect the religious opponent who differs most widely from me in the same enjoyment; for if I permit his right to be infringed, I undermine my own. Thus as the sentiment of my kind friend expresses, it is wisdom for our state to sustain our perfect religious freedom, and it would be a suicidal fanaticism for any religious body in this republic to aid in procuring any diminution of the civil rights of any other.

These, Sir, have always been my convictions—I have so proclaimed them as I felt them, strongly and without restriction. Once I did fear that the same bad spirit, which elsewhere has overshadowed some of our legislative halls, was about to spread its sable wings over our own. I did believe that its influence was about to be manifested in a reference to the church over which I preside, of an indulgence which is granted to every other. I proclaimed what I feared. I showed the legislators that even without their aid I could attain my object, by using my private right as a citizen; but I had another, and I trust a nobler motive, for the anxiety which I felt—I was proud of Carolina—I loved the untarnished honor of the south—and I trembled lest I should see our State placed by the side of others in the degradation of bigotry. But they showed me that I was deceived, and their

vote of the next day proved to me, that in place of having any well-founded apprehension, I was only troubled by a nervous sensibility—and the enactments of our State prove her wisdom, whilst they show her to be just and generous, as she will always continue to be, by protecting all her children in their religious rights, whilst she gives no preference to any one above another.

Allow me, Sir, to repeat my thanks for the manner in which ^{so} humble a name has been introduced and received by your Society.

It will be perceived that Mr. England avows in the most unqualified terms that the object of his settlement in Carolina was “*to promulgate*”—the papal system; a system which he admits the people knew little of—had not enjoyed many opportunities of learning—and had made great mistakes about.—This admission at once puts to silence all the outcry which this individual and his friends have set up about the intolerance of protestants, in their opposition to the papacy. Here are people who avow their object to be, the promulgation of a religion—as to us, new, misunderstood, and mistaken. They come as apostles of a better system, and demand its examination and adoption. We have examined it; we discover it, to be one great mass of lies, folly and corruption; we find its aim to be universal domination, and its past history to be written in blood. We are resolved not to embrace it; nor to permit our countrymen to be deceived into the fatal error of so doing, if we can possibly prevent them. And now when we tell Mr. England all this to his teeth,—he “*promulgates*” his creed, by secret devices rather than open and manly exposition,—by dinner harangues over the bottle, rather than fair controversy on the rostrum or thro’ the press. Nay he throws off, when occasion requires it, his character of an apostle, coming to enlighten and convert a whole people; and raising the silly cry of intolerance and persecution, on the part of those who refuse to be converted by him—sneaks ingloriously off, or defends his system only when his courage is warmed over his potatoes. Said we not truly—that a double faced God, is their just emblem? Pity that the face of the lion should conceal the heart of the stag.—

But our principal object with regard to Mr. Bishop England at this time is to point out the flat, positive, and repeated contradictions, between this dinner speech, and the plain and repeated oaths, taken by this same individual, on the most solemn occasions; oaths by virtue of which he is and continues to be a papist—a Jesuit—a Bishop—and an Inquisitor, or as many of those notable characters as he may confess that he sustains. *In the speech, the author declares himself, to be thoroughly and on principle and conviction, devoted to the most absolute religious liberty, for all mankind. He declares that it would be treason to the constitution, traitorous folly on the part of papists,—suicidal fanaticism,—degradation and bigotry, unwise, unjust and ungenerous, to trespass in the smallest degree, or to connive at it on the part of others, even the state itself, or restrict in the least, the most absolute equality of religious liberty as between one person and another, and the most unlimited freedom to all!* Well done Bishop England! We venture to predict that this prelate will make himself scarce at Rome, from the moment that this speech falls

under the eyes, of the congregation of the Index,—or those of that for Inquisition into heretical pravity. Or has he a dispensation to speak the truth? Well done Bishop England—*full!* Oh! that his sentiments and oaths when *empty*, accorded with these just and true statements.—That they do not—that they are directly at variance with them; and that Bishop England himself is solemnly sworn to diametrically opposite and irreconcilable statements—we shall now proceed to show in the clearest possible light.

In the 13th article of the creed of Pope *Pius IV.*—every time Bishop England has repeated it, he has said “I acknowledge the holy Catholic and Apostolical Roman church, *the mother and mistress of all churches; and I promise and swear, true obedience to the Roman Bishop, the successor of Saint Peter, Prince of the apostles, and vicar of Jesus Christ.*”—and as often as he repeated the same universal standard of his church he said in the words of the 15th article; “this true Catholic faith, *out of which none can be saved, which I now freely profess, and truly hold, I JOHN ENGLAND, promise, vow, and swear, most constantly to hold and profess the same, whole and entire, with God’s assistance, to the end of my life; and to procure, as far as lies in my power; that the same shall be held, taught and preached, by all who are under me, or are entrusted to my care, by virtue of my office. So help me God, and these holy gospels of God.*”—

Now the Chatechism of the Council of Trent declares it to be of faith in this holy church, to which the Bishop has bound his soul “that *hereticks and schismatics, are still subject to the jurisdiction of the church, and liable to be anathematised and PUNISHED BY IT.*” (see *Cat. Council, Trent, page 94.*)

The papal church has put translations of the Scriptures into all vulgar languages, when not accompanied by authorised notes,—into the Index of prohibited books; that is, they are prohibited. The church has reserved to herself the right to give a version with *proper notes*. And it has done so. In 1582 the Jesuits at Rheims published an English version of the New Testament, with authorised notes; and both the version and the notes, have been repeatedly printed by competent papal authority in various countries, and both are in circulation amongst papists to this hour. In a note on Matthew, xiii. 29, it is taught “that where bad men, whether *malefactors or HERETICKS can be punished or suppressed, without disturbance and hazard of the good, they may and ought by public authority, either spiritual or temporal, to be chastised or EXECUTED.*” In a comment on luke ix. 55, the infallible church teaches “*that rigorous punishment of sinners is not forbidden—NOR THE CHURCH nor Christian princes blamed, FOR PUTTING HERETICKS TO DEATH.*”

In the usual forms of papal excommunication, the heretick is not only “excommunicated, anathematised, cursed, and separated from the threshold of the church:” but with a minuteness almost as ridiculous and indecent, as it is horribly blasphemous, he is cursed in every part of his body—every act of his being, every spot where he reposes; and then all who favour, countenance, or in any way protect, comfort or even converse or deal with him, are cursed with the same bitterness. Nor is the case only with gross *heretics*, and on spe-

cial occasions: but annually on the 16th day of April, when that day is Thursday, or otherwise on the Thursday nearest thereto,—all the “Hussites, Wickliffites, Lutherans, Zuinglians, Calvinists, Huganots, Anabaptists, Trinitarians, and other apostates from the faith” —with all their “adherents, receivers, favourers and defenders;—and all other heretics by whatsoever name they are called, or of whatsoever sect they be, together with all who, without authority —read, or even retain their books, and together with all Schismatics —and such as obstinately recede from their obedience to the Roman pontiff:”—in short, every protestant on earth—is thus largely and fully damned for time and eternity. And so sacred a duty is this, on the part of Bishop England himself, and every other papal prelate; that the day is called in their calendar “**HOLY THURSDAY.**”

The “*Laity’s Directory, or Catholic Almanac for 1836*”—published at the Baltimore Cathedral, by archiepiscopal authority—informs us, that the IV. Council of Lateran was the 12th *General Council*; and of course, that its decrees, were irrevocable and infallible.—Now we are furnished in the *Annals of Cardinal Barronius, continued by Bzovius, vol XIII. pages 226-7*, with a full decree of that holy council, as to the *mode of judging and punishing hereticks*. In that decree the secular power is directed, and the spiritual is commanded to teach and aid the secular in its duty,—*to exterminate hereticks—but if the secular power refuses, it is to be communicated and exterminated itself; and the country given to any Catholics who are able to conquer it. And to induce them to undertake it, all are promised the same favours and indulgences in killing hereticks, as in killing Turks or Saracens.* Let it be remembered that Bishop England has very often asserted in the words of the 14th article of the creed of Pius IV. that “*he undoubtedly receives all things delivered, defined and declared, by all General Councils,*” of course therefore by the IV. *General Council of Lateran!* Still further in the same article, he proceeds to say, and has doubtless said many thousands of times,—“*that he condemns, rejects and anathematizes, all heresies whatever, condemned, rejected and anathematised by the church:*” of course then; all the real protestantism on earth! Now let any candid man compare Mr. England *full*, with Mr. England *empty*, and say is he not worthy to have JANUS, written both on the back and front of his head?

Thus far we have only considered our table orator, in the light of a private member of the papal community; and have shown 1st from the creed of the church; 2nd from the standard catechism of the church; 3d from the authorised notes, to the authorised version of their New Testament; 4th from the uniform and yearly practice of all their Bishops as well as the common forms of their excommunication; and 5th from the decision of a holy General Council, that every word uttered by the *full* orator,—the *empty* papist has sworn to be false, heretical and abominable! But unhappily for our orator, we have other and still more conclusive evidence of the discrepancy between his words when *full*, and his oaths when *empty*, furnished by still more solemn, and awful oaths which, we presume he dare not deny that he has sworn.

Is Bishop England a Jesuit? Now, please your lordship—a plain civil answer—*full or empty*; is Bishop England a Jesuit? *If he is*, he will find in Vol. 1. No. 8. of this Magazine, (for August, 1835;) and in the 2nd Vol. of McGavin's Protestant; and in Usher's Collection called "Foxes and Firebrands;" "*The oath of Secrecy*"—or the initiatory oath of the Jesuits. In that oath he will find, a full declaration of the power of the Pope to depose Kings and subvert states; then a full renunciation of all allegiance to all heretical states; then amongst other tremendous specimens of hard swearing, the following words: "*I do further declare that I will help, assist, and advise, all or any of his holiness's agents in any place where I shall be in England, Scotland and Ireland, or in any other Kingdom or territory I shall come to; (as for example South Carolina;) and do my utmost to extirpate the heretical protestants' doctrine, AND TO DESTROY ALL THEIR PRETENDED POWERS, LEGAL OR OTHERWISE.*"—What does your lordship think of that—as a commentary on your fourth of July speech? Truly we have heard your pulpit orations with wonder: but even in them, we never heard text and sermon so unlike, as this oath and the dinner speech!

We have one more question to put. Is Mr. John England—really and truly a Bishop of the Catholic, Apostolic, Roman church? If he is, he will find in Vol. 1. No. 5. of this Magazine, (for May, 1835:)—and in the masterly work of Barrow on the Pope's supremacy; and in the *Pontificale Romanum, the OATH of ALLEGIANCE*, and vassalage taken by every Bishop to the Pope of Rome. If Mr. John England is a Bishop in that church he has sworn an oath, by the influence of which he ceases to be of a right a citizen of any nation, and becomes the mere servile agent of the Pope: an oath which if he keep not, it is terrific perjury, and if he keep, it is continual treason; an oath anti-social and anti-Christian in every feature of it, which no government ought to tolerate for one moment—and which tends directly to the subversion of all possible governments. The Bull *In Cæna Domini*, sets the Pope up, as virtual sovereign of the whole world; and the *Bishop's oath*, organises the corps of leaders, in the army destined to make the vast conquest. We extract from this oath a single sentence—and beg Mr. England, *if he be indeed a papal Bishop*, to reconcile this sentence with his Charleston speech. "*Hereticks, Schismaticks, and Rebels to our said Lord or his foresaid successors, (that is to our Lord Pope Gregory XVI. now reigning and his successors canonically coming in)—I WILL TO MY POWER PERSECUTE AND OPPOSE; pro posse persequar et impugnabo!*"—Beware my lord Bishop that men are not obliged to write *Janus* on both sides of your head, as well as on its rear and front.—Beware lest a credulous and insulted people, at length discover that the discrepancy between your real principles, and your jack-straw speeches—is too great to be accounted for, on the hypothesis of *full*, and *empty*.

In sober seriousness, do not such cases exhibit poor human nature in a light unutterably despicable! Here are men concealing their real principles and propagating others, for which they themselves will burn their brother, the moment they have the power. Here are priests pretending to believe that their church is infallible

—and yet contradicting publicly the most cherished definitions and decrees of that very church. Here are persons pretending to be Christians, and deceiving habitually the professing Christians around them, as to the most important matters regarding time and eternity. Here are citizens professing to love their country, either native or adopted—and plotting treason against liberty, social order, and all human institutions that deserve to exist.—No men ever did so but popish priests. God has called their system “the mystery of iniquity” and said of its ministers that they “speak lies in hypocrisy”—and act with all “deceivableness of unrighteousness.”—Blessed be his name, he has had in all ages “those who were called, and chosen—and faithful,”—and to these his great and very precious promises—are full and ample—that all his and their enemies shall one day melt away before the brightness of his glorious coming. In the holy kingdom which he will set up finally on the ruins of the kingdom of darkness, well do we know, that “they who love and make a lie,” shall find no place.

We venture, in closing this subject, to recommend to our readers the DISCUSSION ON CIVIL AND RELIGIOUS LIBERTY, as affected by the tenets of the Papal and Presbyterian systems,—by MESSRS. HUGHES and BRECKINRIDGE;—in which they will find the whole matter thoroughly sifted, and the real and anti-social not to say diabolical principles of Romanism set in their true light, and fastened upon the deceitful superstition and its wily and unscrupulous advocate—by irrefragable proofs.—

[For the Baltimore Literary and Religious Magazine.]

THE BIBLE DOCTRINE OF SLAVERY.

No. 2.

IN opposition to those who assert that slavery was established by the Mosaic law as a divine institution, we invited attention in our first essay, to two important facts—1st, that the servitude of the heathen among the Jews, so far from being intended as a punishment for crime, was a plan of the Almighty to bring such of them as were disposed to forsake idolatry into fellowship with his people, where they might enjoy religious instruction and serve God in the manner prescribed in his holy word. And 2ndly—that said servitude instead of being similar to the slavery of this land, stands in direct contrast with it, both in its origin and regulations. The one taking its rise in the corrupt heart of man—in avarice, ambition, the love of ease, &c., and proving by its laws and developements that it is a system of injustice and oppression; while the other emanated from above, and manifests the loving kindness and tender mercies of its author, in all its numerous and minute details. Enough has been said, we think, to prove the truth of the first position, and of the other also, in part; and we now ask a candid consideration to such remarks as shall be offered for the full establishment of the second. It is certainly a very important point in the discussion; for if we can succeed honestly and fairly, in proving that our assertion is correct, it then follows that the servitude of the Mosaic law affords no support whatever to our system of slavery; but on the contrary, stands in the Bible as an open rebuke of it before all people. And further,

that in the light derived from this truth we shall be able to give a fair and consistent exposition of the technical terms "possession," "inheritance," "forever," &c., without bringing them, as many do, into direct conflict with the leading principles and precepts of the Mosaic virtue: and without trenching upon what has been called the "eternal principles of morals." Our purpose will be fully answered by establishing two important propositions.

1st Proposition.—That slavery, such as exists in these United States, is designated in the Bible by the term OPPRESSION, and forbidden to be practised by the Jews, under the heaviest penalties.

No one will deny that the Israelites were held in real slavery in Egypt: that is, that the leading features of the bondage under which they were said to groan, were the same, as the leading features of our slavery.* They were under task-masters who exercised unlimited control over them; they were compelled to serve another by physical force; and the system was perpetual. Now what is the most emphatic name given to this slavery in the Bible? It is some times denominated affliction, and sometimes hard bondage, but most expressively by the term *oppression*. Now therefore, behold the cry of the children of Israel is come unto me: and I have also seen the *oppression* wherewith the Egyptians *oppress* them." Exodus, 3. 9. The word slave occurs but twice in the Bible, and in neither place is there such a word in the original. The Hebrew does not afford a term equivalent to our word *slavery*, and hence the system could not be called by that name; but the inspired writers use the very descriptive word *oppression* in speaking of the thing. Thus teaching that slavery is one form or species of oppression, and such a striking form of it too, that this term is very frequently used to designate it, whether existing in Egypt, or, as afterwards, among the Israelites themselves. It is worthy of notice, however, that God, every where, condemns oppression as a sin, by whomsoever it might be practised. Take the following passages merely as a specimen of a great number found in the word of God. This is the heritage of *oppressors*, which they shall receive of the Almighty. If his children be multiplied it is for the sword; and his offspring shall not be satisfied with bread." Job, 27: 13. 14. "He that *oppresseth* the poor reproacheth his Maker." Prov. 14: 31. "So I returned, and considered all the *oppression* that are done under the sun: and behold the tears of such as were oppressed, and they had no comfort; and on the side of their oppressors there was power." Eccles. 4. 1. Neither right, nor justice, but *power*—the true source of slavery, as well as of other forms of oppression, in all ages. Now the question naturally arises in the mind—Did the Almighty pour out the vials of his wrath upon the Egyptians, and put so many to death for practising the sin of oppression; and then, just fifty days after, license the Jewish nation to walk in their footsteps? Does such a question need a serious answer? If so, it may be found in Exodus, 22. 21. "Thou shalt neither vex a stranger nor *oppress* him: for ye were strangers in the land of Egypt," Thus, by reminding them of their own miseries while slaves in Egypt, does God caution them against reducing any stranger to a similar condition.

It is a well known fact, however, that the Jews forgot this salutary caution, and in their degeneracy, fell into this sin of the heathen. But what was the result? Just what God had threatened in numerous instances, viz.—that he would kill them with the sword, and leave their wives widows and their children fatherless; and that he would carry them into captivity, or slavery, among the heathen. "Thus saith the Lord: execute ye judgment and righteousness, and deliver the *spoiled out of the hand of the oppressor*: and do no wrong; *do no violence to the stranger; the fatherless, nor the widow*; neither shed innocent blood in this place." "If ye will not hear

*In several respects the Egyptian system was really less galling than the American system; but this goes to strengthen our argument.

these words, I swear by myself, saith the Lord, that this house shall become a desolation." *Jer.* 22. 35. See also *Exodus*, 22. 22. 24. In *Zech.* 7. 8 14. we have an account of the fact that these threatened punishments were poured out upon the Jews, because they refused to hearken to Jehovah when he commanded them to cease their oppressions. And Ezekiel, also, confirms this account. "The people of the land have used oppression, and exercised robbery, and have vexed the poor and needy; yea, they have oppressed the stranger wrongfully." (What a correct delineation of slavery and its effects.) "And I sought for a man among them that should make up the hedge, and stand in the gap before me for the land, that I should not destroy it; but I found none. Therefore have I poured out mine indignation upon them; I have consumed them with the fire of my wrath; *their own way have I recompensed upon their heads,*" (he sent them into slavery,) "saith the Lord God." *Ezek.* 22. 29. 31. Thus we see that the bondage or slavery of Egypt, and that practised in after ages by the Israelites, are described in precisely the same language by inspired penmen; and so far from being sanctioned in the latter case, and regulated by law, as learned men would have us believe, severe penalties fell upon the heads of the transgressors in both instances.

Now there is but one way in which the advocate of slavery in this land, can prevent this argument from utterly demolishing his whole fabric, so far as he deems it supported by Jewish institutions, viz.—by shewing that our *system of slavery is not a system of oppression*. Can this however, be done? Or rather, is any one so little acquainted with the cruel nature and debasing tendencies of the various slave codes existing in the land, as to deny the allegation that it is emphatically a system of oppression. If so, we may yet find space to read him a lesson on the point that will silence such an one; at least, if it should not satisfy him. In the meantime we refer him to "*Stroud's Sketch*" of the slave laws, for some useful information on the subject. Let us inquire however, before passing from this topic, into the meaning of the term. *What is oppression in the Bible meaning of the word?* *Cruden*, in his celebrated Concordance, says in answer to this question,—"men are guilty of oppression, when they offer any violence to men's *bodies, estates, or consciences, &c.*" Let me ask, then, if that man is not guilty of offering violence to his neighbour's *body*, who registers it at birth (though the child be of another man) as his own *property*, and holds it 'till death, should he chose to do so, wholly against the consent of the man so held? Again; is not a man's bones and sinews, and the proceeds of his labour, his *estate*? And has he not a valid title to them, under God, if there be such a thing as a valid title to any thing upon earth? Yet slavery bereaves him of them all, and forbids their exercise and use, save for the benefit of another. And lastly; is it not offering outrageous violence to the *conscience* of a free agent, to keep him under a law which forbids him such teaching as would enable him to search the scriptures; and prohibits him from assembling with the people of God to worship his maker, except at the caprice or will of another? Now the slaveholder may be guilty of all such acts of aggression and violence, and of many others of a similar character, and that, too, *in full accordance with law!* The system, then, having all the marks or features enumerated in the definition of *Cruden*, is *manifestly a system of oppression*. And as no sin is more decidedly condemned in the word of God, it follows that the slavery of this land receives neither countenance nor sanction in that holy book.

2nd Proposition.—*That when the Jews, in imitation of the heathen, enslaved their fellow creatures, God commanded IMMEDIATE EMANCIPATION as a duty; and refused to hear their prayers 'till they should give this evidence of repentance.*

If this proposition can be established as a truth, it not only proves the dissimilarity of the two systems—Jewish servitude and slavery, but is absolutely decisive on the whole subject; shewing conclusively that slavery is

altogether repugnant to the word of God. We make our appeal, then, to *Isaiah* 58. 1. 12. Let the reader examine the whole of it carefully. Cast away prejudice, and let common sense and Christian honesty determine as to its meaning. The passage is in fact so plain, that he who runs may read. We quote but a part of it, and our comments will be as brief as possible. "Is not this the feat that I have chosen, to loose the bands of wickedness, to undo the heavy burdens, and to let the oppressed go free, and that ye break every yoke." By analyzing the whole passage the following facts may be clearly deduced from it. 1st. That the Israelites seemed to be zealous in the worship of God, approaching him in the usual way, by fasting &c.—while at the same time their conduct to their fellow men was such that God abhorred their service. They were in fact blind to the enormity of their conduct, and therefore expressed surprise at his refusal to hear them. 2d. That the practise here condemned was not the mere *abuse* of Jewish servitude, or of any thing in itself lawful; for in that case God would have commanded the abuse to be corrected, without abolishing the system. It is evident that nothing less will do in this case than entire emancipation.—"Let the oppressed go free; break every yoke." This language proves conclusively that they had adopted a system different from the servitude prescribed in the law, for God would not certainly command them to abolish a divine institution, which was designed by the Almighty to be as lasting as the Jewish polity. 3d. That the language used is clearly descriptive of a system of slavery. Such is its meaning when applied to heathen slavery in other portions of the Bible, and no hint is given that the terms are here used in a different sense. The direction to break every yoke is very explicit, and shews that it did not prohibit them merely from holding Jews in bondage. Indeed a comparison of other passages will shew that God's controversy with them in many instances was, for robbing the stranger, or heathen of his right. And the probability is, that this was practised so long as to harden their hearts, before they ventured to enslave Israelites. The command, also, to let the oppressed go free, shews the nature of their bondage. It was against their consent, and oppressive in its character; the remedy however was not *mild treatment, but freedom*. The Jews in this matter copied the abominations of the heathen, (just as protestants have borrowed their system of slavery from the mother of harlots,) but it turned out to be a system of iniquity, incapable of such regulations as to make it a blessing to society; and hence nothing short of its total abandonment would satisfy the requirements of an offended God. Will less do, in our case under the full light of the gospel, to avert from us the wrath of the same God? 4th. The passage fairly teaches that God would not accept their worship until they complied with his command; but as he no where licenses men to continue in sin or disobedience for a single day, the inference is unavoidable, that he required nothing short of *immediate emancipation*.

Reader; have we done any violence to this 58th chapter of *Isaiah*? Would not any interpretation, differing essentially from the foregoing, contradict the whole scope of the passage? And does not the above rendering fall in, naturally with the tenor and spirit of numerous other portions of the Old Testament, already quoted? Our second proposition, then, rests upon a firm basis—the unerring word of God; and consequently, so far from slavery being sanctioned by Jewish institutions, they decidedly condemn it as oppressive and unjust.

If we have been at all successful in the foregoing discussion, it would be a waste of time to dwell long on the phrases already quoted from *Lev.* 25. 44. 46.—But as they are stumbling-blocks to some truly pious persons, it may be well to notice them briefly, in order to shew that they admit of an interpretation, which, without being forced, causes them to harmonize with the general scope of holy writ.

I. "*Forever*."—"They shall be your bondmen forever." This, in the estimation, of some, authorized perpetual slavery. As already stated, the word rendered *bondmen* is the same as is elsewhere translated *servants*, and of course proves nothing to the point. And as it regards the *duration* of the service, the word "*forever*" must refer either to the length of *individual service*, or it declares the *permanence* of the regulation. The latter is much more natural, and is fully in accordance with the original, which being literally rendered, is—"Forever of them shall ye serve yourselves." That is, your permanent servants shall always be of the heathen, &c.—Making the word *forever* to accord in duration with the existence of Jewish institutions. But suppose it were otherwise; still the idea of perpetual service will not be established by the use of this expression, for it can mean nothing more than *during the term*, or period spoken of, and is limited by the context to the year of Jubilee. *Bishop Horsley*, says that the man is ignorant of Jewish technical terms who does not know that the expression *forever*, in this connection, means nothing more than to the year of jubilee. So says the law—"Ye shall hallow the fiftieth year, and proclaim liberty throughout all the land, *unto all the inhabitants thereof*." Some may suppose that this language is applicable to Israelites alone, and provided merely for the freedom of such of them as were bound to service. To this we answer, that (with an exception too small to be noticed here) their liberty was secured by another statute which released them every seventh year, consequently the liberty proclaimed on the morning of the jubilee had special reference to servants from among the heathen. Should it occur to the mind of any one, that as it has been already alledged that the servitude which we now consider was a great blessing to the heathen, why attempt to prove that it terminated at the commencement of the fiftieth year? To this we reply that all these transactions were typical of *spiritual blessings*. The permission granted to the heathen to serve the land owner, or elder brother among the Jews was a type of the calling of the gentiles to serve Christ, our elder brother, under the Christian dispensation. The rest of the fiftieth year was a type of the rest of heaven. Now every one will admit that it is a great blessing for the sinner to be converted from his idolatries, and made a voluntary servant of Jesus Christ in this world; yet it will also be admitted that heaven is a still better inheritance. Hence Paul could say—"To live is Christ, but to die is *gain*." To that there is no incongruity in the statement that the servitude of the heathen in Israel was to them a real blessing under the circumstances of the case: and yet they would rejoice at the sound of the jubilee trumpet, as proof of the fact that their service was at an end; and as a type and pledge that they should eventually enjoy a glorious rest in the heavenly Canaan.

This may suffice respecting the word *forever*. The remaining terms will be noticed in the next number; together with other matters founded on the New Testament scriptures.

A PRESBYTERIAN.

THE
BALTIMORE LITERARY
AND
RELIGIOUS MAGAZINE.

VOL. III.

NOVEMBER 1837.

No. 11.

A DISCOURSE

On the Formation and Development of the American Mind. Delivered before the Literary Societies of Lafayette College, at Easton Pennsylvania, on the 20th September 1837.

BY ROBERT J. BRECKINRIDGE—A. M.

THE fashion of this world passeth away. Even as we use its highest gifts, they perish beneath our trembling hands. Its most enchanting beauties fade while we gaze delightedly upon them. Its noblest monuments turn to dust, as with unsteady feet we traverse their august courts. Its awful names cut into its most costly marbles, live dimly in characters, distorted or well nigh effaced: and those mighty institutions which made these names sacred, vanish away, even more completely than they. Amidst this grand and mournful scene, the great human herd passes onward as heedlessly as if it trod not on the ashes of the glorious dead; hearing no voice from the mighty ruins of the past,—seeing no promise in the majesty of coming events. And they whose hearts burn with inward fire amidst events so vast yet so evanescent, they too are borne onward by the same resistless tide, that sweeps all else away; the glory for which they sigh, the mere reflexion of the ruins over which they hasten, and the very works which should win it for them, buried under the fragments of those systems they were intended to commemorate.—

Yet it is a fair and blessed world; and in it there is opened before us a theatre for every high and virtuous effort, for all beneficent and noble influences. We may not perpetuate our own obscure names; nor give lasting continuance to our most cherished plans for good. We cannot blunt the iron tooth of time, nor break his leaden sceptre, under which all former states, and all possible institutions have been broken and consumed, and to which all that shall yet arise may be obliged to pay the same fearful tribute. But there is a subtle and mighty influence, which time itself cannot weaken, which long

ages, as they pass away, hardly dilute. Generation sweeps after generation in its brief career, as wave chases wave on the bosom of the deep, and when each dashes against the shore, it is lost forever. But the spirit that pervades these fleeting and nameless generations, perishes not with those in whose breasts it ruled, nor passes away with the monuments erected to illustrate and enlarge its reign. Here our work for good or ill, is almost immortal. The laws of Solon are no longer laws; his people have for ages scarcely known his name; and for twenty centuries the principles of his polity have been banished from his native city. Yet the spirit of the Athenian people, of their laws, their liberty, their institutions, and their literature, has influenced every succeeding generation; and at this hour burns more brightly and warms the human heart far more intensely, than in the freest and most glorious days of Greece. So too shall it be, with this great republic. The names of its wise and virtuous citizens, except a very few, must be forgotten; the details of its thrilling and romantic history may perish, leaving behind only the grand outline of its origin, its struggles, and its triumphs; its simple and noble monuments may all decay; nay, even its glory may be obscured, its strength depart, its sacred principles be all subverted—and the plough-share of ruin be driven deep and wide through its sacred bosom. Alas! that were indeed a sad day for man. But even then we shall not have lived in vain. The name of Washington will electrify all coming ages, and in the shock of battle nerve the souls, and in the day of triumph rule the evil passions of all who struggle for liberty. The light of our glorious career will forever illuminate the path that leads the weak and the oppressed to freedom, strength and boundless prosperity.—The spirit of our laws, manners and institutions will abide upon earth the redeeming spirit of succeeding times, resisting all the efforts of ignorance, barbarism and tyranny, living in the very core of the world's heart, and defying all attempts to extirpate it,—until the whole mass shall be warmed and enlightened, and the flame, like that the ancients fabled, shall break forth at once in ten thousand places, and fill the earth itself with brightness.

This is our theme to day. We would trace briefly, the origin and growth of this glorious spirit in our republic; *the formation and development of the American mind*. Thus shall we see most clearly how a wise and beneficent providence has made us what we are—the manner and extent of our ability to bless mankind, the nature of the benefits we are able to confer, and the evidence that whatever may hereafter befall us, our spirit must at last pervade the world. The greatness of the theme, will hide as with its shadow the meanness of the attempt at its discussion.

I. Our land has been from the beginning a land of wonders. Every step which has marked its discovery, its settlement, its early history, its glorious revolution, and its astonishing subsequent progress, has exhibited events which were in their individual and separate importance of thrilling interest to the human family, and which have formed unitedly a chain of incidents before unparalleled. A rapid sketch of the most striking of these, with some general elucidation of the times which gave them birth, and the heroic actors in

them, will reveal to us most clearly the school in which the national mind was trained, the noble stocks from which our people sprung, and the deep foundations on which our principles and character are laid.

