# DANGERS

OF

# JESUIT INSTRUCTION.

COMPRISING:

I. SERMON ON JESUIT INSTRUCTION, BY W. S. POTTS.

II. REVIEW OF DR. POTTS' SERMON, BY O. A. BROWNSON.

III. REPLY TO BROWNSON'S REVIEW, BY W. S. POTTS.

---

#62.

ST. LOUIS:
PUBLISHED BY KEITH & WOODS.
1846.

JOB PRINTING OFFICE—REVEILLE BUILDING.

2-351

# PREFACE.

It may be proper to say a few words in explanation of the following pamphlet. During the last fall, the writer, in the course of his ordinary ministerial duties, delivered a discourse on the duties of Christian parents to their baptized children, designed to exhibit to the people of his charge the nature of the vow taken by them in the administration of this Sacrament, and a particular instance in which he conceived some of them were violating it. The Sermon was prepared and delivered with no controversial design, but in the performance of an imperative duty. The congregation, conceiving that the publication of the discourse would be productive of good, requested and obtained the manuscript for this purpose.

The Review of the Sermon, which will be found in these pages, appeared in "Brownson's Quarterly Review for January, 1846;" a periodical published in Boston, Mass., and endorsed by the Roman Catholic Church. This Review would have been passed over with a very brief notice, had it not been for the extraordinary efforts made use of by the Jesuits and Romish Ecclesiastics of this and the neighboring dioceses. A very large edition of the Review was immediately printed in this city, at the press of the Bishop's organ, and sent by mail, and by the hands of private members of the Church, into hundreds of Protestant families far and near. At the same time their periodicals were lauding it to the skies, as a most wonderful production. Under these circumstances the writer was led to extend his articles in the "Herald of Religious Liberty" further than he originally designed, and to take up the prominent points of the controversy, which had been mistified or swaggered over in the Review, with the manifest design of deluding the uninformed. During the publication of the numbers of the Reply in the Herald, many of the readers having expressed a desire that the whole should be reprinted in a pamphlet form, the author has thought proper to revise the whole, and present it to the public in its present shape.

The pamphlets preceding the Reply have been reprinted, because the frequent references in the Review and Reply to what had preceded them, seemed to render such a course necessary, in order to a clear understanding of the whole matter of controversy; and because the author desired that not only his own congregation but his Protestant fellow-citizens should have, from the pen of a Roman Catholic writer, a distinct announcement of the designs of that Church upon our country, and of the arguments by which her writers attempt to maintain her system of idolatry and will-worship.

W. S. P.

*St. Louis, October* 24, 1486.

# PREFACE

# DANGERS OF JESUIT INSTRUCTION.

A

# SERMON,

PREACHED IN

## THE SECOND PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH,

IN ST. LOUIS,

SEPTEMBER 25TH, 1845.

BY WM. S. POTTS, D. D.

---

"*Bring them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord.*"—Eph. vi. 4.

THE text is an apostolic precept given to those who hold in the Church of Christ the important and responsible relation of parents. The Church, consequently, requires in every case in which the Sacrament of Baptism is administered to a child, that the parents bring themselves under a solemn obligation to "endeavor, by all the means of God's appointment, to bring up their child in the nurture and admonition of the Lord."

As in the administration of this Sacrament in the case of an adult, he gives himself up unto God, through Jesus Christ, to walk in newness of life; so parents, in presenting their children, make a formal surrender of them to God, and obligate themselves, as guardians and instructors appointed for the express purpose, to bring them up as God's sons and daughters. For their diligence and faithfulness in the discharge of this duty every parent is to answer, first to the Church officers, whose duty it is to see to the fulfilment of the vows publicly made in the Church, and secondly, to the great Judge of quick and

dead. Hence arises the double duty, that officers should see to it that the Church is fully instructed in reference to the nature of this covenant engagement, and that parents carefully consider the meaning of the vow that rents upon them.

I. What is the meaning of the precept in our text?

1. The world translated "to bring up" signifies to nourish, implying a care and tenderness such as the nurse takes of the infant, guarding against such food, exposure, exercise, as would be hurtful, and supplying whatever may be necessary to its health, strength, and perfect physical development.

2. The next word, (PAIDEIA) translated *nurture*, applies to the whole discipline of the mind of the child, that which we call the education, including the instruction, the example set before it, the admonition in cases of negligence, and the rewards and punishments to be employed. Thus, the obligation under which God brings every parent consecrating his child in baptism respects the whole of its education. There must be especial care in the selection of an instructor, examining what are his principles, and what his information and capacity to give instruction. Care also must be exercised as to the things taught. Whether they are consistent with truth and facts; whether adapted to the growth, expansion and subsequent usefulness of the mind trained under that teaching. As the mind is more important than the body, there should be a corresponding increase of carefulness in selecting the teacher to whom is to be committed the development and formation of the character, over that which is required in selecting the nurse to whom is committed the development of the bodily vigor. If you would not employ a nurse whom you esteem unprincipled or lacking in capacity, to supply your place in watching over the health and nourishment of your offspring, you ought surely to have a double caution in employing the teacher to whom you submit their bodies and souls.

Further, in this nuturing of the mind is included the example set before the child. This will always have more influence than the precepts inculcated. No Christian parent, it is to be presumed, could be so lost to his responsibility to his children as to permit, in the example of their teacher, that of a drunkard, a profane swearer, or a gambler, whatever might be the promises made concerning the precepts to be taught. The example would be always present to contradict the precept, and just at that season of life when the mind most quickly apprehends the former, and very slowly receives the latter. Neither ought an infidel, or one denying essential truths, to be employed. A teacher

possessing any ordinary degree of tact will have no difficulty in winning the respect, if not the affections, of his pupil, then it is easy to transfer this respect and deference to the opinions embraced by the preceptor, who will appear to the pupil's mind amongst the wisest of men. Now, it will avail little for the teacher to inculcate the Bible as truth, if the pupil knows his teacher considers it all "a cunningly devised fable;" or, for the teacher to instruct the pupil in the language of the catechism, the learner knowing that he who gives the lesson esteems it all an arrant falsehood. The example, consequently, in this matter, reaches beyond the outward acts, and embraces the very views and feelings of the mind.

Another very important item in this education respects the discipline, or rewards and punishments that are to be employed. *No discipline* is utter ruin. God governs by rewards and punishments, as best adapted to the character of the human race. All who govern under Him must govern on the same general principle, or their government will be contrary to the constitution of society and the human heart. An important part of education consists in teaching the young to govern themselves; to learn to subdue improper passions, and control unreasonable desires; on this branch of training the happiness of the young is more dependant than on any other. In order to this, reason, not arbitrary command, is to be resorted to; point out the evil of sin and the consequences of indulgence; admonish with kindness and affection where the evil has been the result of ignorance or thoughtlessness; hold out the reward of approbation and praise to encourage the pupil to tread the path of well doing, but punish, with due severity, wilfulness and wanton disobedience. This rule the parent is to lay down for himself in his own family government, and is to require at the hands of those whom he selects to discharge the duty of instructor in his place. One way to bias improperly the mind consists in administering improper rewards and punishments, as where indulgence in sinful gratifications is made the reward of well doing, or prescribing prayer or any religious duty as a punishment for doing evil. Such things confuse all the child's ideas of morals, and pervert in his mind the idea of God's worship, which should be the source of happiness.

3. The governing idea in the application of all these means is contained in the next words, "admonition of the Lord." In other words, the education of the baptized child is to have for its foundation and end the placing before the mind the character of God, and the duties growing out of its relation to him. Hence the instruction required to be given is strictly Christian instruction. They, only, who have felt

the teachings of God's spirit, and have studied prayerfully and with great care the doctrines and precepts of God's word, can be fully qualified to give it. The example set before the child must not be that of worldliness, which is enmity against God; not of doctrinal error, which will betray the child into ruinous falsehood; not of looseness and indifference to sacred things, which cultivate the natural depravity of the heart and blind the mind; but must be a godly example, and hence can be set by no one whose heart is not renewed by the Holy Spirit.

4. These are God's rules, as laid down in the precept of our text, for the direction of parents in the management of his consecrated children, that they may be trained for heaven. A parent of ordinary reflection, having committed a child to a boarding school, would not hesitate a moment as to the propriety of removing it, so soon as he found the instruction bad and the example ruinous that was there set. So, no one of you who are parents superintending the education of God's children, if you are disregarding these rules laid down by him, should expect anything else than that he would remove them from under your care, either by taking them to himself, or calling you to his bar to answer for misdirecting immortal souls.

II. Having presented the meaning of the precept, and shown the solemn responsibility which it imposes on parents, I shall confine myself, in the remainder of this discourse, to pointing out one of the instances in which parents violate this command of God.

The case to which I allude is the indifference manifested by Christian parents to the characters, morals and religious sentiments of the instructors of their children. Many parents act upon the principle that it is of no importance what may be the morals or sentiments entertained by a teacher, provided there is no immorality exhibited before the pupils, and no attempt to inculcate sentiments deemed erroneous. But no opinion could be more untrue, or more practically dangerous. The Scripture declaration, as a man "thinketh in his heart so is he," will be found true. His teachings and example will be insensibly influenced by the doctrines he holds, and there will occur a thousand ways in which the pupil will distinctly comprehend the views and feelings of the preceptor; and these views will not have the less influence, from the fact that he makes no direct effort to impress them upon the pupil's mind. A direct effort of this kind would put the learner on his guard, but the other plan allays all fear, and the poison silently and imperceptibly works. The child is subjected five-sevenths of his time to this influence, and the remaining portion to a different influence; no wonder, then, that the poison has gained so

fast, that errors are fixed beyond remedy in the mind before the parent is aware that they exist at all. Hence, every one soliciting at your hands the post of instructor of your children, should be willing to submit his opinions and life to the most rigid scrutiny before he asks that so important a trust should be confided to him. It is not enough that he promises not to interfere with your notions of what is right, but that he sincerely hold those views himself. For otherwise, he either ignorantly promises what the laws of his mind forbid his performing, or he means to deceive you, for some sinister end, in making a promise he knows it is impossible to fulfill.

The most prominent candidates for public patronage in this work of education in our country, of late years, are individuals and ecclesiastical orders in the Papal Church. They are at our doors soliciting aid in the erection of their colleges and seminaries of learning, and asking Christian parents to commit their children to their hands to be educated, and, of course—for this is the parent's vow—to be trained up for God. Everywhere, throughout our land, their schools are coming into competition with those erected and governed by Protestants, at such reduction of prices, and with a zeal that manifests a desire to get at least a large proportion, if not an entire control, of the education of the country. The vows resting on you as Christian parents, make it obligatory that you examine carefully the claims of these instructors; their capacity to impart useful knowledge; their doctrines, sentiments and lives, that you may be able to judge whether they are likely to bring up the children of Protestant Christians "in the nuture and admonition of the Lord." The officers of every Christian Church, having the oversight of these consecrated children, are also under obligations to make this inquiry, seeing they are directed "to watch as they must give an account." To this examination these guides of youth surely cannot object. In this country every solicitor of public favor and patronage expects that his claims will be fairly examined, and that the award will be made accordingly. Indeed, an honest aspirant after a responsible place will desire that the most rigid scrutiny be instituted before the position is occupied.

1. Our first inquiry is into the doctrines held by these teachers; that is by the Papal Church. The Christian parent, lying under a solemn vow, must know whether the instructor of his child holds the essential truths of the Christian religion. It has been generally the opinion of Protestants that Roman Catholics were not wrong in those doctrines that are fundamental in the Christian faith, but that their great error consisted in the load of trumpery, such as the worship of the Virgin Mary, and of Saints, and relics; the doctrines of Purgatory,

penance and auricular confession; of transubstantiation, and the adoration of the bread, which being wrought into the way of salvation as revealed, served to cloud the mind, and, in most cases, entirely mislead the worshipper from the true objects of faith. This opinion has arisen from the circumstance that Rome held the same symbols of faith with the Protestant Churches, as the Apostles and Athanasian creeds. But these formularies of doctrine are so brief that without explanation it is impossible to know what is the faith held by those professing to embrace them. The Apostle's creed may be adopted by every description of errorists professing to receive the Bible, and the same is true of the creed of Athanasius, with the single exception of Arians, whose error it was designed to detect. Hence the opinion of Protestants referred to, was manifestly made up on insufficient evidence. We must have definitions, and more extended explanations, before we can be in a condition to form a judgment.

The Papal system of doctrine was never settled until the Council of Trent, which closed its sessions in 1564. Previous to this, Councils had dealt very much in formularies, and they had defined and changed, affirmed and condemned, in so many different ways, that it was no very unusual thing for that to be rank heresy in one section of the Church that was orthodox in another, and opinions of every shade and hue were held by different teachers in that communion. The Protestant controversy compelled Rome to settle her faith, and the great and last General Council convened at Trent in 1545 for this purpose. Their decrees having been confirmed by the Pope, according to the doctrine of that Church, are infallible and unalterable. The explanations of doctrine given, are sufficiently extended to enable us now to know what is the faith of that Church, and hence an opinion may now be fairly made up.

It has been thought by Protestants that if there was one doctrine held by the Papal Church that was entirely free from error, it was that of the Trinity. Yet, in the Catechism of the Council of Trent, we find the following explanations on this subject: "Let him, however, who by the divine bounty believes these truths, constantly beseech and implore God, and the Father, who made all things out of nothing, and orders all things sweetly, who gave us power to become the sons of God, and who made known to us the mystery of the Trinity; that, admitted, one day, into the eternal tabernacle, he may be worthy to see how great is the fecundity of the Father, who contemplating and understanding himself, begot the son like and equal to himself; how a *love of charity* in both, entirely the same and equal, *which is the Holy Ghost*, proceeding from the Father and the Son,

connects the begetting and the begotten by an eternal and indissoluble bond; and that thus the essence of the Trinity is one and the distinction of the three persons perfect." p. 27. So that a love of charity proceeding from the Father and the Son, is, in the Romish notion, the Holy Ghost.

Concerning the eternal generation of the Son, the same Catechism gives us the following as an illustration: "As the mind, in some sort looking into and understanding itself, forms an image of itself, which Theologians express by the term "word;" so God, as far, however, as we may compare human things to divine, understanding himself, begets the eternal word." p. 36. So far as this illustration teaches any thing, it is, that the Son of God is a representation of an idea in the mind of God.

On the manner of Christ's birth we have this remarkable instruction from the same source: "As the rays of the sun penetrate, without breaking or injuring in the least, the substance of glass; after a like, but more incomprehensible manner, did Jesus Christ come forth from his mother's womb without injury to her maternal virginity, which, immaculate and perpetual, forms the just theme of our eulogy." p. 40. The humanity of Christ is here denied. He is not the seed of the woman, and no more a descendant from Adam than was the angel that wrestled with Jacob at Peniel. Now, whatever may be said of the orthodoxy of Rome, and the correctness of her teachings in other things, there can be but one opinion amongst Protestants concerning these views of her authorized standard; that the doctrines of the Trinity, and the humanity of Christ, as we hold them, are denied. Yet these doctrines lie at the very foundation of our whole system of faith; an error here is ruinous to the whole fabric. It is true that in other places Rome in her teaching presents a more sound view of these doctrines, if we rightly understand her words, but when those teachings are coupled with the above authorized explanations, doubt, to say the least, is cast over the whole.

There is nothing more important, however, in this inquiry into the opinions of the instructors of our children than *what is the Rule of Faith* held by them. The motto of Protestants since the dawn of the reformation has been "the Bible alone." The moment this is departed from we open the flood gate to all manner of error. The decree passed by the Council of Trent at its fourth session declares the Old and New Testaments, the Apocrypha, and traditions of the Church, to be of equal authority in faith and manners. The words are as follows: the Council "doth receive and reverence, with equal piety and veneration, all the books, as well of the Old as of the New Testament, the

same God being the author of both; and also the aforesaid traditions, pertaining both to faith and manners, whether received from Christ himself, or dictated by the Holy Spirit and preserved in the Catholic Church by continual succession." Then follows a catalogue of the books of the Old and New Testament, amongst which are enumerated *those of the Apocrypha*, after which the decree proceeds, "whoever shall not receive, as sacred and canonical, all these books, and every part of them, as they are commonly read in the Catholic Church, and are contained in the old Vulgate Latin edition, or shall knowingly and deliberately despise the aforesaid traditions, let him be accursed."* Do Protestant parents keep their vow to God and the Church when they commit their children to instructors, who not only receive a different rule of faith, but are bound to curse them and their children for holding "the Bible alone?"