The discovery of America, was undoubtedly the most important physical event to civilized man, that had ever occurred in his history. Nor shall we err greatly if we add that it was the result of a combination of great qualities, perhaps never before or since so united in a single individual. That there must be such a continent, was the clear and profound induction of a great mind, after long, patient and intense thought, directed by all the knowledge that age possessed, to guide its investigations. That it could be, and ought to be reached, was the ultimate and immoveable conclusion of a mighty and daring spirit, which surmounted every obstacle that weakness, ignorance, meanness, rivalry, the ills of poverty, the caprice of courts, the ingratitude of kings, the cowardice and superstition of man, and even the wasting power of time could oppose to its sublime force and singleness. Of all the injustice of mankind, none exceeds the long refusal to award to the great discoverer of the new world, the foremost rank in all earthly renown. Who shall estimate the value of a gift which in its issues doubled the earth itself, with every blessing it contained, and changed its whole aspect, with all the former currents of its wealth, its habitudes, its thoughts, its very spirit and mind!

Well was that glorious deed worthy to stand amidst the galaxy of great events, which marked the awakening of the human mind after ten centuries of death-like sleep. A double apostacy had bound the human soul in chains of adamant, and the glories of the eastern and western empires seemed to have alike expired under the weight of brutal ignorance, and ferocious superstition. Hoards of fierce barbarians inundated the latter of the two, and the leaven of Roman civilization worked in the high and unshapen mass for a thousand years, before the gigantic monster began to be fairly quickened into life. Then, as if to make barbarism repay humanity for the evils it had wrought, new and unnumbered hoards smote the feeble descendants of Constantine, and scattered over the world the relics of knowledge not yet extinct. The Greek mind and literature fell like an electric spark into the throbbing bosom of awaking Europe; and for the third time Greece conquered man. Cast now into the scale the kindred and almost cotemporary events. The use of new and better methods in the investigation of truth, if not perhaps the complete discovery of those, whose exposition and defence made Bacon so illustrious, in an after age. The perfection, if we may not say the invention of the mariner's compass; and the total revolution which it immediately wrought not only on human intercourse, but also on thought and knowledge. The manufacture of gunpowder, by which the whole art of war was thoroughly changed, and so much of its bloody spirit extracted; but above all, by which the weak have found at last a remedy against the oppressions of the strong, the naked multitude been armed in proof against their mailed tyrants, and science and genius elevated to the rank which brute force and the animal passions occupied before. The invention of

printing, that engine of inconceivable power, by means of which immortal youth is bestowed on greatness,—knowledge made the first necessity of the human race, more urgent than bread itself,—and a sympathy established in every breast of man, with all his fellows, through which a blow well stricken, no matter where, will vibrate throughout the earth, and for successive ages. Oh! glorious gift of God; well worthy to usher in that mighty reformation of the church and world, which was amongst the first fruits of its proper use, and which was itself the most illustrious of those grand incidents which clustered around the birth of our new world. Oh! blessed reformation; without which, knowledge had been in vain, the progress of light impossible, the extension of the human family but an increase of ignorance, suffering and sin, and the enlargement of the world itself, a deep woe, over which the whole creation should have groaned.

The circumstances connected with the first peopling of this continent by the European race, were in all respects such as to exercise an unspeakably great and beneficent influence over its future character. And whether we direct our attention to the extraordinary posture in which the early emigrants found themselves on their arrival on our shores,—or to the events which drove them from their respective father lands—or to their own peculiar adaptedness for the gigantic work which God had called them to perform;—we shall perceive in all, concurring elements in the formation of an empire meant to be unparalleled.—

We behold spread out before the enchanted gaze of a world burdened and staggering under the accumulated woes of thirty eight centuries, another new and lovely world—rejoicing in liberty—smiling in beauty and abundance—and beckoning from the verge of creation and beyond the limits of the curse of power and misnamed civilization, all who had sorrows to bewail, or wants to supply, or injuries to conceal, or threatened wrongs to fear, to seek a refuge, a home, a safe and honoured habitation, far, far away under the setting sun!—Who can doubt that in every land—there were thousands panting for such a deliverance?—Who does not know that for three hundred years, the living tide has set with constant and increasing force ceaselessly upon our shores?—Or who would be surprised if whole nations had stood with outstretched arms, sighing for blessings which they could never call their own—and hastening with one accord to the very margin of the sea, that they might follow with anxious voice and eye, those whom a happier star guided to the distant land of promise and of hope?

Under the first movements of such an impulse it would of necessity occur—that the new world must receive from all nations, even the most unlike and hostile, crowds of colonists; and that from every quarter the most vigorous of those who sought for change, would always emigrate first—and while the rivalry continued, and the means were insufficient for all,—the irresolute and weak would always be left behind. In laying the deep foundations of American character,—here are drawn together elements from every portion of, what was to us, the ancient world, the whole that is, of civilized Europe; and from every part the very materials best fitted by nature,

by sufferings, by character, for the new and mighty enterprise before them. It is not one people built up from the useless fragments thrown off in the progress of another's growth. It is not even like the ancient colonies, a new state, founded by portions of the old, selected by choice, by lot, or even by hard necessity, to bear Ilium to Rome, or Greece to other shores. It is a people gathered from all other people; and so gathered that the evils of each might be corrected by opposing good,—and the good from all be strengthened by the common will. They bring from every land their tribute, and a committee of the world in the noiseless but severe ordeal of their new condition, rejects the worthless, confirms the good and useful, honors the great,—and all correcting all, is fitted for its use and rank in the new structure in which human society is ready to be cast.—

But it is not alone to the action of such general principles, however clear and powerful might be their influence, that we must look if we would fully understand the character of those early colonists to whom we are so much indebted for all our country has been, or shall yet become. We must search amidst the troubles and contentions of their respective countries for the events which formed those, who in turn formed us. We must detect in the grounds for which our fathers suffered in their native lands, the principles which they brought with them across the mighty deep—and the spirit which actuated their conduct in their new abodes. We must read the first lines of the states they were about to found in the directly opposite lineaments of those who drove them forth despised, and houseless wanderers—the great proto-martyrs of a new creation.—

Of all human history there is not one field from which patient industry will return laden with richer treasures—nor one in which the wise and generous spirit can expatiate with more delight—than that which develope, the connexion of the settlements of this continent, with the rise, progress and results of the mighty European convulsions, of the sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth centuries. Thanks be to God there is a point beyond which human sufferings cannot be pushed, without on the one hand exterminating the victim of oppression—or on the other driving them to despair and forcing them to smite their tyrants with the broken fetters which have so long eaten into their own hearts. To this last point of most extreme endurance had Europe come under the long and pitiless tyranny of Kings and Priests—of fraud and violence, of corrupt ignorance and brutal superstition, united to cruel, selfish and hardened power. The great living, suffering mass, crushed beneath the weight of thrones and altars, welded to each other and heaped on them, had but to sink into the dust and perish in silent brokenness of heart, or to rise up and in the quickened majesty of out-raged nature, shake from their necks the maddening weight of wrongs and woes—and live again to freedom, truth and virtue. The torch of expiring religion was kindled anew from heaven—and its bright and hallowed beams glanced widely over the earth; and as it gleamed upon the towers of cruel superstition they fell before it,—and as it flashed upon the haggard features of down trodden

nations, the voice of prayer and praise issued anew from their sobbing hearts.—The spark of liberty was struck afresh in the deep spirit of man; and as it caught from breast to breast and from land to land, thrones rocked and the brows of tyrants turned to ashes. Truth, long banished from the world revisited again her ancient haunts—and as she hastened thro' the earth, cells burst open to behold her face—cities and palaces spread wide their heavy gates at her advancing step—and the great crowd of suffering men bowed their adoring heads as her sweet voice entered into their souls!—Oh! it was a goodly and sacred spectacle! And tho' the clang of arms rang for two centuries above the hum of praise and drowned the voice of nature; yet better so than to return again to darkness and despair.—Tho' in many lands the rising spirit was oft times put out in fire and blood—glorious and honoured—yea blessed those who fell with their falling country—rather than live to see and share her former woes. Tho' many a weary exile, fled trembling from the smoking ruins of his native village—and many a bleeding soldier dragged from the last field where expiring virtue struggled, limbs hewn and worthless,—and many a patriot went forth weeping over lands that scorned their love—and many a man of letters shrunk away from the stern rebuke of mitred ignorance, restored to power and borne aloft on arms red with gore,—and many a child of God and many a minister of Jesus Christ made trial of cruel mockings and scourgings, and after that, of want and banishment; yet all, nay more ten thousand fold,—is long ago repaid. Their tears and blood were precious seed. Look far and wide upon our happy land, and see its ripening fruit. Look up and down in our large heritage, and learn the lessons of their wisdom—the fruits of their toil. Read in our long catalogue of good and glorious names, the records of their children's children!—Yea, if, in all other lands, all the blessed results of those stupendous events in which all our fathers were actors, and of which so many were victims—could be this day effaced, and the black tide of ruin roll back upon them its fearful wave, still here alone, are fruits enough to repay beyond compute, all the vast price at which the world has bought these blessings.

During the last quarter of the sixteenth century, Europe began in earnest to plant colonies in the new world: and with little intermission till near the middle of the eighteenth, new settlements—of new bands from almost every European nation, were formed from point to point along our whole Atlantic slope, from the snows of Canada to the mild skies of Florida and Louisiana. During that hundred and fifty years what grand events crowded upon each other throughout all Europe! What obstinate and endless wars!—What ceaseless and fervid mental effort, strife and rivalry!—What trying of all things, by new and fiery processes!—And amidst it all, what grand progression of the human race!—Throughout all lands their victories and their defeats alike furnished colonists to us. And whilst in them all their own historians place their golden ages, within this very period, it was ordered that from them all our first emigrants should come in strange connection with their most striking eras; and so that whether by glory or defeat the gain was still

to us. If the cruel and perfidious Stuarts ruled, the sweet villages of England, the misty hills of Scotland, and the green fields of Erin, gave us in turn crowds of men, who forsook home and country for religious liberty. If the glorious commonwealth spread its proud banner over Britain—a misguided, but heroic legality, drove into distant exile the defenders of the throne.—And on these shores they who signed the death warrant of Charles Stuart, and they who plotted against the life of Cromwell sat down, beneath the shade of the same boundless wilderness. The vast plains of Germany drenched in the blood of its bravest children, fed with new victims, wars which seemed to have no other object but to restore the empire of darkness, and no end but in the extinction of the human race. But at every gleam of peace,—crowds of patient and laborious people sought in the new world a respite from the ills which seemed their heritage at home.—The Danes, the Swedes, the glorious United Provinces, marked the most thrilling eras in their respective histories, by colonies sent out to us; and Spain, and even Italy, forsaken Italy, upon whose lovely plains, and gorgeous cities the light of reviving letters and religion so early and so brightly glowed and was so soon put out in tears of blood—they too sent to us, exiles laden with gifts rejected by themselves. France too, heroic France, so beautiful, so brave, whose children nothing consoles for having lost her, and whom nothing but stern necessity can drive forth from her bosom; even she gave to us and to the earth her best and wisest. In human story, there are few pages so full of remorseless priestly cruelty and ferocious love of blood, as that on which is written the tale of the immortal Huguenots. Disciples of a pure faith—subjects whose loyalty and truth knew no stain—soldiers without fear and without reproach—brethren of the best King France ever had, this noble race embracing a fifth part of the entire population of France, was given over as accursed of God, and delivered up to the rack, the scourge, the dungeon, and the stake;—their marriages annulled, their children bastardized, their goods confiscated, the doom of exile enforced against such as would have staid, and death inflicted upon such as tried to fly! A bleeding remnant, found its way, into our wide heritage, and mixed its blood with all those rich streams which warm our hearts to day—and threw the leaven of its noble character into our mighty mass.

We see the instruments,—chosen by God, and how he formed and brought them to their appointed field. We see the field itself. Such men, so situated, could not fail to be impressed with the grandeur of their new position. To them the ancient world was dead; and they were launched into a new existence, where their own destiny, and that of ages upon ages yet unborn, was waiting to be shaped by their own hands. With minds thoroughly alive to all the great questions which had already convulsed the world; actors themselves in the vast movements before which all states still reeled, victims of every form of ancient evil, or victors in every varied strife which the reborn, waged against the dying Europe, they stood upon the margin of a second world and a new futurity,—strangely august.

In the midst of this sublime scene there are two points which so command the whole, as to require specific notice. The first is explained in this reflection, namely, that the great principles which then agitated the world, partly because many of them were unsettled as yet by any compromise with ancient abuses, partly because those holding various modifications of them were called to act in concert, in forming a new order of things, and partly because that order was strictly and in every respect new;—on these accounts these master principles were laid, deeply, simply, and broadly—in strict obedience to reason, justice, and common sense. Or is it more just to say, that these latter were themselves the strong foundations upon which all else was built? At present we pause not on such distinctions: for in either case the final result is equally remarkable and the same.—Behold in every community, sprung from whatever race, or planted in whatever clime of our broad empire—the same grand model,—the same pervading spirit—the one majestic fabric built by man, for man, and therefore unique as his own nature!

The other consideration is not less important. It lay in the boundless greatness of the field itself. These were indeed mighty men; yet were they men—subject to passions like our own. Tho' they did more than other men had done before them—yet in some few things they marred their own glorious work,—in others came short of their grand destiny.—But in this vast continent spread out before them, they all had room to try their weaknesses, as well as to confirm their strength. Some false principle admitted into a system, would soon be made manifest by the superior action of some neighbouring system; or finally be destroyed by the opposing efficacy of the great truths associated with itself. And while it endured, those who should become subjected to its evil influence, or be unwilling to endure it, had a world before them, inviting to new settlements, and the formation of other states on better and surer grounds. Here too we behold one of the chief causes of that multiplication of sovereign bodies, an element of our general system, which, in the various forms in which it enters into it, and has always modified our character and acts, has been from the beginning, one of the most influential ingredients in the formation and development of the American mind.—Indeed, the play of both these latter principles has been incessant;—and while the action of the parts upon the whole, and of the whole upon the parts, has been unspeakably important, that of the parts upon each other has been so constant and decisive, that from the earliest period of our history the whole current of change in all the parts has been to make each more closely resemble all. The colony at Plymouth might err in decreeing a community of goods; but surrounding example and fair experiment soon corrected the strange mistake. Massachusetts Bay might hang the Quakers and banish Baptists and Prelatists;—and Virginia refuse to tolerate any form of religion but that established by law in England. But by and by Virginia set up religious liberty on its eternal basis;—one of her loftiest spirits besought that his simple monument might record that he was the author of that act; and Massachusetts at length followed her bright example. Massachusetts might forget for a time the great principle on which her

people came wanderers to her shores—and not only establish a peculiar state religion—but disfranchise all who could not embrace its tenets. But under the peculiar circumstances which these striking cases are cited to illustrate, this intolerance had as its great result the formation of two sovereign and enlightened states (Rhode-Island and Connecticut;)—and as its end, the total change of these hurtful and absurd notions and practises of the state itself—under the influences already stated.—

The Colonial history of North America, to be understood must be considered in two entirely different aspects. From the first planting of the respective colonies, to the declaration of American independence—their foreign and exterior affairs were so far regulated by the states which planted or the corporations, or proprietors who governed them; as to reflect always the features of the old rather than of the new world: while those affairs which were strictly interior and which alone could truly exhibit the real character of the newly formed settlements, were themselves for a long time subject to the same controlling or at least disturbing influence. The violence of the contending states of the old world, was always communicated to their respective colonies in the new—and every European contest for nearly two centuries, found responsive passions on this side of the Atlantic, and again and again involved one part of our continent in wars with another, and every part successively with the aboriginal inhabitants.—These were the bitter fruits of European policy and of the ancient social system, which reckoned justice to be subordinate to interest and revenge,—and the blood of man well repaid by plunder.—In the progress of the new social developement, the opposing elements of European influence and American principle can be distinctly marked, at every step in the progress of internal affairs.—With the growing strength of the colonies, collisions more repeated and serious, could not fail to occur between parties and principles thoroughly unlike and steadily acting upon each other. The respective tempers of the parties, pointed out from a very early period the conduct that might be expected from each, when the time for the final settlement of all these great controversies should have fully come; and the whole history of the past, had already demonstrated that every such question, between such parties, has no final umpire but the edge of the sword.—For when did power ever loosen its iron grasp, but as that grasp relaxed in death? Or when did the brow of man, once lifted up to heaven in sacred freedom, willingly bow down again in galling servitude? Let man but taste one morsel of his birth-right,—and he will purchase with his blood, its extremest crumb! Or suppose it were not so,—who that saw Virginia arm for the Stuarts against the Commonwealth merely from a proud loyalty—could doubt what she would do—when bleeding freedom screamed for succour at her knees? Who that saw above a century afterwards, the flame lighted up throughout the continent by the stamp act,—could err as to what must come, when distant fears of evil, should be realized in acts of insolent and cruel wrong?—

The declaration of American independence was indeed a national event unequalled for its sublimity.—But it was an event, which un-

der its attending circumstances could not but have occurred. The glorious contest from which it sprung—and whose triumphant principles embodied in it, were borne to final victory thro' scenes which should live forever in all generous hearts—and by men whose names deserve to stand in the first rank of fame—was one that first or last must needs have come,—and could scarcely have ended differently.—All that hallowed contest, incalculable as are its influences upon us, and upon man; was itself the result of the grand influences which had gone before. And while the warm and grateful heart recalls its story with tears of constant joy, the philosophic mind must see that any different result would have been almost impossible. Glorious era:—pregnant with the whole destiny of man! Glorious generation: worthy of such an era!

The region over which we have heretofore passed belongs to history; and time and truth have already stamped upon it, a verdict never to be effaced. In regard to it, to speak with hesitancy were only to make manifest a culpable want of knowledge. But now, our rapid sketch brings us upon a period whose furthest verge is yet within the range of present being, and whose great events gather in successive and increasing majesty around our foot-steps.—History begins where all the angry passions die,—and he who writes it, must stand sufficiently remote to catch the true and vast proportions of his theme. Yet even now we may anticipate the coming praises of a long posterity—wrung even from unwilling breasts—and heaped upon our great career.—

The history of our country might naturally be divided into three great eras; the first beginning with the discovery and settlement of the country—and extending down to the planting of the last of the original colonies, (Georgia) in 1733: the second including the colonial and revolutionary history, and reaching down to the close of the old confederation; the last covering the last half century—commencing with the establishment of the Federal Constitution—and reaching to our own day.—The first is our seed time,—the second our harvest,—and the last our season of strength and rejoicing which these blessed fruits have yielded. Oh! may its duration and its fulness, know neither stint nor limit.—May the noble form of government our fathers have built for us, be a stranger to decay forever. May the great and blessed land bestowed upon us, be the free and unpolluted habitation of our children's children to generations of generations. May the mighty instrumentalities operating to enlighten and save the people, spread and thicken, till the infant of days shall be wiser than the aged man. May the inheritance of glory and prosperity we have received be transmitted un tarnished and undiminished to others wiser and better than ourselves;—and all the noble and precious principles which have come to us at so great a cost,—and conferred on us such priceless blessings, be cherished by our country with all the fervour of her primeval love, and scattered in her speech, and by her acts, till they shall enlighten all the habitations of man, and fill the earth itself with peace, freedom and abundance!

II. The course of our subject now conducts us to other contemplations. We have sketched feebly, events which have no parallel;

it remains to develope the principles which produced those, and which flowed from these grand transactions. We have seen the acts which give lustre to our early history;—let us view the rules which guided them—the maxims to which they led, and which unitedly have nourished as well as illustrated,—have formed and do still develope that spirit which already shakes the earth. The American mind is not more striking in its formation, than in its great developement.

Upon every page and every event of the history of our fathers is written, their unwavering and heroic devotion to principle. No trials have ever shaken their constancy, for a single moment. No heighth of prosperity has seduced them into a momentary forgetfulness of their settled purposes,—nor any temptation of advantage allured them from the great ideas which formed the basis of their character. When they have erred, it has been thro' some false analogy, or by reason of some mistaken application, of great and unquestioned truths; and uniformly and speedily, have they returned, as light and truth made the unwilling error manifest. In vain will the keenest search be made—for the unworthy compromise, the wilful violation, or the complete and purposed surrender of any one of those great principles, for which any one of our colonies migrated to the country,—on which any one of our states have been formed,—or which have from the beginning guided the spirit of the nation.—Inflexible lovers of justice, their laws are all equal, merciful, and wise. Ardent disciples of liberty,—true and real,—absolute and universal liberty,—step by step has this sacred principle been ceaselessly developed, in our whole history, mounting higher and higher with every age, and confirmed, enlarged and illustrated by every monument in all our annals. The firm and enlightened advocate of peace, equity and perfect independence in all national intercourse; again and again has our country resisted occasions when interest and enthusiasm alike invoked a departure from its principles;—and curbing by reason its own passions, and by force, when need required, those of foreign states, she has held the strong and even current of her way. Friends of general knowledge and of perfect civilization,—the earliest settlers laid with the foundations of the republic,—and by their side, those for the complete instruction of the people and the amelioration of all the evils and sorrows to which man is incident; and thenceforward what schools have been scattered over the nation's bosom, what charities have adorned her whole extent, what ample and increasing efforts to effect these cherished plans! Disciples of an unfettered, simple, cheap, and public social system—they have, in all directions and at every period held fast by their wise preference; and neither the mad violence of popular phrenzy—has tempted any to arm the state with unusual powers; nor the height of general wealth provoked even a proposal to depart from our severe simplicity; nor any pretence of urgent danger given birth at any time to any movement, however slight, towards cloathing our public acts of whatever kind, with dubious secrecy. It is a land whose fathers entered with fixed devotedness to principle, as such; and all its people, may safely challenge until this hour, the world's approval of their steadfast and faithful walking in the same bright career.

Some of the points now stated in illustration only, need more ample notice; yet may we pause for a single moment to contemplate the amazing influence of this great characteristic upon a nation's destiny. Such is the mixed condition of all human things, and such the power of outward circumstances, that most kinds of social order, which are long and fixedly adhered to, may at last not only be made enduring, and mould their subjects conformably to their will, but rise to much power and greatness. The prime internal cause of weakness in all states, lies first in want of *any*, and secondly of *fixed* efforts. How vast, incalculably vast, then must be the prosperity and grandeur of that people—whose ardent, wise and practical spirit,—free to choose the noblest ends by the best means,—is guided from age to age, by an unchanging love for what is right,—to a fixed support of what is just, beneficent and true! Who shall limit the rise of such a commonwealth at home: who estimate its power abroad? What can resist the action of such principles within a state; or who without, will long contend with those, who before all contention will do from principle, more than any contest could wring from them; and who, against principle, will give nothing, to save life itself?—Sacred force and majesty of right!—How does our story illustrate its deathless power—its countless triumphs!

Every outward circumstance in the state of the country itself and in that of the first emigrants to it, rendered the formation of many separate communities necessary; and the various interests, and established order in all these communities, conspired with the necessities already stated, to modify the character of the entire nation, when it became one, and to shape the form of its general institutions. It was never possible at any time in the past history of this country, to have formed one general government and constitution—upon any other than these two principles,—namely, that the nation must be formed of confederated but independent states, and that the constitution must be written, precise, and limited. *Centralism* was the very opposite of all the possibilities of the case; *nationalism* was possible only to a limited extent, and on fixed points, after mutual concession and upon precise terms;—and out of these sprung of force, a defined and written constitution.

What a multitude of reflections crowd upon us here; and what fundamental principles of all our greatness, and all that distinguishes our political system in its public action, are here developed! The union of the states for all purposes strictly national;—a union upon whose foundation has been built all the prosperity, glory and strength of the republic,—all the sacred monuments which make our country's name immortal, and all the power to make our immense continent the garden of the world, and our glorious principles the heritage of man. A union pregnant in all the past only with blessings and triumphs, and full in future promise only of honour and usefulness. A union, which every child should be taught to love next after liberty,—every man to cherish next after independence—and every statesman to venerate next after the blessings it was formed to win and to secure. And yet in every statement of the rise and nature of that union, it must be manifest that it is a confed-

eracy formed by the free and unanimous choice of sovereign states, who cannot and never should be bound beyond the terms and nature of the act itself; and who are admonished by all their own experience, and all the light which the past has to give, that in such governments, the disturbing and dangerous tendency is towards the strengthening of the central power. Of all forms of human government, this has been found in practice to be the most enduring, —the most difficult to be abused to ends of violence,—the easiest to be restored to its own proper action. And none who either read or think, can fail to see, that by it above all others, are knowledge and civilization advanced: for by it, are formed a multitude of separate centres,— each giving increased activity to every thing within its reach, and thus far greater impetus to all human movements;— and each affording in times of trial and darkness—a refuge and shelter against the errors and crimes of all the rest. Here too, we find reduced to practice the grand idea of written covenants, binding alike the general will and the active agents of it:—the clear subversion of the pretended power of rulers derived from any source but the consent of the governed; or to be used for any end, but the general good;—and the prescription by the true sovereign, of the true principles on which active authority should rest, the true ends for which it shall be exercised, and the clear limits in which it shall revolve. Here also, the great conception of reserved rights seems first embodied: not only that sovereignty does not reside in those who rule us, for our own purposes and by rules prescribed by us:—but that there are modes by which we will withhold vast powers from all our rulers; powers which rulers need only to oppress,— confederacies only to ingulph their forming states; powers not only never to be intrusted to mortal hands,—but in whose ample scope we will remodel, or at our will withdraw, other and smaller powers already given to form, whatever government. And last of all, we see here, the germ of that long hidden but precious truth, that states and laws are made for man, not man for them; and therefore that the less they model us and the more free and perfect play they give to human effort, the higher will be the destinies of man. Lycurgus made a code and wrought his people to it. Solon found a people, and made a code that should only repress the evil and give free developement to all the good it found. Here was a code for man, and there man bent and hardened to a code. In Sparta nothing breathed or acted but by this iron code,—and even her noblest monuments told only that Lycurgus lived.—At Athens man lived, tho' Solon was forgot. And the free, active, glorious spirit, that conquered at Salamis when Sparta would have fled, and won its bloodiest trophies at Marathon, which Sparta shunned, once and again at the loud call of eloquence which still thrills the world—repulsed the victors of the earth; not for conquest's, nor for plunder's sake, but only for freedom's sake, and that the voice of Plato and the schools might not be hushed amid their wonted shades, nor Phidias', broken marble lie beneath barbarian feet,—nor the sweet sounds of eloquence expire along those sacred streets, nor all the muses weep amid their costly halls.—Here also lies the grand distinction between the Jewish and the Christian states; the one a state, so

ordered and so circumstanced that it must always be small and singular; the other so simple, so perfect, and so clear, that if contrived for universal empire, it could not be otherwise. The one exact and rigid in forms that will not be denied, and which reject all that cannot be made into their own precise image:—the other august in its few and sacred principles,—a spiritual state confederate of all in every land who love its glorious head.—It is the spirit of man and of the age to accumulate the means of power and greatness;—but to do it by gathering in one, a multitude of separate and perfect parts. And in these various principles lie some of the first and surest elements of all our greatness—as well as some of the clearest developements of our pervading character.

In the formation of such a state, various forms of original constitution might have entered into the parts, various tempers pervaded each, and several opposite characters been stamped upon the nation thus composed. There have been confederacies in which all the parts were pure democracies; others of simple monarchies; others made up of other forms;—and others still, into which all forms entered. So there have been confederacies where every part was actuated by the same, and some peculiar spirit;—others with a spirit directly the reverse; others still with portions mixed of each. As the papal states of Europe united to suppress the reformation,—the united Belgic provinces leagued to uphold religious liberty,—and the papal and reformed Swiss Cantons united for the protection of national independence.—With us, one spirit, one object, and the same principles, pervaded every element that formed the nation—and every breast in every separate colony and state. A few of the chief of these should be illustrated.—

With one accord our ancestors have built up all their fabric, upon the great truth of absolute human freedom and equality.—The first postulate of all our systems is, that man is capable of self-government, and entitled to its exercise. If this great democratic principle be false—we and our country are undone. If it be true, no mortal power can estimate the height of grandeur waiting to receive us—nor compute the depth and thoroughness of that tremendous change which the influence of our spirit must operate throughout the earth. Our fathers have attested by their blood, their faith in this great truth; and by our works and lives we set it to our souls, that they judged rightly. They and we have frankly periled all upon it; and oh! how rich the stake which they and we have won!—Who are the tyrants of the earth but men? Who the proud oligarchs but men,—often most base, corrupt, and impotent of men?—And are not we too men? And shall they rule us and themselves also, being but men; and we incapable to rule ourselves yet being men?—Yes they shall do it—when they are wise, or strong, or brave enough to bind us again with broken fetters. Till then, we rule ourselves.

The influence of this simple principle upon the duration and grandeur of states, and of course upon the national and individual character of men, is immense, almost beyond conception. Man as we have found him commonly,—not man degraded by long misgovernment, and heartless tyranny,—not every man, nor possibly

at every era, men of every clime, but man in general, is fully competent to rule himself;—this is the grand truth. And if there be departures from it, they will be found not less, perhaps more frequently above than from beneath the common level of the race;—upon the thrones, and in the palaces of princes, often as grinding at the mill, or toiling in chains. Man is competent to rule himself, and therefore competent to settle the principles chosen for the direction of the state,—to expound and to apply these principles,—and to do this by the consent of the majority of wills. Now such a state must be secure forever, from ruin from within,—while men continue competent to rule themselves.—For to suppose otherwise, is to suppose the greater number not content with their own will;—nor even content to change it;—but bent on war against themselves. Or else that the smaller number shall deny the first principles of the social state itself, in which they live, and shall be stronger than the larger number, and so by force, subvert the state. But of all authorities the hardest to subvert, is that to which the greatest number give consent; and of all forms of government that which is surest to have this surety is that which is most popular. Men can be prevented of their will, at last, only by force. The bayonet or popular consent, are the naked final causes of all control. The greatest strength must always come at last into the hands of the greatest number—and therefore—they at length must every where decide the character of all authority; and better surely take it as their consent, than by their force. Better prepare those now unfitted for this trust, than waste in useless contests, what had otherwise been saved. Better take part with us, for man, than cling to the mouldering ruins of the past, and die inglorious victims of departing tyranny. He who would estimate the nature of the struggle, which otherwise must come, need only ask his heart the price at which it values the issues staked upon it. He who would estimate its result, must count the palaces, and then the hovels of the earth. He who would learn the origin and trace the progress in modern times, of this great controversy, now ready to be renewed, must seek its germ, its first expansion, its earliest fruits—and greatest promise, in the same events, amid which he traces the story of our country and our principles, their birth, their trials, and their fruits. There he will learn how impotent are all things that oppose themselves to the strong will and brave arm of man, roused to contend for sacred right. There will he see the utter worthlessness of all fictitious things not based in truth and nature; the strength of settled principle, the power and majesty of real greatness.

In such a state as this, the actual power and influence, are, of all states, most likely to reside in fitting hands. There are no lasting distinctions but those which are purely personal; and to a great extent all such depend upon the man himself. Hence the necessity for constant effort,—and hence that effort on the part of all. Hence the paramount value of knowledge, and therefore, its wide diffusion,—for want of knowledge in such a state, is the only real and hopeless poverty; and of all knowledge that which is most practical is most esteemed. Hence too the universal communication of thought, by voice and pen; the cultivation of eloquence and taste;

—the wide, if not controlling influence of the school, the rostrum, and the press. Hence also the grand and true progression in all real learning, and the disuse of all its trifles and vanities;—the wide diffusion of light,—the general spread of knowledge upon all, but especially all popular affairs;—the profound impulse communicated to the national spirit, the gradual approximation of all to the same lofty standard—and the intense stimulus to all, to exert in every department of life their best efforts, by the best methods, to the best results. To say that this picture is over drawn, is only to assert that we have not as yet fully perfected our social institutions, nor perfectly accomplished our immense plans and hopes. But who in a thousand years has gone so far, as we in fifty, in reducing all things that are factitious to the dust, and elevating real worth and virtue to their just rank;—and in furnishing the means of universal preparation for usefulness to all, and eminence to the most deserving. Well may we point to what we have already done, nor blush to own that we have still larger purposes, and confidence that daily grows to certainty, of ultimate complete success.

They who bewail the array and bitterness of parties,—their vile contentions,—their base ends, and their mean jealousies,—do but bewail the common frailty of our kind. This spirit is the rust of human systems;—better to brush it off by a free action, than that it eat into the heart. But who can truly charge ours, or any popular institutions with its evil influence, more than all besides? Who shall dare to say that the highest aristocracies upon earth and its most privileged classes are not more completely the slaves of all personal and selfish influences—than the most untutored populace of all that ever they despised or sold? Where all may be misled by passion, or deceived by prejudice—all forms of government may some times be endangered even by their friends; and where none are free from weaknesses and frailties, and many prone to gross corruption—every state may be thus endangered also. But if reason teaches us one clear lesson, it is that all men's interests are safest in their own hands:—for in no age of blindness or corruption have any people yet willingly undone themselves;—but oh! how many have been undone by false and blinded rulers!—There are however many important respects in which the parties in free states differ from others. Here the fundamental principles of all,—those great principles which give distinctiveness to our whole system are always remarkably the same; they differ chiefly where honest differences do really exist, in their modes of application, their methods of exposition or their policy in daily use. But in all other states the opposing parties fight over the vitals of society itself;—and at this moment there is no land but ours, in which some thorough change in great and established principles of the governments themselves, is not involved every party contest. With us too, charge even to the last degree of party heat, may be made in peace: for the right to change and even to abolish and reconstruct the government itself, is a right admitted and defined,—yea often exercised without commotion, and sometimes with much advantage. But in all governments differently constructed, every change is in itself a revolution; and if it be thorough, is often treason to propose,—and

always reached through blood. From hence, as from the whole tenor of our principles, result the mild and equal spirit of our laws,—the humane character of all our public punishments,—the kindness, purity, and mildness of all our national manners and amusements. Where are our gladiatorial shows? Where the bloody combats of inferior animals to gratify a ferocious public sentiment? Or where the brutal pugilistic sports that still disgrace some states, not backward to celebrate their high civilization?—Here all are citizens, and therefore we neither murder nor degrade each other to feast the polluted eyes of bloody oligarchs, or a brutal populace, shouting for “*bread and games!*” All are equal in the law’s eye, all have one privilege and right—and therefore cruel and unnatural punishments are not required to protect the special claims of any. All have serious and weighty duties to perform,—and therefore the food of light and idle minds is foreign from us, and corrupting sports useless and despised. All know their duties,—their rights,—their dignity,—and therefore all know how to shun offence,—as well as to respect in others, the sacred treasures so precious to themselves. To utter all at once, our principles imply a state where man is free—and then enlightened.

Freedom is much,—knowledge perhaps not less,—but knowledge and freedom may be social evils without virtue. In themselves considered and simply in personal respects, freedom is good and knowledge is good. But as social elements neither is good for those on whom we act, if virtue do not direct them. Here too our whole principles are most peculiar;—and with characteristic singleness of purpose we have frankly periled all upon their truth. Religion is the only parent of virtue,—as God is the only source of every good. The will of God revealed to us, is the only sufficient guide to virtue, and the only solid basis of all true religion;—for God is the great object of all pure religion,—and the only author of all real virtue. Alas! how signally has every age illustrated by its errors these simple, but unknown truths. Men have won by their great deeds immortal praise, and yet have turned and worshipped stocks and stones!—Men have braved death in fearful and hideous shapes with stern composure, yet trembled at the low chirping of a bird, or the hoarse bellow of a stupid ox—which they called God! Nations have risen, even to the pinnacle of learning, elegance and all the arts,—for a brief space,—whose souls were dark as midnight on eternal things; and others have won release from grinding wrongs, and borne on their victorious flags, freedom to many lands,—upon whose hearts was graved, *there is no God!* And even they who knew the truth, with one accord mistook the way, by which alone it could most highly bless the world. For ages Bishops and Kings laid the united burden of their staves and sceptres upon the necks of men, and ground down the earth, calling aloud on order and religion. For ages still longer—black and tedious ages—he who proclaimed himself vicar of God, and therefore sovereign of the whole earth,—Bishop and King at once in his own person, and therefore Lord of all who were either, among men,—sat with consuming wrath upon the world’s heart and brain, smothering and maddening the human spirit;—with his two swords

cleaving down, upon the right hand knowledge—upon the left freedom; with his two keys, locking up heaven, and opening hell; and with the fearful weight of his great tripple crown, crushing all hope, all peace, all virtue, into fine powder like the small dust of the balance! Yea all have erred:—for even in those better days, vouched safe to many prayers and struggles—how hard it is often to recognize in most of our father-lands—the humble apostles of our Lord, in mitred and titled wealth and pomp; and the mild, free and upright spirit of his word, in systems decreed by kings,—richly endowed by states,—and upheld by harsh, unreasonable and exclusive laws!

If man is free in view of earth—who shall bind his soul in view of heaven? If it be good to deprive the state of power to bind man's will and acts—except so far as clear necessity requires in temporal things,—that rule applies with far more force and clearness in spiritual things. For if the state desire an engine to oppress its people—none has been more near at hand or more effectual in every age than a state religion; or if a faction should desire to use the state for evil purposes, no principle resides in man, to which so many and so effectual appeals have been made, as to a perverted religious sentiment. Then if people or governments desire security,—let every state and all religion be always separate. Not that a state shall have no God; for then most surely will God reject that state. But as factions in the state are not the constitution—so let not sects in religion become the government. And as all political opinions are free, so also let all religious opinions be: but as all overt acts that endanger the public security, peace or order, are to be published tho' they be called political, and even proceed from settled principle—so also overt religious acts that threaten or hurt society are not to be allowed, altho' men say they have exclusive reference to God. Religion of all things may be most free,—because of all things, most of its varieties may well consist with public security,—which is the great end of law. And besides, the whole subject, so long as it confines itself to acts not hurtful to society,—is one, out of all human reach; except our minds and hearts should be seduced to embrace the established faith, by such temptations as corrupt all religion, or forced to its profession by cruelties which prove that all religion is extinct; and in either case the cruelty or corruption is a gratuitous evil to society and useless to those employing it—as true religion suffers, and that established—gains but in name. In religion then, absolute freedom—and thorough independence of the state, is best for itself and safest for the world. The state must punish acts of open wrong, and suppress practices which hurt the public peace or decency; not because they are religious acts or practices—but because they are hurtful, indecent, or unjust. And so far there it is a great and sacred duty on every commonwealth, not fully understood by us,—because not often required to be performed; but which may yet demand a constant watchfulness and frequent interposition of the laws; for already are prisons erected in many portions of the country, under the name of religious houses, and much corruption of manners, and many crimes are creeping in under the pretext of religious profession. Beyond this, no govern-

ment can interfere without great injury;—nor ours without the grossest usurpation of forbidden power. Religion is the strongest necessity of the human soul; no people have done without it,—none ever will. Rather than have no God, men worship things which they themselves see to be both corrupt and despicable. Sooner than be destitute of some settled faith, they will attempt to credit things too gross to be believed—and do things too cruel to be detailed. They who at any time have escaped this mighty influence, have done so only after having discovered the vile delusions, by which they had been misled, and the terrible pollution of those who seduced them into sin, professing to guide them to God; and even these have soon returned again submissive to the all pervading power of nature—which even while they pretended to cast off, they showed their proneness to obey, by every freak of superstition and credulity. All commonwealths may trust as implicitly that man must be religious, as that he is capable to rule himself. His rule may be unwise,—his religion false and corrupt; his rule may be subverted, and his religion itself destroyed. But as there is no better security on which to build a state, than to rely on his ability to rule himself; so there is no certainty so great and yet so safe that religion will exist as to rely on man's proneness to it. Here ends the duty of the state and here begins that of the church of God. The way is free and wide; the heart of man, tost to and fro, is panting for that it never finds but in the peace of God;—and here the heavenly messenger is sent to teach, to guide, to quicken, sanctify and save. Here is our commonwealth, and there our church. Here is our agent to consolidate our freedom, to secure our rights, to guard our growing greatness, to watch and provide the means, whereby the humblest citizen may be prepared for honest competence, and real though obscure usefulness. But yonder is our home, our last and blessed abode, not built of men, but God;—and he, his word, his spirit, his messenger, his glorious grace, need little help of human governments far less their guidance,—titles—power and riches,—and least of all their glittering swords, or noisome dungeons to win our father's children to the skies. A stranger's voice they do not know; a stranger's steps they will not follow; and from the voice of man's authority, their spirits shrink—and at the sound of the armed tread of power, the timid bird of peace flies backward into heaven. Oh! that the wise would learn, that in their carnal wisdom, they are but fools with God; and the strong know that God's weakness is mightier than their strength!

III. In estimating the probable influence upon the nations of the earth, of such a system as the one whose origin and developement we have now faintly sketched,—a field of illimitable speculation is spread out before the mind. The mental history of the world has never yet been written. The true progress of human opinion, if it can ever be exhibited with tolerable accuracy, will be found to be one of the most striking and extraordinary, as it has been one of the most neglected branches of knowledge. The brother of Seneca in the pride of cold and skeptical philosophy, in the politest age of the world, spurned from his tribunal, as a mere question of useless

words, that system of religious truth, which from that day to this has borne in one hand the destinies of the world that now is, and with the other taken fast hold of all the stupendous issues of that which is to come.—The feeble voice of an unknown monk, was heard in the silence of his narrow cell, far off amid the rude and sluggish people of the north; and the sleek and pampered ministers of ignorance and corruption, smiled in scorn, as they drew their purple robes around them, and set their heels more firmly on the dead conscience of the universe they had enslaved. But a resistless might dwelt in that low whisper; and by and by it swelled into the loud cry of many nations cheering each other onward in the way of truth and knowledge.—A band of despised men, few and distantly seated almost beyond the pale of human fellowship, rose up in the sublime power of right, and uttered the simple cardinal truths of freedom and independence—while the world laughed in mockery—and its rulers gnashed their teeth in mortal hatred. To day that heroic company, is but just passed away; and already what thrones have fallen, what sceptres been broken, what victories won for bleeding liberty! Nay rather what secret habitation of cruelty and darkness has escaped wholly the entrance and the life-giving power of their sacred principles! Majestic power of sentiment and thought! Sublime force of human sympathy to propagate itself! When true and wise, and rightfully directed, resistless for all good: when evil or misguided, terrible for ill. A principle grand and uniform; yet oh! how much perverted, neglected or unknown!

Upon this principle alone, so far as direct national influence could be exerted, have we rested the hope of influencing for good, the nations of the world, through ours. We make no conquests. We bury the implements of blood deep from human sight, and weep when insupportable wrong forces us to dig them up. We abhor all aggressive war. We offer to mankind the light of our example; we lay before all people our simple principles. There is our story; let the wise read it. Here is its issue; let the hearts of men be glad as they behold. Time, that great witness for the truth, is doing his work with a rapidity and thoroughness, that ought to satisfy the most impatient,—to quicken the most sluggish. And every development of the state of free opinions throughout the earth, makes more and more manifest the close connexion of our history with their progress, and the growing influence of our spirit over their character. The spark that lighted up all the mighty revolutions of the last half century, was caught from our altar of '76. And though the flame thus kindled has sometimes threatened to consume the nations with its fearful and indiscriminate violence,—and been again and again extinguished in blood, yet even the excesses of liberty are fewer and less protracted than those of the cruel tyranny which always engenders them; and its final aspect, the most serene and constant which society can possibly assume, will bless and repay the lands that bled for it, a thousand fold, for all their sufferings in such a cause. Yea within the narrow compass of those fifty years, even if liberty itself were deemed a curse to nations,—the contests which have been waged for it, and the spirit which has been engendered in their midst, have so thoroughly renovated all human things, that

for this service alone every coming generation would rise up and bless our memory. The spirit of ancient evil, was too strong to be resisted by any spirit but that of liberty. If the strong man that unbound the nations, tore down some gorgeous palaces and shining temples, to make free passage for the enslaved to sally forth; or if he cooled the heated chains he could not rend, with some blood of kings; or if he trod with his mailed foot upon the carcasses of the blind and deaf herd of princes and their armed slaves, who rushed furiously to break themselves against him: men will forgive the stern physician, and the sharp remedies, when they remember that the dark spell of ages is at last broken—the madness of the nations, well nigh cured—and life from the dead entered into them. But these are most extreme admissions. For they who sow the wind, are in the nature of the case obliged to reap the whirlwind. And they to whom is left the single choice,—to perish, or to gather in and quell the storm, must put forth a strong arm and an unflinching courage.—We have taught this lesson to a world anxious to learn and practice it. Its first attempts have broken vile and corrupt states against each other, like the potter's worthless vessels. Its ripened skill, will settle all things which cannot and should not be shaken, upon foundations which will be removed no more forever.

It was not to have been expected that the world could long remain indifferent to the nature, or ignorant of the source of such new and mighty influences. On the one hand, all who hoped in the future, saw in our history the proof of what man could accomplish, and in our system the model towards which his highest efforts should be directed: while on the other, all who saw only danger in improvement, and ruin in the overthrow of ancient abuses, directed towards us an eye of jealous watchfulness, and increased in malice against us, as our influence for good augmented; until at length the overthrow of our institutions has become a settled point of that policy which their own preservation dictates. Nothing would be easier than to prove that the anti-liberal party in Europe has desired our ruin from the very commencement of our national existence; and that for a number of years past, a large, influential and increasing portion of it, has actually plotted and contrived means to effect it. From the dawn of the American revolution to the present moment, there has flowed over Europe one incessant stream of falsehood and detraction in regard to this country, and all that is peculiar in our manners, institutions and social state, until at length the public mind is sunken into a condition of ignorance and prejudice towards us, at once mournful and amusing. At intervals, these clouds have been dispersed; and then the hearts of the people have broken forth in overpowering sympathy for us,—at the same moment that they have been maddened in convulsive efforts for themselves. And each successive throe becomes continually more violent than the one preceding it, as increasing knowledge gives increased power and urgency to the motives which actuate those who struggle for long with-held rights. This too, the rulers of the earth have learned; and therein they have perceived the necessity of stronger measures against us, in proportion as greater watchfulness became needful in the changed position or clearer aims of their own sub-

jects. As long as general ignorance, a numerous police, a bloody code of punishments, and fierce and endless foreign wars were sufficient to make tolerably sure, their own seats upon their people's necks, slander of us was deemed enough to guard against the entrance of light from this quarter. But when the altered circumstances of the nations and the silent spread of the spirit which has worked so deeply of late in the souls of men, forced a change of their domestic policy, a corresponding change towards us is visible. At all times we have beheld a sleepless watchfulness on the part of foreign states to intrude into our political and social questions, at the very period, when they were most critical, and into the very questions that seemed to be most trying to our institutions; in so much that at different times, parties have been denounced as the Spanish, the French, and the British party, at several eventful periods of our history. At the present moment, there is a wide spread organization in this country, operating recklessly against the peace of the nation, the union of the states, and the integrity of the constitution, under the pretext of hostility to one of the domestic relations in the southern states; a party which is in all its spirit, aims, and sympathies, as well as in its origin, a foreign party, alien and hostile to the republic,—led by men, some of whom have affected shame for their country, others denounced and slandered it and its institutions, abroad,—and others received foreign treasure to support their enterprises. At the same time hundreds of thousands of foreigners are launched into the bosom of the nation,—many indeed worthy of a cordial reception, and able to repay by their virtues, the blessings they receive,—but multitudes of others driven out for crimes, or discharged from jails and poor-houses and sent hither at public charge and by public authority,—while still more are in total ignorance of all human knowledge, and especially of all that concerns the duties and privileges of freemen. From another quarter we see millions of money, and herds of foreign ecclesiastics finding entrance into the land through all our ports; the money contributed by foreign princes, and people of a strange religion, avowedly to proselyte the nation to a system hostile to liberty; and the ecclesiastics planting themselves over the country and seeking to engross the direction of public morals and general education,—while they confessedly receive their appointments, their authority, and their fantastic honours, from a foreign potentate, whose predecessors for thirteen centuries have denounced, as they say by the direct and infallible authority of God, every principle which is precious and peculiar to us! Here is indeed a fearful combination. The ignorance, the crimes, the superstition, the fanaticism, and the anti-social spirit of the age, united against our beloved country, and directed against its glory and its stability, if not its very being, by the priests, oligarchs, and bigots of Europe, sustained by its press, its riches and its thrones. And as if to make full trial of us, to the last degree at once,—a portion of our own people seem ready to embrace each new absurdity; a portion of our public press to be misled by every wild extravagance; and a portion of the religious community itself to be embued with strange disorder.

Never was there a moment when the nation was more imperatively called to manifest its clear comprehension of its great principles, and its thorough devotion to them. If indeed we know these things, blessed shall we be if we be found faithful to our fathers and to posterity, in so great a crisis. Let no man's heart fail,—let no man's purpose waver; nor let any cast about for new expedients, as if the principles we have so highly praised, and the power we have in former days so signally put forth, were not sufficient for the present, and for all coming trials. Let us stand nobly by the great landmarks of our code, and make manifest the same courageous steadfastness in what is right, that sheds such lustre around our past career; and new triumphs and final security await us. Such a system as ours presents, from its very nature, as has already been shown, the utmost possible means of resisting evil influences from within; both as it is most dependent on the general will, and therefore most dear to the common heart, and because its capacity for self-adjustment is most perfect—and its centres of influence and security most multiplied; insomuch that it would be necessary that a great absolute majority of the whole, and a concurrent majority in every part should be corrupt and alienated from the great principles of the system itself, before it could be defeated in all its strong holds; and while even one remained, it might eventually redeem the whole. Nor is its capacity for resisting hurtful influences from without, when they come in the shape of open force, less decisive, or less favoured by the character and action of our whole principles and institutions. Powerless in aggressive war, which we repudiate, and which is foreign to all our habits and views,—if man can be impelled to irresistible energy in self defence, and human interests can be so arranged as to be out of the reach of foreign violence, that fortunate conjunction exists with us. Nay it exists fortified by the separate geographical position of the United States, with reference to the other great powers of the earth; and direct interference by force, already twice repelled, is at length become nearly hopeless, by reason of the greatness of the country itself. And it is well that it is so, in the present juncture. For connected with the portentous indications already pointed at, is the growth of another faction which contents itself, while others seek our ruin, with preaching to us, the sinfulness of self-defence. To such dreamers, if indeed they be deceived themselves, or traitors if they be not—there needs but this reply. As long as the Bible teaches us that the defence of our country, our liberties, and our mercies, is often a high christian duty to be performed under the guidance of the spirit of God; as long as history informs us that every nation which now enjoys freedom, independence, the free spread of knowledge, or the unmolested practice of true religion, does so, only because God blessed the victorious arms of its valiant people upon the field of battle; as long as every monument around us most signally owned of heaven, is sprinkled with the life blood of our heroic ancestors;—we pity the honest errors, and despise the shallow guile of such as would thus bind us hand and foot, defenceless victims to a crowd of mortal foes, ourselves recreant to the loftiest destiny and the sublimest trust, ever committed to the hands of men!

But the evils which threaten us, from without, bear on their front, no hostile image. They come to us in forms so adapted to our condition, and veil themselves under pretexts so accordant with our common rights, that the nation has been slow to realise the greatness of the threatened danger, or the reality of the alleged conspiracy against its liberties. At length it begins to be awakened to the truth of its position, and before its open glance danger will flee away. Let the public sentiment be fully enlightened, roused and concentrated; let the laws have free course, so that they who come hither fugitives, or missionaries of evil, shall not be allowed to practice habits and follow courses suited only to the thralldom they have escaped; let the patriotic spirit of the country be thoroughly aroused and directed to the evils which threaten us from foreign parties at home, and foreign nations cast like deluges upon us; let the protestant and christian feeling of the whole republic be stirred up to arrest the swelling tide of dangerous and cruel superstition, and pour the streams of gospel purity over the unwashed multitudes who flock in all their defilement to our shores; let the school-master bestir himself in every corner of our land, and shed the light of knowledge upon the whole mass of human intelligence; let the free and noble spirit of our country have full scope, to transform the children of those sent to undo us, into enlightened champions of our sacred cause; in short let our principles have complete exercise, in proportion to the greatness of the present exigency, and the world will see that their transforming power is equal to their capacity for self adjustment, and their efficiency in resisting open violence. To day men may be Britons or Germans, strangers or barbarians to us. Tomorrow they are all Americans. The first generation born upon the soil, shall be a native generation; American in all its feelings, principles and aims. And thus in the providence of God, that very portion of the human race, which could never have been controlled at a distance by our mind and spirit, is brought near to the fountain of influence, and transformed by its power into new beings, fit to enjoy and propagate blessings they were destined to subvert. Thus too, by the reactive power of truth, new entrance will be obtained for it into habitations of darkness where, else, it never could have found its way; until the very instruments of tyranny and superstition, shall become apostles of truth and liberty,—and the fetters with which they would have bound the free, be converted into implements with which to hew in pieces, every throne of wickedness, with all who set upon them.

There is one aspect of the relation of the United States to the great human family, and the possible influence of the American mind upon the entire race of man, which invests this whole subject with surprising magnitude. We behold the human race divided into three great families, which, however they may be again subdivided, preserve every where the characteristics which mark the respective descendants of Shem, Japhet, and Ham. In general terms it may be stated, that from the earliest dawn of knowledge up to a period not long preceding the commencement of the christian era, the first of these stems was principally used by God in promoting all the grand results which affected the whole race of man; and

that to the family of Shem the world was not only chiefly indebted for all it possessed worth having for almost four thousand years of its existence, but that with comparatively small exceptions it was absolutely under its control, during the greater part of that long period. For the last two thousand years the stem of Japhet has been the depository of human excellence, power and grandeur; and it has steadily progressed from the rise of the Greek power until the present day, in the same degree that the race of Shem has declined, until its empire, whether moral or physical, it become absolute and undisputed—and every great and blessed possession its exclusive heritage.—Who can read in the dim future, the destiny of Ham? Shall it indeed be his hard lot to know a servitude to his brethren, that has no end nor mitigation? Or is it the will of God to retain for him, a final reign of unparalleled civilization, illustrious as it was long deferred? This at least is remarkable, that those portions of the earth which seem from the progress of modern arts, manners, and refinement to be most indispensable to man, and to yield most abundantly, if not exclusively those productions which have become most valuable and important to all conditions of society, are precisely those which Ham alone can occupy, or to which at least, he is most congenial.

But what is striking to observe, in the posture of our country, is this. If God design in the latter days, great things for Ham, it must be manifest at a glance, that the position, the state, the relations of our country to this unhappy race, and to the lands most congenial to it, point out the United States, as the nursing mother of its destiny. Oh! what a recompense to virtue and humanity. To receive slaves, to give back freemen. To receive savages and heathen, and restore civilized and Christian men, laden with fruits, not the less precious, that they have been gathered in sorrow and bedewed with tears. To receive helpless individuals to whom the very idea of nationality is unknown, and out of them to construct the first elements, of what is now the grand desideratum of civilization, a great Hamite commonwealth in some tropical clime! What a bright and beneficent providence, that such results should flow exactly through that channel, where the very spirit and impulse which must at last control the world, should have been embibed even in the cradle, and absorbed into the blood, with the earliest national attempts of a race, destined it may be, to behold such stupendous revolutions in its condition.

But suppose it should be otherwise, and that the race of Japhet shall hold forever the mastery over his brethren, and control their destiny at will. Even then, the influence of our country in future ages would appear to be only increased, and the highth of glory to which its instrumentality may carry the fortunes of this renowned stem, beyond conception. At this moment the commerce of the world, and with it all exterior influence, is almost engrossed not only by a few kindred nations, but substantially by one other with ourselves,—both Japhetan, both protestant, both essentially sprung from the same illustrious original, amongst the subdivisions of their common stem—and both using the same noble speech, honoured throughout the earth for the great deeds it records, and blessed to

man by the treasures it contains. What triumphs has not this strangely glorious race already achieved; and what difficulties are beyond the compass of its present power? What land even now is ignorant of the Anglo-Saxon name? But oh! what wonders will that name have wrought, when Britain shall have become as free and just, as she is great and wise; and when we shall recount our acts by centuries instead of days!

It is an august subject of contemplation, to look back upon the series of great empires which have been thinly scattered through the track of past ages, and behold how each has in its course accomplished for man, its mighty though perhaps undesigned, or even unknown good; and then, laid aside by the same almighty hand that made it great for its own purposes, gradually melted back into the common mass of human littleness. From the empire of Nebuchadnezer to that of Napoleon, how immense has been the distance, and how diverse the work which they, and each intervening one,—the Median and Persian, the Greek, the Roman, and that of Charlemagne, have all performed, that the condition of human affairs might be precisely what it is this day? How stupendous have been the revolutions which were required before the many could be taught that the world was theirs; and the few be made to see that their claims to rule the bodies, and brutalize the minds, and kill the souls of men, were as horribly absurd as their own numbers were infinitely insignificant! How has this fearful and protracted contest, which has burned through such ages of strife, changed not only the agents and implements but the very theatre of its warfare, until it has left no spot of earth which has not been stained with its bloody track! Springing up with the empire of the Babylonians in the centre of Asia,—Cyrus with his Medes and Persians exposed it to the farthest verges of that nursery of mankind. Alexander transferred it into the fairest provinces of Africa, and drew it across the Hellespont into Europe. The stern soldiers of old Rome covered the earth with the shadow of their glory and their strength; and heaved up to the most northern frontiers of Europe, the empire, which under Charlemagne and Napoleon, only struggled to shake off the incumbent mass of corruption, ignorance and oppression which the barbarism of countless hoards of savages, and the superstition of centuries of apostasy had accumulated. At length northern Europe, a wilderness when this conflict had its origin, had become the only theatre on which man struggled; and pushed, as has been exhibited in the early part of this discourse, the great victims of it across the atlantic, to build up here an impregnable strong hold, from which freedom, knowledge and religion, might turn back their streams, to fertilize again the parched regions consumed by so many and so great misfortunes.

From that hour the current of all things is changed. The tide has struck the pole; and now it rolls backward to the equator its resistless and sacred wave. Let the nations hail the coming waters; for verily the hour of their deliverance is come. The knell of tyranny is struck. The only Lord of men returns to claim his great and long abused heritage; and where his spirit is, there is peace and freedom.

For ourselves, if our course were already finished, our name, our example, our spirit, our mind would live forever to illuminate and cheer mankind. Upon the brightest page of the world's history would be recorded, as a divine episode amidst its bloody details, our surprising story; and all coming ages would blush or rejoice, as they found in it the image of their virtues and success, or the lasting condemnation of their cowardice and crimes. But as Greece gave her literature, and Rome her civilization to the world—it is ours to give it liberty. This vast continent is yet to be crowded from shore to shore with a free, educated, and virtuous population; and the banner of our republic wave over an empire unparalleled in the greatness of its extent, as unequalled in the wisdom, justice and humanity of its institutions. Our brethren of the races of Shem and Ham now weeping in our midst, or neglected around our wide frontiers, must yet rejoice under the shadow of our protection, and be repaid for sufferings too long protracted. Streams of blessings must issue from our land, to make the nations smile in the same prosperity, exult in the same freedom and light, and rejoice in the same divine Lord who has done all things for us. Yea vast and sublime is the work yet laid up in store for us; and peerless the glory dependent on its wise and faithful performance. And when it is done, what boots it afterwards, whether the God of nations shall continue to our country an interminable career of blessings and renown as one united people;—or whether this immense continent shall be studded with a hundred separate republics, all built upon the foundations we have laid, all consecrating the principles we have made immortal, and all perpetuating the felicity which God has raised up our country to win and to illustrate?

To make any system attain its highest degree of developement and perfection, it is necessary that every particular portion of it should perform with exactness and regularity, its appropriate function. In the judgment of enlightened reason, nothing is small, nothing great, except relatively as it is effective upon all other results, or in turn affected by them. But especially in every social system, must it inevitably occur, that the perfect accomplishment of its ends, will depend on the degree in which every individual embraced in it, perfectly comprehends its scope, is thoroughly imbued with its spirit, and completely devoted to its propagation and defence. In such a case, failure could result only from the inherent evils of the system itself: while in all others, the best intentions and the amplest arrangements may be defeated by imperfect sympathy, or still worse by direct hostility, between the parts and the whole, or between one part and another.

But of all organizations, ours most imperatively demands this cordial action of the universal will, which is indeed its vital breath,—this complete and intelligent devotion of the popular affections, upon which its entire strength reposes. And who can exaggerate the dignity and grandeur of those motives which are set before the American people, and which urge us with constant importunity to be all that such a system requires, all that such a heritage, such a destiny, such mercies, such privileges demand! Every field of use-

fulness, happiness and greatness lies open before us, enticing every generous spirit to all good and noble enterprises. And whatever may be the theatre or nature of our pursuits, whether in private or public life, whether studious or practical, or however various or diversified—there is not one honest course approved of God, which will not conduct our patient and laborious steps, to competence and honour, at the same time that it obliges us to contribute to the common glory of our country, and the general welfare of our race. Happy people! Blessed country! Singular and sublime destiny!

But oh! let us evermore remember that all these paths are beset by manifold temptations; that these unprecedented mercies are all held by us as stewards of God, and as trustees for generations of generations, and so must be accounted for before earth and heaven; and that in the eye of God, and in the enlightened contemplation of this great and thrilling subject, we have set before us, but one end worthy of our efforts, or our regard, namely, to do good here—and to be blessed forever.

PRIEST DELUOL, AS A CONTROVERSIALIST.

WE have tendered a fair field to all the papal priests of the country for the last three years. We have received from them only, "expressive silence;" but their friends have apologised for them in private, by saying that they were such holy men, they had no taste for controversy,—such laborious men, they had no time for controversy—such liberal men, they saw no need for controversy, such charitable men, they thought religious dogmas not worth controversy—and we know not how many similar explanations of a timidity at once ludicrous and most judicious. But the reader will bear in mind, that the controversy for which these priests have so great abhorrence, is only that which is open, manly and public—in which a competent and responsible opponent is offered to them. This sort, they were a few years ago, seduced into with Dr. John Breckinridge, and Dr. Brownlee, and still more recently in the West, with Mr. Rice, and Mr. Campbell; and upon every attempt they have been so soundly and so heartily beaten, that they have reserved their forces, for private enterprises entirely—and those only with boys, and females. In conversation with the protestant boys committed to their care by thoughtless parents—they are wise, and learned—oh! how wise and learned! In schemes to proselyte unprotected females, they are bold as "sucking doves"—and taught in all the depths of wisdom!