The doctrine of *Justification by faith* has ever been the peculiarly cherished doctrine of the Protestant Church. Luther pronounced it "the doctrine by which the Church stands or falls." It teaches us that our justification is alone through the merits of Christ. The Scriptures teach "the just shall live by faith"—"being justified freely by his grace, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus"—"therefore, being justified by faith, we have peace with God, through our Lord Jesus Christ." Now hear the Council of Trent:

*Canon* 11. "Whosoever 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 favor of God: let him be accursed.

"12. Whosoever shall affirm, that justifying faith is nothing else than confidence in the divine mercy, by which sins are forgiven for Christ's sake; or that it is that confidence only by which we are justified: let him be accursed."

"18. Whosoever shall affirm, that it is impossible even for a justified man, living in a state of grace, to keep the commandments of God: let him be accursed."

"24. 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.

"25. Whosoever shall affirm, that a righteous man sins in every good work, at least venially; or, which is yet more intolerable, mor-

---

* Cramp's Council of Trent, pp. 54, 55.

tally; and that he therefore deserves eternal punishment, and only for this reason is not condemned, that God does not impute his works to condemnation: let him be accursed.

"26. Whosoever shall affirm, that the righteous ought not to expect and hope for everlasting reward from God for their good works, which are wrought in God, through his mercy and the merits of Jesus Christ, if they persevere to the end in well-doing and observance of the divine commandments: let him be accursed."

These canons are aimed directly against protestants. Every doctrine here condemned is held by every evangelical protestant denomination as lying at the very foundation of the plan of salvation. Whilst the doctrines set forth, *that man can keep the whole law of God, and that the righteous deserve everlasting reward for their good works*, are universally regarded by protestants as ruinous to the soul. Do Christian parents keep their vows to God when they commit their children to instructors who teach doctrines believed by the parents themselves to be destructive to the soul, and who curse the parents and their children for holding that they must depend on the *merits of Christ alone for salvation?*

In the seventh session, the Council passed a Decree upon the subject of the Sacraments, from which me make the following extract: "In order to complete the exposition of the wholesome doctrine of justification, published in the last session by the unanimous consent of the fathers, it hath been deemed proper to treat of the holy sacraments of the Church, *by which all true righteousness is at first imparted, then increased, and afterwards restored, if lost,*" they "resolved to frame and decree these following canons," &c. We quote four of them.

"4. Whosoever shall affirm, that the sacraments of the new law are not necessary to salvation, but superfluous; or, that men may obtain the grace of justification by faith only, without these sacraments (although it is granted that they are not all necessary to every individual): let him be accursed.

"5. Whosoever shall affirm, that the sacraments were instituted solely for the purpose of strengthening our faith: let him be accursed.

"6. Whosoever shall affirm, that the sacraments of the new law do not contain the grace which they signify; or, that they do not confer that grace on those who place no obstacle in its way; as if they were only the external signs of grace or righteousness received by faith, and marks of christian profession, whereby the faithful are distinguished from unbelievers: let him be accursed."

"8. Whosoever shall affirm, that grace is not conferred by these sacraments of the new law, by their own power, (*ex opere operato*,) but

that faith in the divine promise is all that is necessary to obtain grace: let him be accursed."*

These quotations are sufficient to show the ground-work of the Papal plan of salvation; *the sacraments by their own power confer grace, thus the believer is regenerated by baptism, united to Christ by the Eucharist, is then able to keep the whole law, and deserves heaven for his good works.* A plan that is the very opposite of Christ's as revealed in the word of God. And if salvation is only found by embracing Christ's plan, then the papal system, so far from teaching the essential truths of salvation, teaches a system that will inevitably destroy the soul. If the question is asked, are there not true christians in that church? My answer is, I think so: but they are the children of God, not *because* of the teachings of that church, but *notwithstanding* those teachings. They are those, who, from the word of God, have gathered the system of Christ, and hold a plan of faith the opposite of that of Rome, whilst they still continue in her communion, instead of obeying God's command, "Come out of her, my people."†

It is not to be supposed that a Christian parent, with the vows of God and the church resting upon him, would knowingly and deliberately place his child, for whom those vows were taken, in the hands of those who were bound by their oath of allegiance to Rome to instruct them openly or covertly, as might best suit the circumstances, in a system that was ruinous to the soul. This would call for the immediate exercise of discipline on the part of the church. The evil has been in a sinful indifference on the subject of the opinions held by instructors. They have not inquired whether they held the essential truths or not. The Papal church has been considered as one amongst the denominations holding peculiar forms and ceremonies, but not differing in the fundamentals of the way of salvation. The recital of doctrines here from their own standards, will, we trust, be sufficient to waken an inquiry upon this subject, which cannot but result in the conviction that the plan of salvation drawn by Rome from *the Bible, the Apocrypha, and traditions of the Church*, is entirely different, and directly opposed to that which protestants draw from "*the Bible alone.*"

We have said nothing, in this examination, of the monstrous doctrines of indulgences, purgatory, prayers for the dead, the worship of the Virgin, Saints, relics, and the adoration of the wafer, all confirmed by the Council of Trent, because, though no one can conform to them without sin, they do not go into the very vitals of the way of life. Yet it must be matter of grave inquiry with every protestant parent, since all their

---

* Rev. xiii, 4. † Cramp's Council of Trent, pp. 124, 126.

pupils are required to assist in their religious services, whether he is performing his vow to God, whilst he permits his child to pass through these idolatrous services, and to have his mind filled with the hopes of gratifying sinful inclinations with impunity, which these doctrines foster.

2. The question very naturally arises, how has it happened that Rome has become the great fountain for supplying the world with teachers of the young? And why is it that from her coffers are poured forth so many millions for the erection of Universities, colleges, seminaries for young ladies, free schools, and orphan houses, all over our land? It cannot be because she fears that our liberal republican institutions cannot be maintained without our children are educated, for her own government is one of the purest despotisms in the world; and it would be absurd to suppose she cherished republics. It cannot be because she supposes education essential to the progress of pure religion, according to her notion of it, for the children in the Ecclesiastical States, under her own civil sway, are kept in ignorance; and the doctrine that "ignorance is the mother of devotion" originated with her. Still, there are no candidates for this kind of patronage in the land half so earnest and persevering as these. Whole ecclesiastical orders of men and women are traversing the country and establishing themselves in costly buildings wherever a favorable location can be found. A brief glance into history will throw some light upon this mysterious subject.

At the time when the reformation was making its first onset, and had spread consternation among the Papal ranks, "while the Pope experienced opposition or desertion from every side, while he had nothing to expect but a lingering and progressive decline, a society of men was formed, volunteers, full of zeal and enthusiasm, with the express purpose of devoting themselves exclusively to his service." This society, pleased with the idea of a military warfare with Satan, adopted the military title of the "Company of Jesus," and received the sanction of the Pope in the year 1540, about twenty years after the commencement of the reformation. "They combined the clerical and monastic duties, rejected the monastic habit, emancipated themselves from the common devotional exercises which consume the greater part of the time in convents," and from every obligation that was secondary. They devoted themselves to preaching, hearing confessions, and the education of youth. They immediately became the great Missionaries of the Roman Church. "Instruction had till then been in the hands of those men of letters, who, after having long addicted themselves to profane studies, fell into speculations on religious subjects, not wholly agreeable to the court of Rome, and ended by adopting opinions utterly reprobated by it. The Jesuits made it their business to expel them from their post, and occupy it in

their stead. They began on a more systematic plan than had hitherto been pursued. They divided the schools into classes, which they taught from the first rudiments up to the highest branches of learning, in the same spirit. They paid great attention also to the moral education, and formed men of good conduct and manners; they were patronized by the civil authorities; and, lastly, they taught *gratis*. When a city or a prince had founded a Jesuit's College, private persons needed no longer to be at any expense for the education of their sons. They were expressly forbidden to ask or to receive pay or alms; their instruction was as gratuitous as their sermons and their masses; there was no box for the receipt of gifts even in their churches. Men being what they are, this could not fail to make the Jesuits extremely popular, especially as they taught with no less success than zeal." * "We see," says one of their own number, speaking of their success, "many robed in the purple of a cardinal, who were but lately seated on the benches of our schools; others have attained to posts in the government of cities and of states; we have trained up bishops and their councils; even other religious communities have been filled from our schools." They soon obtained an incalculable influence by these means over the minds of men. Their labors were, first, to get such a control over Catholic countries as would secure them against the jealousy of rival orders, and their success may be learned from the fact, that when Ignatius Loyola, their founder and first General, died, in 1556, but sixteen years from their establishment, the company numbered thirteen provinces exclusive of the Roman.

In 1551 they were introduced into Germany, for the purpose of counter-working the reformation, which threatened at that time to sweep the whole empire. The Emperor Ferdinand I, in the letter he addressed on the subject to Loyola, expresses his conviction, that the only means of propping the declining cause of Catholicism in Germany was, to give the rising generation learned and pious Catholic teachers. Thirteen Jesuits speedily repaired to Vienna, where the Emperor gave them a dwelling, chapel and pension, and shortly after incorporated them with the University, and assigned them the superintendence of it. From this, as a centre, they spread with almost incredible rapidity, by acquiring the control of the Universities, and establishing schools throughout Germany. "In fifteen years," says Prof. Ranke, that is in 1566, "their influence extended over Bavaria and Tyrol, Franconia and Suabia, a great part of Rhineland and Austria, and they had penetrated into Hungary, Bohemia and Moravia. This was the first counteracting influence the reformation in Germany received." The

---

* Ranke's History of the Popes, vol. I, p. 146.

same historian adds: "The Papal theology had, as we have said, fallen nearly to utter decay. The Jesuits arose to revive it. Who were the Jesuits that first appeared in Germany? They were Spaniards, Italians, Flemings; for a long time the people did not know the name of their order; they called them the Spanish priests. They got possession of the chairs of Universities, and found pupils who attached themselves to their instructions." "They conquered the Germans on their own soil, in their very home, and wrested from them a portion of their own country."

In the early part of the Reformation Protestantism made rapid strides in France, so that for some time the whole people seemed to lean towards the Protestant confession. But in 1562 a re-action took place growing out of measures that were strictly political. Favored by the state of the public mind the Jesuits obtained firm footing in France. Their beginning was small, for they were compelled to be content with colleges thrown open for their reception by a few ecclesiastics, their devoted partizans, in places remote from the metropolis. But by perseverence and court influence they obtained, in 1564, the privilege of instructing the youth, which was all they asked. Their power was soon felt throughout the kingdom, in every species of intrigue, so that thirty years after, an attempt having been made to assassinate the King, Henry IV, by one of their pupils, who confessed in his examination that he had frequently heard from the Jesuits that it was lawful to kill a King that was not reconciled to the Church, the order was suppressed in France. The sentence commanded all the members of the order to leave the kingdom within fourteen days, and assigns as the reason that they were "*seducers of the youth, disturbers of the public peace, enemies of the King and of the State.*" Four years afterwards, in 1598, the King having in the meantime been reconciled to the Romish Church, they were permitted to return, and continued under the bigotted sovereigns of that country (who were generally ruled by them) until 1762, when their commercial transactions and frauds having enabled the Parliament of Paris to lay their hands upon them, they were finally suppressed in France.

After having held the sway over Portugal and Spain for two hundred years, they were banished the first country for their connection with an attempt on the King's life, in 1759; and in a few years after from Spain, for being concerned in a plot to dethrone the King; and such was the dread Charles had entertained of them, that when the work was accomplished he exclaimed: "I have conquered a new world." Naples and Parma immediately followed the example of Spain. The ambassadors of all these powers presented their accusa-

tions against the Jesuits before the Pope, and demanded the total suppression of the order. After every effort at resistance, Clement XIV. was compelled, on the 21st July, 1773, to pronounce the following sentence:

"Inspired, as we humbly trust, by the Divine Spirit, urged by the duty of restoring the unanimity of the Church, convinced that the Company of Jesus can no longer render those services to the end of which it was instituted, and moved by other reasons of prudence and state policy which we hold locked in our own breast, we abolish and annul the Society of Jesus, their functions, houses, and institutions." *

Here then is a society, or ecclesiastical order, originated for meeting the emergency produced by the reformation, and fundamentally adapted to meet the struggle with Protestantism, pushing forward with an unprecedented success, and answering most perfectly the end of its institution, by controling education. Arrived at the plenitude of power, they become the arch-intriguers in all countries, and are finally suppressed by the influence, not of Protestants, but of Roman Catholic sovereigns, *for seducing the youth, and forming conspiracies for the overturning of established governments.* By the light thus thrown by history upon this order, can any one be at a loss to solve the mystery of their operations in our own country now? The movements are precisely the same. The actors governed by the same constitutions; the ends aimed at the same, as we shall see by the brief statements we have to make in bringing that history to the present time.

The revolution in France, and the wars of Napoleon which succeeded and brought the Pope and almost all Europe to his feet, utterly precluded for the time any action on the part of the Papacy. The supremacy was gone, and the Pope became a prisoner of the Emperor in the palace of Fontainbleau. But no sooner had the tide turned and the allies became the victors, than the grasping ambition of the pontiff revived. Pius VII. had scarcely reached Rome on his return from his prison before the decree reviving the Order of Jesuits, properly termed the "Janisaries of the Pope," was issued, in 1814. But thirty years have passed, and they are swarming in every Catholic country of Europe, have crept back in the face of the decree against them in France, and are building their colleges in England, Switzerland and the United States, and by *the education of youth* again counterworking Protestantism. The same struggles are again renewed in France and Switzerland, and in the latter country blood has already been shed. To control the countries and mould their governments to

---

* Continuazione degli Annali, tom. XIV, part ii, p. 107. Quoted by Ranke.

suit their own purposes, and reduce the whole to the spiritual domination of the Pope, is the end for which their order was orignated; for which when suppressed it was revived; and consequently, for which it now lives and acts. That they will involve this land in troubles and conflicts is just as certain as that like causes produce like effects. Where is the American parent, let alone the Christian under vows, who, knowing these facts, will turn over his child to be trained up by men who will use him afterwards, as their tool, to ruin the liberty, civil and religious, which our fathers transmitted, a priceless boon, to us?

3. The character of the instruction imparted in their schools has nothing in it giving them a peculiar claim to popular favor, unless it be in their prices. At the origin of their order, the new Protestant Universities had become popular through the celebrity of the great men who were connected with them, and they were ambitious of rivalling their popularity. "The education of that time being a purely learned one, rested exclusively on the study of the languages of antiquity. These the Jesuits cultivated with great ardor, and in a short time had among them teachers who might claim to be ranked among the restorers of learning." Upon the reputation of their names, and the popularity their institutions then acquired, the order has lived since its restoration, without producing a single name above mediocrity. The course of training was long and the studies few, and hence their modes of laborious drilling being carried through, they made thorough scholars in the branches taught. Times have changed, the world become utilitarian, whilst their system of instruction has remained the same. The time has been shortened for the whole college course, and the subjects of study greatly increased. Hence their method no longer succeeds in making even good scholars in the ancient languages. The modern improvements in mathematics they do not attempt. Philosophy, natural, moral, and mental, is studied very superficially, and the physical sciences, as chemistry, mineralogy, and geology not at all. History is to them a dangerous subject, especially when the sons of Protestants are the pupils, and is therefore skimmed, in a compend prepared by Roman hands. The rights of man, and of conscience, enlightened views of civil government, form no part of their course. The consequence is, that their Universities, whilst conferring the highest honors, scarcely rise above the grammar schools of our country. A graduate of their Universities is unable to enter the Junior class at Princeton, Yale, or any of the more respectable Protestant colleges of our land.

The special candidates for patronage in the intruction of your

daughters are the orders of the Urselines, the Sisters of Charity, the Visitandines and the Sacred Heart; orders shown by Prof. Michelet, in his late work, to be peculiarly under the Spiritual direction of the Jesuits, and the last a creation of their own, composed of women enthusiastically engaged in the work to which they have vowed, and blindly obedient to the will of their confessors and spiritual guides. They are satisfied of the infallible truth of the destructive doctrines we have rehearsed, and sure that the curse of God rests on the parents of the children they are educating, and hence bound, by every feeling of benevolence, to separate the child from the baneful influence of the parent and infuse their own dogmas into her mind. What is a promise not to interfere with your child's religion worth under such circumstances? How long think you would they continue their self-denying labors in a Protestant community, if they were assured the result must be the making of all their pupils firm and decided Protestant Christians? Yet this is the end you are bound by your vow to seek for in an instructor for the child God has committed to you.

The instruction given in these Convents and Seminaries is liable to all the objections belonging to the Jesuit schools. The teachers in three-fourths of the cases are unqualified for their work; and that lack entails itself; for each succeeding generation of teachers was taught by the one preceding it. A modern language or two may be well taught, for the teachers are mostly foreigners; the English rudiments may also be pretty correctly imparted; and some ornamental, showy branches thrown over the whole to hide its meagreness. But the things that form the character, and make useful, intelligent wives and mothers, fitted for the stations they are about to occupy in society, will be wholly wanting, for the simple reason that they are things no cloistered nun can from experience know, and hence can never impart.

Whatever may have been the difficulties in former times in this community in finding suitable schools conducted on strictly Protestant Christian principles, no such difficulties now exist. Seminaries, free from any real objection, and possessing greatly superior claims to your patronage, both on the ground of instruction and instructors, are now sufficiently numerous. Hence, no necessity can any longer be pleaded as an excuse for violating the precept of the text, and the vow made by parents to God and the Church. The violation must be accounted willful, or the result of imperfect information.

III. It will be well, in closing this subject, to look at the consequences that result from the violation of this precept.

1. God's goodness forbids the supposition that he would, in any case, lay burdens upon the members of his Church, that were un-

necessary. His wisdom equally forbids the supposition that any duty he has enjoined upon his children can be violated with impunity. He knows what is in man, and has framed his government and all his laws with reference to this end. Our own experience fully confirms the truth, that on the training depends the character and after life of the child, and hence reason assents to the propriety and necessity of the precept, and leads us to look for disastrous consequences if it is neglected.

2. The fulfillment of the solemn vow taken by Christian parents upon the baptism of their children, is the condition upon which rests the blessings contained in God's covenant to Abraham: "I will be a God unto thee, and to thy seed after thee."—"The children of thy servants shall continue, and their seed shall be established before thee."—"He that feareth the Lord, his seed shall inherit the earth." These covenant blessings have no mysterious sense, they will be realized so certainly as covenant is kept with God. But if you break covenant, failing in the performance of your vow, you lose all claim to the promised good. Your children lose the advantages of these promises through your sin. Thus, parents sin not alone, but by casting off their duty to God, He casts their children off from His covenant, and generations unborn feel the effects of their neglect of duty. O parents! have mercy upon your children—be not destitute of natural affection—secure to them, as you may, God's covenant blessings, that He may be their Father and their God.

3. Another consequence is found in the utter ruin of family peace. The domestic circle is God's appointed refuge from the toils and perplexities and sorrows of life. The domestic altar is the dearest and sweetest shrine at which man's offerings are made; where those most loved on earth present together their morning and evening vows to a God of love. But trust your sons and daughters to those who are under vows to estrange them from you and your religion, and who are conscientious in performing their vows, because they believe they will do God and your children service; and your domestic peace is gone. There will be secrets cherished in the breast of your child that he will not reveal to you, and your altar will be an abomination in his sight. Your home will be filled with discord, and the God of your fathers will be forsaken.

4. By indifference to this precept, and consequently committing your children to the commissioned emissaries of the Roman Church, you give your patronage, your money, and what is worse, the energies of your own offspring, to build up a *politico-religious* system, designed to pull down the institutions of freedom under which you live. The

head of that Church is a temporal prince, ruling three millions of subjects; the form of government absolute monarchy; he claims universal spiritual empire, and uses the spiritual to build up and extend the temporal. His most efficient agents are the Jesuits, and their mode of accomplishing his purposes the education of youth. By this method they subdued Germany, France, a large part of Switzerland, and reigned with despotic sway for two hundred years in Italy, Spain, and Portugal. They have always advanced by attaching the youth of the country to their cause, and selecting the most talented to fill their own ranks as co-workers. The scheme is wise, the means well adapted to the end, and the whole machinery is in operation in your midst; and you give your sons and daughters into their embrace! If, before your head is silvered over and laid in the grave, you find them destroying the temple of liberty and of your God, you need not feel surprised;—it is a consequence invoked by your own acts.

5. Lastly, the destruction of the souls of your children, unless God's grace prevent, is a consequence. You place them under influences where the light of truth will be shut out from their minds, and a false system presented for their belief; if they receive it, they have embraced an error that destroys the soul; if they reject it, you have seared their consciences by exposing them to a system of superstition and idolatry, bearing the name of the Christian religion, and thereby tempting them to reject the Bible and all religion in their hearts. The absurdities of the Papal faith made Deists of Voltaire and his companions, and has made infidels of hundreds wearing the priestly garb this day in their own communion, and such are its natural tendencies.

Let these consequences be fairly examined; see if they do not legitimately flow from the evil held up to your minds to-day, and may God enable you to act aright in view of the responsibility he has laid upon you.

# A REVIEW

OF THE

# SERMON BY DR. POTTS,

ON THE

# DANGERS OF JESUIT INSTRUCTION,

PREACHED AT

## THE SECOND PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH, ST. LOUIS,

## SEPTEMBER 25TH, 1845.

BY ORESTES A. BROWNSON.

---

THE author of this sermon, we presume, from its doctrine, and tone, is a Presbyterian mintster, and most likely pastor of the church *at* which it was preached. We know nothing of him except what the sermon itself tells us. From that we gather that he stands high in his own estimation, has some earnestness and zeal, but is rather deficient in theological and historical knowledge, as well as in the meekness and sweetness of the Christian temper.

The sermon is from Eph. vi. 4,—"Bring them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord," or, as the Catholic version has it, "in the discipline and correction of the Lord;" and is designed to set forth the solemn obligations of Christian parents to give their children a truly Christian education, and to point out one remarkable instance in which they violate these obligations.

"The text," he says, "is an apostolic precept given to those who hold in the Church of Christ the important and responsible relation of parents. The Church, consequently, requires, in every case in which the Sacrament of Baptism is administered to a child, that the parents bring themselves under a solemn obligation to 'endeavor, by all the means of God's appointment, to bring up their child in the nurture and admonition of the Lord.'

" As in the administration of this Sacrament in the case of an adult, he gives himself up unto God, through Jesus Christ, to walk in newness of life; so parents, in presenting their children, make a formal surrender of them to God, and obligate themselves, as guardians and instructors appointed for the express purpose, to bring them up as God's sons and daughters. For their diligence and faithfulness in the discharge of this duty every parent is to answer, first to the Church officers, whose duty it is to see to the fulfillment of the vows publicly made in the Church, and secondly, to the great Judge of quick and dead. Hence arises the double duty, that officers should see to it that the Church is fully instructed in reference to the nature of this covenant engagement, and that parents carefully consider the meaning of the vow that rests upon them." —p. 1.

The inquiry might arise here, Who are these "Church officers"? and, especially, who is to see to it that they rightly instruct, or do not misinstruct, the Church? The Church officers instruct the Church, but who instructs and appoints the Church officers? The earth stands on the turtle; but what does the turtle stand on? If the sermon reaches a second edition, we hope the author will condescend to enlighten us on this point.

The explanation of the precept of the text, though it overlooks the immediate sense intended by the blessed Apostle, is well enough. The general duty of Christian parents to educate their children in a Christian manner is set forth with tolerable clearness. It is a solemn duty, and one which it is to be deeply lamented, parents too often, and too fatally neglect. The parent who brings his child to the Sacrament of Baptism, incurs a solemn obligation to do all in his power to bring him up in a truly Christian manner; and if he do not, and the child through that neglect be lost, terrible will be the account he will one day be called upon to settle with his Maker and his Judge. But the main design, and much the larger part, of this sermon is devoted to pointing "out one of the instances in which parents violate this command."

"The case," the author says, "to which I allude, is the indifference manifested by Christian parents to the characters, morals, and religious sentiments of the instructors of their children. Many parents act upon the principle, that it is of no importance what may be the morals or sentiments entertained by a teacher, provided there is no immorality exhibited before the pupils, and no attempt to inculcate sentiments deemed erroneous. But no opinion could be more untrue, or more practically dangerous. The Scripture declaration, as a man 'thinketh in his heart so is he,' will be found true. His teachings and example will be insensibly influenced by the doctrines he holds, and there will occur a thousand ways in which the pupil will distinctly comprehend the views and feelings of the preceptor; and these views will not have the less influence, from the fact that he makes no direct effort to impress them upon the pupil's mind. A direct effort of this kind would put the learner on

his guard; but the other plan allays all fear, and the poison silently and imperceptibly works. The child is subjected five-sevenths of his time to this influence, and the remaining portion to a different influence; no wonder, then, that the poison has gained so fast, that errors are fixed beyond remedy in the mind before the parent is aware that they exist at all. Hence, every one soliciting at your hands the post of instructor of your children should be willing to submit his opinions and life to the most rigid scrutiny, before he asks that so important a trust should be confided to him."—pp. 4, 5.

The principle laid down here, we regard as a sound one. We should find it extremely difficult to bring ourselves to intrust the education of our children to instructors we held to be unsound in the faith. There is no torture we would not endure sooner than trust them to the care of Presbyterian teachers, even in matters but remotely connected with faith and morals. We agree entirely with Dr. Potts in the principle he lays down, and are quite certain, that, if the Americans generally would adopt it, and act upon it, there would soon be an end of that monopoly of education throughout the United States, which has hitherto been enjoyed by Presbyterians and Calvinistic Congregationalists. The great majority of the American people are anti-Calvinistic, and if they were not shamefully indifferent to the doctrines entertained by those they employ as instructors, we should not see, as is even yet the fact, the greater part of our colleges, academies, and literary institutions under Calvinistic control.

But, if we agree with Dr. Potts in the principle he lays down, we are far from agreeing with him in the application he makes of it. From the fact that parents are bound to bring up their children in the discipline and correction of the Lord, he infers that they are bound not to intrust them to Catholic instructors. But this is a plain *non sequitur*, for none but Catholic instructors do, or can, impart a truly Christian education. He would also infer from the same premises, that Christian parents can in conscience employ none but Presbyterian educators, which is another *non sequitur*. Educators cannot impart what they have not; and Presbyterians must be Christians, before they can give a Christian education. That they are not Christians now, we have a right to say; since, in a recent act of their general assembly, asserting the invalidity of Catholic baptism, they have *unchristened* themselves. Men are made Christians in the Sacrament of Baptism. The Presbyterians have no baptism but that which they derived from the Catholic Church, and their title to the Christian name rests on the validity of that baptism. They have declared that baptism invalid. Consequently, according to their own declaration, they have always been, and are, a set of unbaptized—*Presbyterians*, and therefore completely out of the pale of Christendom. Evi-

dently, then, if Christian parents are bound to give their children a Christian education, they must not employ Presbyterian instructors.

Dr. Potts asserts that Catholic individuals and ecclesiastical orders are at the doors of Protestants, "asking Christian parents to commit their children to their hands to be educated, and, of course,—for this is the parent's vow,—to be trained up for God."—p. 5. This, if so, is no doubt horrible, and not to be tolerated; for we suppose Protestants are not at liberty to refuse the request. But we are inclined to think he labors under a slight mistake. We are sure the Catholics do not solicit Protestants to intrust them with the education of their children. We establish schools for our own children, that we may discharge the duty the preacher is laboring to enforce; and it can be no sin in us to request Catholic parents to send their children to Catholic schools. We do not request Protestants to send their children to our schools; we are not particularly desirous of receiving them, and some of our colleges will not receive them at all. It is a favor we confer on Protestants, when we admit their sons and daughters into our schools, for which they should thank us, both for their own sake and their children's sake, not abuse us.

We think also the preacher is ungenerous in objecting to our schools because they furnish education at "reduced prices." This objection comes with an ill grace from the party that claims to be the especial friends of education, and the founders of free schools. That our schools give a better education, and at a less expense than Protestant schools, we do not question; for our instructors are for the most part vowed to poverty, and devoted to the work of education, not for the love of money, but for the love of God. Education is with them a religious vocation. They are men and women dead to the world, and alive only to God, and no doubt they have special graces from Almighty God for the work to which he calls them. They are thus enabled to educate better than Protestants can, whatever their zeal, diligence, learning, or natural ability; as they have no expensive families or position to maintain, they can educate much cheaper than Protestants can. This sufficiently accounts for the excellence and cheapness of our schools, and for their ability to compete more than successfully, wherever established, with Protestant schools. But this surely implies no fault on our part, and can be no ground for condemning us or our schools.

But the reduced prices at which our schools furnish education is not the only objection the preacher brings against them. He thinks the Christian parent cannot send his children to our schools, because Catholic instructors are not sound in the faith. He proceeds, therefore, to set forth wherein Catholics have not the essential Christian faith. If Catholics do not hold the essential truths of the Christian religion, pa-

rents undoubtedly cannot, with a safe conscience, commit their children to their care. No parent can safely trust his children to an infidel, or a misbelieving instructor. So far, we agree with Dr. Potts. But this question as to the orthodoxy of Catholics is a somewhat delicate question. It is simply, Does the Catholic Church hold and teach the true Christian faith?

Now, it is undeniable that we cannot decide this question, unless we have some standard, or criterion of orthodoxy. What is this criterion? By what standard does the zealous Doctor propose to try the Catholic faith? By the Bible? Well, by the Bible as he understands it, or as Catholics understand it? If as Catholics understand it, then he must concede the orthodoxy of Catholicity; for the Catholic faith is authorized by the Catholic understanding of the Bible. But will he say as he himself understands it? But whence does it follow that Dr. Potts, who preaches *at* the Second Presbyterian Church in St. Louis, understands the Bible better than the Catholic? Why, are we to say, that the Catholic faith is heterodox, because it does not agree with his understanding of the word of God? Is he infallible? Does he pretend it? Then how settle the question, whether his or the Catholic's understanding of the Bible be the true understanding?

"But take the Bible itself; neither your understanding of it, nor mine,—but the Bible, the precious Bible, the very word of God itself."

With all my heart. But the Bible is nothing to us, unless we attach some meaning to it; and if we attach a false meaning to it, then what we take to be the Bible is not the Bible. We do not take the Bible unless we take it in God's sense,—in the sense intended by the Holy Ghost who dictated it. How shall we ascertain this sense?

But the good Doctor is troubled with no questions of this sort. The earth rests on the turtle, and it does not occur to him to ask what the turtle stands on. We should not be over-curious, and no Christian ever allows himself to ask impertinent questions. So he tacitly assumes his own infallibility, that the turtle stands on his own feet,—for what else should a turtle stand on?—and proceeds to try the Catholic faith.

"Our first inquiry is into the doctrines held by these teachers; that is, by the Papal Church. The Christian parent, lying under a solemn vow, must know whether the instructor of his child holds the essential truths of the Christian religion. It has been generally the opinion of Protestants that Roman Catholics were not wrong in those doctrines that are fundamental in the Christian faith, but that their great error consisted in the load of trumpery, such as the worship of the Virgin Mary, and of saints and relics; the doctrines of purgatory, penance, and auricular confession; of transubstantiation, and the adoration of the bread; which, being wrought into the way of salvation as revealed, served to cloud the mind, and, in most cases, entirely

mislead the worshipper from the true objects of faith. This opinion has risen from the circumstance, that Rome held the same symbols of faith with the Protestant Churches, as the Apostles' and Athanasian creeds. But these formularies of doctrine are so brief, that without explanation it is impossible to know what is the faith held by those professing to embrace them. The Apostles' creed may be adopted by every description of errorists professing to receive the Bible; and the same is true of the creed of Athanasius, with the single exception of Arians, whose error it was designed to detect. Hence, the opinion of Protestants referred to, was manifestly made up on sufficient evidence."—pp. 5, 6.