This secret and underhand proselytism is a regular part of the life of every priest; indeed next to making dough Gods, and contriving ways to "raise the wind"—is the very business for which they are trained. At present, their vocation is rather profitless, by reason of the light and knowledge which the press and pulpit, have diffused over the country. But still they prosecute their labours with ceaseless diligence.

The following is an odd paper in one of those numerous controversies—which by some accident escaped destruction with its fellows. It is from the hand of DR. DELUOL, and published from the original, placed by him, in the hands of the lady, who placed it as a curiosity in the hands of the individual who gave it to us. Our pages are open to Dr. Deluol, for denial or explanation. Meantime we state, that he sought, first an acquaintance, then an oral discussion, then a written one, with a respectable female of this city—whom he harrassed, until she uncerimoniously put an end to their intercourse:—and that the document published below, is a precious wreck from the doctor's part of the controversy.

As an attempt at reasoning, it is unspeakably contemptible and ridiculous; and furnishes another, to be added to the ten thousand proofs already before the public, that these priests are as shallow, and as ignorant, as they are impudent and boastful. Can any thing equal the impertinence of asking a rational being, to give up Christianity and follow Romanism, for such reasons as the following paper furnishes? For shame, Mr. Deluol:—fie, for shame!

You begin thus;

“First: All Christians acknowledge,” you grant, “that the revealed truths of Christ are essential to salvation.”

Be it so.

You add: “and this revelation is made to all that believe in his name.”

If by “those who believe in his name,” you mean what is generally understood by the terms *believers, faithful, &c.*, allow me to say that, it cannot be said that this revelation “is made” to them; for they already believe—if you mean any thing else, please to let me know what it is. At all events, the question is *not*, to whom this revelation is made; but, by what means we are to come to the knowledge “of the revealed truths of Christ.” St. John, from whom you borrow the phrase “those who believe in his name,” says, that “to them he gave the power to become the sons of God.” (chap. 1. v. 12.) That is to say, by baptism, and the gifts of faith, infused into their souls, *they* become the adopted children of God, *who*, by nature, as St. Paul speaks, were “children of wrath.” “Those *sons of God*” believe *implicitly* “the truths of Christ;” and when these are made known to them, by the successors of his apostles, whom he commanded “to teach,” *even to the end of the world, all things whatsoever he himself had revealed to them*—(Matthew, 28 v. 20.)—When these truths, I say, are made known to them, by this means, then, and not before, they believe them *explicitly*.

“2dly: He did propose means,” you say, “to come to the knowledge of these truths.”—See St. John v—39. “Search the scriptures, for in them ye think ye have eternal life, and they are they that testify of me.”

This text is, as I have told you before, the only one (as far as I can recollect) in which our Lord advises the reading of Scriptures. But, unfortunately, it cannot be said that Christ “proposes” therein, “a means” to know the truths he revealed; for it relates only to the Scriptures of the Old Testament, to which Christ referred *the Jews*,

and *not the Christians*: to know, *not* all that God had revealed to their forefathers, but merely that he was promised, foretold, &c., in those Scriptures.

You also quote Acts xvii. and part of the 11th verse: "And they searched the Scriptures daily whether those things were so."—

These texts, do not point out the means "proposed by Christ" to know the truths he revealed. St. Paul, "reasoned with" the Jews of Thessalonica, "opening and alledging, that Christ must needs have suffered, and risen again from the dead; and that, this Jesus, whom I preach unto you, is Christ." So that, he proved from the Scriptures of the Old Testament, that Christ was the Messiah, promised to their fathers; that his birth, death, and resurrection, were foretold by their prophets; but he did not "propose" the reading of the Scriptures, as the "means of knowing the truths revealed by Christ."

As to the 11th verse "they searched the Scriptures daily, whether those things were so."

It suggests to the Jews *a means* to know that Jesus, is the Christ' promised to their fathers: but not (I must again say it) of knowing the truths revealed by Christ. Nor is this means, proposed by St. Paul, whose words they had no business to doubt. Whatever is found in Scripture is not, thereby, "*proposed*" for our imitation—"Judas went out and hanged himself:" does this text propose a means to end our life?

You subjoin: "Which is the duty of every Christian as well as his privilege to do so, without restraint."

To call this a *duty* and a *privilege*, is supposing, or as logicians term it, *begging the question*, namely; that "to search the scriptures," is the means *proposed by Christ*, to know the truths he revealed. But this is not the case.

Do you wish to know, the means proposed by Christ, to know the truths he has revealed? It is *the teaching* of the Apostles, to the end of the world; and, of course, of their successors. "*And Jesus came, and spake unto them, saying—Go ye and teach all nations—and lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world.*" Matt. 28. 18. 20. That this means was put into execution, and that, by this means, *they* who believed "*in his name*" (Christ's), became "*sons of God*," and of his church, is plainly declared in in the Acts, chap. 16. v 4. 5. "*And as they went through the cities, they delivered them the decrees for to keep, that were ordained of the apostles and elders which were at Jerusalem. And so were the churches established in the faith, and increased in numbers, daily.*"

As for the privilege you speak of, it was by using it, that Calvin had the impiety to assert that "God has, without any condition, and from all eternity, consigned a part of the human race to perdition"—That Christ suffered all the punishment of the damned," &c.

And in truth: "Hence have all heresies arisen," says St. Augustin, "that the scriptures, that are *good*, have been interpreted badly"—by whom? I ask you; but by those men, who exercised the *unrestrained privilege*, which you would claim.

Your quotations, from Ephe. 11. 5.—Rom. 3. 27. and 5. 1. 2 and x. 6., &c., do not seem to me, to have much to do with the

rule of faith, or the *means proposed by Christ*, to know the truths, which he revealed. They relate to *justification, grace and faith*. Upon these subjects, St. Paul and St. James, *seem* (though in reality they do not) to disagree. These doctrines are rocks, upon which the "unrestrained searchers" of Scripture have often split, whilst they "wrested them unto their own destruction as they do also the other Scriptures" (St. Peter, 2. ep. c. 3. v. 16.)—

You write: "3ly. That means must be found in his church."—
This, I think is one of my propositions.

You add: "I ask what constitutes the church of Christ?"—

And you answer: "All faithful Christians."

So do I:—But I must ask too, what you mean by faithful Christians—they who believe the truths revealed by Christ—Is it so? Thus, my proposition about the means of knowing these truths, still stands *firm and unshaken*.

You proceed: "what name then was given to his church?"

This I did not ask, in my propositions; for I did not mean to contend about *names*. However, your answer reads as follows; "Acts xi. 26. Disciples (or his church) first called Christians (not Roman Catholics) in Antioch."

The word *Catholic* does not occur in the New Testament; but that the church of Christ was to be *Catholic*, that is to say, *universal*, is mentioned throughout the whole Bible. That these disciples were *first* called Christians in Antioch and not in Rome, insinuates that the apostles preached at Antioch, before they preached at Rome. But these *Antioch Catholics*, were afterwards called *Roman Catholics*, (when Rome was converted to the faith), and so were all the disciples of Christ, all Christians—and so are they now; for, every Christian, *properly so called*, every *true* disciple of Christ is a *Catholic*, and every Catholic, is a Roman Catholic.

You proceed thus: "Fourthly. God does not confine his grace to the Roman Catholic church.—Rom. 3. 29. "Is he the God of the Jews only?"

What! Are Roman Catholics, Jews?

You continue: "Is he not also of the Gentiles? Yes of the Gentiles also."—

Do you mean that *Catholics* are designated by the name of *Jews*, and *non-Catholics* by that of *gentiles*?

You quote, lastly, St. John x. 16. "And other sheep I have, which are not of this fold: them also, I must bring, and they shall hear my voice, and there shall be one fold and one sheperd."

These sheep, you know, were *the gentiles*, that is to say, according to your exposition, the *non-Catholics*; for Christ was addressing the Jews, whom you suppose to have represented the Roman Catholics—"them also, he must bring," as you remark, "and there shall be one fold and one shepherd."

Be it so! And may you, yourself; be the first to join that *one fold*, to hear that *one sheperd*, to profess that *one faith*.—Blessings, which, Catholics and they alone, enjoy.

[For the Baltimore Literary and Religious Magazine.]

ERRORS IN DOCTRINE.

It was asserted by a learned divine of the established church of Ireland, Dr. Miller of Armah, that the belief of Calvinism has a natural tendency to introduce Arianism; he says, to suppose that the son of God in his mediatorial work, only executes what God has purposed for the benefit of the elect, is to depreciate his work, and it is an easy step from the derogation of his work to the derogation of his person.—He then points to the lamentable decline and falling away of the Calvinistic churches of Europe, as if it were by such a process of thought, they departed from the faith. He was replied to by the Rev Mr. Paul, who showed that this departure had only occurred in those churches which had disregarded the entrance of errors, and had failed to keep proper watch over the purity of their ministers.

When therefore the concern now existing among Presbyterians on account of the diffusion of erroneous tenets, is exclaimed against as unnecessary, because they are at the worst *only small errors*, it becomes us to remember how universal and uniform has been the decay of those portions of God's heritage which have made light of innovations upon the order and the doctrines of Christ. Wherever discipline hath been neglected, there "evil men and seducers have waxed worse and worse, deceiving and being deceived," until the gospel hath been superseded by the preaching of "the words of man's wisdom." Thus in the French church, the complaints against erroneous teachings were silenced, and the friends of the truth were forbidden to use the press, in opposition to those who were its enemies. In the church of Geneva, the subscription to the confession was virtually done away, and an agreement was framed that no one should preach on any *disputed point*,—that is, on the truths which are peculiar to Christianity, and thus the people ceasing to hear them, forgot them. A similar policy was pursued with the like result in the Low Dutch and the Saxon churches, in the Scotch and the Irish Presbyterian church, in England also, and even in Hungary. The established church of England by permitting a subscription to her articles without inquiring if the subscribers were honest, became infected with the worst heresies, so that Dr. Clarke's book, tho' openly Arian, escaped censure and he and hundreds of others retained their pulpits, to propagate deadly errors. The decline in New England was the result of wilful connivance or easy indifference, to the want of doctrinal correctness, and the increase of gross corruptions in our own church, (such as perfectionism, pelagianism, &c.) has been chiefly in those sections of the country in which the Confession of Faith has been regarded as an odious test, and its phraseology as the absurdity of an unenlightened age. The decline has in every instance, begun in slight variations of expression and has spread just in proportion to the indifference with those variations have been overlooked. When the experiment has been tried so many times and under such a variety of circumstances, and when

without a solitary exception, the result has been evil and fatal, why should we hope that indulgence to errorists will promote the interests of the church?

But it is said, *your concern is foolish, for what you call errors are the results of the march of mind.* This was the substance of the language of a minister on the floor of one of our Synods in 1836. "Ecclesiastical organization said he, avails nothing, for out of Princeton, with all its orthodoxy, have come some of the most powerful New School men. Now there was no fault in Princeton,—it was the progress of truth and you can no more prevent the progress of the truth, than you can arrest the sun in the heavens." But that these are errors and not new and clearer views of truth, appears from the fact that they have been entertained in each of the churches mentioned above, by those who have covertly brought in notions, subversive of the gospel. They are not new—and that they are not *the truth* appears from their effects, for wherever they have been suffered in the church, they have been followed by the awful vagaries of fanaticism. Rationalism always has been fruitful of fanaticism and delusion, and in proof we allege, that wherever rationalism prevails, delusions have arisen and excesses followed, and that all the wild and absurd sects which have disgraced christendom, have uniformly rejected with abhorrence, the cardinal doctrines of the religion of Jesus. Thus in Massachusetts while the great and the learned were embracing Pelagian and Arian errors, the people were carried away, with Shakerism, Restorationism and Universalism,—and now with the Atheism of Kneeland. And it is worthy of note, that it was the class of persons who inclined to Universalism and infidelity—not the *bigotted Calvinists but the liberal Christians*—who destroyed the Charlestown convent, and have recently maltreated the Irish Roman Catholics of Boston. In England, the follies of Swedenburg were received as the *oracles of God*, by the Pelagians, and in Boston, the adherents of the New Jerusalem church, are chiefly from the enlightened Socinians. In Germany, Deism has worn the garb of Christianity, and has gone on to Panteism. *Christians, Mormonites, and Cambellites*, have all risen, and they all concur in despising those truths which we hold sacred. *Of this march of mind, we were afraid; its effects were visible, and deplorable.*

But not only by the operation of these errors in other times and other religious bodies, were we warned: but also by the effects they had produced among ourselves. The *new measures* had been tried, and in connection with the self-determining power of the will, or the plenary ability of the unrenewed sinner, they had been carried to such an extreme, that children were whipped to compel them to submit to God. The temperance extravagancies had been enacted, the Lord's supper decried, and the words of scripture almost erased. The abolition crusade, had reached its height with its contempt of the decencies of life as well as of Christian rule. Perfectionism had broken out, (as the viper from the egg) where the doctrine of human ability had been the truth principally insisted on, to lead sinners to repentance. These things were notorious; yet the teachers of the *new doctrines* and their friends, upheld these various classes of fa-

natics,—denied that they were doing mischief, and refused to condemn them when they could no longer deny the mischiefs of their course. They made common cause with them, that they might shield themselves from prosecution as errorists. Under such an aspect of things, what more criminal than to withhold discipline, and to continue to them fellowship and countenance?

The identical errors, now attempted to be palmed off as *clearer views of truth*, were those by which the churches of Europe were destroyed; whenever they have been favoured, they have been accompanied by formidable and pernicious heresies, and which have obtained a wide circulation and a permanent establishment; they have been the precursors of delusion and excess, and finally, every sect of fanatics has openly rejected the doctrines of our creed and espoused the principles we oppose. Can there therefore be a plainer course than that which providence marks out for the lovers of the truth of God?—To exercise discipline speedily, firmly and thoroughly on all occasions, where there are departures from the faith.

[For the Baltimore Literary and Religious Magazine.]

ESSAYS ON JUSTIFICATION.

No. 3.

VI. JUSTIFICATION is only on account of the *righteousness of Christ*. The whole system of popery is opposed to this proposition. It is true, the 10th canon *seems* to be favourable. "Whoever shall affirm that men are justified without the righteousness of Christ, by which he has merited for us; or *that they are thereby formally just*; let him be accursed." The last clause does away with the admission in the first—in which the righteousness of Christ is denied to be the *formal* cause of our justification. The 11th canon denies that we "are justified *solely* by the imputation of the righteousness of Christ, to the exclusion of grace and charity, which according to the decree (as quoted in the introduction) is the *formal* ground of our justification.

The great papal champion Cardinal Bellarmine, faithfully interprets the Romish heresy, and shows that the introduction of the *merit* of Christ, is only for the sound, and to garnish their own righteousness, which like the Pharisees they "go about to establish." "But it will be said, if the merits of men are necessary, it proves that the merits of Christ are insufficient. Not so: for the merits of men are not required because of the insufficiency of those of Christ, *but because of their own very great efficacy*. For the work of Christ hath not only deserved of God that we should obtain salvation, *but also that we should obtain it by our own merits*." De Justific, lib. v. c. 5.

But it is by their doctrines of *meritum de congruo*, and *meritum de condigno*, that they presumptuously set aside the righteousness of

Christ. Luther's explanation of these blasphemies is very suitable to my purpose. "The wicked and pernicious opinion of the papists, is utterly to be condemned, which attributes the merit of grace and remission of sins to the work wrought. For they say that a good work before grace, is able to obtain grace of *congruence* (which they call *meritum de congruo*) because it is meet that God should reward such a work. But when grace is obtained, the work following deserveth everlasting life, of due debt and worthiness, which they call *meritum de condigno*. As for example: if a man being in deadly sin without grace, do a good work of his good natural inclination: That is, if he say or hear a mass, or give alms, and such like, this man of congruence deserves grace. When he hath thus obtained grace, he doth now a work which of worthiness deserves everlasting life. For the first, God is no debtor; but because he is just and good it behoveth him to approve such a good work though it be done in deadly sin, and to give grace for such a service. But when grace is obtained, God is become a *debtor*, and is constrained of right and duty to give eternal life. For now it is not only a work of free will; done according to the substance, but also done in grace, which maketh a man acceptable unto God, that is to say, in charity." Luth. on Gal. ch. ii. v. 16. This luminous illustration, accurately corresponds with 32nd canon which I again quote, that it may be present to the reader. "Whoever shall affirm, that the good works of a justified man are in such a sense the gifts of God, that they are not also *his worthy merits*; or that he, *being justified by his good works*, which are wrought by him through the grace of God, and the merits of Jesus Christ, of whom he is a living member, does not really *deserve increase of grace, eternal life, the enjoyment of that eternal life if he dies in a state of grace, and even an increase of glory*: let him be accursed." This canon certainly "makes the faith of God of none effect:" carrying the sinner away from Christ, the rock, and inducing him to build upon the sandy foundation of his own merit.

In contrast with this, we maintain the proposition, that our justification *formally and meritoriously* (for this is a distinction without a difference) is founded only upon the righteousness of Christ. It is proper to explain what I mean by his righteousness. It consists in the first place in the holiness of his human nature. This was necessary that he might be a lamb "without spot." In his human nature he was "holy, harmless, undefiled, and separated from sinners." It is necessary here to bear in mind, that his *person* was not *human* but *divine*. That "the word was made flesh"—and the human nature subsisted in the divine person of the son of God: and thus "God was manifest in the flesh."

2. This righteousness includes his holy life, in obedience to the law of God.—The law which man had violated. "He magnified the law and made it honorable," by a life of spotless innocence, and perfect obedience. "Think not that I came to destroy the law; or the prophets; I came not to destroy, but to fulfil."

3. It includes moreover, his propitiatory death. The spotless human nature of Christ, was offered by himself "an offering and a sacrifice to God, for a sweet smelling savour." And "by the sacri-

face of himself" he "hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us." And thus, "brought in an everlasting righteousness." These three parts—the holiness of his human nature as subsisting in his divine person—his obedient life, and satisfactory death—as our mediator and surety, woven, as it were, into one garment constitute the unspotted robe of Christ's righteousness.

This is the alone formal and meritorious ground or cause of justification. He is thus, "the Lord our righteousness."—The end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth." And of God is made unto us righteousness—and we are "made the righteousness of God in him." We can perform neither works of congruence or condignity—but "when we have done all—we are unprofitable servants"—"and all our righteousness are as filthy rags." There is salvation in none other," but Christ—and "surely shall one say, in the Lord have I righteousness"—"and their righteousness is from me saith the Lord." And upon this principle proceeds the declarations,—"*In the Lord shall all the seed of Israel be justified and shall glory. Other foundation can no man lay, than that is laid which is Jesus Christ.*"

VII. This righteousness of Christ is received by faith. Faith is the great and internal instrument of our justification. It is the great instrument, as it is that by which we receive and rest upon Christ alone for salvation as he is fully offered to us in the gospel. "But to as many as received him to them gave he the power to become the sons of God, even to as many as believed on his name." Jesus Christ is revealed in the gospel as the righteousness of God," as having brought in an everlasting righteousness." He is offered in his character as "the Lord our righteousness"—to such as are "wretched and miserable, and poor, and blind and naked." It is the province of faith to receive Christ as the righteousness of the believer, and to rest upon him as the only and sure foundation of eternal happiness. In this consists its instrumentality in our justification. It does not constitute a part of our justifying righteousness; but it is the instrument of our justification, to shew that it is wholly of grace. Rom. iv 16. "Therefore it is of faith that it might be by grace." Its instrumentality then is nothing more than to be the gifted hand that receives and applies the righteousness of Christ on account of which we are freely justified. Hence the faith of the believer is accounted to him for righteousness, as it receives the righteousness of Christ—or Christ "the Lord our righteousness." Abraham's faith was thus counted to him for righteousness. Rom. iv. 13. "For the promise that he should be heir of the world, was not made to Abraham nor to his seed through the law—but through the righteousness of faith:" which is the everlasting righteousness of the mediator, which faith as the gifted hand receives, and upon which it rests for salvation.

With this corresponds the sentiment of Luther. "But we instead of this charity do place faith, and we say that faith apprehendeth Jesus Christ, who is the form that adorneth and furnisheth faith as the colour adorneth and beautifieth the wall. Christian faith is not an idle quality or empty husk in the heart which may be in deadly sin, until charity come and quicken it: but if it be true faith,

it is a sure trust and confidence of the heart, and a firm consent whereby Christ is apprehended. So that Christ is the object of faith, yea rather even in faith Christ himself is present.—Faith therefore justifieth because it apprehendeth and possesseth this treasure, even Christ present.—And this is the *true formal righteousness*, whereby a man is justified, and not by charity, as the popish schoolmen do most wickedly affirm.” “To conclude, like as the schoolmen say, charity furnisheth and adorneth faith: se do we say that it is Christ that furnisheth and adorneth faith, or rather, that he is the very form and perfection of faith. Wherefore Christ apprehended by faith and dwelling in the heart, is the *true Christian righteousness, for the which God counteth us righteous, and giveth eternal life*. Here is no work of the law, no charity, but a far other manner of righteousness, and a certain new world above and beyond the law *ut supra*. Thus the power of justifying does not belong to faith of itself, but only as it receives Christ. “For if faith were to justify of itself, or by an intrinsic efficacy, as it is expressed, being always weak and imperfect, it never could effect our justification but in part; and thus it would be a defective justification, which would confer upon us only a partial salvation. To say that faith justifies as it is an act of the mind, or by an intrinsic efficacy, would be to make justification partly of works, “for to him that *worketh* is the reward not reckoned of grace but of debt.” It is not however, of works—“but to him that *worketh not* but *believeth* on him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness.” It is of faith *that it might be by grace*—for—“by grace are ye saved through faith, and that not of yourselves, it is the gift of God.” A man therefore is justified *by* faith, as it is an instrument given him by which he receives and rests upon Christ as he is offered in the gospel. It does not justify as an act performed by the natural powers of the mind,” for it is not a natural exercise of the natural powers of the unrenewed mind, because “all men have not faith.” “It is not of ourselves, it is the gift of God—and “wrought by the exceeding greatness of his power” by which Christ was “raised from the dead.” When we are enabled thus to receive Christ as our righteousness—his righteousness becomes as much our own, as the gift of the benefactor, becomes the property of the pauper who receives it; and avails him as much as though it were the fruit of his own toil.

Finally. This righteousness thus received, is *imputed* for our justification. This the papal canon substantially contradicts. “Who-soever shall affirm that men are justified solely by the imputation of the righteousness of Christ—let him be accursed.” By *imputation*, we mean—God’s accounting or reckoning the righteousness of Christ to the sinner, as if he had obeyed the law, and satisfied the justice of God in his own person, and dealing with him accordingly, God on account of Christ forgives us our debts, in the same manner as when the creditor lets the debtor go free, when his debts have been liquidated by the surety. This is plainly the doctrine of the scriptures Rom. iv. 6. “Even as David also describeth the blessedness of the man unto whom the Lord *imputeth righteousness without works.*” Here the imputation of Christ’s righteousness is taught in

so many words. God is said to "impute righteousness without works." This can mean none other than the righteousness of Christ, which is irrespective of the works of man—of either congruence or condignity. This righteousness is transferred to the account of the believing sinner, upon the principle that Christ "was made sin for us who knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him."

The righteousness which is by works, is no more than "a filthy rag." It is the righteousness of the law, and can never procure blessedness; "for they that are of the works of the law are under the curse." But "the righteousness of God which is manifested without the law," is that which renders a man blessed, and is imputed without works: for it is "even the righteousness of God, which is by faith of Jesus Christ, unto and upon all them that believe." "For what the law could not do in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending his own son, in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin condemned sin in the flesh, that the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us." Christ has fulfilled the righteousness of the law, by a perfect obedience to all its precepts, which the flesh could not do as it is "weak," and this righteousness is "imputed without works" to the sinner, and he is rendered blessed, as his sins are all pardoned and his person accepted as righteous; for "blessed is the man to whom the Lord will not impute sin;" his "iniquity being covered" by the righteousness of the surety.

This righteousness is imputed to us upon the ground of Christ's representing us as mediator of the covenant, and our union to him in time. Christ is the representative head of his elect, in the eternal covenant. Eph. v. 23. "Christ is the head of the church." The elect are the members of his mystical body. iv. 15. "The head even Christ in whom we grow up in all things." He acted as surety—for them and not for himself. As the human nature of Christ never subsisted separately by itself, but in the person of the son of God, the acts of obedience performed therein, were never the acts of a mere creature, but of him who is God-man, mediator: and consequently acts of obedience not for himself, but for us—"But when the fulness of time was come, God sent forth his son, made of woman, made under the law—to redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons." Gal. iv. 4. 5. Upon the same principle it is said, he died for our sins. He gave his life a ransom for many. He performed these acts in good faith, and with the full intention that they should benefit those for whom they were performed. Hence they are in the fulness of time applied. "As many as are ordained to eternal life believe." Are united to him by faith, and become actual partakers, yea possessors of his righteousness. The members are united to the head "from whom the whole body fitly joined together, and compacted by that which every joint supplieth according to the effectual working in the measure of every part maketh increase of the body unto the edifying of itself in love:" and the members thus united "hold the head, from which all the body by joints and bands having nourishment ministered, and knit together, increaseth with the increase of God." By virtue of this union, the bonds of which are the spirit of regenera-

tion, and faith of his "operation," Christ and his righteousness become the property of the believer. His righteousness is just as much the property of the believer, and upon more permanent principles—than the property of the husband is that of the wife, or the juices of the vine the property of the branch. Being *his own*, shall it not be reckoned or *imputed* to him, and avail him for the discharge of his debt at the bar of God? It is so "counted" to him, and *he is that blessed man, to whom the Lord imputeth righteousness without works.*

This view might be confirmed—by a more minute consideration of the surety-ship of Christ—and the facts that justification is not of works,—that there is however justification for sinners,—that—those who are justified are ungodly in themselves, and have no righteousness of their own,—that we are justified *by faith*—which always has respect to Christ *as its object*—and a variety of other considerations. But we desist. We have given the reader a summary view of this all important doctrine, in contrast with the pestilent heresies of the Roman church. Let the reader not follow the monks and priests in their delusive and destructive opinions, but the apostle of the Gentiles—who "*knowing that a man is not justified by the works of the law, but by the faith of Jesus Christ,—believed in Jesus Christ that he might be justified by the faith of Christ, and not by the works of the law: for by the works of the law, shall no flesh be justified:*" Gal. II. 16. By this doctrine, moreover—*pride is hidden from man,* "and all boasting is taken from the creature:" Rom. III. 27. And we are taught that faith itself, by laying hold upon the surety righteousness without us, is nothing else but a *solemn declaration* of our poverty and nakedness; and that therefore it is our duty, to glory only in Christ Jesus, saying,—"*SURELY—IN THE LORD HAVE WE RIGHTEOUSNESS AND STRENGTH.*" Is. XIV. 24.

R.

FINALE OF THE CASE OF THE ABDUCTED CHILD, ELIZA BURNS.

Papal mode of conducting controversy.—Threats of Assassination and Lynching.

WE promised to inform our readers of the issue of the case of the orphan child, whose name is at the head of this article—and the narrative of whose abduction by certain papists of Baltimore, was given several months ago. It has been our purpose and earnest wish, to lay somewhat minutely before the public, the steps taken in this trial, and the conduct of all the parties connected with it, up to the issue of the matter. But we have been so much pressed by other engagements, and have found so much difficulty in arranging a detailed narrative, which should be at once of sufficient interest to command attention, and so accurately exact as to forbid just complaint—that on the whole, we have been obliged to pass it by for the present. Nor indeed is such a detail of more than secondary importance. For it is sufficiently manifest, by our own and all the experience of other protestants in this country, for a few years past—that the services of able counsel can always be had, whenever a resort to the courts of jus-

tice, is considered advisable against the audacious acts of the papists; and therefore the information to be derived from the first successful attempts to check them by legal processes, is the less important to the Christian public.

We will take leave, however to say, that the thanks of the Christians of this city are due to HUGH DAVY EVANS, Esq., for his generous and successful efforts in the case now under consideration. E. L. FINDLAY Esq., was prevented, only by severe indisposition, from taking an active part in the case: and RANDALL MOALE Esq., who was the first counsel employed, abandoned the cause at a very early stage of it; for reasons, which altho' we are informed of them, through those to whom he communicated them, at least in part,—we presume he would prefer stating himself, and in regard to which we are therefore silent.

Of all the classes of men, who adorn modern society, and to whom liberty and civilization are indebted for their triumphs and their security, there is scarcely one, so deservedly dear to mankind, as the legal profession. Nothing surely, is a more radical proof of ignorance, and malignity combined, than those sneers which are too often heard, against a profession, which has in all ages been the bulwark of all the temporal interests of man, and which has produced from amongst its ranks more glorious names, than all others united. In our own country especially, the discerning eye of society has sought and rejoiced to confer on the enlightened members of this noble profession, the choicest and most multiplied evidences of public gratitude and applause. And faithful history will record, that they well deserved the nation's confidence. For however unworthy particular individuals may be, and however extensive the evil influence, of their vices; as a body, these men, have been the benefactors of the human race, and as a profession they have well fulfilled the prime duty of their condition, namely to redress the wrongs, and to protect the rights of all.

The laws of all states are designed to be, and in all free and civilized states really are, adequate to the protection of every citizen in the enjoyment of all his rights,—and to the restraint or punishment of the wicked for all their injuries to their fellow men. Deeply impressed with the force of these truths, we have from the beginning of this papal controversy, advised all who have been injured by the audacious incroachments of the Romanists, to resort upon the first occasion to the laws for redress. And so, when the papists have threatened any with legal prosecutions—our advice has uniformly been, that protestants should keep themselves strictly within the lines of truth—and the laws, and then court, rather than shun prosecution. Not that we would contend, at all times, even for our rights; far less that we would wantonly aggrieve, even the most captious of our enemies. But the public do not understand this controversy,—and the utmost sifting and publicity that can be given to the errors and injurious proceedings of the papists, the better for the truth. Protestants generally do not understand the nature of our legal system, in regard to the silly and wicked pretensions of the Romanists; and therefore, it is good to show them how strong our cause is. Papists are still more ignorant of the extent to which our laws go, in frowning upon their vices and follies; and it is exceedingly well to have them enlightened, and brought into a salutary terror of the civil tribunals, as well as of public sentiment. In short, the whole of society needs to be taught, that crime is not winked at by the laws, because wicked men call it religion; that truth is not to be put to shame in our courts, because bigots call it persecution; and that nonsense and wickedness, are not entitled to public reverence, because the fiftieth part of the people choose to call a cake of flour God, and debauched ignoramuses, his vicars upon earth.