This is a beautiful extract. So Protestants have hitherto been mistaken as to the real character of the Church. Well, there is some comfort in that. If they have heretofore erred, it is certain they are not infallible, and may therefore err again. Drowning men will catch at straws. So, since it is admitted Protestants may err, we will conclude it is *barely* possible they do err, when they deny that the Church believes and teaches "the essential truths of the Christian religion."

But the question of the criterion or standard still comes up. By what authority does our Presbyterian friend distinguish between the essential truths of the Christian religion, and the "trumpery" with which they are loaded? This question continually haunts us, and, like Banquo's ghost, "will not down at the bidding." We are even anxious to cast off all "trumpery;" but you must prove to us that what you require us to cast off is trumpery, before we can consent to cast it off. What is the authority for saying this or that is trumpery? The Bible? That answer will not suffice; because the moment that is introduced, the question comes up, What is the true sense of the Bible? How determine that? By private judgment? But I have private judgment as well as you. If I am required to submit my private judgment to yours, the right of private judgment is denied, and then you are as badly off as I. Moreover, our private judgments clash. You call some things trumpery which I revere as sacred. If the right of private judgment is admitted, you cannot be required to submit your private judgment to mine, nor I mine to yours. Where is the umpire to decide between us? The Presbyterian General Assembly? But, at the very worst, the authority of the Catholic Church is equal to the authority of the Presbyterian Assembly; why, then, shall I submit to the Assembly rather than to the Church? As a prudent man, how can I do so? Your Assembly is quite young and inexperienced. It represents a sect born only the other day, and which includes at best only a small portion—a very small portion—of those who profess to be Christians, and they no

prodigies for their intelligence or their amiability. Who has given them authority to teach? What, in fact, is their authority, making all you can of it, before the Catholic Church, which now embraces, and which has embraced from the times of the Apostles, the overwhelming majority of all who profess, or have professed, the Christian religion, and from which you have pilfered all the Christianity you have? To exchange the authority of the Catholic Church for that of the Presbyterian Church, would be like Glaucus exchanging his golden armor for the brazen armor of Diomed. Sure we are we should get only *brass* in return. No, no, most excellent Doctor, we cannot make so foolish an exchange. You must bring me higher authority than that of the Presbyterian Assembly, especially since it has *unchristened* itself, before its decision will suffice for determining what are the essential truths of the Christian religion, and what is mere "trumpery."

For our part, we shrink from calling the devotion Catholics pay to the blessed Virgin and the saints by so harsh a word as "trumpery." To brand with that name the uniform practice of the great mass of professed Christians for eighteen centuries, including the greatest, best, and holiest men and women that have ever lived, requires, to say the least, very respectable authority, and is not to be done lightly. Dr. Potts knows perfectly well that Catholics pay supreme worship to God alone, and that they are strictly forbidden by their religion to give that to a creature which is due only to God. We honor the blessed Virgin, we admit; for the angel Gabriel honored her, when he saluted her "full of grace;" for God himself honored her, when he chose to become her son, and to love and obey her as his mother; and we cannot believe it wrong for us to honor whom God and his holy angels honor. Dr. Potts, doubtless, professes to believe that Jesus Christ was both God and man, two distinct natures in one person,—that he was truly born of the Virgin Mary, and that she was literally and truly his mother, as much so as any woman is the mother of her son. If so, he must believe that she is still his mother, and that our blessed Lord still loves and honors her as such. If she is still his mother, if he still loves and honors her, he cannot regard it as "trumpery" that we, too, love and honor her. Would our Presbyterian friend regard it as a slight to himself, if such were our esteem for him that we loved and honored his mother for his sake? Would he regard our disrespect of his mother as a proof of our love and esteem of him? If he is not a bad son, he would be more offended at our want of respect to his mother than at our want of respect for himself, and would resent it quicker and more deeply. Was our

blessed Lord not a good son? Why, then, tell us it is "trumpery" for us to honor his Virgin Mother? Alas! how little does our Presbyterian minister know of the sublime mystery of the Incarnation! How much does he lose by his ignorance of the exquisite tenderness and grace of that devotion which Catholics pay to the Mother of our Lord; who by the Holy Ghost declared that henceforth all nations should call her "Blessed!"—St. Luke i. 48.

Nor are we willing to regard it as "trumpery" to honor the saints. We have always supposed that the saints have honor in heaven, that God himself loves and honors every saint; that to be loved and honored of God is included in the reward of sanctity. May I not love and honor whom God loves and honors? If we love God, will not our hearts overflow with love to all that are dear to God? And who are dearer to God than the saints who have washed their robes white in the blood of the Lamb, who have borne the cross here below, fought the good fight, won the victory, and now sing their triumph in songs of benediction and joy before the throne of God himself? May we publicly assemble to honor the memory of the statesman, the patriot, and the hero, stained, perhaps, with a thousand vices and crimes; and yet must not honor the saint whose life was fragrant with divine grace, and whose footsteps have hallowed the earth? Or is our crime in the fact, that we believe that the saint still lives, and that there is a blessed communion of saints, including the saints above and the saints below, binding us altogether as one body, united to God as the soul? May we request the suffrages of those we love, who are still in the flesh, and not the suffrages of those who are released from their bondage, and are now in the very presence of God? Has the departed saint lost a portion of his faculties, or has his heart become callous to the wants of those for whom, when he was in the flesh, he would willingly die? O, call not the devotion we pay to the saints, the interest we beg in their prayers, "trumpery!" You know not what you say; and may the saints pray God to forgive you for blaspheming him in them!

We do not worship "relics." We regard and honor them for what they represent, or the worth to which they are related. They are memorials we value and treasure up. Has Dr. Potts never a memorial of a dear friend, now departed, with which he would not willingly part? Is that picture of his ever honored mother, which the pious son preserves with so much care, or that locket, which was her mother's, the pious daughter prizes so highly, mere trumpery? The New Englander makes his pilgrimage to the rock on which our forefathers landed, and the descendants of the Pilgrims, when erecting

in the old town of Plymouth, *Pilgrim Hall*, place a fragment of that rock in its walls. The patriot feels rich in the cane, snuff-box, or paper cutter, made from the wood of "Old Ironsides," and we saw but a few days since that the representative of our Government in Peru had sent to the National Institute at Washington, a fragment of the flag of Pizarro, together with one or two other valued relics. We go into our State House, and we see old muskets, swords, a headless drum, and other curious relics of the early Indian wars or of the Revolution, preserved with great care. All this is proper, and is commended by even the sternest of the Puritan race. But it is all "trumpery" to preserve with respect the relics of a saint of God, one whose presence blessed the race of men, and who has been crowned in heaven! We may preserve with affectionate care the coat of Washington, or visit with reverential feeling the room where Voltaire penned his blasphemy, or the bed where he slept after having reviled the religion of God; but it is all "trumpery," if the pious Christian preserves the sacred tunic worn by his Lord when he tabernacled with men, or finds his devotion quickened on beholding it. It is only the relics of those dear to God, who followed him in humility and all fidelity, who, by his grace, won immortal victories over the world, the flesh and the devil, who came off more than conquerors through him who loved them; it is only the sacred relics of such as these it is offensive to God that we should preserve, or "trumpery" that we should respect for the sake of the worth to which they are related. The lover may wear the picture of his mistress next his heart, and poets will sing his praise, and romancers immortalize him; but if I wear next to mine the image of the Virgin Mother of my God, whose heart was transfixed with a sword of grief, as she saw her divine Son suffer and die that I might have life and joy, it is all "trumpery." You may fill your houses and grounds with statues of heathen gods and goddesses, naked dancing girls, and wild bacchantes, or hang round your rooms the pictures of bandits, cutthroats, and villains; but if I place in my study, or the Church places upon her altar, the image of the Crucifixion, or if in my devotions I kneel before the cross, or the image of the Queen of Saints, it is all "trumpery," besotted superstition, debasing idolatry! O miserable Protestantism, thou wert born of contradictions; thou stealest away the brains and petrifiest the hearts of thy votaries! The fatal cup of Circe wrought not more frightful transformations in the companions of Ulysses, than thou dost in those who drink from thine.

The doctrines of purgatory, penance, and transubstantiation we

pass over for the present; but the charge that Catholics adore "the bread," even Dr. Potts must be aware is not true,—not true, even if it were possible for us to be mistaken in the Catholic doctrine of transubstantiation. We do not adore the bread, for we do not believe there is any bread there. What we adore is not what we see with our eyes, what we detect with any of our senses, but our blessed Lord himself, whom we believe to be, not *represented*, but *concealed* under the appearance of bread and wine. Our adoration is intended for God, for the Incarnate God,—is directed to him, and is adoration of him, even if he be not present in the manner we believe. Yet it is not strange that Protestants, who regard themselves as the more enlightened portion of mankind, since they believe Jesus Christ is *represented* by a piece of bread, should suppose that Catholics must believe him to *be* bread; for to believe him to be bread is, after all, not so far removed from believing that bread represents him as some may imagine.

But here is another curious extract:

"The Papal system of doctrine was never settled until the Council of Trent, which closed its sessions in 1564. Previous to this, Councils had dealt very much in formularies, and they had defined and changed, affirmed and condemned in so many different ways, that it was no very unusual thing for that to be rank heresy in one section of the Church that was orthodox in another, and opinions of every shade and hue were held by different teachers in that communion. The Protestant controversy compelled Rome to settle her faith; and the great and last general Council convened at Trent in 1545 for this purpose. Their decrees, having been confirmed by the Pope, according to the doctrine of that Church, are infallible and unalterable."—p. 6.

This is easily said, but not easily proved. That heresies have arisen in the Church, both before Luther and since, nobody denies; but that they have ever been permitted in the Church, by any portion of the Church, is not true. The faith of the Church is always and everywhere the same; and never have individuals in one age or one country been authorized to hold what in another age or country has been accounted heretical. No doubt, Protestantism would delight to find that the Church had contradicted herself; but this, though often asserted, has never been made out, and never can be. The faith of the Church is that which the Church through her pastors teaches authoritatively, or commands her children to believe; and she always and everywhere has commanded one and the same faith. It is in vain Protestants assert the contrary. They have never succeeded, and never can succeed, in adducing a single instance which impugns this statement. The holy Council of Trent made not the least alteration

in the faith. It simply defined it more fully on certain points than it had been before, repeated several former definitions which had been controverted, and condemned the new heresies which had arisen. To say that the Catholic faith was not settled till the Council closed its sessions, in 1564, betrays either an ignorance or a recklessness which is by no means creditable to him who says so.

But here is something worse yet:

"It has been thought by Protestants, that, if there was one doctrine held by the Papal Church that was entirely free from error, it was that of the Trinity. Yet, in the Catechism of the Council of Trent, we find the following explanations on this subject:—'Let him, however, who by the divine bounty believes these truths, constantly beseech and implore God, and the Father, who made all things out of nothing, and orders all things sweetly, who gave us power to become the sons of God, and who made known to us the mystery of the Trinity, that, admitted one day, into the eternal tabernacles, he may be worthy to see how great is the fecundity of the Father, who, contemplating and understanding himself, begot the Son like and equal to himself; how a *love of charity* in both, entirely the same and equal, *which is the Holy Ghost*, proceeding from the Father and the Son, connects the begetting and the begotten by an eternal and indissoluble bond; and that thus the essence of the Trinity is one, and the distinction of the three persons perfect.'—p. 27. So that a love of charity, proceeding from the Father and the Son, is, in the Romish notion, the Holy Ghost.

"Concerning the eternal generation of the Son, the same Catechism gives us the following as an illustration:—'As the mind, in some sort looking into and understanding itself, forms an image of itself, which theologians express by the term *word*, so God, as far, however, as we may compare human things to divine, understanding himself, begets the eternal word.'—p. 36. So far as this illustration teaches anything, it is, that the Son of God is a representation of an idea in the mind of God.

"On the manner of Christ's birth we have this remarkable instruction from the same source:—'As the rays of the sun penetrate, without breaking or injuring in the least, the substance of glass; after a like, but more incomprehensible manner, did Jesus Christ come forth from his mother's womb without injury to her maternal virginity, which, immaculate and perpetual, forms the just theme of our eulogy.'—p. 40. The humanity of Christ is here denied. He is not the seed of the woman, and no more a descendant from Adam than was the angel that wrestled with Jacob at Peniel. Now, whatever may be said of the orthodoxy of Rome, and the correctness of her teachings in other things, there can be but one opinion amongst Protestants concerning these views of her authorized standard; that the doctrines of the Trinity and the humanity of Christ, as we hold them, are denied."—pp. 6, 7.

The objection to the first extract is, that the Holy Ghost is said to be the "love of charity," *charitatis amor*,—but why this is objec-

tionable the preacher does not tell us, and we do not know. The Father loves the Son with an eternal and infinite love, and the Son loves the Father with an eternal and infinite love, and from their mutual love *proceeds* infinite and Eternal Love, which is the Holy Ghost. This love is termed *amor charitatis*, because theologians distinguish several kinds of love; and the highest, purest, and most perfect love is what they term the "love of charity." The word charity does not, as our learned preacher seems to imagine, express the object of the love, but its quality, and determines the love in question to be that love which is termed charity, not some other kind of love, as, for instance, *amor concupiscentiæ*, or *amor amicitiæ*. The Catechism merely terms the Holy Ghost, in plain English, Charity, or most perfect love, proceeding from the charity or most perfect love of the Father for the Son, and of the Son for the Father. This is the worst that can be made of it. But what is there objectionable in this? Does not the Apostle St. John (1 St. John iv. 16) say *Deus charitas est*, or as the Protestant version has it, "God is love?" If the blessed Apostle calls God charity, or love, why may not the Catechism call the Holy Ghost, who is God, also charity or love?

Does our Presbyterian minister fancy that he sees in the assertion, *charitatis amor qui Spiritus Sanctus est*, an attack on the personality, or, indeed, the substantiality, of the Holy Ghost? He must bear in mind, first, that, in the sentence he quotes, the Catechism is not defining nor even giving a general statement of the Mystery of the Holy Trinity; but in the paragraph from which it is taken is giving a caution against subtle speculations concerning this mystery, teaching that the words in which it is expressed are to be religiously observed, and admonishing us to pray diligently that we may be found worthy at last, when admitted into the eternal tabernacles, to see and understand what here we must believe on the authority of God, without seeking too curiously to ascertain how or why it is that God exists in unity of essence and trinity of persons. And in the second place, he must bear in mind that the doctrine of the Trinity, as it is to be received by faith, the Catechism here presupposes, because it had in the previous sections given a clear, distinct, and precise statement of it. We quote from the paragraph but one preceding the one from which the author takes his extract:

"Tres enim sunt in una divinitate personæ: Patris, qui a nullo genitus est; Filii, qui ante omnia sæcula a Patre genitus est; Spiritus sancti, qui itidem ab æterno ex Patre et Filio procedit. Atqui Pater est in una divinitatis substantia prima persona, qui cum unigenito Filio suo et Spiritu sancto unus est Deus, unus est Dominus, non in unius singularitate personæ, sed in unius Trinitate substantiæ. Jam

vero hæ tres personæ, cum in iis quidquid dissimile, aut dispar cogitare nefas sit, suis tantummodo proprietatibus distinctæ intelligentur. Pater siquidem ingenitus est; Filius a Patre genitus; Spiritus sanctus abutroque procedit. Atque ita trium personarum eandem essentiam, eandem substantiam confitemur; ut in confessione veræ sempiternæque Deitatis, et in personis proprietatem, et in essentia unitatem, et in Trinitate æqualitatem pie et sancte colendam credamus."—Art. I. 12.

If this does not satisfy the worthy preacher, the fault must be in himself.

The second extract is not fairly made. The Catechism of the Council of Trent is designed mainly to guide, direct and assist pastors in the instruction of their flocks. It not only lays down what is of faith, but suggests the explanations which theologians adopt to enable the mind to conceive them with less difficulty. This is the case in the paragraph from which Dr. Potts quotes a part of a sentence. We quote the whole paragraph:

"Ex omnibus autem, quæ ad indicandum modum rationemque æternae generationis similitudines afferuntur, illa proprius ad rem videtur accedere, quæ ab animi nostri cogitatione sumitur, quamobrem Sanctus Joannes Filium ejus, (1 Joan. i. 1,) Verbum appellat. Ut enim mens nostra, se ipsam quodammodo intelligens, sui effingit imaginem quam Verbum Theologi dixerunt; ita Deus, quantum tamen divinis humana conferri possunt, seipsum intelligens, verbum æternum generat; *etsi præstat contemplari, quod fides proponit, et sincera mente Jesum Christum verum Deum et verum hominem credere et confiteri, genitum quidem, ut Deum, ante omnium sæculorum ætates, ex Patre; ut hominem vero natum in tempore ex matre Maria Virgine.*"*—Art. II. 15.

There is here no occasion for comment. The idle objection of the preacher is not worth answering.

The third objection will vanish, the moment the preacher shall learn to distinguish between *conception* and *parturition*. The illustration is brought to enable us to conceive the possibility of the birth of our Lord without damage to the virginity of his mother, not to teach the silly heresy the sagacious Doctor deduces from it. The passage we have just quoted proves that the Church teaches the humanity no less than the divinity of our Saviour, as might well be inferred from the fact, that we

---

* "But of all those things which are made use of as similitudes to show the manner and way of his eternal generation, that seems to come nearest the matter which is taken from the thought of our mind; wherefore St. John calls the Son his Word. For, as our mind, in some manner understanding itself, forms an image of itself, which theologians call Word, so God, (as far as human things may be compared with Divine,) understanding himself, generates his eternal Word; nevertheless it is better to contemplate what faith proposes, and with a sincere heart to believe and confess that Jesus Christ is true God and true man, begotten, indeed, as God, of the Father, before all ages and generations, but, as man, born in time, of his mother, the Virgin Mary."

call the blessed Virgin the mother of God, and as such delight to honor her.

If the Doctor has any doubts as to the soundness of our faith in the respects in which he seeks to impugn it, we refer him to the Athanasian creed, which he knows is authoritative for all Catholics, and which, with due deference to him, we must believe is express, not only against Arians, as he alleges, but against all who impugn the doctrine of the Trinity, or that of the Incarnation. Did he ever read it? Has he ever found a Socinian, a Unitarian, or a Sabelian that could subscribe to it? Nay, what standard has he himself for the doctrine of the Trinity, but the Nicene and Athanasian creeds? And what evidence can he give that even he himself holds the true doctrine of the Trinity, but the fact, that he holds it as the Catholic Church has defined, and still defines it?

The next objection the preacher makes to the Catholic Church is to her "rule of faith,"—that is, he objects that she does not adopt the Protestant rule of faith. The Protestant rule of faith is "the Bible alone." We deny it. The Bible alone is not, and never can be, the Protestant's rule of faith. The pretensions of Protestants in this respect are arrant nonsense or rank hypocrisy, with which they humbug themselves, or seek to humbug others. Where in the Bible alone does this Presbyterian Doctor find his doctrine of infant baptism? his obligation or his right to keep the first day of the week, instead of the seventh, as the Sabbath day? nay, his doctrine of the Trinity itself? Separate the Bible from the commentary on it furnished by the belief and practice of the Church in all ages, leave merely the naked text, with grammar and lexicon, and there is not a man living who can maintain any consistent system of doctrines from it without doing violence to its letter and its spirit. It would be a book of riddles, and no one could make any thing out of it, except here and there a portion of it. If Protestants take the Bible alone, why do they differ so among themselves? why have they so many commentators? and why is it that those born and brought up Presbyterians, as a general rule, find the Bible teaching Presbyterianism, and those brought up Unitarians find it teaching Unitarianism? Every sect has its traditions, and by these it, consciously or unconsciously, interprets the Bible. It cannot avoid doing so, even if it would.

But what authority has the Protestant for asserting that the Bible alone is the rule of faith? He must establish his rule, and from the Bible itself, or he has no right to assume it. This he has never yet done, and this he never can do; for the Bible nowhere professes to be the rule of faith. It commands us to hear the Church, and assumes throughout that the Church is the ultimate authority in controversies concerning faith. Moreover, the Bible alone is not, and cannot be the rule of faith. A rule

of faith is that by which controversies concerning faith may be decided. But the Bible alone cannot decide controversies; for it is, in itself considered, a dead letter, and cannot speak till made to speak by some living authority, and because nearly all the controversies which arise are controversies concerning what is the faith as contained in it.

Our Presbyterian friend is quite indignant that the Church receives as canonical, certain books which he is pleased to term apocryphal. Will he tell us on what authority he denies the canonicity of these books? Is not, even humanly speaking, the authority of the Council of Trent equal to any authority he can bring against it? We do not recollect any Protestant synod that has ever assembled, more respectable for their numbers, their learning, their ability, or their piety, than were the fathers of the Council of Trent. These decided, as the Church had previously decided and held, that the books in question were canonical; and the preacher must bring us an authority higher than theirs for saying they are not, before we shall be convinced they are not rightfully included in the sacred canon. He admits that the Presbyterian Church is fallible, and he can say no more of the Catholic Church. If his Church is fallible, it may err as to the canon, as well as respecting other matters. Her authority, then, can never be a sufficient motive for setting aside the authority of the Catholic Church. How will he, then, prove to us, that in this very matter he himself is not the party in error?

The Church, it seems, errs not only in her rule of faith, but in her faith itself, especially in her doctrine of justification. She teaches concerning justification, a doctrine which is different from the Protestant doctrine. Admitted. What then? Why, then, she is wrong. We beg your pardon. Before you can say we are wrong, because we differ from you, you must prove that you are right; for, till then, it may be that you are wrong because you differ from us. But "the doctrine of justification by faith has ever been the peculiarly cherished doctrine of Protestants."—p. 8. Granted. But Protestants are fallible, and may have cherished with peculiar affection a falsehood. But "Luther pronounced it the doctrine by which the church stands or falls."—*ib.* But Luther also said that all who entertain the views of the Eucharist, taught by the Sacramentarians, which views the author of the sermon before us entertains, when they die, go straight to hell. Was Luther right in this? No? Then Luther was fallible. Then he may have erred in this doctrine of justification. Then how do you know he did not? By what criterion do you determine when Luther taught truth, and when falsehood? From the Bible? But Luther had the Bible as well as you; and how know you that you understand the Bible better than he did? We also have the Bible, and we say the Bible is against you

both; and how will you determine that your interpretations of Bible doctrine are better than ours? Do you say our church is fallible? We deny it; but admit it, and even then it is as good as yours, for yours is not infallible.

But this is not all. Luther's doctrine of justification by faith alone is rejected by many Protestants themselves. Swedenborg sends Luther to hell for teaching it; the Unitarians, Universalists, Quakers, some Anglicians, the Genevans, the majority of the French Protestants, and a great part of the German Protestants, virtually, if not avowedly, reject it. It is hardly true to say of any Protestant sect, at the present day, that it really holds it as it was taught by Luther and his brother innovators. Dr. Potts ought in justice to convert his Protestant brethren to this doctrine, before making it a ground of accusation against the Church that she does not teach it. If she were to accept it, she would gain nothing, for she would still be arraigned by Protestants, who, with Bible in hand, would undertake to convict her of accepting a false doctrine.

Moreover, the doctrine in question is a very bad doctrine. As originally set forth, by the Reformers, it is, Believe firmly that God remits your sins for Christ's sake, and you are justified, without any respect to a moral change which may be effected in you. The justified man, morally considered, or considered in relation to his actual intrinsic character, is just as much of a sinner as he was before justification. The only difference between the justified and the unjustified is, that the sins of the former are not imputed, while the sins of the latter are. Thus you may sin as much as you please, but so long as you believe firmly that God remits your sins for Christ's sake, not one of the sins you commit will be imputed to you, or reckoned as sin. This was Luther's doctrine, and hence, when a young man asks him his advice as to the best manner of resisting the temptations of the devil, tells him to drink, get drunk, to sin lustily, and spite the Devil. But to justify signifies to make just, and no man destitute of justice is justified. The error of the Protestants is in placing justification in the simple remission of sin. Sin may be remitted, and yet the man want justice. Consequently the remission is not alone justification. God is a God of truth, and can call no man just who is not just. But we will let another speak for us in this matter:

"'Justification' is that action or operation of Divine Grace on the soul by which a man passes from a state of sin; from an enemy becomes a friend of God, agreeable in the Divine sight, and an heir to eternal life. This act of transition from the one state to the other, with its operating causes, is called 'justification.' From the circumstance of its being a spiritual and interior operation, it is evident that it affords an opportunity for theological subtleties to those who would make use of

it; and at the same time, renders it difficult to expose the error which those subtleties may be employed to foster. The Church, therefore, has always preserved her ancient and orthodox teaching under the form of sound words, which heresy has ever betrayed itself by refusing to adopt.

"Thus, in both communions, justification is acknowledged to be, as to its efficient source, from, and through and by Jesus Christ alone. But in the Catholic system, this justification, occurring in the modes of the Saviour's appointment, is not only the imputation, but also the interior application of the justice of Christ, by which guilt is destroyed, pardon bestowed, and the soul replenished by the inherent grace and charity of the Holy Spirit.

"According to the Protestant principle, justification is when a man believes with a firm and certain faith, or conviction in his own mind, that the justice of Christ is 'imputed' to him. This is that 'faith alone' by which they profess to be saved. The sacraments, for them, have no other end or efficacy, except as signs to awaken this individual and personal faith, so called, and as tokens of communion. Neither is it that any intrinsic or interior operation takes place in the soul by this, in which she is changed, by a transition from the state of sin, now remitted and destroyed, to a state of justice wrought for her, and in her, by the application of the merits and infusion of the grace of Christ. No; this is the Catholic doctrine. But, according to the Protestant principle no such change takes place. According to that principle, the impious man is not made just, even by the adoption of God, or the merits of Christ. But, leaving him in his injustice, it is conceived that his sins are no longer imputed to him, but that the justice of Christ *is* imputed to him. Thus, a criminal is under guilt and condemnation; but, in consideration of a powerful and innocent intercessor, the chief magistrate pardons him. It is only by a certain fiction of thought and language that such a person can be considered innocent; or that his intrinsic guilt can be conceived of as still existing, but as imputed to the one who interceded for him, and the justice of that intercessor imputed to him. Such is the exact likeness of justification, as taught in the theology of Protestantism. But it is to be observed that the sphere which is assigned as the seat of this species of fiction is the mind of God himself! The sinner is not intrinsically or really justified in this system; but we are told that God, on account of the merits of Christ, is pleased to regard and 'repute' him as such; that is, God 'reputes' him to be what, in reality, he knows him not to be!

"St. Paul, in his Epistle to the Romans, speaks of the faith of Abraham as having been reputed to him unto justice. And Luther, to meet the exigencies of his case, seized on the letter of this passage, and distorted its spirit and meaning. God had made rich promises to Abraham and his posterity. The hope of this promise was in his son Isaac. And God, to try the faith of his servant, directed Abraham to immolate this, his only son, as a sacrifice to his name.

"Such an order, under such circumstances, was calculated to throw deep and impenetrable mystery over the previous promises treasured up in the mind of the patriarch. Nevertheless, he falters not in his confidence, but obeys without a moment's hesitation. He sinks all the apprehensions arising from the suggestions of flesh and blood, and, in the

simplicity of his confidence, prepares to execute what had been commanded. And it is only when his hand is uplifted to strike, that God manifests his acceptance of the will, which, however, embraced the work itself, that he is no longer permitted to execute.

"Such was the faith of Abraham. But it is evident that it embraced the works, and that, so far as obedience, will, intention, purpose, and even feelings were concerned, Abraham had already completed the sacrifice. Thus, the same Apostle writes, in the Epistle to the Hebrews, ii. 17, 'By faith, Abraham, when he was tried, *offered Isaac*, and he that had received the promises *offered up* his only begotten son.'

"As, however, the outward immolation was not actually or physically consummated, Luther was pleased to exclude it altogether from the faith of Abraham, contrary to the express words of St. Paul himself. The error of Luther has been incorporated, with but slight modifications, into the theology of all the other Protestant denominations. Hence the doctrine of salvation by 'faith alone.' By faith, to use their own phraseology, the sinner 'seizes' on the merits of Christ, —by believing firmly that they are 'imputed' to him. It is not that by this he is made just or innocent, but God is pleased to *declare*, to *suppose* to *repute*,—let us say it with reverence,—to *imagine* him as such. It is all God's work; he has not the smallest share in it; and thence the seductive boast of the system, that thus 'all the glory returns to God, and nothing to man.' Under the same plea, good works were decried as hindrances, rather than helps, in the matter of justification. It was supposed, indeed, that, by a necessary consequence, they would appear in the life of the believer, as the fruit and evidence of his faith. But even then they could be of no advantage to the soul. Neither could sin, except that of unbelief alone, defeat its salvation. To such a point of insanity did Luther carry his doctrine on this subject, that he declares, that, 'if adultery could be committed in faith, it would not be a sin.' 'Si in fide fieri posset adulterium, peccatum non esset.'—*Luth Disput.* t. 1. p. 523."*

This is sufficient, and far more to the purpose than anything we could ourselves say, and shows conclusively that Catholics "depend for salvation on the merits of Christ alone." These merits obtain for us not only the grace of forgiveness, but also the grace of justification, whereby our works are rendered meritorious. They are the source and ground of our merit, and without them we could merit nothing. Thus, in our act of Hope, we say, "O my God! relying on thy goodness and promises, I hope to obtain forgiveness for my sins, and life everlasting, through the merits of Jesus Christ, my only Lord and Redeemer."

The author of the sermon makes further quotations from the Council of Trent, which, he says, teach that "all true righteousness is at

---

* Rt. Rev. John Hughes, D. D., Bishop of New York. From the Introduction to "An Inquiry into the Merits of the Reformed Doctrine of 'Imputation,' as contrasted with those of 'Catholic Imputation.' By Vanbrugh Livingston. New York, 1843."

first imparted, then increased, and afterwards restored if lost," by the holy Sacraments. (p. 9.) Well, what then?

"These quotations are sufficient to show the groundwork of the Papal plan of salvation; *the Sacraments by their own power confer grace; thus the believer is regenerated by baptism, united to Christ by the Eucharist, is then able to keep the whole law, and deserves heaven for his good works.* A plan that is the very opposite of Christ's, as revealed in the word of God. And if salvation is only found by embracing Christ's plan, then the Papal system so far from teaching the essential truths of salvation, teaches a system that will inevitably destroy the soul. If the question is asked, Are there not true Christians in that Church? My answer is, I think so; but they are the children of God, not *because* of the teachings of that Church, but *notwithstanding* those teachings. They are those, who from the word of God, have gathered the system of Christ, and hold a plan of faith the opposite of that of Rome, whilst they still continue in her communion, instead of obeying God's command, 'Come out of her, my people.'"—p. 10.

"The Sacraments confer grace by their own power;" but what is their own power? Simply the power of God, who instituted them. He is himself the *causa efficiens* operating in the Sacrament. Is it contrary to Christianity to look upon God as conferring grace? "The believer is regenerated by Baptism." Very well. Is it contrary to Christianity to assert that the individual is regenerated by the Holy Ghost in the Sacrament of Baptism? If we assert that the water used in baptism, or the words pronounced by the administrator, regenerated, as efficient causes, the recipient, we should doubtless contradict the "plan of salvation." But we see no contradiction in saying that one is regenerated in baptism by the Holy Ghost operating in it. If any one should have called the burning bush that Moses saw, God, he would have been wrong, and yet he might have said God was in the bush. The Sacraments are instrumental causes of grace, but God is himself the efficient cause. "We merit heaven by our good works." Granted, if be understood good works wrought in us by grace, or by us through grace; otherwise, we deny it. The merit comes through the grace, which itself comes through the merits of Christ, and therefore it is only through the merits of Christ that we do or can merit heaven. The merit itself is of grace, not of nature. Nothing we are naturally able to do, does, or can merit eternal life. Our Saviour says, "Without me ye can do nothing." We do not merit the grace; that is freely bestowed in reward of the merits of Jesus Christ, and it is only through that grace working effectually in and through us that we are enabled to merit everlasting life.