No instance has occurred where either the papists or the Christians of this country have brought any part of the momentous subjects in contest between them into the courts of the nation, in which our cause has not been decidedly advanced thereby. We suppose, it will be a long day

before the case of *Duparque vs Rice*, will be forgotten; or the papists cease to remember that an intelligent jury valued the character of the priests and nuns of Kentucky at ONE CENT!!! This result is always to be expected where the laws have free course, and justice is impartially administered, because, all the institutions of the country are based in reason, and assume the truth of Christianity. In our courts in this city—for example, when the representatives of deceased papists—as has often been the case—put into their accounts, monies paid to the priests for prayers and masses for the dead:—what do our courts know about purgatory? Of course nothing!—So also, when Christians are insulted or beaten, because of want of what papists choose to consider suitable reverence, to their superstitious rites; what do the courts know about transubstantiation? Absolutely nothing.—Men may be ridiculous if they please; but observe, they are not at liberty to bind others, either by force or intimidation to be silent as to their follies—nor to embrace them—nor even to appear to do so. The papists need to learn this lesson.

It was precisely in view of these principles, that we advised the friends of ELIZA BURNS to resort to the courts, for the recovery of the abducted child. To consider Mr. Bishop Eccleston, and all his abettors, male and female, legal and private—simply as so many citizens—and to hold them all responsible for the performance of an act, which no gentleman or Christian, ever should have had any hand in. We thank God for inclining their hearts to follow that counsel. We thank him, for raising up friends of the little orphan, in this land of strangers. We thank him for giving our land faithful public servants—upright judges, and able and honest lawyers. We thank him for discomfiting the counsels of wicked men—and snatching this poor child, from certain ruin, as a brand from the midst of the burning. We thank him for having given us courage to execute our duty even at the risk of our lives;—and above all, we thank him for the complete success of the cause of the righteous, and the confounding of the machinations of his subtle enemies.—*The child, ELIZA BURNS, has been rescued, by due process of law, from the hands of the papists who abducted her; restored to the custody of her proper and lawful friends; and is now in the Orphan School, in Mulberry street, to which the dying injunctions of her generous protector, ELIZA GIFFORD,—the friend of her deceased parents, and the support of her helpless infancy had consigned her.*

All who love God and the orphan children of his people—will rejoice at this issue. It is an event in the progress of the papal controversy that is worthy of deep consideration. It erects another barrier against the flood of cruel superstition which is coming in upon us. Let us remember, that while we organize public sentiment, and enlighten the popular mind—the courts of the country are open to us, for protection and redress. We wish to injure no one; therefore it is no terror to us, to say the laws will restrain us. But we contend with men ferocious in spirit, indifferent to the means by which they effect their purposes—and bursting with malignant and unbridled passions. It is therefore of immense importance to us, to teach such people, that the laws will punish their misdeeds, and redress their injuries inflicted on the innocent. It is vital to our cause, that these people comprehend at once that we will hold them responsible, both to exposure and punishment in the courts of law; and that the figment of non-resistance, has no place whatever, in our code. We know our rights, and mean to enjoy them.

We have spoken of the personal risk, we have been obliged to encounter, in this affair. We will be more specific; and if other persons find occasion for offence in what we are about to say, they must charge their own insolent folly with their mortification.

It is perfectly known to all the world, that in all ages, the papal sect has reasoned a thousand fold more, with the rack, the gibbet, the dungeon and the stake, than with the common instruments of moral evidence. Their first and most common answer to all the remonstrances of all God's people in all ages, has been the very same, uttered by the Jews to our Lord. *Crucify him, crucify him*,—is their standard argument, in every age, and in answer to every antagonist. When they have had power, they have openly killed people, in the name of the laws. When they have not had the entire rule—they have killed them by mobs and organized violence; as now, and for ages past in Ireland where for six hundred years, not one week has passed without witnessing the murder of some protestant, by a band of papists.—When they have feared the open opposition of their victims, they have assassinated, sometimes a whole people in a day, as during the *Sicilian Vespers*, and the *massacre of Saint Bartholomew*; at others only their chief enemies, as the assassination, of Henry III., and Henry IV. of France, the prince of Orange, the prince of Conde, and others without number.

We have therefore known from the first moment we entered into this controversy, that we took our lives in our hands, when we did so; and it has always been in our view a probable thing, that we should be, some day, put to death, by some myrmidon of the priests. We have received numberless proofs of their malignity,—weekly threats against our lives;—and all kinds of insults—slanders and abuse, have been incessantly heaped upon us, in public, and in private, for the last three years. Our printers have been threatened; our friends insulted; our dependents tampered with; our private correspondence pried into; our dwellings beset, in the night season; our private walks watched—and every species of annoyance set on foot, to brow-beat, frighten, and silence us. It is known to all our readers, that one of the conductors of this work, spent a considerable part of the last and the current years, in Europe. But as yet, it is not known to the great bulk of them, that rumours of his death, by poison, by accident and by violence, were repeatedly circulated in this city, during his absence; and that these reports, were always found to originate with some of the most active papists in this city. Still fewer of them are aware, that in the expectation of his visiting Rome, a likeness of him, was obtained in this city, and sent thither!! For what use, let the authors of the act explain.

We have now to state, that inconsequence of our former article, relative to the case of ELIZA BURNS, the malignity of the papists, has risen to its highth; and that since the decision of the case in favour of the friends of that child, open and repeated threats against our lives, have been made by responsible persons, in the streets of our city. We will at present give the names of two of these persons only.

A young man, who called himself TIERNAN, and whose Christian name we believe to be CHARLES, called at the printing office of this Magazine, and after some conversation with our printer, became enraged, and declared the fact to be within his knowledge, that the life of one or other of the Editors, should pay the forfeit of our conduct in the case of ELIZA BURNS. To prevent all possibility of mistake, the senior editor assumes the responsibility, of the present and former articles, on this subject. But he utterly repudiates the conduct attributed to him by this deluded young man. He declared his cause of offence to be the improper introduction of his mother's name, into the former article, and our indecorous use of it. Now we expressly deny having said one single disrespectful word, of Mrs. Tiernan, or any other private female whatever; and we as expressly deny having referred to any *private* conduct of any person whatever. We have abundant evidence of the private corruption of many priests, which we have declined using, simply because it chiefly concerned their personal characters, rather than their religious system; and our quarrel is only with

the latter. We have sedulously spoken of females, even when obliged to use their names, in treating of their public and official acts, with the utmost forbearance; as our whole pages testify.

Mrs. Tiernan, was one of the official actors, in an event, which we have felt obliged to lay before the public: and of her official conduct *only* have we spoken, and that in terms, of as perfect respect, as are compatible with decided disapproval.—We deeply reverence, the most enthusiastic feelings which a son can cherish for a mother, and therefore we take this trouble to explain that young Mr. Tiernan, is utterly mistaken in point of fact. As to his threats, we heed not, of course any such things, come from what quarter they may. Mr. Tiernan—had better be careful, how he is prompt to shed blood; and read once more the laws of God, and of his country on that subject, before he attempt that, which end as it may, will hardly be pleasant to him in the remembrance of it.

The other individual to whom we have reference, is a certain **GENL. WILLIAMSON**, son of a protestant, and brother of a priest,—himself also an amateur member of the church of Rome, and a mere volunteer, in this quarrel. Mr. Tiernan, we pity, and in some degree sympathise with,—while we respect the *pretence* of his anger. Genl. Williamson, has no claims, but on our contempt and defiance, which nothing, but our Christian principles prevents us from hurling at him.

He would Lynch us, indeed! He would cut off our ears—but for the fear of soiling himself,—in truth! He would, in his own refined speech, “*HIRE A BIG NIGGER*” to chastise us!—

Now Sir, let us fairly say to you—you are not wise, in this matter. First, there are those who would be *very* glad, at the least feasible opportunity, to hold you responsible for those threats, in a way, which we take it for granted would be very unpleasant to you—as it would be most painful to us, to be the occasion of damage to you. You have excused yourself by saying that as we are preachers, you cannot challenge us; and therefore justify your vulgarity, on that pretence. But surely Sir, all the protestants on earth, do not preach; and therefore unless you be very eager to get yourself in trouble, we beg you to guard your tongue a little.—But in the second place, we entreat you to be careful, least you talk yourself into so great a rage, that you should finally lose all prudence; or finally persuade yourself that you can, not only abuse, but chastise us with personal security. Now if you should accomplish this feat, it would add little to your military glory; and if perchance you failed in it, it would be a sad mortification to you. And we suggest to you not to forget, that the writer of this article was bred a man of the world, and is therefore not entirely ignorant of your kind; and that altho’ he is a *preacher*, he claims also to be both a *gentleman* and a *Kentuckian*. *But above all, Sir, it were wise for you to recollect before you commence the shedding of social blood, that in this city, your sect numbers but one in five, and in this nation not one in fifty!* Mark, Sir,—this prophecy—we make it deliberately; the first drop of Protestant blood, shed in this controversy, will rouse a spirit in this broad republic, which neither you nor we, will live to see allayed,—and which in its results must sweep the very name of papists from the land. Surely no madness is so great, as for one man to expect to destroy fifty, in open combat!—Better, Sir, keep cool—digest your wrath,—learn manners, and let alone affairs with which you are no way called to meddle, and people whose serious business as well as inclination and duty, lead them entirely out of your track.

A word in the ear of Mr. **ECCLESTON**,—so called, Arch-Bishop of Baltimore. Does your eminence imagine, we or our friends, to be so silly, as not see the hand of Joab, in this business? Power has its troubles as well as its sweets. Sir, you must keep, all bullies—great and small, off our backs. We turn not aside, for small or great,—it is the papal superstition.

we war against, not papal ladies, gentlemen, nor generals. We hold the priests as a body, and you as their head, responsible at the bar of public opinion,—and at every other bar to which we shall see it to be our duty to carry the citation—not only for the fatal system taught by them, but for the personal injuries inflicted by consequence of their principles, and in virtue of their sanction—if not in obedience to their orders. Your *tool*, Gildea, once expressed surprise, that the Virgin Mary, had not killed us. Now two devotees seek our blood. In all these, and every other case—our sole offence has been, the exposure of the absurd, and pernicious dogmas,—and vicious conduct of the priests. Gentlemen, if you love your own lives, you will show wisdom in respecting ours. If you would understand your true policy,—silence your street advocates—for their threats are lost on us—and bring your own cause into public odium.

MUTUAL LOVE OF ANGRY VICE-GODS.

THE infallible and every where-alike, church of Rome, has sometimes exhibited even in this country, sad evidences of the smothered fires that burn in her maternal breast.—A very remarkable case was that which occurred in relation to *St. Mary's church*, in Philadelphia, some years ago; in which divers mobs and rows were held to edify the faithful—and at the conclusion of the whole the paternal heart and sweet voice of Bishop CONWELL, gave vent to the blessings which follow, against a certain *William Hogan*, a brother priest, and vice-God, and at that time pastor of the church in dispute.

We copy the Anathema, from one of the various pamphlets to which the controversy gave rise—entitled “*A call to the Catholics: or a word of Conciliation to both parties. By an Observer.*”

By the authority of God Almighty, the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, and of the undefiled Virgin Mary, mother and patroness of our Saviour, and of all celestial virtues, angels, archangels, thrones, dominions, powers, cherubims and Seraphims. And all the Holy patriarchs, Prophets and of all the Apostles and Evangelists of the Holy Innocents, who in the sight of the Holy Lamb, are found worthy to sing the new song of the Holy martyrs and holy confessors, and of all the holy Virgins, and of all the Saints together, with the Holy elect of God—may he *William Hogan* be damned.

We excommunicate and anathematise him, and from the thresholds of the holy church of God Almighty we sequester him that he may be tormented, disposed, and be delivered over with Dathan and Abiram, and with those who say unto the Lord “depart from us, we desire none of thy ways,” and as fire is quenched with water, so let the light of him be put out forevermore, unless it shall repent him, and he make satisfaction, Amen!

May the Father who created man curse him! May the Son who suffered for us, curse him! May the Holy Ghost who was given to us in Baptism, curse him! May the Holy Cross, which Christ for our salvation, triumphing over our enemies ascended, curse him!

May the holy and eternal Virgin Mary, mother of God, curse him! May *St. Michael*, the advocate of holy souls, curse him! May all the angels

archangels, principalities and powers, and all the heavenly armies, curse him!

May the praise-worthy multitude of Patriarchs and Prophets; curse him!

May St. John the Precursor, and St. John the Baptist, and St. Peter, and St. Paul, and St. Andrew, and all the others, Christ's Apostles together curse him! and may the rest of his disciples, and the four Evangelists, who by their preaching converted the universal world, and may the holy and wonderful company of martyrs and confessors, who by their holy works are found pleasing to God Almighty, curse him! **May the holy choir of the holy Virgins, who for the honour Christ have despised the things of the world, damn him!** may all the saints from the beginning of the world to everlasting ages who are found to be beloved of God, curse him.

May he be damned wherever he be, whether in the house or the stable, the garden or the field, or the highway, or in the path, or in the wood, or in the water, or in the church, may he be cursed in living and in dying!

May he be cursed in eating and drinking, in being hungry, in being thirsty, in fasting, in sleeping, in slumbering, in sitting, in lying, in working in resting, in ———,* and ———, and in blood-letting.

May he be cursed in all the faculties of his body.

May he be cursed inwardly and outwardly, may he be cursed in his brains, and in his virtex—in his temples, in his forehead, in his ears, in his eyebrows, in his cheeks, in his jaw-bones, in his nostrils, in his teeth and grinders, in his lips, in his throat, in his shoulders, in his arms, in his fingers.

May he be damned in his mouth, in his breasts, in his heart and puterance, down to the very stomach:

May he be cursed in his reins, and in his groins, in his thighs, in his entrails, and in his hips, and in his knees, his legs, and feet and toe nails!—

May he be cursed in all his joints, and articulations of the members, from the top of his head to the sole of his foot, may there be no soundness in him.—

May the Son of the living God, with all the glory of his Majesty, curse him! And may Heaven with all the powers which move therein, rise up against him, and curse and damn him—unless he repent and make satisfaction! *Amen, so be it—Be it so, Amen!*

* Omitted because of its indecency. [ED'S.]

STATISTICS ON THE MOVEMENT OF POPULATION.

IN the majority of European nations, the annual births amount to 1 in 30, and the annual deaths to 1 in 40, of the total population, which will yield an average increase of about 9 per cent, every 10 years. The highest rate of births observed in any nation, has been about 1 in 23, the lowest rate about 1 in 33. The highest rate of deaths observed, has been about 1 in 30; the lowest rate in England 1 in 50 of the total population. The highest rate of increase of population ever observed, is that of the United States of North America, next to which is that of the population of England. In the United States the increase, for a long period, has been at the rate of 32 per cent, every 10 years, independently of the gain from emigration. The white population and the slave population have increased at the same high rate. In England, during a recent period, the rate of increase has been 16 per cent, every 10 years, which is just twice as great as the average rate of increase in other European countries.

The high rate of increase in England, compared with that in the rest of Europe, has not been derived so much from a higher average of births, as from a lower average of deaths. The higher rate of increase of the American population, is as the consequence of a rate of mortality as low as that of England, combined with a higher portion of births,—say 1 in 23.

The rate of births among the slave population of the United States cannot be estimated at less than 1 in 23 annually: while the rate of births among the slave population of the West Indies, has not exceeded 1 in 40. The decrease of the black population of the West Indies is mainly attributable to a diminution of births; for the annual mortality, 1 in 36, has been frequently observed, and now exists in several increasing European populations.

It is a remarkable fact, which has never yet been explained, that a very great increase in deaths, for a short period, is always accompanied by a great diminution of births at the same period. The most marked instances are found, in Sweden, during the years 1772—73, and during the years 1806—10; in Belgium, during the year 1817; and in France, during the year 1832 (the year of cholera). The explanation of this fact, consists in an increase of deaths, including *fatal* deaths or miscarriages. From observations of Dr. Granville on women of Lying-in Charities of London, it appears that one in three of all conceptions terminates in miscarriage. Since the mortality of infants in large towns is double of that prevailing in the country at large, it may be inferred as highly probable, that a similar relation exists between the proportion of miscarriages; and consequently, that in an entire nation, one out of every six conceptions terminates in miscarriage, in years of ordinary mortality.

In Sweden and in England, the proportions of marriages, births, and deaths has been progressively diminishing, since the year 1790 in the case of Sweden, and since the year 1780 in the case of England. In England, the progressive diminution of mortality, during the four decennial periods from 1780 to 1820, was extremely regular. Out of a constant population of 1000, the annual deaths at the four decennial periods ending with 1790, 1800, 1810, and 1820, were 27, 25, 22, and 20, respectively. The introduction of vaccination, in 1800, produced no interruption in the course of diminution then in progress. It cannot be denied that the deaths from

small-pox have been diminished by vaccination; but it may be doubted whether the deaths from other diseases have not proportionally increased. The diminution in the aggregate mortality of the English nation has been derived chiefly from the diminution of the mortality of children.

In Sweden, during three successive periods of 25 years, 1756—80,—1781—1805, 1806—30, the mean annual rate of increase was constant, and equal to 75 for every 10,000 of population, or eight per cent, every ten years. In England, the mean annual increase on 10,000, varied from 70, in the first 25 years, to 112 in the next 25 years, and to 142 in the last 25 years. The rate of increase of the English population was at a maximum during the ten years 1811—20, when the rate of mortality was at a minimum. In France, for a population of 10,000, the mean annual increase was only 55; in Belgium, 87.

In the majority of European nations, the disturbing effect of migration is scarcely sensible: Ireland is probably the only exception. America gains from migration what Great Britain and Ireland together lose. The average gain to America, previous to 1820, is supposed not to have exceeded 10,000 annually; but since that year the numbers migrating to the Canadas and the United States have greatly increased. During the five years 1825—29, North America received from Great Britain and Ireland 23,047 people annually; during the five years 1830—34, the average number was 73,442 annually. During the four years 1829—32, the mean number of emigrants arriving annually at New York and Quebec was 57,053, of which there were from England and Wales 23,851, from Ireland 27,241, and from Scotland 5961. We may say then of England and Wales alone, that the annual loss from emigration was 4000 previous to 1820, 9000 at the year 1827, and 30,000 at the year 1832. The mean annual increase of the population of England and Wales, from 1820 to 1830, was 180,000. Taking the mean annual number of emigrants at this period to have been 8000, it will form less than the 22nd part of the excess of births over deaths. The mean number of births at the same period having been not less than 450,000 annually, the loss from emigration was no more than the fifty fifth part of this number. During the ten years 1820 to 1830, the population of England and Wales, must have been diminishing from migration, if the number of emigrants from Ireland did not amount to 8000 annually.

Another source of decrease of the population of England, is the maintenance of the army and navy in foreign countries, which requires a large number of recruits, to supply the vacancies by deaths. A force of 30,000 men in the East Indies, 7000 in the West Indies, and 13,000 in the Ionian Isles, Canada, &c., will suffer 3000 yearly deaths, in time of peace. Adding to which, 1000 yearly deaths from shipwreck, we shall have 4000 as the number of soldiers and sailors quitting England every year, and never returning. If this number be added to the 8000 emigrants from England previously determined, we shall have the number 12,000, to present the average annual loss by emigration during the ten years 1821—30. Consequently, the balance of migration would have been against England, if it had not been receiving 12,000 people every year from Ireland.

There exists materials which satisfactorily show that the registered births in England ought to be increased twenty six per cent, in order to obtain the true numbers of births. From the census of 1821, it is found that there were living of females under the age of five years, at the beginning of that year, 879,590. These are manifestly the survivors of the numbers born during the five years 1816—20, which according to the registers, are stated to have been 815,350. That is to say, we have the

apparent absurdity of the survivors exceeding in number the original stock. By means of the table of mortality, deduced from the English observations for females, it may be calculated that 100 survivors, under the age of five years, proceeded from 117½ births in the preceding five years. Consequently, the enumerated population of 879,590, proceeded from 1,034,800 births during the five years 1816—20, which number is 27 per cent, greater than 815,350, the stated registered births. The true increase of the English population is represented by the difference between the registered births increased twenty per cent, and the registered deaths increased ten per cent.

ADVERTISEMENT.

This is an original work, devoted to the advancement of Knowledge, Liberty, and Religion.

It is published in the city of Baltimore, on the first day of each month. It contains forty eight pages in each number—and is furnished to subscribers at \$2 50 per annum, which may be discharged by \$2 paid at the beginning of each year, or on subscribing.

The most liberal terms to active agents; travelling agents always wanted.

Address the Conductors, POST PAID, Baltimore: and money can be remitted by mail at their risk.

THE
BALTIMORE LITERARY
AND
RELIGIOUS MAGAZINE.

VOL III.

DECEMBER 1837.

No. 12

(For the Baltimore Literary and Religious Magazine.)

EXPOSITION OF ROMANS IX: 1—3.

I SAY the truth in Christ, I lie not, my conscience also bearing me witness in the Holy Ghost. That I have great heaviness and continual sorrow in my heart. For I could wish that myself were accursed from Christ, for my brethren, my kinsmen according to the flesh.

THE point in this passage of Scripture which requires more particular attention is the expression in the 3rd verse: "*I could wish that myself were accursed from Christ.*"

Those who hold that all virtue consists in disinterested benevolence, understand these words literally, and believe that the apostle here expresses his willingness to be eternally accursed, or separated from Christ for the benefit of his brethren the Israelites.

That this is not the true sense of the passage appears—First, from its being at variance with those common sentiments of self preservation, which were implanted in the human breast by the hand of infinite wisdom, and which are unquestionably to be followed when co-operating with higher motives.

In the next place: It is inconsistent with the profession of Christianity to be willing to be God's enemy for a moment, much more, for ever; but to be eternally accursed, or separated from Christ is the doom of his enemies, all of whom, are to be punished with everlasting destruction "from the presence of God and from the glory of his power."

Again: If the apostle here literally means that he was willing to be accursed from Christ, he is for once and only once, unaccountably inconsistent with himself; for in the epistle to the Philippians, 3d chapter, after mentioning the many advantages he had enjoyed as a Jew, in consequence of his having strictly observed the ceremonial law, he says—"But what things were gain to me, those I counted loss for Christ. Yea, doubtless, and I count all things but loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus my Lord; for whom I have suffered the loss of all things, and do count them

but dung, that I may win Christ."—And in Rom. 8: 38, 39—He says, "I am persuaded that neither death nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature, shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord." Now since he says he had willingly suffered the loss of all things in winning Christ; and having just pronounced it impossible to be separated from his love, is it not utterly preposterous to imagine that, he should immediately at the commencement of the next chapter express a *willingness* to be separated from Christ!—

And further—According to the literal sense of this passage Paul's being accursed from Christ was to have procured the salvation of his brethren. But the doctrine of the Bible is that "there is but *one* mediator between God and man, the man Christ Jesus, who gave himself a ransom for all:" and therefore Paul's eternal misery was not at all *essential* to the salvation of any one. And since, as a sinner, he was exposed to eternal perdition on his own account, it was impossible that his sufferings could be meritorious of salvation for others. We conclude, therefore, that the apostle did not wish to be accursed from Christ for his brethren or for any one else; since by doing so he would have set aside the lawful sentiments of his nature, as a *human being*; he would have grieved the spirit of Christ dwelling in his heart as a *Christian*: he would have forfeited his claim to *inspiration* by writing contradictions; and lastly, he would have ceased to be an apostle of Christ, by desiring to become himself a *Saviour of sinners*!

The commonly received opinion concerning the sense of this passage is, that Paul, in view of the excision of the Israelites nationally, and being grieved at heart for the calamities which were about to come upon them, here expresses his willingness to be devoted to temporal destruction, suffering all kinds of calamity and even exclusion from the visible church, if by that means his brethren could be brought to believe the gospel and be saved.

This interpretation apparently so accords with the context, that it may possibly be the true sense. And we would naturally suppose that the warm temperament of the apostle would lead him to make some such declaration in order to preclude the possibility of others supposing that he had a preference for the gentiles, or was indifferent to the welfare of "his kindred according to the flesh." But this explanation is not unobjectionable. In the first place, it represents the apostle as being actuated by that fanatical spirit of patriotism so common among heathens, who under the influence of gross superstition, were ever willing to devote themselves to destruction, in order to avert the wrath of the gods from their friends, or country. Of the several instances of this kind on record, the following are the most remarkable. The heraclida making war upon the Athenians, the oracle declared that the victory would be granted to that nation whose king should fall in battle. The heraclida upon this, gave strict orders to spare the life of Codrus the Athenian king; but the patriotic Codrus, disguising himself as a peasant, attacked one of the enemy by whom he was slain. Victory declared for the Athenians, and Codrus obtained the title of

father of his country. Another instance occurred at Rome. A gulph having opened in the Forum, it was declared by the augurs, that it would never close, until the most precious things in Rome were thrown into it. Curtius, a man of heroic valour, devoting himself to the safety of his fellow citizens, leaped boldly with his horse and armour in the midst, crying out "that nothing was more truly valuable than patriotism and military virtue." Historians say that the gulph closed immediately, and Curtius was seen no more. These practices, however, were condemned by the wiser heathens; how then can we suppose that the apostle Paul, writing for the instruction of Christians, as he was moved by the Holy Ghost, could manifest a disposition, barely *excusable* in a superstitious pagan? And in the next place, it is not probable Paul meant *temporal* calamity by his being "separated from Christ," for in Rom. 8: 35, 37—he says—"what shall separate us from the love of Christ? Shall tribulations, or distress, or persecutions, or famine, or nakedness, or peril, or sword? Nay, in *all these things*, we are more than *conquerors* through him that loved us."

There is another exposition which the passage will bear, and which we believe to be less objectionable than any we have met with.

The words rendered; "*accursed from Christ for my brethren*" are ἀνάθεμα εἶναι ἀπο τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἵπὲρ τῶν ἀδελφῶν μου. ἀνάθεμα is derived from ἀνα, a preposition denoting, when in composition with other words, exclusiveness, thoroughness, excellence, &c. and πῶμα to give, make, place, appoint, the exact sense to be determined by the connexion in which it is used. And hence the literal meaning of ἀνάθεμα is a thing set apart, or exclusively devoted to a specific purpose. And altho' the word is used elsewhere in the New Testament only in a bad sense, yet since it does not *necessarily* denote a thing devoted to destruction, the precise meaning must be determined by the context. The preposition ἀπο, altho' primarily signifying *from* yet as here used should be rendered *by*. And ἵπὲρ *for*, would be as correctly translated *for the sake of*. According to this explanation the whole passage may be paraphrased thus.—"I could *earnestly* have wished myself devoted by Christ to the service of my brethren, my kindred according to the flesh: being the apostle to the Jews instead of that to the gentiles.

The great objection to this is that it appears to be hardly strong enough to be preceded by the solemn asseveration. "I say the truth in Christ. I lie not. My conscience also bearing me witness in the Holy Ghost." But when we consider the deep rooted affection of all the apostles for their own people and their nation as prejudicial against all others, scarcely removed by the most astonishing miracles, it is no wonder that Paul's heart should be filled with great heaviness and continual sorrow, in the prospect of their judicial blindness as a nation followed by eternal perdition to many individuals. Well might he call his conscience, Jesus, the Holy Ghost, all to witness, that as his heart's desire and prayer to God for Israel was, that they might be saved, so he was willing to labour and suffer reproach in preaching to them the gospel, if by any means he might save some of them.

This sense of the passage is warranted by many circumstances in the apostle's life. Immediately after his conversion, he preached Christ in the Jewish synagogues of Damascus; and when he was come to Jerusalem, and while praying in the temple, no doubt, that his preaching might be blessed to his brethren the Jews, Jesus in a vision appeared to him, saying, "get thee quickly out of Jerusalem; for they will not receive thy testimony concerning me." To this Paul replied in a manner manifesting the most ardent desire to preach the gospel in Jerusalem, alleging reasons why he thought he ought to do so. It was however, to no purpose, for the Lord Jesus said unto him: "Depart; I will send thee far hence to the gentiles." And in prosecuting his missionary operations, his custom was in every place to preach *first* in the synagogues of the Jews. At length, coming to Antioch in Pisidia, where he met with much opposition from the unbelieving Jews, he waxed bold and said: "It was necessary that the word of God should *first* have been spoken unto you; but seeing ye put it from you, and judge yourselves unworthy of everlasting life, lo! we turn to the gentiles"—And tho' as the apostle to the gentiles he on one occasion magnified his office, it was that he might provoke to emulation them which were of his *flesh* and thereby *save* some of them."

Now it does not follow, that Paul in wishing to have been the apostle to the Jews was deficient in affection to the gentiles, nor does he insinuate, those to whom had been committed the apostleship of the circumcision, had neglected the interests of their brethren, nor that he would have been more successful in preaching to them, than they; but lest it should be supposed that disaffection towards his brethren, with which he was frequently charged, led him to speak of their exclusion from the privileges of the covenant people of God, he introduces the subject of their rejection, with a solemn appeal to Christ and the Holy Ghost, for the reality and the degree of his sorrow for his nation; and so far from being indifferent to their misfortunes, he could have wished himself devoted by Christ to their service.

But his remark was peculiarly appropriate, on this account; The church at Rome, to which this epistle was written, was composed of Jews and gentiles, between whom there were several controversies. If therefore, he had been less cautious in introducing a subject of so exciting a character as that of the rejection of the Jews and the calling of the gentiles, the most serious consequences might have ensued in the proud boasting of the gentiles and the alienation of the Jews from the truth. But the apostle, while he here faithfully declares the whole counsel of God, concerning the national excision of the Jews and the ingrafting of the gentiles upon the church, treats this interesting subject in so judicious and delicate a manner as to give no just occasion for the gentiles to be proud, or for the Jews to blaspheme. And hence, in expressing his ready devotion to the service of his brethren the Israelites, if the gentiles had any regard for this apostolic authority and example, they would be induced to do likewise; and labour for the salvation of God's ancient people, to whom instrumentally, they were so much indebted. And when in the discussion of this subject he

says—"I say then, hath God cast away his people? God forbid: for I also am an Israelite of the seed of Abraham, of the tribe of Benjamin," he means, that altho' God had cut them off as a nation, he had not cast them all away *individually*—as appear'd from the fact that he himself was an Israelite; and therefore, salvation being still attainable by *any other* Israelite, the Roman Jews would be encouraged still to seek the favour of God, and induced to lay aside their national prejudices against the gentiles, uniting with them as fellow-heirs of the promises made to Abraham by faith.

This exposition of the passage, tho' plausible, may still be liable to objections: it is therefore suggested with diffidence, and cheerfully submitted for the consideration of those who are more skilful in the word of truth than the writer.

But notwithstanding all the difficulties attending this portion of Holy Writ, its *practical lesson* stands forth, a brilliant contrast to the obscurity in which its literal sense is enveloped. What ever be the literal meaning of the words "*accursed from Christ*"—one thing is plain: that Paul was actuated by such a love for his brethren as induced him to pray and labour for their salvation. Doubtless he acknowledged his duty to regard all mankind as his neighbour and to love them all as he did himself. But in this instance he manifests that interesting concern for the eternal salvation of his kindred and countrymen as is peculiar to a regenerated heart.

A disposition similar to this, was manifested by Andrew, when on finding the long expected Messiah, he first communicated the glad tidings to his brother Simon. And altho' the spirit of Christianity does not cherish family partialities, or exclusive patriotism, yet these sentiments of attachment to relations and country, being inherent in our nature, are therefore, not to be extirpated, but are to be exercised in subordination to the higher service due to our creator, not in promoting the temporal enjoyment, or the worldly advantage of those related to us by the ties of kindred or friendship, but in seeking, with a devoted heart to have them enriched with "the unsearchable riches of Christ."

Our duty to our relations are numerous and important. But alas! they are not sufficiently understood, and but imperfectly performed. How few professing Christians experience "*great heaviness, and continual sorrow of heart*, for their brethren, their kindred according to the flesh." How few feel it their duty to exhort their brethren daily, to "flee from the wrath to come." And still smaller is the number of those who perceive the danger to which their friends are exposed, have the *moral courage*, or even the *willingness* to show their relatives their transgressions, and to lead them "to the lamb of God that taketh away the sins of the world."

O my friends! how fearfully will our condemnation be augmented, when standing before the burning throne of judgment, we behold beside us a brother, a sister, a wife, a child, or a friend—ruined by our neglect or ill example. And how can we behold their countenance agonized by the untold horrors of perdition, without feeling in our own hearts a thousand additional stings of the worm that dieth not, and writhing with deeper anguish amid the everlasting burnings of Tophet.

And if it were possible for a shade of distress to obscure the peaceful sunshine which illumines the abode of the righteous, what horrible darkness would pervade our souls even in heaven, if in beholding the smoke of the torment of the lost; we have to remember but a single instance of imprudence, or neglect, by which a dear friend was not restrained from the commission of a fatal sin,—or encouraged by our criminal indifference to live and die ignorant of the way of salvation.

Would to God, every Christian had the self denial of the apostle Paul, who made himself all things to all men, if by any means he might save some. We hear him at one time say—"If meat make my brother to offend, I will eat no flesh while the world standeth lest I make my brother to offend. And at another time when he was besought not to go up to Jerusalem, he answered—"what mean ye to weep and break my heart? for I am ready not to be bound only, but also to die at Jerusalem for the name of the Lord Jesus."

Were we followers of Paul in his faithfulness to those around him, what mighty revivals of religion would there be in our families! And be persuaded, my friends, if we are religious, every where but at the family altar, our religion is of a very equivocal character. Genuine religion like charity, must begin at home. If it exert its holy influence, first in the family circle, then we have some rational ground to hope for the increase of unfeigned piety in the world and pure devotion in the temple of God.

If we were followers of Paul, even as he was of Christ, then should we behold how sweet and pleasant a thing it is for brethren to dwell together in unity. Then should we bear each others' burdens, and love each other with pure hearts fervently.

We need not be reminded how this would smooth the rugged path of life, and sustain us under the trials which constantly beset us. For then could we press toward the mark for the prize of our high calling, free, at least, from those family feuds, and unbrotherly bickerings which so frequently and so effectually impede our way to glory and render us "unmeet to be partakers of the inheritance with the saints in light."

[For the Baltimore Literary and Religious Magazine.]

THE PICTURE OF THE THEBAN CEDES.

(Translated from the Greek, by William McJimsey.)

1. FORTUNATELY, as we were walking in the temple of Saturn, we saw a multitude of consecrated gifts suspended there. A peculiar picture was suspended before the temple, upon which there was some new writing, and having its remarkable words or objects, which we could not decypher whence or what they were. For the description or picture did not appear like a city, or camp, or army; but it was a paraboloid or circle, having in it two other circles or paraboloids, the one greater, the other less. There was a gate to the first circle, and by the gate a great multitude seemed to be assembled; and within the circle, a company of women was seen; and by the entrance of the first gate and circle, there was an old man standing, making signs as explaining something to the multitude or people going within.

2. Then we were inquiring respecting the mystery for some time among ourselves; and the old man said, Oh! strangers, nothing wonderful has happened to you, inquiring respecting this picture. For not many strangers, nor the citizens themselves know the meaning of this allegory. It is a political picture of society. It is not a present of any of the citizens, a certain foreigner left it here, a man of prudence, experience and wisdom, in word and deed, having lived a Pythagorean or Parmidean life, who consecrated the temple and picture to Saturn. The stranger said, who is that man, whom you see, do you know? Having seen him you know him,—do you not? I have been wondering or admiring, said the old man, for some time at that young stranger! He seems a man of candour and honesty and has shown much desire and curiosity to explain and hear something respecting this picture.

Oh! I beseech you said I, if the labour is not too great, show it to us. We want to hear what this mystery is! Take no jealousy, strangers, but its explanation is involving danger to yourselves. What! Said I. If you learn and obey these words, you shall be wise and happy, but if you are foolish and evil and indolent and ignorant, there shall misery befall you. For this exegesis is like the enigma of the sphinx, which is most hard to be understood she gives forth to men. If they understand it, well,—but if not they are destroyed by the sphinx. So it is respecting this exposition. For the sphinx is not wisdom but folly to men. They inquire respecting good, and evil, and indifferent, but have no usefulness in their actions of life. If any one does not comprehend, they are destroyed by her; not at once as when devoured to death by the sphinx, who has a face like a woman, and a form like a lion, but they are progressively destroyed as those waiting for execution in a prison. If any one seeks knowledge and

rejects folly, they shall enjoy pleasure and happiness. Therefore think and do not hear rashly.

4. Oh! Hercules! How have you greatly increased our desires, if these things be truth. Truth they are. Not more quickly will you explain to us this picture than we will hear with attention, and care, and labour, since its great importance addressed to our hopes and fears, involves reward or punishment. Raising then his staff or cane and pointing it to the writing, he said, you see this great inclosure or circle. We do see it. All this circuit is called the circle of *life* or human life; and the great multitude standing by the gate, are they who are about to enter into life. The aged person standing by the entrance having a chart in one hand and showing signs with the other, is called Genius. He gives directions to those going in, what they ought to do when they enter into life, and shows them which way they must go if they would enjoy happiness in life.

5. And which way does the address exhort them to go? Where is it, said I old citizen. Do you see that throne or seat by the gate near this place or portal into which the people enter, upon which sits a woman, splendid in her dress, fascinating in her appearance, and holding a cup in her hand? I see her, and who is she? She is called dissimulation or deceit? The misleader of men. And what does she there? To those entering the portal of life, she offers them to drink of her cup? And what is this drink? *Error and Ignorance*; drinking which they go into life. Do all drink of this cup of error?

6. All drink, but some more and some less. Do you not see *further forward* within the gate, a multitude or company of women, each having various *dresses and airs*? I see. Those are the opinions, desires and pleasures of human life; who as the crowd enters fly and seize them and lead them away. Where did they lead them? Some to the place of safety, others to destruction by their folly. Oh! why did they use that pernicious drink? All say that they will show the best way, and a life pleasant and happy. But they by ignorance and error received from the cup of deceit, cannot find out the right way in life; but those who have been in the circle for some time go about here and there as these opinions, desires and pleasures lead them.

7. Who is that woman who seems blind and angry, and standing upon that round stone? Her name is Fortune, and she is not only angry and blind but deaf. What work has she to do? She goes about every where and snatches the possessions of one for a gift to another; and then takes away the present and gives it to others without stability or sense. How striking the figure of her representation or nature. Her standing upon this round stone, shows that her gifts is unstable and insecure; as all that place confidence in her, find by great and unexpected vicissitudes.

8. What means that company about her? What do they want, and what called? These are the *inconsiderates*, seeking those things that Fortune throws around. Why have they not similar forms? Some full of joy, others full of sorrow or anguish, striking their hands? The former have received something from Fortune; they

call her good Fortune; the others call her bad Fortune, for she has taken away the presents first given. But why should they so rejoice or weep at what she gives or takes away? Those things seem good to most men. Wealth, and glory or fame, and rank or nobility and children, and dignities, and crowns, and so on are these things. And are these things *not* good? As it respects these things we will again, but now let us acquire a knowledge of the picture or mythology.

9. You see after you have entered this gate, there is another inclosure, higher up, and having women standing before it, with the dress of ladies' of pleasure. This is called *intemperance*; that luxury, this is avarice, that flattery. Why stand they there? They are waiting for those having received any thing from Fortune: they meet them, they address them with apparent friendship, seek their affection, do all they can to please them, and wish them to stay with them and promise or say that their whole lives shall be pleasant and delightful and free of trouble or care. Any one carried away with them to *voluptuousness* will find them agreeable at first, while they please and address his passions, but he soon finds when he recovers his senses that he did *not* enjoy them, but was enjoyed by them. And when by them he has destroyed all he received from Fortune, they are reduced to slavery by these women, to bear their insults, to yield with degrading submission to evil customs and finally to do villainy for their sakes, such as to betray, to do fraud, to rob, to commit sacrilege and perjury and then is given up to *punishment*.

10. Where is she? You see there a narrow cavern, a small dark door, and a miserable, dirty, ragged woman. She that holds the rod is Punishment, Sorrow has her head between her knees; and the other pulling her own hair, is Anguish of Mind. Who is that poor, wretched, naked man standing near them; and that meagre woman resembling him? He is called Discontent, and she his sister, Despair. To these is the wretch delivered and lives in punishment till he is cast into the house of *misery*, where he spends his days in terror, unless *Repentance* steps in his way.

11. Repentance takes him out of his evil situation and places a new *opinion* or *desire* before him, one leading to true *science*, the other to false science. If he receive the *desire* for true science he is led to happiness, but if false science, he is immersed in ignorance and error.

12. How great the danger! But what is false, Philosophy or Science? Do you see the second circle? Do you not see a woman standing *outside* the inclosure, having a fine dress and striking figure or appearance? The unthinking part of society call her *Science*; though she is False Science. Those who are saved out of the house of misery, in going to true Science give a call here. Is there no other way to true Science but this? Yes, there is.

13. But who are those men walking back and forward within the inclosure? Those who are attached to False Science, mistaking her for the true Philosophy. These are poets, orators, logicians, musicians, arithmeticians, and mathematicians and *geometricians*,

astronomers, pleurists, peripatetics, critics, and others of the same rank or standing or respectability in society.

14. Who are those women so active and so like *Intemperance* and her associates in the first circle? They are the same. Are they admitted into the second circle? Yes; but not so readily or frequently as in the first. And are the *opinions* admitted? Doubtless; for the persons admitted into this circle have not become clean of the drink from the cup of deceit and hypocrisy ignorance and folly remain with them nor can they become clean of the *opinions*, nor all the rest of the wicked and mean train, till they turn from the *false to true science*, till they drink of her purifying liquor and wash away all the dregs of the evils that remain in them, which true science alone can do. Such as live with false science will never be delivered, nor can all their thoughts and efforts clear them from those evils.

15. Which way leads to true science? Do you see that place where no one walks, but it looks like a wilderness. Do you see a small opening and a path leading to it, untrodden much, but where few go, as it is rough and stony and difficult. Do you not see an elevated cliff on the eminence almost inaccessible and having several precipices about it. That is the way which leads to *true science*. It is terrible to look upon. And above that cliff, do you see a certain great rock, elevated and surrounded with a deep abyss below?

16. You see the two women standing upon the high rock, strong and beautiful in their bodies, and stretching out their hands with much earnestness. These two are sisters, called *temperance* and *perseverance*. Why do they stretch out their hands so earnestly? They call to those arrived at that eminent rock, to be of good *courage* and not to give up *hope*. They say their sufferings will be but short, and then the road will be pleasant and easy before them. But how do they go up to that elevated rock, as there seems to be no path? The sisters descend from the *elevation to meet them* and draw them up. They urge them to take rest, inspire them with new *courage* and resolution and promise to conduct them to *true science*. They point out the way and show how easy and pleasant and uniform and beautiful it is as you see.

17. Before that grove you see a meadow beautiful and brilliant with much splendid light. You see the *third circle*, in the centre of that meadow and the portal leading to it? That place is called the mansion of *happiness*; for there happiness and the virtues dwell. How pleasing and captivating their situation!

18. You see that woman by the gate, with beautiful countenance, rather past the meridian of life, and dressed with a long and plain robe but without ornament or *affectation*? She is standing not upon a round but square stone, firmly fixed in the ground; and by her are two other women, who appear to be her daughters. She in the centre is *science* and her daughters *truth and persuasion*. Why does science stand on that square stone? To show that her ways are *sure* and her gifts to those that arrive at her abode, are permanent. Her gifts are *cheerfulness* and *contentment* of mind, arising from the conviction and persuasion that all their life they shall be free from evil.

19. How lovely are her presents. But why does she stand without the circle? To welcome those that arrive there, and to give them to drink of her purifying cup, and to introduce them to the virtues within, when thoroughly cleansed by its influence. I do not comprehend what you mean by this *purifying*. Suppose your friend was afflicted with some dangerous sickness; and by going to some skilful physician and taking a *cathartic* to clear out the causes of the disease, he can be restored to health and strength, but if he rejects the *medicine*, he is given up by the physician and loses his life. I understand it by your illustration. In like manner when any person comes to *science*, she takes him under her *education*, and gives him a draught of her cup for the purpose of cleansing him of all evil dispositions, tempers and passions. What distinctive things? The *ignorance* and error from the cup of *deceit*, and his pride, and lust and intemperance, and anger, and covetousness, and of all the evil *impressions and habits* of the first circle.

20. When thus cleansed where does she send them? In through this portal, to *knowledge* and the other *virtues*. Where are they? Do you not see within that gate, a choice society of Ladies, of peculiar *beauty and politeness*, both in their dress and address, and possessing beauty without vanity? I see them and would be glad to hear their names. That the most conspicuous is called *knowledge*; and the others are her sisters, fortitude, justice, integrity or honesty, prudence, decency, freedom, temperance and clemency. How beautiful! We desire to enjoy their company. You can do that if you wisely go the way I have shown. That will we do as far as we can. Then you shall be safe.

21. Where do these lead those arrived at this eminence. To the ir mother. Who is she? Happiness. Where is she? Do you see the course which leads to that sublime eminence yonder, which appears like a citadel above all the other circles? Do you see that gentle, beautiful lady, sitting upon a throne in the portico to it, with an air so pleasant and mild, and with that beautiful chaplet of fresh flowers on her head? She is happiness.

22. When any one arrives there what does she do? Happiness, assisted by the other virtues, crowns him with her own influence or authority, as conquerors are crowned with the laurels of victory and honour. But what conquests has he obtained? The greatest conquest, even over the most terrible *monsters* which formerly opposed and tormented, and enslaved him; all these he has overcome and driven from him; and he is become so much master of himself and of them, that he makes them obey him, though he obeyed them before.

23. What monsters; I would be pleased to hear. Ignorance and error; these are monsters; and very dangerous ones. Then his sorrows and repinings and avarice and intemperance and every thing that is bad. He has overcome these and is *not* overcome by them as formerly. O glorious works! and splendid victories! But what is the influence of that crown where-with he is crowned? It is that which makes him happy; for he who has it on his head, became immediately easy, and settled, and does not place his hopes of happiness in any thing without him but in his own *breast*.

24. Oh! how desirable are honour! what does he do, and where go after he is crowned? The virtues take him and lead him to the place he had left and bid him remark those who continue there, amid what difficulties and affliction they pass their time and how they are shipwrecked in life and wander about in it; or are conquered and led along like captives, some by *intemperance*, some by pride, some by avarice, and others by vain glory; or any other of the vices, whose chains they are trying to break and get loose, that they may arrive at this place of happiness, so that their whole life seems a useless effort. And all this they suffer for their mistake respecting the *right way* and forgetting the directions given them by the guardian *genius*.

25. That appears to be so; but I do not see why the virtues lead the person that has been crowned back to the place he had left. Because he had never formed an *exact idea* of the things there; but had been in a state of infidelity and scepticism respecting them; far from the draught of *ignorance and error*, that he had taken at his entrance, he imagined things that were bad, to be good, and things that were good, to be bad; by which means he lived in musing as all do that are there. But now that he has obtained the knowledge of good, can live in happiness himself and see the misery and poverty of others.

26. What then does he do, and where go? Wherever he pleases, for every where he is safe as one in the Coycian cave: so that where-soever he goes he lives in safety and happiness and is received by all others, with as much pleasure as a good physician is by his patient. And he has no more fear of those females called *monsters*, nor any *suspicion* of being hurt by them. Not at all: for he will never more be troubled by anguish, sorrow, intemperance, avarice, poverty, or any other evil; for he is now master of them all, and superior to every thing that formerly gave him trouble; as those who practice the catching of vipers are *not hurt by the bite of those creatures* which is so venomous and even mortal to others because they have an antidote against the poison; so he is safe from the power or influence of all those evils, because he has an antidote against them.

27. Well explained, but tell me yet further who they are descending from the middle of the rock, some of them crowned and with an air of joy in their faces, and others without crowns that seem rejected and have the *marks* of melancholy about them and are followed by certain women. The former are those who arrived safe at *science*; and the others are they who lost their courage when they came to the precipice where *patience* stands and turned back from that point and now wander about they know not where. Who are the women following them? They are sorrow, anguish, despair, infamy and ignorance.

28. All these are evil; but when they get down into the first circle, to voluptuousness and intemperance, they do not blame themselves, but censure science, as much as they can, and all going to her; and tell how miserable and wretched those poor people are and how much they suffer, who leave the life they might have enjoyed below and the good things bestowed there. What good

things? *Luxury* and *intemperance*, to speak under two leading words; for the indulgence of the passions like brutes is what they think the perfection of their happiness.

29. Those other two men so gay and self-complacent, who are they? The *opinions* who after leading those to science who have gained admission to the virtues, are returning to bring up others and to acquaint them how happy those are whom they have already conducted there. And have they been admitted to the virtues themselves? No! for it is not allowable for *opinion* to enter where knowledge dwells but science conducts them there and they conduct to science; and when science has received, they go back for others, like ships carrying burthens, they unload their cargo and return again.

30. You have well explained the *figures* of this *picture* of human life, but you have not told us what directions or advice, genius at the first portal gives to them, who are entering life. He says, be of good courage; be of good courage then, and I will explain all to you? We will be under obligations to you. You see that blind woman on the round stone, whom I told you was fortune.

31. As to that woman, he directs them not to place any confidence in her, nor to look on any of her gifts as secure and stable nor to consider them their *property*; for she gives nothing but she takes it away and gives it to another as often it is her custom to do. He advises them to regard her gifts with indifference and neither to rejoice at the giving of them, nor to be sorry at their being taken away. For she does nothing with *thought* but all by accident and caprice as I have told you. For this reason genius commands them not to fix their affections upon any objects she bestows and not to resemble those bankers who when they receive money on trust, are apt to be pleased with it and to look upon it as *their own*, and when called upon to repay, grow uneasy and think it hard, — not thinking that it was deposited in their hands on that very condition, that the true owners might call for it when they wanted it. Thus *genius* directs men to look upon all the gifts of fortune; and to remember that she may recall them when the fancy strikes her, or she may give more than she has given, and take them all away together. He advises those entering life to receive her gifts and immediately go on in pursuit of a new permanent *possession*.

32. What acquisition is this? That which they may obtain from science if they can arrive safe to her. What does she give them? The true knowledge of what is good and the firm and certain and unchangeable gift of it. He directs them to quit fortune immediately in pursuit of knowledge; and when they come to those women who are Intemperance and Voluptuousness, to leave them too, at once, and not to mind what they can say but to go on for the circle of false science; there he bids them to stay a while to procure what may be useful on the road and then to go on to true *science*. These are what the *genius* directs on entrance into life and whoever transgresses or neglects them, will be a miserable wretch.

33. I have now explained the whole of the parable contained in this painting but if you have any particular questions to ask, I am ready and willing to answer. We thank you; what then is it the

genius orders them to get in the circle of false science? Whatever may be of use to them. And what is *there* that may be useful? Literature and so much of mathematical and metaphysical science as Plato says, may serve people in youth as a bridle, to keep from being drawn away by idle amusements. Is it necessary for all that would arrive at true science to do this? No, it is not necessary; but it may be useful, though in truth these things themselves do not contribute towards making them better men. Not contribute at all towards making them better! Not at all, for they may be as good without them. And yet they are not without use, for they may some times help us as interpreters do, to the meaning of a language we do not *understand*; but after all, it is better to understand the language ourselves than to have the necessity of an interpreter; and we may be good without learning.

34. In what then have the *learned* any advantage over others, towards becoming better men? Why do you *imagine* they should have any advantage; since you see they are *deceived* like others, as to what is good or bad, and continue to be involved in all manner of *vices*. For there is nothing that prevents a man who is a master of *Literature* and skilful in general science, from being at the same time, given to *intemperance*, or drunkenness or avarice or injustice or villany or in one word, to imprudence of judgment in all his ways. 'Tis true we see too many examples of such, of what advantage then is their *learning* towards making them better men!

35. You have made it appear that it is of none, but what is the reason of it? The reason is this; that when they get into the second circle they fix there as if they were arrived at true science. And what does it profit them? Since we see several persons who go on directly from *Intemperance* and the other vices in the first circle, to the circle of true science, without ever calling in where these learned persons have made their abode. How then can the learned have any advantage over them? On the contrary, they are less apt to exert themselves or to be instructed than the former. How *can* that be? Because they who are in the second circle, not to mention any other of their faults, at least profess to know what they do not know; so that they acquiesce in their ignorance and have no motive to stir them up toward the finding out of true science. Besides, do you not observe another thing, that the *opinions* from the first circle enter in among them and converse with them as freely as with the former? So that they are not at all better than they; unless *Repentance* should come to them and convince them that it is not *true but false science*, they have been embracing all the time, Continuing in this mind, there is no hope for them. To close all, my friends, what I would beg of you is, to *think over every thing* I have said to you, to weigh well in your minds, and to practice accordingly. Get a *habit* of doing right whatever pain it costs you; let no difficulties deter you in the way to *virtue* and *think every thing else* worthless, compared with this. Then will the address you have now learned thus prove to *yourselves* a lesson of *happiness*.

THE STATE OF POPERY IN SCOTLAND.

WE print below a report made to the *General Assembly of the Kirk of Scotland*, at its meeting for 1837, on the subject of preventing the spread of popery in that country. It will be read with profit—by all who desire to know the state of popery in that renowned protestant kingdom,—and the present vices and temper, of the descendants of *Knox, Buchanan, Melville*, and the noble band of martyrs, confessors, and heroes, who subverted the idolatry, tyranny and corruption of Rome at so great expense of toil and blood—and whose successors upheld the rights and liberties, if not at all times the pure doctrine and Godly discipline of the church—at so great cost and sacrifice, in past ages.

The steady, enlightened, and noble testimony which every branch of Evangelical Presbyterians, in all ages and countries has borne against the apostate man of sin—is one of the most glorious facts in the thrilling history of that body of Christians. No land nor age can be found, in which the sound of their testimony has not gone forth—for enlightened liberty to the people—for purity in the church—and for righteousness on the part of rulers; and of course, against the ignorance, the corruption, and the oppression, of the papacy. God grant to all their ministers and churches, in this time of defection and rebuke, grace to walk in the foot-steps of our humble, wise, learned, laborious, holy and courageous ancestors.

Mr. Murr, of Edinburgh, Convener of the Committee, appointed with the view to prevent the spread of Popery brought forward the Report. To the queries, issued by the Convener, about five hundred returns had been obtained; in which returns were presented an account of 23 chapels, 14 schools, 31 priests, and 14 schoolmasters, as nearly as could be ascertained, and a Roman Catholic population, of about 39,800. It was however to be *particularly and carefully noticed*, that the results now given, come out of a limited set of returns—limited, as compared with the extent of the districts to be surveyed; and therefore, the results now given, were by no means to be taken as affording a complete view of the state of Popery in Scotland. In some parishes the numbers had declined, owing to conversion, and especially to emigration, while in several parishes they had increased. He then referred to various old Acts of the Assembly, as pointing out the course which the Church ought to pursue in reference to this subject. There was no doubt that Popery has greatly increased in Scotland of late; and though certain causes have been assigned for its increase, which do not imply, in every case, the thinning of the ranks of Protestantism, by direct apostacy; and though it is not affirmed, therefore, that the giving up of the use of means, such as our forefathers employed to check the spread of the evil, has, in all instances, widened it; yet the fact must be stated, that such means have been very generally suspended, and that for *this*, among other causes, we have to lament the diffusion of sentiments, most prejudicial to the support and exclusive importance of the true Reformed religion. It has been hastily considered too, that Popery is changed to the better, and is ameliorated in its design and spirit, by the progress of society. In opposition to facts also, it is thought that with the wide diffusion of secular knowledge and liberal views, Popery cannot be supposed to be able any longer to hold up its head. Much

ignorance, besides, prevails among the people as to the difference between the doctrines of the Romish Church and those of the Protestant faith. Under the plea also of maintaining candour and liberality of sentiment, the public mind is brought to treat these distinctions as trivial; hence it comes to be supposed that there is so large a portion of common and safe ground appertaining to the two systems, that the adherents of both may unite without being disturbed by any reference to the points of separation. Moreover, in accounting for the recent spread of Popery, there is reason to believe, that the zeal and resources of the Church of Rome have, of late years, been steadfastly turned on Great Britain. From a *Narrative*, published not long ago, by a German professor of great eminence, both as to literature and moral character, we learn that the Romish Society, *De Propaganda Fide*, converges its whole energies, from time to time, on a single portion of what are called the heretical territories. And he expressly declares, that our country now occupies the chief attention and efforts of an Institution, whose emissaries are the Jesuits, whose schemes are prosecuted by any and every means, and whose ample funds are made up of contributions from all quarters of the Papal dominions. This may, perhaps, explain in part, the otherwise inexplicable fact, of so many chapels being built in England and Scotland, which, for splendour of architecture and pomp of circumstance, holds out a striking contrast to the poverty of the persons who frequent them. In accounting for this increase it may be mentioned, that where public works are raised, the Roman Catholics abound chiefly from the coming in of a Roman Catholic population. The demand for labourers brings over vast numbers of people from Ireland—the strong hold of Popery. These people intermarry with the Protestants in this country, and although a compromise is made that one portion of the family shall be educated in the father's belief and the other in the mother's, the common result is, that this attempt at compromise increases the number of professed adherents to Popery, which might arise in a great measure from an indifference to Protestantism, rather than from any real change of opinion. But whatever causes are assigned for the recent advance of Popery in Scotland, there is no doubt that the number of Papists have been exaggerated. In some places a chapel is built or purchased (chiefly by aid of foreign money), rather to hold out a lure to bring people to it, than to provide for those who want it. A chapel has been opened not far from Edinburgh, though as yet only a few families of Roman Catholics live near it; another has recently been raised in Wick, Caithness, capable of containing about 500 persons; and yet it is doubtful whether there be a native Roman Catholic in the whole country; certainly, there are not above twelve residents in the town belonging to that persuasion. It is true, that in manufacturing towns a very large excess of Roman Catholic population is found above the capability of their chapels,—still, it is certain, that in districts where no public works are, chapels are raised,—and that, of course, more for gleaming adherents from around them, than supplying existing congregations. Another reason is traceable back to the period during which the proposal was made for changing the policy of the Government towards the Roman Catholics. The projected measure was obviously to be advantaged by a show of numerical force; and therefore it is scarcely to be wondered at, that in carrying forward the measure their number should have been over-rated by themselves, and their statements readily received by their friends. For example, the enumeration given by themselves for Glasgow, amounted then to nearly fifty thousand; whilst the returns now made to the Committee, even against the influx population of Irish labourers going on since, is only between nineteen thousand and twenty thousand. But still, after every abatement which can be made in the case, the call for pastoral care, energy, and exertion may well be heard and felt in the department of ministerial duty, to which the inquiries of the Com-

mittee have been pointed. There is reason to believe, that the number of Papists in Scotland, on the nearest calculation, amount to 70,000. Though, as already mentioned, the great cause of their increase is found in the importation of Irish labourers, and their intermarrying with the natives; yet it is a fact much to be deplored, that not a few are now professed Roman Catholics, who originally were adherents to the Protestant Church. The Convent, too, is begun, where cheap education, in the common and ornamental branches, within its walls, is advertised for the public at large; and where already some of the youth of Protestant families are brought under the influence of Popish teaching and ceremonies. The college is opened, where instruction and support are afforded gratuitously to all who will prepare themselves for what is called the ecclesiastical state. The Sisters of one of the Romish orders are now seen for the first time within centuries, moving among the people, with benefactions in the one hand, and their breviary in the other. Musical entertainments, under the name of Sacred Oratorios, for charitable purposes, are offered in the chapels, to which numbers of the Protestants are drawn by the plea of aiding a good work, and where their eyes and minds are familiarized with a service which our Church solemnly declares to be idolatrous. And, add to all these things, that a false species of liberality prevails, which confuses the distinction of creeds; and extracts from the Church of Scotland, the character of a Grand Missionary Institution, whose aim is not only to prevent the spread of error, but to promote the circulation of truth; and unchecked by the fear of reproach for proselytising, is to endeavour to bring within her pale, all who have lapsed from the truth, or are ignorant of it. The means the Committee had devised to remedy and check those evils, were various, and amongst others were the extending of the Church the continuance and increase of assiduous visitation, and the catechising the flock—an increase of schools, in which the Bible should be the chief book, and the Shorter Catechism regularly taught. Discourses should also be given in the pulpit from time to time, in which the great distinctions between the Protestant and the Catholic doctrines should be pointed out; and there ought to be more prayer in private with those in error, where access could be had to them; and while their errors were pointed out to them, tender concern should also be shown for their personal wants. With regard to public controversy, some talked of its benefits, and others earnestly deprecated it. On this point the Committee stated, that times had been and might occur again in which the course pointed out was needed and must be advantageous; at the reformation, for instance, the public mind in Scotland, as elsewhere, was sunk in the greatest ignorance. But no doubt the most favourable means for diminishing the evil was in the quiet and assiduous exertions of every parish minister in his own sphere. The establishment of infant and otherschools, where a secular was not torn aside from a religious education, might also be highly conducive to the great end they had in view.

[Continued from Page 454.]

ON THE MORAL GOVERNMENT OF GOD IN GENERAL.

Volition, or choice, is necessary to moral agency.