Our liberal Presbyterian minister, we are gratified to perceive, thinks there may, after all, be some Christians in the Catholic Church,

We are much obliged to him, and shall be still more obliged to him when he proves that there can be good Christians out of the Catholic Church. He asks us to come out of her. Well, where shall we go, if we leave her? Into the Presbyterian communion, and offend by so doing the immense majority of the Protestant world? When all Protestants will agree as to what is the true Church of Christ, the true Christian faith, and "Gospel ordinances," we will consider the question of leaving the Church, but till then we cannot entertain it. We have had disputation and vexation enough for our short life, and we cannot consent to come out of the Church, unless we know where and to what we are to come. As matters now stand, we should, if we joined the Presbyterians, be assured by five hundred other sects, that we were wrong. And the Scriptures also say something about the dog returning to his vomit, and the sow to her wallowing in the mire. We have been a Presbyterian once.

The preacher (p. 11,) speaks of the "idolatrous services" of the Catholic Church. We answered this charge of idolatry in our last Review, and have no occasion to say anything in addition to what we then said. The charge is as silly as it is false. Yet one cannot but be grieved at the ignorance or the malice that makes it, and at the fatal effect it has in keeping the great mass of Protestants from the way of life.

After these charges, the preacher proceeds to sketch the history of the Jesuits, and to show what an intriguing and dangerous set of mortals they are. We have no room to follow him through this part of his discourse. He falls, of course, into almost as many errors as he makes assertions. But we must leave them for the present. In the meantime we cannot forbear expressing our full conviction that the Society of Jesus is under the special guidance of Almighty God, and that he will avenge himself on its persecutors. France warred against the Jesuits and expelled them; she had her reward;—Spain warred against the Jesuits and expelled them; she is now reaping her reward. We want no better proof of the sanctity and utility of the Order than the fact, that Protestants, infidels, and tyrants are everywhere opposed to it. It is remarkable now what dread the word *Jesuit* inspires. Who are the Jesuits? Simple priests vowed to poverty, devoted chiefly to educational and missionary labors, without power or influence, save what is in their faith, talents, learning, zeal, and sanctity. When such men inspire terror, the just may take courage, and thank God that we have them. The Order is unquestionably one of the most efficient instruments in the hands of God for recalling the erring, confirming the wavering, converting the unbe-

lieving, and of consolidating the empire of our Lord in the hearts and lives of men, and hence the hostility it everywhere has encountered and still encounters. Hence the nations rage and the people devise vain things against it; hence the wicked foam at the mouth and gnash their teeth, and kings and princes conspire against it. In vain. "Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me? It is hard for thee to kick against the pricks." The Lord knoweth how to defend his own. This Order is dear to him, and for the sake of its saints and martyrs he will protect it and crown it with new honors.

To hear people talk, one would think half the world were Jesuits. They swarm everywhere. One cannot turn over a leaf, but a Jesuit will start up. They are omnipresent. They are omnipotent. They are at the bottom of all movements,—of every intrigue, every outbreak. Nobody is safe. Yet the Order counts in all less than five thousand members dispersed on missions among infidels, or employed in the quiet and simple business of education. It is strange that such a small company of men should create so much terror and alarm. Alas, "conscience makes cowards of us all."

Dr. Potts tells us, "The children of the Ecclesiastical States are kept in ignorance."—p. 11. The population of the Ecclesiastical States is about two and a half millions. In these States there are seven universities; and in the city of Rome, with a population of a hundred and fifty thousand, there are for the children of the poorer and middle classes at least three hundred and eighty schools, the greater part of them supported by private munificence. To assert that the Church holds that "ignorance is the mother of devotion" (*ib.*) betrays more ignorance than malice. If it were so, we should have fewer Protestants in the world. The Church undoubtedly holds that there may be false learning, false philosophy, deceitful, vain, that puffs up, makes its possessors wise in their own conceit, indocile, and unwilling to bow in meekness and humility to the word of God; and such learning and philosophy she unquestionably does not encourage; for she holds and teaches what her invisible Spouse has said, that "Blessed are the poor in spirit, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven." But real knowledge, but true learning, that knowledge and learning which make "wise unto salvation," she does her best to impart and diffuse. Would that we could say as much of her calumniators.

For ourselves, we do not suffer ourselves to be humbugged by the cry about education. Give us the right sort of education, and the more of it the better; give us the wrong sort, and the less of it the better. Our people are a reading people; better that they could not read than that they should read the miserable trash the press is now

sending forth. We have lived long enough to learn that not every "whitened heap yonder" is to be taken for so much flour. Immense danger may lurk under specious names. We are, as we have always been, the friends of education, but not of bad education, or of an education which educates for earth instead of heaven, for the devil instead of God.

The author of the sermon thinks the aim of the Jesuits in this country is, by the education of youth, to counterwork Protestantism (p. 14.) What! is the Doctor afraid of education? Is Protestantism not proof against light? We thought it was the boast of its friends that it was born of the advanced intelligence of the human race, and had the capacity to expand and adapt itself to every change of the human intellect. A moment ago, the Doctor upbraided us with our love of ignorance, accused us of not educating our children; and now he is afraid, if we educate it will be all up with Protestantism. Really, it is a hard thing to please a Presbyterian Doctor of Divinity.

"They [the Jesuits] will involve this land in troubles and conflicts."—p. 15. The truth never yet was preached, but it produced troubles and conflicts. Our blessed Lord himself said, "Think not that I am come to send peace on earth." No doubt, if the Gospel is preached here truly, faithfully, boldly, by its earnest and devoted missionaries, the wicked will be offended, and the devil will do his best to stir up troubles and conflicts. But we would rather have war than peace with error, with sin, with the world, with the flesh, with the devil. If Dr. Potts would not, then all we have to say is, that he does not appear to agree with our Lord and his apostles.

But "they will gain an influence which they will turn to the ruin of liberty."—*ib.* But we thought one of the principal charges against the Jesuits was, that they were the enemies of crowned heads, and king-killers. If so, they must be ultra-republicans. In monarchical governments they are dreaded as enemies of the monarchy, in republics as the enemies of popular liberty! This is singular. We have before us the *Remonstrance for the Divine Right of Kings*, written by the English Solomon, the learned King Jamie, in which he labors to prove that the Catholic Church is at war with kingly government, and for that reason ought not to be tolerated. Our American Calvinists, men who began here by founding a theocracy, or rather a *minister-ocracy*, and made church-membership the condition of citizenship, are now terribly alarmed lest the Jesuits shall overthrow democracy and set up a king. When our Calvinistic brethren shall show that they have some regard for any other liberty than the liberty of gov-

erning, we will listen to their fears on this head. We are Americans as well as they, love our country as much, and have as much at stake as any one of them; for, in becoming a Catholic, we did not cease to be a man, a citizen, or a patriot; and we are as well convinced as we are that we are now writing, that the preservation and wholesome working of our democratic institutions depend on the general prevalence among our people of the Catholic religion. We say this not merely as the Catholic convert, but as the citizen who has not wholly neglected political and philosophical studies.

But it seems that "the character of the instruction imparted in our schools has nothing in it giving them a peculiar claim to popular favor, unless it be their prices."—p. 15. Perhaps the Doctor is not a competent judge. It is possible, also, that he is not acquainted with all the names the Order has produced since its restoration, for we could mention some of the names which are at least "above mediocrity." As educators, the French University seems to stand in awe of them. The Doctor would do well to become acquainted with their schools, before undertaking to discuss their merits. Perhaps, were he to do so, he would not hazard the assertion, that "a graduate of one of these universities is not qualified to enter the junior class at Princeton, Yale, or any of the more respectable Protestant colleges of our land." The regular course of studies in our Jesuits' colleges is as thorough, as extensive, and of as high an order, as that of the best Protestant colleges, and those who take the regular and full course will have, on graduating, no occasion to regard themselves as inferior to the graduates of Protestant universities. University education in this country, whether by Catholics or Protestants, is, however, we are willing to admit, far from being what it should be. The characteristic of our people is to "go ahead." We are impatient, averse to long, slow, and toilsome labor. What we cannot do quickly we will not do at all. We will not spend the time necessary to become thorough scholars; consequently the whole scholarship of the country, with a few individual exceptions, is limited and superficial. The Jesuits cannot at once overcome this. Their education becomes necessarily in some degree *Americanized*, and is, no doubt, less thorough than it is generally abroad, or than it will be here when their colleges have had time to become more thoroughly established and are more liberally supported.

But be this as it may, the Jesuits' colleges are admirably adapted to the present wants of the Catholic population. They suit us very well, and whether they suit Protestants or not is a matter of small moment. We ourselves have our sons in the colleges of the Jesuits,

and, in placing them there, we feel that we are discharging our duty as a father to them, and as a citizen to the country. We rest easy, for we feel they are where they will be trained up in the way they should go; where their faith and morals will be cared for, which with us is the great thing. It is more especially for the moral and religious training which our children will receive from the good fathers that we esteem these colleges. Science, literature, the most varied and profound scholastic attainments, are worse than useless, where coupled with heresy, infidelity, or impiety.

As to the female schools under the charge of the Ursulines, the Sisters of Charity, of the Visitation, the Sacred Heart &c., we want no better proof of their excellence than the simple fact, that Protestants, notwithstanding their prejudices against the religious orders, send, and are eager to send, their daughters to them, and feel that they are safe so long as under the more than maternal care of the good sisters. That it is not the price that induces Protestant parents to send their daughters to our schools is evident from the fact, that the project for a sort of female university, started by some good Protestant ladies, at Cincinnati, if we have not been misinformed, cannot be got under way for the want of scholars, notwithstanding the expense for the pupil is to be merely nominal. The institute has funds in abundance ladies who are pledged to instruct gratuitously, and nothing is wanting but scholars. Unhappily, these cannot be got for either love or money.

The disparaging terms in which Dr. Potts speaks of the instructions imparted by the sisters are natural enough from a Presbyterian minister, but may be refuted at any time by a few minutes' conversation with a young lady educated in one of our female academies. There is something in the very atmosphere of the Catholic schools that gives an inexpressible charm to the female character, which we have never found in a Protestant, not brought up in some degree under Catholic influence. There is a purity, a delicacy, a sweetness, a gentleness, a grace, a dignity, about a Catholic lady, that you shall look in vain for in a purely Protestant lady, however high-born or well-bred. It is only in the Catholic lady that woman appears in all her loveliness, worth, and glory. It is Catholicity that has wrought out woman's emancipation, elevated her from her former menial condition, rescued her from the harem of the voluptuary, and made her the companion, and not unfrequently more than the companion, of man. Every Catholic daughter has a model of excellence in the Blessed Virgin, and not in vain from earliest infancy is she taught to lisp *Ave Maria, gratia plena, Dominus tecum; benedicta tu in mulieribus;* for the Holy

Mother reigns grace and sweetness on all who devote themselves to her honor and implore her protection.

The association with those who honor the Blessed Virgin, see in her the model of every female grace and every female virtue, and whom she honors with her special protection, is not without its chastening and hallowing influence, and the loveliest and the noblest Protestant ladies we have ever known are those who have been educated in Catholic schools. The good sisters have nothing to fear from the aspersions of Dr. Potts. Their pupils will speak for them, and constitute their defence. Yet, if Protestants do not like our schools, all we have to say is, let them go and institute better ones,—if they can.

But enough. We have lingered too long upon this not very remarkable sermon; but as we have done little else than to make it the thread on which to string some observations, perhaps not wholly uncalled for, nor inappropriate to the time and country, we hope we shall be forgiven. The Church may be assailed, will be assailed; but we know it is founded on a rock, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. It is now firmly established in this country, and persecution will but cause it to thrive. Our countrymen may be grieved that it is so; but it is useless for them to kick against the decrees of Almighty God. They have had an open field and fair play for Protestantism. Here Protestantism has had free scope, has reigned without a rival, and proved what she could do, and that her best is evil; for the very good she boasts is not hers. A new day is dawning on this chosen land; a new chapter is about to open in our history,—and the Church to assume her rightful position and influence. Ours shall yet become consecrated ground, and here the kingdom of God's dear Son shall be established. Our hills and valleys shall yet echo to the convent bell. The cross shall be planted throughout the length and breadth of our land, and our happy sons and daughters shall drive away fear, shall drive away evil from our borders, with the echoes of their matin and vesper hymns. No matter who writes, who declaims, who intrigues, who is alarmed, or what leagues are formed, this is to be a Catholic country; and from Maine to Georgia, from the broad Atlantic to broader Pacific, the "clean Sacrifice" is to be offered daily for quick and dead.

# REPLY

TO

# BROWNSON'S REVIEW.

BY WM. S. POTTS, D. D.

---

Mr. Brownson, in his Quarterly Review of January, 1846, has written a long article, occupying twenty-six pages, reviewing the Sermon on the "Dangers of Jesuit Instruction." As he stands before the public endorsed by the Romish Church in this country—he says, "the Bishops and clergy have, we believe, very generally approved our labors"—and as his work is the most popular of their periodicals, we propose devoting a few numbers to his article.

In the commencement it may not be improper to return a compliment paid to the author of the Sermon, in the first few lines of the Review, by saying of Mr. Brownson we know *something* of him, though it is not much. Our first recollection of his name was in connexion with the Democratic Review. He was then a most violent and ultra partisan in the political ranks, remarkable for wild and visionary speculations, and regarded as very unsafe by his own party. The next phase of his Review that came under our obseravtion showed its author a convert to Transcendentalism, having all his ideas so sublimated that the every day sort of readers thought he wrote nonsense, and paragraphs from his pen were quoted and passed from one paper to another all over the land as extraordinary specimens of the *non*intelligible. The next phase of the Review—this soaring spirit had returned to earth and become a second "Defender of the Faith." Meek as a child he is found sitting at the feet of his ghostly superiors, "not relying," he says, "on our own private judgment, but receiving the truth in humility from those Almighty God has commissioned to teach us, and whom he has commanded us to obey." We have been informed, that he has been also a Fanny Wright man, and again a Unitarian; and he tells us in the article under consideration, to complete the cycle of his changes, that he "has been a Presbyterian once." This last assertion we are disposed to question, be-

cause, after an experience of some twenty years in the Presbyterian Church we have found it composed of a very different material; and because we think he does not distinguish between Congregationalists and Presbyterians. Our knowledge consequently of the Reviewer is not very favorable. There is a screw out somewhere whenever a mind is found veering about through the whole universe of opinions —holding notions to-day and pronouncing upon them with all the dogmatism of an oracle, which to-morrow he flatly contradicts, and as peremptorily asserts their opposites.

In the recent change that has taken place in this erratic genius there are two things that have occasioned surprise: *first*, that such a mind, rejoicing in its freedom as it shot off and coruscated through the heavens, should have been caged by his holiness and sunk into the mere tool of a set of priests, abjuring the right of exercising his own judgment; and, *second*, that the wily emissaries of Rome should have endorsed so uncertain an instrument. The only explanation we can find for the first difficulty is, that "extremes meet;" and, perhaps, it is well, when a man finds that he is incapable of managing his own mind, because of his utter want of ballast, that he has the wisdom to commit it to the management of others. Macaulay in one of his reviews, commends the policy of the Romish establishment for its facility in managing all kinds of minds and turning them to good account. He says, if in a Protestant Church a man becomes wild and fanatical, they admonish him to be quiet, if he refuses they throw him over the wall; but with the Romish Church it is different, her Ecclesiastics pat him on the shoulder, bid him cultivate his beard, put on him an old grey cloak, tie a rope round his waist and hang a huge wooden cross to it, and send him forth, like Peter the Hermit, to preach a crusade. Perhaps this may throw some light on our second difficulty, and the fiery zeal and eccentricities of this new made convert from amongst the Puritans are to be used for a similar employment.

The first difficulty the Reviewer finds in the Sermon is in ascertaining who are the Church officers to whom the oversight of the Church properly belongs, and who are consequently charged with the duty of seeing that parents perform their vows to bring up their children "in the nurture and admonition of the Lord." He says, "who are these Church officers? and, especially, who are to see to it that they rightly instruct, or do not misinstruct the Church? The Church officers instruct the Church; but who instructs and appoints the Church officers? The earth stands on the turtle, but what does the turtle stand on?"—p. 20.