SEC. VI.—We must remember that *volition* or *willing* is an act of the mind, directing its thought to the production of any action, and thereby exerting its power to produce it. The will is nothing but a power in the mind to direct the operative faculties of a man to motion or rest, as far as they depend on such direction. Locke B. II. Chap. 21.—The *will* (without any metaphysical refining) is, *that by which the mind chooses any thing*. The faculty of the *will* is that power or principle of the mind by which it is capable of *choosing*; an act of the *will* is the same as an act of *choosing* or *choice*." Edwards, II. 15.—When the herdmen of Abram, and the herdmen of his nephew had by their strife endangered the peace of the parties, the patriarch proposed a separation; and condescendingly, offered the young man his choice of the whole land, "Then Lot chose him all the plain of Jordan." What did he? He took a view of the different localities. He observed the pasture lands, the hills, the vales, the springs and brooks of each—he weighed the motives—he balanced in his own mind the advantages and disadvantages, and as the most promising prospects were—as the motives were—so was his choice. Thus is *volition* an act of the mind "directing the operative faculties of a man to motion or rest." And so Lot forthwith descended into the plain. Now we say that *volition* or *choice* is necessary to constitute moral agency. If a man is compelled by any force or physical strength, to do any act good or bad, it is obviously not an act of his mind, and all men hold him irresponsible. For it is not any mere *physical operation* to which we attach the nature of right or wrong, of moral or immoral; but it is the act of mind, which here is not expressed. Physical acts spoken of as right or wrong, only as they are significant of mental operations. This distinction governs the practice of mankind in all civilized communities. Involuntary homicide is not murder. On the other hand, if a man waylay his neighbour with intent to kill him, and yet by his gun missing fire, he does not kill or injure him, all men admit that in the sight of God he is a murderer. Because there was *volition*—the mind acted. Here *physical ability* is not necessary to moral action, nor connected with it. In the other case the physical ability existed and was exerted, and yet there was no moral character to it. Wherever no *volition* is, there is no accountability. Thus far, only it may be necessary for us to go, for our purposes, at least, for the present. And thus far there is almost no contrariety of opinion. Should the reader desire to throw in the question of freedom of will here, I would simply remark with Edwards, II. 38.—Locke B. II. Chap. 21, and Dickerson, page 37, that freedom is not predicable of the will. The first says—"to talk of liberty or the contrary, as belonging to the *very will itself*, is not to speak good sense; if we judge of sense and nonsense, by the original and proper signification of words. For the *will itself* is not an agent that *has a will*; the power of choosing itself has not the power of choosing."

So Locke. "The question itself, viz: whether man's will be free or no? is altogether improper—and it is as insignificant to ask whether his sleep be swift, or his virtue square; *liberty* being as little applicable to the *will*, as swiftness or motion is to sleep, or squareness to virtue."

Edwards states the Pelagian notion of liberty thus: Vol. II. 39 "1.—That it consists in a *self-determining power* in the will or a certain sovereignty the will has over itself, and its own acts, whereby it determines its own volition, so as not to be dependent in its determinations, or any cause without itself nor determined by any thing prior to its own acts. 2. Indifference belongs to liberty in their notion of it or that the mind previous to the act of volition be *in equilibrio*. 3.—Contingence is another thing that belongs and is essential to it; not in the common acceptation of the word, as that has been already explained, but as opposed to all *necessity*, or any fixed and certain connexion with some previous ground or reason of its existence." To refute this doctrine is the grand design of Edwards in his treatise on the will. This every careful reader of the treatise knows; and whether the first of the errors alone, viz: "that the will has a self determining power—which is the chief and capital error, be not the radical principle of all modern improvements in theology, the reader must judge.

Volition is necessary to moral agency, but it is still a question, whether volition and even this combined with rational intelligence is sufficient of itself to constitute it. Are these all that are necessary to render a being morally accountable for his conduct? This is a philosophical question and yet an interesting and profitable one. But brevity is indispensable. It will be agreed on all sides that reasoning is necessary to volition. There can be no choice where there is no thought, and no capacity to compare one thought with another. The weighing of motives, and the yielding of the mind to the stronger, implies and includes the exercise of reason. The precise question then is, whether in the act of choice there is any morality: that is, necessarily. Can there be volition—an act of choice, to which the terms right or wrong, moral or immoral cannot be applied? If there can, the volition and the measure of reason necessary to it, are not every thing required in a moral agent. Let it therefore be asked whether the act of mind which directs my lifting this pen, rather than that one is necessarily moral. Would it have been sinful for me to have chosen that pen? Unless this last act of choice would have been wrong, that is immoral, can it be said the other was right and moral? But how can the idea of right and wrong exist, except in reference to a rule of right? And where is the rule in this case? Or rather, how could I have the idea of a rule of right; if possessed only of reason and volition? Did not the dog in the case alluded to just now, perform an act of reason, did he not exercise volition? Human language every where supposes that animals have a power of choice. They exercise volition. Are they moral agents? No. Something more is necessary

A moral sense is necessary to a moral agent.

SEC. VII. That the properties and powers of our animal nature are most intimately connected with the intellectual, is most obvious to our consciousness, yet are they very distinct and separable. So the intellectual powers are distinct from the moral, but more intimately connected than the preceding. Still it does not appear to me that they are necessarily blended and confused. A capacity to be influenced by motives presented through the reasoning faculty, does not involve accountability independently on the character of the motives. "To moral agency" says Edwards, II. 40. "belongs a *moral faculty*, or sense of moral good and evil; or of such a thing as desert or worthiness, of praise or blame, reward or punishment; and a capacity which an agent has, of being influenced in his actions by moral inducements or motives, exhibited to the view of understanding and reason, to engage to a conduct agreeable to the moral faculty." A little below he observes, "The brute creatures are not moral agents" because "they have no moral faculty or sense of desert, and do not act from choice, guided by understanding or with a capacity of reasoning and reflecting, but only from instinct, and are not capable of being influenced by moral inducements." To all this I heartily subscribe except that, probably reasoning and choice, which are here denied to brutes, are taken in notwithstanding under the general term *instinct*. What is instinct? Is it not simply that measure (undefined, perhaps undefinable) of reason and choice, which the Creator has allotted to brutes?

The time has been when the doctrine of a *moral sense* was controverted on philosophical ground, its advocates were challenged for proof, and proof of such kind was demanded, as was utterly inconsistent with the subject. Mathematical evidence on a moral subject! Mathematical evidence that man has a conscience! You might as well demand mathematical evidence that Brutus's dagger pierced the robe of Cæsar—that Arnold attempted to betray his country. What then is the proof of the existence of a moral sense—a conscience—a faculty or power in man of perceiving right and wrong, and feeling the force of moral obligation? I answer 1. The very existence of these terms, if they express any ideas at all, these ideas or thoughts must have an existence in the human mind. If all human languages have terms expressive of these very thoughts, it proves the universality of the principle or power of the mind, by which alone the thoughts themselves can be perceived. 2. The ideas of right and wrong, can be traced universally among men, by their language, and the customs and manners connected with criminal jurisprudence. But 3d and chiefly, the internal irresistible consciousness of every living man. And here moral science stands on lofty ground. She is not dependent on any external powers. She carries with herself and in herself (as it were) the very evidence for which many other sciences are dependent. She appeals directly to the present witness in every man's bosom. True under the peculiar circumstances the testimony of the witness may be confused and indistinct and unavailable, but not more so than the witness at any other tribunal, nor in greater numbers.

Exceptions there are a few, where the internal consciousness is not satisfactory; but in the immense majority—the almost universality of cases, conscience is her own vindicator. The moral sense speaks out with a voice that must be heard. If insulted and abused she may modestly retire from the tribunal, but only for a time. Soon she rallies and returns, and will command attention. “If our heart condemn us, God is greater than our heart and knoweth all things. Beloved if our heart condemn us not then have we confidence toward God.” 1. John III. 20. Here the moral sense and conscience is clothed with a species of judicial power. And so Job xxvii. 6. “My righteousness I hold fast, and will not let it go; my heart shall not reproach me so long as I live.” Here the same principle, or *moral sense*, is set forth under the same name, *heart*, conscience. Nor is there perhaps a single instance in the Bible wherein the existence of a moral faculty is formally affirmed. It is every where assumed; just as the being of a God is every where assumed. Nor are we to be distracted or disturbed though men may throw metaphysical difficulties in the way. What is this moral faculty. If it is not reason—nor volition—nor a mere bodily organ, what is it? Where does it reside? We can just as easily retort—what is reason? What is the will? What and where understanding? &c. &c. Nay but let us dismiss this folly and rest in the broad, undeniable *fact*—men do have and exercise continually a *faculty* of perceiving and feeling that there is a right and a wrong; they have a sense of guilt or liability to punishment for some actions; and a feeling of approbation, and sense of desert of reward for others. Now is it this MORAL SENSE, connected as it is with *reason* and *volition*, and some others to be mentioned, that constitutes man a *moral agent*? This presents moral motives. How man should feel any power in motives to right action, or any repulsion or aversion from wrong actions, without it, is, I suppose inconceivable. Take away this and all talk about the rewards of virtue is absurd, for all distinction between virtue and vice must cease. “The moral maniac pursues his way, and thinks himself a wise and a happy man; but feels not that he is treading a downward course, and is lost as a moral being.” Abercrombie *Moral Feelings* &c. 134.

Self-love; or the desire of happiness implied in moral government.

SEC. VIII.—The sacred scriptures have prescribed love to ourselves, as to manner and measure, as a rule in reference to others. “Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself.” Love is the principle of communicative goodness—the principle of diffusive benevolence; that disposition and feeling in us, which leads and prompts us to do good to the loved object. All living beings desire to be happy. This has been appropriately styled the first law of nature—a law indispensable to the continuance of life. “No man ever yet hated his own flesh, but nourisheth and cherisheth it.” From the minutest insect to the mightiest angel, love of happiness is the law of life. Efforts towards self-preservation are but the actings of this law.

Self-love is an original and essential ingredient of our being—in itself a holy and a right feeling. Its corruption and degeneracy ends in selfishness, which makes its own supposed enjoyment the supreme object of pursuit, irrespective of the claims of our fellow men or of our Creator. True self-love, on the contrary, is perfectly consistent with both. Indeed, it necessarily involves both; for our highest enjoyments lie in communion with men and God, which communion consists in the full and fair discharge of the relative duties we owe to both. As therefore self-love leads to self-preservation, and the utmost possible extension of our own happiness, so are we bound to exercise the general principle of love, in promoting to the utmost possible degree, the happiness of all our brethren of the human race. The strength of obligation in the latter is inferred, in the rule, from the force of the principle in the former. How this becomes important in morals will appear in the next section.

Rewards and Punishments are addressed to the principle of self-love, and are essential to the idea of moral government.

SEC. IX. A reward, is some good conferred as a consideration for right action. When a child has been obedient to his parents, something is given to the child or done for him, which affords him happiness; and this as an expression of his parent's approbation of his conduct. On the contrary, if the child's conduct has been wrong, the parent withholds the expression of satisfaction; he inflicts some privation or pain, as an expression of his disapprobation. This is *punishment*; and whether it consists in the withholding of a benefit, or the positive infliction of pain, it is addressed to the principle of self-love; and when held up before the mind, previously to the perpetration of the deed, it constitutes what is called a *motive* to action. It is so called, because of some suitableness or adaptation in it to move the person to act. "By motive," says Edwards, "I mean the whole of that which moves;" now the hope of happiness, and the fear of pain have their common origin in self-love. Every thing therefore, which is done to alarm our fears, and to excite our hopes, derives from this first law of nature, its moving force. Take away from the human bosom the love of happiness; hope and fear are terms without meaning. If pain and pleasure were matters of perfect indifference, how could the one or the other influence to action? But as the law exists in every man's consciousness—as we feel it impossible to throw off the fear of pain, and to extinguish the lights of hope, we experience continually the repelling influence of the one and the attracting force of the other.

If we look narrowly into these things, we shall find that the precise design of the Creator in furnishing us with such a constitution, was to make us capable of being influenced by motives, that we might be under moral government; and that the design of men in applying reward and punishment, is to connect most intimately in the mind, upright action with happiness on the one hand; and wrong action with pain on the other, and all with the same view of bringing motive to act upon self-love. Two remarks, of very con

siderable importance to a right understanding of the nature of moral government and of the great doctrine of justification, it may be as well here to present more distinctly to the reader's most serious consideration, viz.

1st. *The precise object of reward is right action.* No parent feels that he ought to reward—that is, to bestow good—to confer benefits on his child as a consideration, for nothing—for no action at all. No government holds out a premium for indolence, no more than for vicious conduct. The very idea of rewarding inaction is absurd. We have seen that the possession of faculties adapted to useful action, is an expression of the Creator's will that we ought to exercise them. The possession infers the obligation to use. Inactivity is a sin. The burying of his talent, or the hiding of it in a napkin, was a punishable offence—a sin in itself—a resistance of his lord's will who gave it. In other words, *innocence* is not meritorious of *positive* reward.

By *innocence*, I understand the primitive state of nature or of moral being prior to his active performance of duty or active commission of sin. Adam was innocent the moment of his creation; but he was not entitled to heaven. Positive and perpetual bliss, is the reward of perfect righteousness. Innocence is entitled to exemption from painful endurance. "Adam was not to have the reward merely on account of his being innocent, if so, he would have had it fixed upon him at once, as soon as ever he was created; for he was as innocent then as he could be; but he was to have the reward on account of his activeness in obedience; not on account merely of his not having done ill, but on account of his doing well." Edwards, v. 396.

An objection will here perhaps occur to the reader's mind—If innocence is not entitled to reward, can the moral being, who has a corrupt nature, prior to his own *active sinfulness*, be entitled to punishment? The answer to this must depend upon a previous question, viz. How came he into this state of sinfulness? Was it by a direct and immediate exertion of creating power? Then God is the author of this corruption! which is blasphemy! was it a result of previous moral action with which he was immediately connected? Then he in whom the corruption of disposition exists, is not innocent. His inclinations and desires after evil are consequences of sin—have their cause of existence in sin, and are therefore sinful like their cause; and of course, are deserving of punishment.

"Activeness in obedience"—righteousness is that to which alone reward,—good, blessing is promised. This doctrine of the good Edwards, of the Bible, and of common sense, ought to be a little farther illustrated. It is the fundamental principle of all morality and religion. Let us have distinct ideas here, or all will be obscurity. Let us know what *righteousness* is, and light will shine upon our path throughout. What then is *righteousness*? I answer; it is *doing right—right action—action according to the rule of right—conformity with law.* When a moral being has done what the law under which he is placed requires him to do, he is *righteous*. "The formal nature of righteousness, (says Edwards, v. 397,) lies in

a conformity of actions to that which is the rule and measure of them. Therefore that only is righteousness in the sight of a judge, that answers the law.—That perfect obedience, is what is called righteousness in the New Testament, and that this righteousness or perfect obedience, is by God's fixed, unalterable rule, the condition of justification, is from the plain evidence of truth, confessed by a certain great man, whom no one will think to be blinded by prejudice in favour of the doctrine we are maintaining."—He then quotes Locke with approbation. "For righteousness, or an exact obedience to the law, seems by the scripture to have a claim or right to eternal life: Rom. iv. 4. 'To him that worketh,' that is, doeth works of the law,—'is the reward not reckoned of grace, but of debt' "

"Such a perfect obedience in the New Testament is termed δικαιοσύνη, which we translate righteousness"—"this, adds Edwards, is that which Paul so often styles *the law*, without any other distinction: Rom. ii. 13; "Not the hearers of the law are just before God, but the doers of the law are justified." It is needless to quote any more places, his epistles are all full of it, especially this to the Romans." Edwards v. 398.

Here I am in a strait. The vast importance of this principle in moral government, strongly invites to spend more time in its illustration and defence; and this the more because this fundamental principle is almost wholly lost sight of in a large proportion of all that has been written, and come to my knowledge in the nineteenth century, on the subject of religion and morals. It is amazing how the very foundation on which all government rests; or rather, the essence of the thing itself, can be left out of sight, whilst a vast amount of commotion exists all around it.

On the other hand, the heavenly simplicity of the principle—its inexplicability because of its elementary simplicity, seems to me to foreclose discussion and frown upon all attempts at explanation. To save himself from the labour of reading page after page of attempted illustration, where the subject is, at the outset, intuitively true—rather where its truth is intuitively perceived, will not the reader agree, and pledge himself, *never* to forget, that **RIGHT-EOUSNESS IS CONFORMITY WITH LAW**: and *the only proper object of reward?*—that there is in the government of God, *an eternal connection between upright action and the happiness of the actor.*

Presuming that you are perfectly satisfied with the terms, I offer the 2d, Remark, viz: That there exists an indissoluble connection between wrong doing and suffering—that neglecting to act rightly and acting wrongly are to be followed by punishment.

Punishment is the pain, whether of privation or of positive infliction of wrath—the evil which is inflicted by the ruling power, as an expression of displeasure against sin. The infliction of such evil goes on the principle that it is right to connect sin and suffering. The assumption of its truth will not be accounted improper here. We surely need no laboured argument to *satisfy* us that it is right to punish sin—to visit evils upon men, proportional to the magnitude of their offences. We have the evidence within ourselves, that it is right. We have the evidence of its correctness in

the universal consent of men, as that is expressed in all the governments exercised by man. We have the evidence in the whole of God's visitations upon human folly and crimes. "Though hand join in hand, the wicked shall not go unpunished," It is therefore utterly unnecessary to delay for the purpose of proof. Penal evil is essential to moral government—prior to the act of sin, as a motive operating by fear—posterior to sin, as a vindication to the justice of the government and of the holiness and truth of the governor.

POSTSCRIPT TO THE CASE OF ELIZA BURNS.

WE are obliged by a sense of justice to an individual who says we have circulated a false report regarding him, and possibly we may have done unintentional wrong—to return again, to this case—so full of hope to every Protestant heart, and so fatal to the character and designs of papists. Let the two following papers speak for themselves.

I am informed that my name is used in an article in your Magazine of this month, and that it is therein asserted that I called upon the Editor, in reference to a piece which appeared in one of your previous numbers—The assertion is gratuitous and not founded on fact.—I did not at any time deem the piece referred to, of sufficient importance to require any notice or attention.

Yours, &c.

CHARLES TIERNAN.

Lexington st.

November 7th, 1837.

To the Conductors of the
Baltimore Literary and Religious
Magazine. }

A young man called at my office during the month of October (to the best of my recollection) and asked me if there was there the last two numbers of the *Literary and Religious Magazine*, when I replied in the affirmative, and at his request I presented them to him. He sat down complacently and commenced reading, occasionally making observations, all of which I don't recollect as I was employed—However, I recollect distinctly of his stating that he had heard of a design, or recommendation of some persons to Lynch the Editors. On my replying that such effects always argued a bad cause, he justified it, and said he thought it right. He

said the Literary and Religious Magazine was of a similar character with the *Castigator*, and some other infamous papers. To which I replied that that was not so—as the editors were both gentlemen of respectability in society, and openly inserted their names in front of the Magazine. He became angered and stated that he “heard a person that morning swear by the eternal G—d that he would put a ball in him” (Mr. Breckinridge) I replied that I was only the printer of the paper, but as he heard such an assertion made I required his name. He stated it was Tiernan, and that the Mrs. Tiernan whose name was mentioned in one of the Magazines, associated with the relation given of the abduction of Eliza Burns, was his mother, and “*by the God that made me (him) one of those (pointing to the names of Messrs. Breckinridge and Cross on the cover) should answer for using it (Mrs. T’s name) there,—* walking out as he was speaking—I inferred from his manner, that he was the individual who would put the ball in Mr. Breckinridge. Mr. Tiernan did not say whether his Christian name was Charles, nor give any name—nor do I know his name. I deemed it my duty, (under those circumstances) to tell Mr. B. and as Mr. Charles Tiernan in a note to the editors says that the assertion that “I (he) called on the editors relative to a piece which appeared, is gratuitous, and not founded on fact.” I am called upon to make this statement.—The inference is plain that it was a brother if not Mr. Charles Tiernan. I would know him again if I saw him.

There were two other persons present.

R. J. MATCHETT.

The reader will see at once from Mr. Matchett’s statement, that all we have formerly said, and more was true to the letter. He will also perceive, on consulting the article in our November No., that we do no more than express our *belief* as to the Christian name of the person who called himself Tiernan. We will now say, that we arrived at that belief, after considerable enquiry, and as we then supposed satisfactory information. We insert the foregoing note of *Mr. Charles Tiernan* with great pleasure; and sincerely regret having been led into any mistake—if indeed that has been the case!

We are not more assured now, that the note we publish is from the veritable author, than we were formerly that we named the person rightly; for then we had responsible persons as our informants, and now we have only a note left at our office, by we know not whom. Again, it will be remembered, that we never said Mr. Tiernan had “*called upon the Editor;*” it will also be observed that this is the specific matter now denied in the note. There may be a mere play on words here. Or the note may not be from him whose name is to it. Or the first individual may have given a false name to Mr. Matchett.

The probability however seems to be that the present note is from Mr. Charles Tiernan; that we were misinformed in calling the person who honoured us by the first notice by his given name; and

that it was another member of the family and not himself who made the threats in question. Supposing the facts to be thus—we repeat, that we publish this note with much pleasure, and sincerely express our regret at the supposed and unintentional mistake—if *as we have already said, any has occurred!*

It will be observed however, that Mr. Charles Tiernan's reason for not having "*called upon the Editor*" is frankly given: namely, that he "did not at any time deem the piece referred to, of sufficient importance to require any notice or attention."—Therefore of course, whenever we shall be able to write an article which he shall think worthy of notice, we may expect a call, perhaps a bullet, or possibly a Lynching at the hands of Mr. Charles Tiernan. And in the meantime, the other Mr. Tiernan who *did* deem the piece already published, worthy of his "notice and attention"—may at his leisure, still favour a poor parson, with a call, a ball, or a Lynching; even if GENERAL WILLIAMSON, and his "BIG NIGGER" should let him escape.

Still we are glad to publish this note. For it puts to rest the hope, over which the priests have chuckled, embroiling us, with layman, and about temporal and personal affairs. You have outwitted yourselves gentlemen; and God has once more, for the hundredth time delivered us out of your hands.—Whatever may befall us hereafter, let it be forever remembered, that the pretence of our having offended a son by speaking improperly of his mother—is a fabrication and contrivance of the priests—nailed down and finished. The son comes voluntarily forward and says he took no offence—deemed our article not requiring any notice. Remember that gentlemen;—See how a plain and honest course has confounded you. See how God has turned your machinations to your own exposure.

Mrs. Tiernan, is known to this whole community, as a most decided Catholic. Very well; she has the right to be so. But she is also known as one of their most active official members, in various societies, institutions, schools, &c. &c. Her private conduct, rights and duties, are matters with which we have never meddled, and never will. Her *official and public acts*, we suppose are on the same footing, as those of all other females, of equal condition in life; and therefore we cannot be deterred from taking such notice of them, as public necessity may require. Being a female, she shall never receive from us, any treatment of which any lady could justly complain. But if she performs *official and public acts*—she must expect them to be respectfully canvassed, and where needful, decidedly condemned; as for example, in the official connivance at the abduction of an orphan protestant child.

After all, we are afraid there is foul play in the present denial; and that the individual who called at our office *was* Mr. Charles Tiernan,—and that he has now sent us this note, under the pressure of public sentiment roused against him by his former conduct. We say this with pain: but we fear on sufficient authority. We do not know, even by *eye-sight* any Tiernan on earth, and are therefore liable to be many ways imposed on in the whole affair. But we are strongly assured by persons who ought to know, that *the Mr. Tiernan who did threaten our lives, is the one who has*

been of late years residing much out of this city, perhaps in New Orleans; and that he is really named Charles. In that case what are we to think of his present conduct?

One thing at least rejoices our hearts: the orphan child, abducted and secreted, is redeemed from destruction. Thanks be to God for permitting us to have had any agency in this blessed work.

When our memory is cursed by the enemies of God, the grateful tears of this orphan will be like sweet incense upon our tomb. When the wicked revile our names, the oppressed and the forsaken will point to our monument and bless the God of truth, who inclined and enabled us to do them good—at so great risk, and amid such ferocious opposition. And in the hour of death and the day of judgment,—a faithful Saviour will not forget, that we have not held our lives dear, that we might rescue one of his little ones. We have never seen the face of this poor child; but we humbly beseech the Lord that we may meet her in heaven.

THE PAPAL SUPERSTITION PROPAGATED BY OUR PUBLIC MONEY.

THE papal sect is far more a political party than a religious denomination. And of all political associations, it is the only one in modern times that is totally exclusive, and intolerant.

The Pope of Rome, who is at the head of the sect, and is believed by the universal body, to be God's vicar on earth, and therefore entitled to all the reverence and possessed of all the power that God himself could be, if personally in our midst.—This pope is a temporal monarch, and his policy is now, and has for thirteen centuries been, that of all the worst despots of the earth.

But this pope, appoints all the papal bishops in the United States, and they not only hold their offices and dignities during his mere pleasure, but they are all bound to him, by an official oath, more comprehensive and minute, than any oath of allegiance, which is at this period, exacted by any other potentate, prince, or commonwealth whatever. The oath of allegiance required by our government, of all foreigners who become naturalized citizens, bears no comparison to that required by the Pope of Rome, of all persons who hold any ecclesiastical office under him. This oath has been several times published by us, and often quoted in the course of the last three years.

To put the climax to the subject, the whole system is based on the idea of God's having given all the earth to the pope—and that all who do not recognize and submit to this authority, are to be considered, and when opportunity permits, treated as rebels and traitors! To this all are sworn—and the fearful reality of their purposes, may be read in the blood of martyrs—in the ruins of cities, in the hosts of crusaders, in the curses of the popes against whole nations, and in the settled and diabolical career of the whole body from the year 533, of the Christian era 'till this day.

Such a political organization as this, puts the whole world at once on the defensive and at defiance. All other states, have no alternative, but to be subdued to this hypocritical superstition, which constitutes a real temporal kingdom under the pretext of religion,—or to subdue it, and banish it from the hearts of their people. The only choice left to any state, is to be swallowed up in this incarnation of all evil, or to trample it into the dust. It is a political warfare where debasing and galling servitude, or complete triumph, are the only results which can occur.

So clear and well established are these truths, that some of the wisest states in modern times, have banished the papal state, from all participation in their civil polity: many of the best of men, have considered the toleration of it fatal to liberty; nearly all enlightened commonwealths have discouraged it; very many people have established an opposite religion, mainly to be rid of it; all that have allowed it to gain any fast hold amongst them—have found without exception, nothing but trouble and evil, crime and commotion from its presence; and God has plainly commanded all men to hate and shun it, and solemnly pledged himself to bring it to ruin.

In the United States, above all countries on earth, nothing should be done by the government to favour this vile system; because it is thoroughly and inherently at war with every feature and principle of our systems, public and private, social, civil, religious and political. But more than this—the government has no right nor power, to spend the public money, in the direct support, of such a tremendous, anti-social, irreligious, and hateful code.

Yet the public money is spent, by the general government, for the direct spread of this infernal engine of ruining man, and dishonouring God! Let the nation read the proof and remember the fact with horror.

“WE HAVE SIX INDIAN MISSIONS, FOR WHICH THE AMERICAN GOVERNMENT PAY ME YEARLY ONE THOUSAND PIASTERS.”!!!!

FREDERICK RESE.

Bishop of Detroit,

To the Leopold Society in Austria.

Detroit, Oct. 12, 1837.

[For the Baltimore Literary and Religious Magazine.]

RELIGIOUS EXCITEMENT:

The evils attending it, when it is sought as a means of enjoyment.

“Lovers of pleasure more than lovers of God.”—

This is the character of professed followers of Christ, who having a form of godliness but denying the power thereof, would bring perilous times to the church.

The seeking after pleasure, is the great business of the world, and the methods employed to obtain it, are as various as the characters, the advantages and the situations of men. Multitudes attempt to procure it, by the excitement of their feelings; and by the awakening of the imagination, the arousing the sympathy by working on the sensibility and calling into holy exercise the strongest emotions, the novel reader and the play-goer enjoy an exhilaration, enlivening and delightful. This is the sole object with the readers of works of fiction, and the frequenters of theatrical amusements; and just in proportion to the degree that they are interested in the narrative, or the spectacle of unreal wo, and that the generous susceptibilities of our nature are moved, is their satisfaction. Those susceptibilities which God gave to us, that we might pity the wretched, weep with those who weep and do good as we have opportunity,—they pervert from stimulants to virtuous action into mere instruments of selfish recreation.

It is most dreadful when this love of pleasure infects the church; when the truth is listened to and meditated upon, not for increase in knowledge and holiness, not to be impelled to activity in good works but merely to keep up a pleasurable flow of feeling. To regard religion chiefly as a source of pleasure, to use the means of grace only for the sake of high wrought emotions, is a common error—a prevailing and enormous sin. Many do honestly suppose that love to God, and all the graces of the gospel, signify nothing more than the excitement of the feelings in the view of the truth, and they suppose that to grow in grace is to acquire the art of easily exciting their emotions, of raising them high and keeping them in that state for a long period. Their notion of sin is, that it consists in the dying away of emotion and in the difficulty of moving the imagination and the sensibility. The large class of professing Christians—(for they are to be found in every denomination)—who entertain such views; are remarkable for their diligent attendance on all the services of God’s house, their visible earnest regard and lively interest in them, and equally for their making little if any progress, in holiness, and for their indifference or neglect to the duties appropriate to their situation.

The particular kind of excitement which is chosen according to their natural turn of mind. One finds his pleasure in meditation on the great doctrines of revelation, and is wasted in imagination or

moved to tears; or lulled in revery, as he occupies his thought with the divine glory, or the sufferings of the Redeemer, or the promises of God's protection below, and of his favour above. Another delights himself in the crowded meeting, where emotions are propagated as by contagion, and where the set design is to operate upon the passions. A third prefers the private conversation, where the sole topic is the exercises of the mind, and where by mutual disclosures, (exaggerated, though unintentionally,) of the changes of frames, to which an unoccupied and ill informed mind is subject, the hour is whiled away, and the fancy pleasantly and profitlessly employed. While a fourth cares only to listen, to *searching or preaching*, which makes the conscience sensible of guilt, and which produces pungent self reproach. All these individuals wear the appearance of religion; "*they seek me daily, and delight to know my ways, as a nation that did righteousness and forsook not the ordinance of their God; they take delight in approaching to God.*" Is. LVIII. 2. But it is an appearance only,—"*their heart is not right in the sight of God;*" it is pleasure that they love, not God; it is themselves they are serving, not the Lord Jesus. They give up no sin,—on the contrary, this dallying with the religious affections, blinds the understanding and the perception of sin and emboldens the conscience. "By amassing to a prodigious height, these spurious evidences of sanctity, a commensurate license has been obtained for the indulgence of the most hideous passions." Thus a deadly antinomianism or contempt of moral obligation, is fostered, and they become regardless and unfitted, not only for the service of God, but for the plain and common duties of life.

This *love of pleasure* prostitutes God's institutions. It degrades the ministration of the gospel to a mere exhibition—and the holy sacrament to a ceremony to affect us through the senses,—and hence only such topics must be touched upon, and they treated only in such a manner as require no exertion of mind to follow and retain, and as will excite, sustain or increase the glow of high-wrought feeling. The effect is this:—a faithful ministry is disrelished and despised, and every new-fangled system of error in belief or practice is greedily embraced. "The word of the Lord is a reproach," except as it affords fuel to this flame of enthusiasm.

It contravenes the great end of our being, and employs our rational faculties to promote our pleasure, so that even in our worship of God we aim not to glorify him but delight ourselves.

Its effect is to make one dislike exertion of mind or body,—to wrap the man in slothfulness and selfishness. This kind of pleasure is one that may be obtained by the wandering of the mind, or by listening to others. It may be enjoyed without the cultivation of the understanding or the possession of knowledge, and it may be as completely enjoyed when in the neglect of known and important duty, as when one has a "conscience void of offence toward God and man."

It degrades the Christian character, for it produces depression, just as effectually and as inevitably as the use of ardent spirits. The exhilaration is only temporary, it leaves the mind jaded as well as empty,—and as the sensualist by over-indulgence incapa-

citates himself for enjoyment, so they who delight themselves in the excitement of the feelings, bring upon themselves a languor and restlessness, which they cannot shake off. Having no stores of thought, having no taste for the pure and true pleasures of religion, their melancholy is frequent, unavoidable and insupportable. By the superficial observer, their unhappiness is unhesitatingly attributed to much concern about religion, whereas it is because they are without God—being lovers of pleasure more than lovers of God, that they thus spend their strength for nought and weary themselves for every vanity.

This craving after excitement is the frequent cause of insanity. The times when insanity has most prevailed have been seasons of great agitation, such as the French revolution, when the lunatic asylums were crowded, and suicides occurred daily; or such as the heavy pressure under which the mercantile interests of Great Britain and America are labouring, or the frenzy of speculation by which it was preceded and produced. Religious excitement as naturally tends to insanity as any other kind,—the effect is the same whether it be caused by ambition, or avarice, or enthusiasm. This working upon the imagination and the sensibility, for the sake of pleasure, wears out the faculties of the mind; some are worn out by disease, the others are exhausted. The madness that follows is almost hopeless. As that blindness which is produced by the constant and excessive use of the eye, is beyond human relief,—as diseases are incurable when the body has to contend with the disease and debility consequent on over-strained exertion, or as the drunkard sinks into premature age and wretched helplessness from the consuming effects of his habits,—so the insanity of that one who has lived upon excitement, lies beyond the skill of man, for it is not a derangement but a destruction of the mind. It seems probable that if the greater part of the cases of insanity which are attributed to religion, were examined, it would be found that it was the craving after excitement, not the judicious and hearty seeking after God, by which the understanding was unsettled.

It is not to be doubted that many true Christians put too much stress on the state of their feelings, and that they neglect the growing in grace to seek an increase of emotion, and what they mistake the play of imagination and the tenderness of sensibility for their best evidence of acceptance with God. They need to be taught the true nature of holiness, that they may not suppose they are doing what is pleasing to God while they are only doing injury to themselves.

Those who are living only for pleasure, should be reminded that they are the servants of God, and therefore bound to seek something higher than mere enjoyment. They are to serve Him, according to his revealed will. It was not that we might be happy, but that we might be holy that our Lord gave himself for us; happiness however is the necessary attendant upon the love of and obedience to his commandments.

There are those who follow Christ out of selfishness, because they think they can surely and easily secure their happiness by means of him. They value Christ only as the chief means of Good;

but the renewed soul loves the Saviour on account of his holiness, and serves him out of gratitude and because it loves his precepts.

It is not by seeking after happiness, from God, that we can glorify him. A man may say, "*you like that kind of pleasure, I prefer this.*" It is your seeking after conformity to Christ, and your doing of his will, that convinces them of the superiority of religion, and that leads them to self condemnation and hearty renunciation of folly. Besides, the imperfection of the Christian's happiness, would if happiness be regarded as the great end in view, deter men from choosing God as their portion; but if holiness be "the prize of your high calling, your love of it, your struggles after it, your self denial will reprove them, and force from them the acknowledgment of the excellency of Christianity.

To the love of pleasure, is owing that utter indifference with which the gospel is regarded in the world; to the love of pleasure, is owing the inconsistency, and apostacy of many professors: but to the misuse of religion as a means of gratifying the love of pleasure, is to be attributed the melancholy and the decline of godliness, the enthusiasm and the fanaticism, the new doctrines and the wild excesses that have made Zion to mourn, and her enemies to take up a reproach against her.

[For the Baltimore Literary and Religious Magazine.]

ESSAYS ON JUSTIFICATION.

No. 4.

To complete the brief outline of the doctrine of justification, and to give some attention to the adversary's chief argument for his legal view of the subject, I will endeavour to reconcile the apparently contradictory sentiments of the apostles, Paul and James. The infidel, in his ruthless opposition to "the scriptures of truth," exults over this seeming contradiction, and the papist, who is an infidel in a religious dress, bases upon it his heresy of justification by works. The following quotations illustrate the papal doctrine. "By the observance of the commandments of God and the church, faith co-operating with good works they (the friends and servants of God) gain an increase of that righteousness which was received by the grace of Christ, and are the more justified." As it is written, "he that is just, let him be justified still," Rev. xxii. 11. And again, "be not afraid to be justified even to death;" Ecclesiasticus xviii. 22. And again, "do you see that by works a man is justified, and not by faith only;" Jam. ii. 24. Holy church seeks this increase of righteousness, where she prays. "Grant us, O Lord, an increase of faith, hope and charity." Decrees of Council Trent, De Justi Ch. x.

"It must be believed that the justified are in no respect deficient, but that they may be considered as fully satisfying the divine law (as far as is compatible with our present condition) by their works, which are wrought in God, and as really deserving eternal

life to be bestowed in due time, if they die in a state of grace." *Ibid*—Ch. XVI.

"Whosoever shall affirm, that justification received is not preserved; and even increased, in the sight of God, by good works; but that works are only the fruits and evidences of justification received, and not the causes of its increase; let him be accursed." Canon, 24.

The sentiments of James, are given ch. II. 22—24. "But wilt thou know oh vain man! That faith without works is dead? Was not Abraham justified by works, when he had offered up Isaac his son upon the altar? Seest then how faith wrought by his works, and by works was faith made perfect? And the scripture was fulfilled which saith, Abraham believed God, and it was imputed unto him for righteousness; and he was called the friend of God. *Ye see then how that by works a man is justified, and not by faith only.*" Paul's view of the subject of justification is given, Rom. iv. 1—8.

"What shall we then say, that Abraham, our father, as pertaining to the flesh, hath found? For if Abraham *were justified by works*, he hath whereof to glory; but not before God. For what saith the scripture? Abraham believed God, and it was counted unto him for righteousness. Now to him that worketh is the reward not reckoned of grace but of debt, but to him that *worketh not*, but *believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly*, his faith is counted for righteousness. Even as David also describeth the blessedness of the man unto whom God imputeth righteousness without works, saying—blessed are they whose iniquities are forgiven, and whose sins are covered. Blessed is the man to whom the Lord will not impute sin. The apparent contradiction of the apostles, the papists attempt to reconcile, by their views of justification—expressed in the above quotations. The difficulty they imagine is solved by their false distinction of "a first and second justification." The first, that by which a man from being unrighteous is made righteous, the second, that by which from being just or righteous, he is made more righteous, by an increase of righteousness. The first, is effected by the infusion of the *habit* of faith and charity; the second by the exercise of these graces, in the production of good works. The first is entitled—the merit of congruence—the second the merit of condignity; which have been explained and confuted in the preceding essays. Paul, they say, speaks of the first, which he denies to be by works. James treats concerning actual justification by good works. Bellarmine, De Just Lib. II. chap. 16, and Lib. IV. chap. 18; says—"We therefore affirm that Paul speaks of the first justification, by which a man from being impious becomes righteous; James concerning the second, by which a man who is already righteous, becomes more righteous."

To defeat the infidel, and confute the papist, I shall attempt a concise reconciliation of the sentiments of the apostles—and prove that they are not contradictory, but correspondent.

I. Justification, as exhibited in the scriptures, has a *five-fold* reference.

1. To that which takes place *at the tribunal of God*. This is justification in its highest and most important sense; and is presented,

Rom. v. 1; "*being justified by faith, we have peace with God, through our Lord Jesus Christ.*" This view has been illustrated and confirmed in the preceding essays. The righteousness of Christ is the alone meritorious cause of this justification. It is through our *Lord Jesus Christ*. Faith is the instrument by which this righteousness is received. "*Being justified by faith.*"

2- To that which occurs *at the tribunal of conscience*. Conscience is that reflecting power of our mind which compares our qualities and actions with the law of God known to us, and approves what appears good, and condemns and upbraids for what appears evil. It is good, when, *being sprinkled with Christ's blood*, it clearly discerns the will of God, and urges obedience to his law from gospel motives, and approves the same. Thus *purged from dead works* by the blood of Christ, it no longer *accuses*—but *excuses*. It does not condemn, but gives *confidence* before God. John III. 21; "*Beloved if our hearts condemn us not, then have we confidence toward God.*" This approbation or peace of conscience is the consequence or blessed fruit of justification at the tribunal of God. A sense of forgiveness—*peace with God, through our Lord Jesus Christ*. It has a regard however, to our actions as they correspond with, or differ from the law of God.

3. The term justification, is further referable to that which takes place at the bar of the world. The people of God are on trial before the world. They are expected to correspond in character with Christ whom they profess to follow. "*By their fruits ye shall know them,*" is the rule by which the world judges their character. Their *good works*, wrought by the grace of God, and maintained in a consistent life, constrains the world to "*take knowledge that they have been with Jesus.*"

4. It refers moreover to the judgment of the church respecting her members. The same great rule applies here. The tree, here, is known by its fruits. The church, when she does her duty—receives individuals into her communion—upon evidences of genuine piety, manifested in the fruits of grace in the life. And upon the same principles, they are allowed to dwell in the house of God. The rulers of the church may be deceived, yet their admission of members upon evidence of godliness, is a species of *Justification*; though it affects not its subjects before the divine tribunal.

5.—It finally refers, to the justification of the saints *on the great day of retribution*. God "hath appointed a day in which he will judge the world in righteousness." This is exhibited in Rev. xx. 12. "And I saw the dead, small and great, stand before God: and the books were opened; and another book was opened, *which is the book of life*. And the dead were judged out of those things which were written in the books, *according to their works.*" Those whose deeds are written in the book of life *are justified "according to their good works."* Those whose actions are recorded in the book of death are condemned, according to their evil works. The works of the believer are not the meritorious ground of his justification on that day, but his evidences of his union to Christ, and interest in his righteousness, on account of which he is justified. The reader is requested to fix these illustrations in his mind, that he may be able.

to decide with regard to the correctness of the following argument, based upon these different references of the term justification.

II.—I affirm that Paul treats of justification *at the bar of God*.
 1.—This is plain from Romans iv. 2 “If Abraham were justified by works, he hath whereof to glory, *but not before God.*” This justification is *before God*. He may boast before men—but before God works have no place in his justification—there “all such boasting is vain, and Abraham himself is *dumb.*” For Rom. iii. 20. *By the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified in his sight. Abraham therefore relied not upon his works, but “believed on him that justifieth the ungodly, on account of righteousness imputed without works.—*
 2.—Abraham was a believer long before he offered up Isaac, the work to which we will see James has reference. When called from Uz of the Chaldees—he believed, and “departed as the Lord had spoken unto him.” Paul confirms this view, Heb. x. 1. 8. “*By faith Abraham when he was called to go out into a place which he should after receive for an inheritance, obeyed. This is further evident from the passage quoted by Paul, Rom. iv. 3.—“For what saith the scriptures? Abraham believed God, and it was counted to him for righteousness. This is asserted in Gen. xv. 6, in relation to his belief of the promise of a seed, which promise was given about forty one years before he offered Isaac, and eight years before the giving of this promise he had exercised faith, as shewn above in his removal from Uz. Abraham therefore, was justified at least forty one, but really forty nine years, before he offered up Isaac, the work to which it will be seen James referred. These chronological observations, are of great importance in this controversy, and we request the reader to treasure them in his memory. If any one should doubt, however, Abraham’s justification, upon his departure from Uz of the Chaldees—which we believe to be the fact upon Paul’s testimony as given in Heb. xi.; yet no one can doubt for a moment in relation to an event eight years subsequent, referred to above, and recorded in Genesis xv. That of his faith in the promise respecting a seed. v. 5, 6. “And he brought him forth abroad, and said, look now toward heaven, and tell the stars if thou be able to number them. And he said unto him. So shall thy seed be. And he believed in the Lord; and he counted it to him for righteousness This passage is quoted by Paul—and the act of offering up Isaac, referred to by James, is declared to be a fulfilment of the scripture, together with the declaration in II. Ch. xx. 7, in which Abraham is called the friend of God. The writer of this believes as hinted above that the act of the faith possessed by Abraham upon this promise of a seed, is only an evidence of its existing eight years before, at which period he was really justified, and in a state of friendship with God. But Paul in the fourth of Romans does not refer to the same event to which James refers. It is manifest that Paul refers to Gen. xv. as quoted, as an illustration of the faith of Abraham, his faith in the promise of a seed notwithstanding the formidable obstacles. Rom. iv. 18, 22. “Who against hope believed in hope, that he might become the father of many nations, according to that which was spoken, so shall thy seed be,” &c.—and being fully persuaded, that what he had promised he was able also to perform. and therefore it was imputed to him for righteousness.” The seed in*

its great and all important import, referred not simply to Isaac the type—but to the anti-type—*Jesus Christ*. According to Paul, Gal. III. 16. "Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made. He saith not and to seeds, as of many; but as of one. And to thy seed, *which is Christ*." My object in all this is to prove that Abraham was a *believer long before* he offered Isaac, and was of course *justified*. This is of great consequence in the argument, as will be seen, when we come to apply it more distinctly. This justification as Paul affirms, was "*before God*" at his tribunal, and was founded upon the righteousness of God," in whom Abraham believed. 3. It is moreover plain that Paul treats of justification before the divine tribunal, inasmuch as he reasons against the *JUDAISM teachers*, who taught that a man was "*justified by the deeds of the law*. Against these Paul wrote and proves as we have maintained in the preceding essays—that on the contrary, a man justified by faith, as opposed to the deeds of the law and "*freely by the grace of God, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus*." It is important then to keep in mind the persons with whom Paul disputed. A class of men holding distinct sentiments from those with whom James debated. This throws much light upon the point in controversy. Let it be attended to, and applied by the reader.

III.—James, I affirm, in contrast with Paul, treats of justification, as it may refer either to the tribunal of conscience—or that of the world—or church—or a final judgment, indifferently; as we may need satisfaction with regard to our state before either.

This is manifest

I.—Because James reasoned against the *LIBERTINES* or men in his day, who maintained Antinomian principles, and held according to *Augustine* that "*Faith without works was sufficient to salvation*." *De fide et opere* c. 14. Or according to *Salmerus* "*who gloried in the word FAITH, and made their Christian liberty a veil to conceal their sins, and lived to themselves and the world, but not to Christ, as dogs returning to their vomit*." Or as *Tyrannus* describes them. "*Vain, empty, unfruitful professors sapless and bloodless—resembling a broken backed (Elumbis) loathsome and putrescent body*. Such being the character of those against whom James wrote, his subject is entirely distinct from that of Paul. He treats not of justification before God, but employs his pen in demonstrating the evidences of a justified state. To prove to the profligate professor, that his hopes are vain unless his practice adorns his profession. That a man may indeed have a name to live whilst he is dead." 2. Hence he refers to a fruit of faith produced by Abraham, at least forty one years, and as I believe, forty nine *after his justification*. He introduces the unparalleled act of faith. The offering of his only son Isaac, as an evidence that his "*faith wrought with his works*." Paul as we have seen refers to a different example, having a more distinct reference to the ground of justification, the promised seed in whom believing as the Messiah—the Lord his righteousness, he had previously abandoned Uz of the Chaldees, and the idolatry of his kindred. This exalted act of offering up his only son Isaac—the child in whom "*his seed should be called*," was an illustrious manifestation of the vigour of his faith which had been strengthening by

the trials of forty years. "By works was his faith made perfect." It developed its strength more and more, by the progressive and increasing glory of his works. Its first display was given in the abandonment, at the command of God, of his native land, its glory brightened in the belief of the promise of a son, against every obstacle; in his "hoping against hope" in its protracted fulfilment, until it shone with the majestic and overwhelming effulgence of the sun shining in his strength, in the unhesitating offering of his only son Isaac, in whom all the glorious promises of the covenant were concentrated. James reasons against the Libertines, from this brilliant display of Abraham's faith by the lustre of his works. If that friend of God was ready at the command of God, to sacrifice his only son, how much more should all Christians manifest their faith by the sacrifice of their lusts, however beloved, than the sacrifice of Isaac, under all the circumstances, a greater could not have been required of Abraham. It completed his works, and became the capstone of the achievement of his faith.

3. James presupposes faith, and demands works as its evidence, v. 17, Even so, faith, if it hath not works, is dead, being alone, v. 18, I will show thee my faith by my works, v. 20, Know O vain man! That faith without works is dead! Here he plainly teaches the necessity of faith, but demands its manifestation by works. He will show his own faith by works. Faith he presents as the principle, and works as its effects—a vital principle, and active in all who really possess it, in the production of works. His language implies, that works are the product of faith—"Even so faith, if it hath not works," faith without works, faith wrought with his works. For, as the body without the spirit is dead, even so faith without works, is dead also. Faith he holds as essential, and vital to the being of a Christian, yet the faith which he inculcates is not a sapless, bloodless, but living and active principle, and manifests itself in the production of works of obedience. As the body without the breath, the evidence of life is dead, even so faith without works, the evidence of the divine life in the soul, is dead also, being alone. The faith which James teaches, embodies in it the vital principle communicated in regeneration, and develops that principle in works of righteousness and true holiness. He does not exclude faith but demands it—*Shew me thy faith:* but it is a faith that works as a living active grace, tireless in the production of the fruits of holiness—*I will show thee MY FAITH by MY WORKS.*

4. With this view of faith Paul agrees. In the eleventh of Hebrews, v. 17, Paul refers to the same distinguished act of Abraham in offering up Isaac, and ascribes it to his faith, "By faith" Abraham when he was tried, offered up Isaac: and he that had received the promises, offered up his only "begotten son." James introduces this event in the life of the patriarch to prove the necessity of works as an evidence of faith, and Paul reasons from it in proof of the existence of faith in Abraham, and of its wonderful and mighty power in achieving the most stupendous works. The sentiments of the apostles are manifestly correspondent.

In confirmation of this, Paul exhibits faith as a working principle, Gal. v. 6. For in Jesus Christ neither circumcision availeth any

thing, nor uncircumcision; but *faith which worketh by love.* Th. i. 3. "Remembering without ceasing your *work of faith.*" Tit. iii. 8. "This is a faithful saying, and these things I will that thou affirm constantly—*That they which have believed in God be careful to maintain good works.*" Here the apostle of the gentiles urges most explicitly, the necessity of good works, and in harmonious correspondence with him, exhibits faith as an industrious and active working principle. See says James how Abraham's faith "*wrought with his works.*" All is in vain—saith Paul without faith, "*which worketh by love,*" and he remembers with delight, the "*work*" executed by the faith of the Thessalonians—and urges with emphasis upon all that have "*believed*" that they be "*careful to maintain good works*"—as "*good and profitable unto men.*"

There is therefore not the shadow of difference in the sentiments of the apostles. Paul in Romans iv. is reasoning a far different subject, and with a different class of heretics—from the subject of James, and the heretics against whom he employed his pen in the 2d chapter of his epistle. Paul confutes the Pharisaical teachers, who, *being ignorant of God's righteousness, and going about to establish their own righteousness, have not submitted to the righteousness of God*" Rom. x. 3—He presents "*Christ as the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth*"—and holds him forth as *the propitiation through faith in his blood, excluding the deeds of the law* as constituting any part of our justifying righteousness, before *the tribunal of God.* Faith is the gifted instrument in the reception of this righteousness—as we are *justified by faith,* and wherever it exists, it is in that soul a vital active principle, *working* by love and purifying the heart, as it displays itself in the wondrous deeds of *the father of the faithful.*

James treats of faith as existing in those who *have* been already *justified* at the bar of God, and displaying itself in the holy life of the saints, in confutation of those libertine professors of his day, *a numerous tribe in all ages,* who held an ideal faith, as a dry and lifeless seed lying buried in the soul, and unproductive of any fruits of holiness in the life. He calls upon such sapless professors of faith, to *shew their faith by their works,* that their *own consciences* may justify them as truly belonging to "the household of faith"—That the world which beholds their fruits of faith may confirm the judgment of conscience—and the tribunals of the church, and the sentence of the brethren may ratify the whole—recognizing and cherishing them as *believers indeed,* whose faith worketh in the production of holiness, and distinguishes them from devils, who, by a *barren assent* are said to "*believe and tremble,*" and that they may have evidence of their belonging to Christ on the last day. James therefore, by no means contradicts Paul—the apostles harmonize, and happy are they who are justified according to the doctrine of Paul, and demonstrate their *justified state,* by the exercise of the fruitful faith which James illustrates, and which *wrought* so gloriously in the holy life of the most dignified of Patriarchs.

Let us, therefore, serious reader, constantly bear in mind, that the sole *meritorious cause* of a sinner's justification *at the bar of God* is the *righteousness of Christ,* and let us build upon him as the

only foundation. Let us remember also, that justification by faith is a gracious justification—for it is *of faith that it might be by grace*. Let us not then be found with the deluded papist joining those things which God hath separated, nor separating those things which God hath joined. He hath separated faith from works in the *great business of justification*, but hath joined works with faith in the *life of the justified*. They have no efficiency in our justification before God, yet they should co-exist with faith in the justified; for although faith is the *alone* instrument in our justification, as the gifted band in the reception and appropriation of Christ's righteousness, it is not, however, *solitary* in the souls of the justified, but is associated with all the other graces, as "the fruits of the spirit;" and in the life of the Christian it diligently "worketh by love, purifying the heart." Let us therefore—seek justification only in Christ, as "the Lord our righteousness," by faith; but, that we may have "the testimony of our conscience," that we are of the people of God—that we may "shew forth the praises of him that hath called us," before men, whose eyes are upon our conduct, and who look for fruits answerable to our exalted profession—that we may be esteemed by those who "rule in Zion," and respected, and loved by the brethren; and that on the awful day when *the sheep* shall be separated from *the goats*, and all men shall be judged according to their works—we may have the *works* of faith wrought in our lives on earth—as evidences of our union to Christ, and our *justified state*, and hear, "the king" say unto us as we "stand on his right hand—come, ye blessed of my father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world; *for I was an hungred and ye gave me meat; I was thirsty, and ye gave me drink; I was a stranger, and ye took me in; naked, and, ye clothed me; I was sick, and ye visited me; I was in prison, and ye came unto me—inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these, my brethren, ye have done it unto me.*" That all this may be our felicity, Oh fellow Christian, LET US BE CAREFUL TO MAINTAIN GOOD WORKS; not in any sense as the foundation of our hope—but as evidences of faith and our justification, and as lovely ornaments of our profession, by which we *adorn the doctrine of God our Saviour*.

L.

THE PALACE OF FONTAINEBLEAU.

THE history of this palace at which the marriage of the Duke of Orleans with the Princess Helen has been celebrated, is lost in the night of time, and only begins to be a little known from the reign of Louis the younger, who constructed, in his manor of Fontainebleau, a chapel dedicated to St. Saturne, which was consecrated by Thomas a'Becket, Arch-bishop of Canterbury. Philippe Augustus likewise inhabited Fontainebleau. Louis ix. called it his deserts, and considerably enlarged it. It was in this palace that this excellent king, being dangerously ill, sent for his son, and addressed to him these memorable words:—"My good son, thou must do thy utmost to gain the affection of thy kingdom, for, in truth, I should prefer that a Scot should come from Scotland, and treat the people well and kindly, than that thou shouldst ill govern it." This monarch built in Fontainebleau a church dedicated to the Holy Trinity, and a hospital for the inhabitants of the hamlet, who were most wretched in the absence of the Court.

The persecutor of the Jews, and the destroyer of the order of Templars, Philippe le Bel, came to life and died in Fontainebleau. His successors, and, amongst others, Charles vii. and Louis xi., extended the chateau, but it was only under Francis i. that it began to rank as a remarkable edifice. This prince, who habitually resided here, threw down part of the old constructions, rebuilt anew the church of the Holy Trinity, fitted out various halls and galleries, and brought Le Primatice, and other distinguished artists, from Italy, to decorate them in a truly royal style. Charles v., on his way to punish the revolted inhabitants of Ghent, in 1539, was received in Fontainebleau by Francis i., his former prisoner, who, advised by the Duchess of Etampes to retain him a captive until he cancelled the treaty of Madrid, so onerous for France and dishonouring for its sovereign, disdained resorting to such a violation of the sacred rights of hospitality to gratify his mistress. Henry ii. continued the embellishments commenced by Francis i., and adorned with decorations and paintings the extensive gallery that still bears the name of that prince. It was in Fontainebleau that Francis ii. convoked, in 1559, an assembly of the notables, to devise means of defeating the conspiracy of Amboise, got up by the partisans of Anne Dubourg, to avenge the death of that martyr of Calvinism, who had been hanged in Paris as a Protestant. Charles ix., to whose name the massacre of St. Bartholomew has attached so sad a celebrity, contributed also to the embellishment of this place. Henry iv. made Fontainebleau his habitual residence, from the treaty of Vervins (1598) until his death (1610). It was here that, under his rein, the famous conference between Cardinal Duperon and Plessis Mornay, surnamed the Pope of the Huguenots, was held in 1600. The following year, Louis xiii. was born in Fontainebleau. In June 1602, Marshal de Biron, the companion in arms of Henry iv., was brought a captive to the chateau, and

after a sojourn of two days, during which that monarch vainly offered him a generous pardon if he would but confess his culpable intrigues, he was removed to the Bastille and beheaded. In the July following Henry iv. constructed the immense buildings that surround the courts of the princes, and of the kitchen, and commenced planting the park, which was, however, only designed and established during the reign of Louis xiv. Louis xiii. bore a particular affection to this residence on account of its being his birth-place. All the constructions commenced under the directions of his father, several suits of apartments, and the ornaments of the Chapel of the Holy Trinity, were finished by this prince, who also erected the grand staircase, in the form of a horse-shoe, that adorns the court of the White Horse.

The fastuous court of Louis xiv. felt too much confined in Fontainebleau, which that monarch, nevertheless, made it a point to visit once a year. In 1644, Henrietta of France, the wife of the ill-fated Charles i., King of England, sought a refuge in this chateau after the revolution that brought her husband to the block; and fifty years afterwards, Charles Stuart, expelled from his kingdom, resided in it during several months.

In 1657 this royal abode became the theatre of a frightful crime. Christina having abdicated the crown of Sweden, decided on visiting France previous to her settling in Italy, where her taste for the arts and literature induced her to fix her residence. On her way to Paris she stopped some time in Fontainebleau. While there, having discovered a libel written against her by her favourite equerry, Monaldeschi, she availed herself of this pretext to get rid of a lover for whom her affection was on the wane, and caused him to be put to death under her eyes, in the *Galerie des Cerfs*. The unfortunate victim was interred, through the care of the prior, Lebel, who had assisted him during his last moments, in the church of the village of Avon, near Fontainebleau, where a small slab, placed near the holy-water pot, bearing this inscription, *Ci git Monalderi, is still to be seen.*

On the 31st of August, 1679, the Princess Louise of Orleans, the niece of Louis xiv., was married by proxy to Charles ii., King of Spain, in the chapel of the Holy Trinity. The revocation of the Edict of Nantes, which banished from France so many useful citizens, was signed in this palace on the 22d of October, 1685. Nothing very important, except the marriage of Louis xi. with Mary daughter of the dethroned King of Poland, Stanislaus, Leczinski, subsequently occurred in Fontainebleau until the time of the empire. Little damage was done to the chateau by the revolution, but, from the state of the abandonment in which it was then left, it would have soon become a heap of ruins, if Napoleon had not fixed upon it as his favourite residence. The restoration of the palace was commenced to receive the Pope, who was to stop in it on his way to Paris, where he was going to crown the Emperor. The works were continued during the whole of the reign of Napoleon, who had it furnished in the most magnificent manner. On the 14th of October, 1807, Napoleon here declared to the *corps diplomatique*, assembled in solemn audience in the hall of the throne, that he

would from that day suffer no commercial or political intercourse between Europe and Great Britain, and that if in the space of two months the Prince Regent of Portugal did not break the connexion, the House of Braganza would cease to reign in that kingdom. On the 27th following, a convention for the partition of Portugal was concluded here between the French and Spanish plenipotentiaries, and shortly afterwards the fate of the Spanish monarchy itself was decided in this palace. In June, 1808, Charles iv. King of Spain, was for 24 days a resident of this town. The first intimation of his intention to divorce her was here made Josephine by Napoleon, in 1809. During the autumn of 1810, the Emperor and his new Empress visited Fontainebleau, where he issued his insane decree (18th of October) ordering all British goods, seized in France and in the countries under her domination, to be confiscated and committed to the flames. Maria Louisa being pregnant at the time, and Napoleon wishing to place the crown of Italy on the head of his son, demanded of the Pope to renounce his temporal sovereignty over that country. On his refusal, Napoleon caused him to be arrested, and brought to Fontainebleau, where he remained a prisoner from the 19th of June, 1810, to the first abdication of the Emperor, which was signed in this palace on the 11th of April, 1814.

Fontainebleau was sadly neglected under the restoration. Louis xviii. only visited it once to receive the princess Caroline of Naples, who was coming to be married to the Duke de Berri. Under Charles X. it was considered as a mere hunting rendezvous, and the court never spent any time at its chateau.

Since the 2d of July, 1831, when Louis Phillippe first arrived in Fontainebleau, after his accession to the throne, all the works undertaken by Napoleon were prosecuted with the most praiseworthy activity. 300 or 400 men have been continually employed to put it in order, and the best painters and architects, such as Alaux Picot, Abel de Pujol, Debreuil, Giroust, &c., have incessantly been at work to restore to the architecture and paintings their primitive character. "Re-establish," said Louis Phillippe to those artists, "the Fontainebleau of Francis i., Henry ii., and Henry iv.: impart a new life to those beautiful paintings of Le Primatice, without changing their composition or altering their character." The intentions of the King have been fulfilled, and in a few years, to use the expressions of M. Jamin, the historian of this noble mansion. France will possess a second and rich edition of the Fontainebleau of Francis i., Henry ii., and Henry iv."

The forest, which encircles Fontainebleau to the distance of four or five miles all round, is beautiful beyond description. It covers a superficies of about 33,000 acres, and offers the most luxuriant and varied vegetation. The ground on which it stands presents at every step the most picturesque sights, hills and valleys, cities of rocks, some of which rise to the height of 1,000 feet, glens, cascades, torrents, limpid streams, ponds, &c. In no other part of France is so great a quantity of plants to be met with as in this forest, and on that account it is much frequented by French and foreign botanists.

ADVERTISEMENT.

This is an original work, devoted to the advancement of Knowledge, Liberty, and Religion.

It is published in the city of Baltimore, on the first day of each month. It contains forty eight pages in each number—and is furnished to subscribers at \$2 50 per annum, which may be discharged by \$2 paid at the beginning of each year, or on subscribing. The year of the Magazine begins with January.

The most liberal terms to active agents; travelling agents always wanted.

Address the Conductors, POST PAID, Baltimore: and money can be remitted by mail at their risk.

NOTICE TO OUR SUBSCRIBERS.

THE present number, closes the 3d year of this Magazine. To our Subscribers residing at a distance, we have not as yet sent their accounts for either of these years. With the January or February No. of 1838, we shall endeavour to send bills made out including that year. It will be conferring a favour upon us and our printers, if those to whom they are sent, would forward us the amount as soon as convenient.