Mr. Brownson is very young in theological studies, and is not yet master of the theory of his new friends. A single year is a very short time in which to expect to master the subtleties of the Papal system alone, and whatever may be the brilliancy of our Reviewer's mind, theology is not grasped by intuition. We presume there is no difference between Rome and us on the questions asked. We hold that the Holy Ghost appoints overseers in the Church and instructs them; if he denies this he cuts himself and his Church off from all Divine appointment, as well as denies the express language of Scripture. Does he mean to say we have no regularly appointed officers because we do not receive our appointment through the Bishops of Rome, and claim an advantage on this score? But the Pope is a Church officer, and if he goes back step by step through his broken and often interrupted chain of Popes to Peter himself, yet Peter himself was a Church officer, and the question arises still, who appointed Peter? Or will he stop with the infallibility of the Church itself? Then, to use his own Brahminical figure, according to him, the Earth stands on the turtle, and the turtle stands on itself?

If Mr. B. had not surrendered his right to think for himself into the hands of his priests, we would refer him to 1 Cor. xii. 28, where the Apostle Paul—held, we believe, to be good authority in the Papal Church, though he was not a Pope—says, "God hath set some in the Church, first, apostles; secondarily, prophets; thirdly, teachers; after that, miracles; then gifts of healings, helps, governments, diversities of tongues." This language of a gospel minister has been the doctrine of the *true* Church ever since—*God appoints Church officers*. To their brethren, similarly appointed, they are accountable for the instructions they give; and these again, are responsible for their decisions to Jesus Christ, the *alone* head of the Church. With us, the earth stands on the turtle, and the turtle stands on the Rock of Ages. If the Reviewer can show a more direct, certain and Scriptural mode of appointment we will be glad to hear; we are open to conviction, not having relinquished the right to exercise "our own private judgment."

---

*Protestant Parents are bound not to intrust their Children to Roman Catholic Instructors.*

Mr. Brownson agrees perfectly with the author of the Sermon on the "Dangers of Jesuit Instruction," as to the importance of the precept of the text, and also in its explanation, thereby differing very

widely from a certain Mr. Davis, of the Alton Telegraph, who thinks that religion has nothing to do with education. The Reviewer says: "The parent who brings his child to the Sacrament of Baptism, incurs a solemn obligation to do all in his power to bring him up in a truly Christian manner; and if he do not, and the child through that neglect be lost, terrible will be the account he will one day be called upon to settle with his Maker and his Judge."—p. 20. We heartily concur in this sentiment, and recommend it to the careful consideration of every Protestant parent.

All that is said in the Sermon concerning the danger of intrusting children to instructors whose characters, morals, or religious sentiments are bad or erroneous, even though those sentiments should not be directly taught, Mr. B. also approves; and further, he concurs in the opinion of the author, that persons seeking this important trust should be subjected to the most rigid scrutiny. He says: "We should find it extremely difficult to bring ourselves to intrust the education of our children to instructors we held to be unsound in the faith. There is no torture we would not endure sooner than trust them to the care of Presbyterian teachers, even in matters but remotely connected with faith and morals."—p. 21. Here then is an open acquittal, by a regularly endorsed organ of the Roman priesthood, of the very crime with which the Bishop's News Letter of this city has charged the author of the Sermon, and which the Alton mouth-piece of the Jesuits has reiterated, viz: having given publicity to his sentiments on these subjects from bigotry and a disposition to persecute the papists. For the Reviewer plainly shows, that were he in charge of a congregation, he would feel the duty imperative to warn the people of his charge against intrusting their children to persons esteemed by him "unsound in the faith." The sentiments of the Reviewer too, be it remembered, are warmly endorsed by the News Letter, which thinks the Review a most masterly production, and co-operates in its re-publication in this city. Then, it seems, our worthy Romish prelate thinks it very wicked, bigoted and persecuting for a Presbyterian minister to do what, the circumstances being reversed, would be a most righteous action in a Romish priest. Very good logic, and very like the past history of Rome.

But Mr. Brownson finds great fault with the inference drawn from these admitted principles: that because parents are bound to bring up their children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord, therefore they are bound not to intrust them to Catholic instructors. But why? If the author has shown that Catholic instructors are not sound in the faith, does not his conclusion inevitably follow? But Mr. B. says:

"None but Catholic instructors do, or can, impart a truly Christian education." But that is Mr. Brownson's opinion merely, worth as much as many an opinion given concerning Unitarianism, Fanny Wrightism, and all the other *isms* on which he has formerly pronounced. He had better have waited until he got through the examination of that part of the Sermon which inquires into their faith. But the object of this unexpected leap to a conclusion was to get an opportunity of having a thrust at the decision of the last General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, that baptism by a popish priest is not valid. A very annoying decision, no doubt, to Mr. B.'s mind, now that he was just coming to the conclusion that he had found rest in the true Church after his weary journeyings from sect to sect. He says: "In a recent act of their General Assembly, asserting the invalidity of Catholic baptism, they (the Presbyterians) have *unchristened* themselves." Mark his reasoning: "Men are made Christians in the Sacrament of Baptism. The Presbyterians have no baptism but that which they derived from the Catholic Church, and their title to the Christian name rests on the validity of that baptism. They have declared that baptism invalid. Consequently, according to their own declaration, they have always been, and are, a set of unbaptised—*Presbyterians*, and therefore completely out of the pale of Christendom."—p. 21. The Pope should send him the golden rose, or a leather medal for his reasoning—such a man can prove anything, especially if you allow him to assume his premises. That men are made Christians, in the sense of the Sermon, in the Sacrament of Baptism, is a perfectly new idea to Protestants. We, poor silly people, thought men were made Christians by the "renewing of the Holy Ghost;" and that was the opinion of *one Paul*, whose writings we have before adverted to, as of supposed authority in the Romish Church. The second proposition of his argument is just as faulty. Presbyterians derive their baptism from the command of God, and never dream of the necessity of requiring the administrator to trace back his authority to Papal or Pagan Rome. Neither does Mr. B.'s own Church require any such thing in the administrator. In the exercise of her infallibility, she has decided that a Jew, Turk or Infidel may properly administer baptism, provided he means to do what the Church does in the administration of that rite. The Reviewer had better take care, or else he will get into trouble with his superiors to whom he has promised to surrender his private judgment. We again assert, that from the principles laid down in the Sermon and admitted fully by the Reviewer, the conclusion follows irresistibly, that if the Church of Rome is unsound in the faith,

Christian parents are solemnly bound not to intrust their children to Roman Catholic instructors. In other words, all Protestant Christians are so bound, for the very name *Protestant* shows that they protest against Rome for this very unsoundness.

Mr. Brownson takes exception to what is said in the Sermon about individuals and ecclesiastical orders in the Romish Church, soliciting Protestants to intrust their children to them. He says:

"We are sure that Catholics do not solicit Protestants to intrust them with the education of their children. We establish schools for our own children, that we may discharge the duty the preacher is laboring to enforce; and it can be no sin in us to request Catholic parents to send their children to Catholic schools. We no not request Protestants to send their children to our schools; we are not particularly desirous of receiving them, and some of our colleges will not receive them at all. It is a favor we confer on Protestants, when we admit their sons and daughters into our schools, for which they should thank us, both for their own sake and their children's sake, not abuse us."—p. 22.*

So—we have been under a mistake. The Jesuits, an order established to "counterwork the reformation" by educating the youth, are not particularly desirous of receiving Protestant children into their

---

* We are aware, that in every prospectus for a female school, they are careful to publish to the world, that they do not interfere with the religious principles of their pupils. But whatever may be the truth or falsehood of such pledges, we know from their own publications what is the main design of these institutions. What says Bishop Flaget, of Bardstown? "Still, had I treasures at my disposal, I would multiply colleges, and schools for girls and boys; I would consolidate all these establishments, by annexing to them lands or annual rents; I would build hospitals and public houses: in a word, I would compel all my Kentuckians to admire and love a religion so beneficent and generous, *and perhaps I should finish by converting them.* The directors of the association for the faith ought not to scruple sending abundant alms to bishops, whose wants plead more eloquently than their letters." What says the publication of the association? "Mgr. Flaget has established in his diocese many convents of nuns devoted to the education of young females. These establishments do wonderful good." Now, stop here, reader, and inquire in what way these establishments do wonderful good. By promoting general education, one would suppose. No—this is not even mentioned. But they do wonderful good *in this way:* "Catholics and Protestants are admitted indiscriminately. The latter, after having finished their education, return to the bosom of their families, full of esteem and veneration for their instructresses. They are ever ready to refute the calumnies, which the jealousy of heretics loves to spread against the religious communities; *and often, when they have no longer the opposition of their relations to fear, they embrace the Catholic religion.*" This is the way in which these institutions do good. Bishop Flaget expresses himself as greatly consoled by the fact, that "more than two hundred young women who have taken their vows in these institutions, (viz: the Lovers of Mary, the Sisters of Charity, and the Dominican Nuns,) are principally devoted to the education of persons of their own sex."

That the main design of Roman schools is to promote Popery, is manifest also from the following letter from the Bishop of St. Louis to the Leopold Society: "On coming to this land we felt sensibly the want of proper schools, *for furthering the propagation of our holy religion.* At present, a college is connected with the Seminary of St. Mary, at the Barrens, &c. It may be objected, perhaps, that the establishment of these institutions is not connected with the progress of religion. But when we consider that thus not only is religion prevented from suffering important injury; but also furnished with numerous and important advantages, we shall be convinced, that we are indeed laboring, for the growth of the faith, when we call into life such institutions. I will only say, that our universities, colleges, nunneries, hospitals, and orphan houses, *give Protestants the most favorable and exalted opinion of our religion,*" &c. Can we be mistaken when we assert, in view of these statements from Roman bishops, that the main design of Roman schools is, to promote Popery? They are not established by societies for the promotion of *education*, but by the society for the propagation of the *Faith*, and by the Leopold Foundation, a governmental society in Austria, headed by the Emperor, for the same purpose. Unless, therefore, we are willing to contribute to the extension of the impious and destructive errors of Popery; we cannot patronize such institutions. So far as we do so, we contribute to the establishment of a system of religion, whose fundamental principles are at war with our free institutions, and destructive to the best interests of society.—*Nunneries Exposed, by N. L. Rice, D. D.*

schools, but only admit them occasionally as a special favor! We regret that the colleges were not named that refuse utterly this favor to Protestant children. It must have been because Mr. B. thought this, their policy, was so notorious as to render specifications unnecessary. And yet, such is the ignorance of the Protestant and Roman Catholic population on this side of the mountains, that we suspect this intelligence will take them all by surprise. We have colleges established in our own State in places where all the Roman Catholic children in the county could not furnish a respectable common school. Preparations are in progress, as we learn, in other places, for similar erections, where there is scarce a Roman family within several miles. Still we are told these schools are to supply the wants of "our own children." We have been very ignorant—very.

Mr. Brownson agrees with the author of the Sermon that these institutions are designed to furnish education at reduced prices. We merely call the attention of the Alton Telegraph to this fact, in passing, seeing a considerable part of the Review from that quarter consisted in a labored argument to show that Roman Catholic schools were more expensive than Protestant. These two gentlemen of the "short robe" had better have an understanding. Mr. B. says: "Our instructors are for the most part vowed to poverty, and devoted to the work of education, not for the love of money but for the love of God. Education is with them a religious vocation." Therefore he infers they are able "to compete more than successfully, wherever established, with Protestant schools."—p. 22.* Thus it has happened that the love of getting things cheap, has induced many a Protestant parent to break his vows to God, and be instrumental in the destruction of the soul of his child.

---

* Nunneries in our country are grand *speculating establishments*. The clergy erect splendid buildings, adapted to accommodate from one hundred to two hundred boarders; they place a parcel of Nuns in them—some of whom are to be employed as teachers, while others can do the coarser work. Some can figure in the school room and in the parlor—others in the kitchen and corn-field. Thus prepared, they invite parents to commit to them the education of their daughters. Their establishments are filled with multitudes of boarders; and thousands of dollars annually flow into them. Suppose we take Nazareth, near Bardstown, as an example. This institution is located on a large farm. Perhaps there are generally in the establishment from thirty to fifty Nuns, to perform the necessary labors. The institution has had about one hundred boarders. Suppose their board and tuition to average one hundred and fifty dollars per annum—and this is certainly a moderate estimate—their annual income will be fifteen thousand dollars. What becomes of all this money? Do the Nuns receive a just reward for their labors? No—their vow binds them to *poverty*. It goes into the coffers of the clergy. Other literary institutions in our country do nothing more than support themselves; but these Nunnery academies enrich their owners. We hold it to be the duty of every philanthropist to throw the whole weight of his influence against establishments which by superstitious delusions deprive females of their liberty, and then by their hard labor enrich a parcel of pretended clergymen. Such institutions are in the strongest sense of the terms *anti-Republican* and *anti-Christian*. Their whole discipline is despotic. The Nunneries of Kentucky have been one of the chief sources of the immense wealth now possessed by the Roman clergy in this State.—*Nunneries Exposed, by Dr. Rice.*

*Can the Bible be understood without the explanation of the Church?*

We come now to the examination of that part of the Review in which Mr. Brownson attempts to defend the Romish faith from unsoundness. After all his quibbling, he finally agrees, "if Catholics do not hold the essential truths of the Christian religion, parents undoubtedly cannot with a safe conscience commit their children to their care. So far," says the Reviewer, "we agree with Dr. Potts." But here a new point of difficulty is raised. He says: "It is undeniable that we cannot decide this question, unless we have some standard or criterion of orthodoxy. What is this criterion? By what standard does the zealous Doctor propose to try the Catholic faith? By the Bible? Well, by the Bible as he understands it, or as Catholics understand it?" Again: "But take the Bible itself; neither your understanding of it, nor mine,—but the Bible, the precious Bible, the word of God itself. With all my heart. But the Bible is nothing to us, unless we attach some meaning to it; and if we attach a false meaning to it, then what we take to be the Bible is not the Bible. We do not take the Bible, unless we take it in God's sense—in the sense intended by the Holy Ghost, who dictated it. How shall we ascertain this sense?"—p. 23. Again, further on: "Separate the Bible from the commentary on it furnished by the belief and practice of the Church in all ages, leave merely the naked text, with grammar and lexicon, and there is not a man living who can maintain any consistent system of doctrines from it without doing violence to its letter and its spirit. It would be a book of riddles, and no one could make anything out of it, except here and there a portion of it."—p. 32.

This string of puerile sophistry and blasphemy, of which there are pages in the Review to the same purpose, requires some special notice, because it is the old argument of Rome against the word of God, and which we find in almost every one of their books we open. It requires very little penetration for the reader to perceive that the doctrine here laid down is just as applicable to every other book that ever was written as to the Bible. And the consequence is, if Mr. Brownson's reasoning is correct, there is no book in the world that can be understood. Take for example Prescott's Conquest of Mexico. Mr. Prescott had a certain meaning which he designed to convey in every sentence he wrote. When we read the book we put a certain meaning upon his words, and when Mr. Brownson reads it he puts a certain meaning upon the words. Now, it is possible that in more places than one, an idea may have been expressed with some ambiguity, and we may not put the same construction upon

the words that Mr. B. puts on them, and neither of us the identical meaning of the author. Does any sensible man, from this imperfection incident to language, draw the conclusion, therefore the Conquest of Mexico is a book of riddles. Yet this is Mr. B.'s argument. Put it in Mr. Brownson's words: the Conquest of Mexico is nothing to us, unless we attach some meaning to it; and if we attach a false meaning to it, then what we take to be the Conquest of Mexico is not the Conquest of Mexico. We do not take the Conquest of Mexico, unless we take it in Mr. Prescott's sense—in the sense intended by him who dictated it.

But will Mr. B. say the Bible is a more difficult book, and hence no parallel can be instituted between it and the book named, or any other? If so, he will involve himself in still greater absurdity. The Holy Ghost, he says, dictated the Bible. Now, has God designed simply to mock mankind and their wants, by professing to give a revelation of his will, when in truth he meant to give them a book of incomprehensible riddles? Dare any prelate of Rome say so—and thus charge God with a lie? Then, if God sincerely intended to do what he professed in giving the Bible, the question is simply, is the Holy Ghost less able to convey his meaning in words to the comprehension of men, than Mr. Prescott or Mr. anybody else?

But even were we to admit that the Bible is incapable of being understood, the remedy Rome proposes of helping it out of the difficulty is, on her own principle, unavailing. Did it never occur to these wiseacres, that if men, by putting their own meaning upon the words of the Bible, were liable to misunderstand it, the same thing would occur in putting their own meaning on the commentary of the Church appended to it? The commentary is nothing unless we attach some meaning to it; and if we attach a false meaning to it, then what we take to be the commentary of the Church is not the commentary of the Church. We are just where we started. Well, suppose the priest, or the Pope, the living teacher explains—the priest's words are nothing to us unless we attach some meaning to them; and if we attach a false meaning to them, then what we take to be the explanation of the priest or Pope is not the explanation. No better off yet. Nay, if the reasoning of Mr. Brownson and the Romish Church,—for he is not original here,—were true, it would follow, that the Creator has rendered it impossible for the human family to communicate with each other at all; the difficulty is not confined to written language, but teaches the impossibility of communicating ideas from one to the other at all. The Reviewer says: "The good Doctor is troubled with no questionings of this sort." True, *no Protestant* is

troubled with any questionings of this sort—simply because, his object being truth, he feels under no obligation to stultify himself or his readers.

Mr. Brownson finds great fault with the Sermon that it should have spoken so irreverently of "the worship of the Virgin Mary, and of saints and relics; the doctrines of purgatory, penance, and auricular confession; of transubstantiation, and the adoration of the bread;" and with a peculiar elongation of face, he says, "we shrink from calling the devotion Catholics pay to the blessed Virgin and the saints by so harsh a word as 'trumpery.'" We wonder that this same instinctive reverence for holy things had not made him shrink from calling the "Book of God" "a book of riddles, that no one could make anything out of, except here and there a portion of it." To join with the infidel in slandering the Word of God awakens no compunctions in the conscience of this Romish devotee, but the moment the ashes of the meek St. Hildebrand, the godly St. Ignatius, or the bigoted persecutor St. Michael Ghisleri, (Pius V.) is spoken of, all his tenderness comes forth, and he is grievously pained at any want of reverence! But we can answer his question, "What is the authority for saying this or that is trumpery?" without going back with him into the foolish mist that the Church of Rome tries to get up about "what is the true sense of the Bible?" There is never any question about the true sense of a book upon a subject that it never mentions at all. Nobody ever started the question what is the true sense of Herodotus on the subject of steam boats, or of Strabo on the British claim to Oregon. Now, the worship of dead men and women, purgatory, penance, confession to a priest, transubstantiation, and the adoration of a piece of bread, are subjects never alluded to in the Bible or discussed at all, any more than the power of steam is discussed by Herodotus. Rome does not pretend to prove these parts of her faith from scripture, but from her traditions. Hence the sense of the Bible has nothing to do with the question. The authority for saying these things are "trumpery" is, that being no part of the revelation God has given, they must be the inventions of men; and reason teaches that inventions of men which contravene the commands of God are *trumpery* and worse.

---

*Worship of the Virgin Mary and of Saints.*

Mr. Brownson has given us a labored argument, occupying several pages, to justify the worship of images, relics, &c., but to very little purpose. This running directly against a positive precept of the deca-

logue, and still holding the Bible to be the Word of God, is a very difficult matter. The Reviewer says, "Dr. Potts knows perfectly well that Catholics pay *supreme* worship to God alone, and that they are strictly forbidden by their religion to give that to a creature which is due only to God."—p. 25. We do not know where, in the Word of God, the Church of Rome gets the authority to divide worship into "*supreme*" and *secondary*, or a worship less than supreme. The command is express: "Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image, or any likeness of any thing that is in heaven above, or in the earth beneath, or that is in the water under the earth: thou shalt not bow down thyself to them nor serve them." It is remarkable for its particularity, as though designed especially to meet every attempt at evasion. It forbids the making of any likeness of God, of Christ, of the Virgin, of saints, of the cross. It forbids every one bowing down to them. Nothing is said about worship, supreme or secondary,—which is a figment of Romish contriving—but, "thou shalt not bow down thyself to them." Now, suppose a man makes an image of the Virgin Mary, and prostrating himself before it says:

"Remember, O most pious Virgin Mary, that no one ever had recourse to thy protection, implored thy help, or sought thy mediation without obtaining relief. Confiding then on thy goodness and mercy, I cast myself at thy sacred feet, and do most humbly supplicate thee, O Mother of the eternal word, to adopt me as thy child, and take upon thyself the care of my salvation. O let it not be said, my dearest mother, that I have perished where no one ever found but grace and salvation."—*Prayer of St. Bernard.*

Will any man possessed of common sense suppose that in this act the second commandment of the decalogue, recited above, has not been violated? This prayer, which is especially recommended to the young in the prayer book, by a *Nota bene* appended to it, ascribes almighty protection, unfailing help, all prevalent mediation, grace and salvation to the Virgin Mary. What more can the sinner, contemplating his salvation, ascribe to God? Yet Mr. Brownson has the effrontery to say, Romanists "are strictly forbidden by their religion to give that to a creature which is due only to God." We are at no loss to see why Rome has labored so hard to show that the Bible is "a book of riddles" without the interpretation of her traditions. And no one can be at a loss to see the force of our Saviour's condemnation, Mat. xv. 6, "Thus have ye made the commandment of God of none effect by your tradition."

But here is Mr. Brownson's Scriptural authority for the worship of the Virgin: "We honor the blessed Virgin, we admit; for the angel Gabriel honored her, when he saluted her 'full of grace;' for God

himself honored her, when he chose to become her son, and to love and obey her as his mother; and we cannot believe it wrong for us to honor whom God and his angels honor;" and,—she, "by the Holy Ghost declared that henceforth all nations shall call her 'Blessed.'—St. Luke i. 48." pp. 25, 26. The reader may be sure that Scripture authorities are scarce when the whole idolatrous fabric of Rome rests on two expressions—"full of grace," and "blessed;" and poor as this support is, the first is untrue. The angel did not salute the Virgin "full of grace," but "*chaire, kecharitomene*"—*hail, favored one.* The Scriptures teach us that it is an honor for any one to be used by God as an instrument through whom he accomplishes his purposes in the world; thus he honors the minister of the Gospel and the humblest Christian, and it is in this sense that the angel calls her 'favored one,' and that she rejoices in the thought that after generations will call her 'blessed.' But to suppose that we are in duty bound to make images of, and bow down and pray to such instruments, even when God has used them for the purpose of working a miracle, is absurd, idolatrous, and contrary to every precept of God's word. God honored the rod of Aaron, the brazen serpent in the wilderness, and even Balaam's ass that reproved the "madness of the prophet," working miracles through them as well as through the Virgin; and Rome, to be consistent, should make images of them and honor them by bowing down and praying to them.

"Nor," says the Reviewer, "are we willing to regard it as 'trumpery' to honor the saints. We have always supposed that the saints have honor in heaven, that God himself loves and honors every saint; that to be loved and honored of God is included in the reward of sanctity."—p. 26. We have always supposed the same, but never thought that we were, therefore, at liberty to make images of any or all of the departed saints and bow down and pray to them—neither does Rome think so. Let an affectionate daughter in the Roman Church make an image of her departed mother, who died in all the odour of Romish sanctity, and pray to it, and make it her patron saint, and how soon will the priest accuse her of idolatry. She must pray to the saints in the Roman Calendar. *Rome* makes the shrines for her Diana, and no one must interfere, or place this, her craft, in jeopardy. Hence, the fact that God honors the saints in heaven, does not prove that the peculiar Romish honors are to be paid on earth to the saints, for it proves more than Rome admits—that all who have gone to heaven are to be worshipped.

But again: "May we," says the Reviewer, "request the suffrages of those we love, who are still in the flesh, and not the suffrages of those who are released from their bondage, and are now in the very

presence of God? Has the departed saint lost a portion of his faculties, or has his heart become callous to the wants of those for whom, when he was in the flesh, he would willingly die?"—p. 26. Here, it will be perceived, there is no attempt to find any Scriptural warrant for the worship of saints. There is no command—there is no example attempted to be drawn from the Word of God. And yet, if Rome's notion of the great advantage and efficacy of the prayers of the Virgin and of Martyrs is true, and was known to Paul, it is most singular that whilst he said to the Thessalonian and Hebrew Christians, "Brethren pray for us," he should never have said, "Oh Mary, Queen of Heaven, pray for us"—"Oh St. Stephen, first of martyrs, pray for us." And moreover, that neither he nor *Pope* Peter should ever have thought it worth while to throw out any intimation to the Churches they so earnestly exhorted, that prayers to the saints would be a great advantage to them. The silence of the Scriptures is utterly unaccountable on this subject, if the notion of Rome be true.

But, having no Scripture, Mr. B. relies for the support of his doctrine on reason. His argument is, if the prayers of the righteous avail whilst they are on earth, they must be equally as available, nay, more so, when in heaven. The object of prayer is entirely misconceived in this argument. To suppose that there is any merit to purchase, or efficiency to move the divine council in the prayers of the redeemed, either in this world or the next, is absurd; for it makes God's purposes unsettled, and Christ's mediation ineffectual. God has appointed the intercession of saints for others here, because of the effect on themselves: It keeps their minds on God; it keeps them sensible of their dependance; it keeps them anxious about the condition of others for whom they pray; it binds Christians and the members of the human family together; it makes them feel continually that they and their friends are indebted to Divine grace for everything. Hence God makes prayer the means through which he will communicate his blessings—he first gives them the spirit to pray, and then gives the blessing prayed for. But the condition of the saint in heaven is entirely different. He is free from sin, from all wandering of mind from God, his spiritual vision is rectified, faith is exchanged for sight, and prayer for praise. Angels "*rejoice*" *over returning sinners*, but contemplating the fullness and sufficiency of the atonement of Christ, and the efficacy of his intercession, there is no need for any prayers in that behalf from them. Hence, whilst reason teaches the propriety and great importance of the prayers of saints on earth, it equally teaches the absurdity of seeking their prayers in heaven.

But this is not all, nor the worst. Rome, in appointing the Virgin and Saints as mediators and intercessors between God and man, flies in

the very face of the Word of God, and denies the efficacy of Christ's mediation. St. Paul says, 1 Tim. ii. 5, "There is one God, and one Mediator between God and man, the man Christ Jesus." But we have already shown in the prayer of St. Bernard, quoted in this article, that "grace and salvation" are ascribed to the mediation of the Virgin. And from the "Commemoration of St. Gregory the Great," we quote the following: "O God, who hast bestowed the rewards of eternal blessedness on the soul of thy servant Gregory, grant mercifully that we, who are depressed with the weight of our sins, may *by his prayers* be delivered." Here, deliverance from sin is ascribed to the prayers of Gregory; and the whole Calendar is filled, for every day in the year, with these men-made mediators. O how awfully must the judgment of God fall upon the contrivers and upholders of a system that thus robs the blessed Saviour of his glory! "Come out of her, my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues."—Rev. xviii. 4.

The contrivance of Rome to justify her idolatry by appealing to the affection with which we regard a deceased or absent friend, and preserve with interest the portrait that reminds us of the lineaments of his countenance, and which Mr. B. brings to his aid, is very far fetched, and very insufficient for the purpose. The affection for kindred and friends belongs to a class of emotions totally different from the veneration we entertain for God, and holy angels, and "the just made perfect." They spring from different sources in the human mind, and their final causes are totally different; so that there is no analogy between the cases. The whole argument exhibits miserable logic and worse philosophy, and could never have been resorted to by Mr. B. but because of the difficulty with which he was pressed. It is very adroit also in this justification to ring the changes upon the ambiguous word "honor," because it is a term of sufficiently general import to embrace exercises towards all classes of persons—we honor God, and we honor our parents, and we honor a servant. But the word *dulia*, from the Greek *doulos*, a slave or servant, which the Roman Church has employed to designate the secondary worship she pays to saints and their images, is less equivocal in its meaning. It imports a worship or reverence exercised by an inferior to a superior class of beings—derived from that prostration of the slave before his lordly Eastern master, still common in that country. Now, where is the man or woman who would not feel degraded by extending the adoration "dulia" to any relative or friend. Who ever thinks of making an image of his departed mother, however beloved, and prostrating himself before it three times a day, and praying to it. Yet this is the *dulia* that Rome demands for her idol gods. We

preserve the portrait of a friend or relative that we may be reminded of his personal appearance and the expression of his countenance, as an aid to memory; or, that the curiosity of more remote descendants may be gratified with seeing what externally their ancestors were. But who pretends that the pictures or statues of the Christ, the Virgin, the Saints, bear any resemblance to their originals: there is no trace of resemblance amongst the pictures themselves; they are pure works of the painter's fancy; so that the design must be, and is different in these objects of adoration. They are, disguise it as Rome may to Protestants, the *Dii Minorum Gentium* of the Papal Roman Pantheon.

---

### *The Worship of Relics.*

Mr. Brownson tells us: "We do not worship 'relics.' We regard and honor them for what they represent, or the worth to which they are related. They are memorials we value and treasure up." Again, to show the inconsistency of Protestants, he says: "We may preserve with affectionate care the coat of Washington, or visit with reverential feeling the room where Voltaire penned his blasphemy, or the bed where he slept after having reviled the religion of God; but it is all 'trumpery,' if the pious Christian preserves the sacred tunic worn by the Lord when he tabernacled with men, or finds his devotion quickened on beholding it."—p. 27. The Reviewer assumes in this argument, that the feeling prompting the preserver of Romish relics, and that which would lead an American to preserve the coat of Washington or to visit the chateau of Voltaire is the same; for this is necessary to make his argument of any effect. Well, we have visited Ferney, in common with all strangers who go to Geneva, certainly with no "reverential feeling" but with the feeling of *curiosity*. With the same feeling we paid, some years since, the necessary amount of coin, and looked upon the three skulls in the Cathedral at Cologne, said to be those of the three kings or wise men. We were about as much edified by the one sight as the other. And had we as convenient an opportunity of looking upon the coat of Washington we would certainly embrace it, and have no doubt with as much edification as in either of the cases above specified. Moreover, it is certain that had we the bed-quilt of Voltaire, or the three skulls of Cologne, or the coat of Washington, we would put any or all of them in our cabinet of curiosities and call the attention of our friends to their virtues. Now, the question is, do we, in the opinion of Mr. Brownson and his friends, exercise the proper feelings for the bones of Cologne? So far from it, that we are aware there is not a devoted Papist, who, after reading these lines, will not be ready to

accuse us of blasphemy in speaking so lightly of the "three kings." And why? Because their bishops and priests have taught them, in conformity with the decree of the Council of Trent, "that the *holy bodies* of the 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." The same worship *dulia* is required to be paid the *bones* that is paid to saints. Then how disingenuous is the conduct of Mr. B. and of his priestly guides and confederates, in trying to impose upon the Protestant community, by teaching that the regard they have for the relics of the saints is similar to the feeling that leads a Protestant to preserve the coat of Washington, or procure a "cane, snuff-box or paper cutter made from the wood of 'Old Ironsides.'" If Mr. Brownson is ashamed of this stupid nonsense of worshipping dead men's bones and rusty nails and bits of wood, as he well way be, let him say so, and not try to justify himself by belying the testimony of his newly embraced Church.

The language of our Saviour to the woman of Samaria may, with perfect propriety, be addressed to the Roman Catholic worshippers of relics: "Ye worship ye know not what." It is certain that many cords of wood have been sold and worshipped by the devout as parts of the true cross; that tons of nails have been used in the same way for the veritable spikes with which his body was fastened to the wood; and ship loads of bones are now objects of veneration in the Churches of Europe, many of them not having even the merit of having belonged to human beings. We have the tunic of the Saviour, the thorns, the sponge, and all the minutiæ appertaining to the crucifixion. The country in which the crucifixion occurred was in the hands of the enemies of Christianity for centuries after Christ's suffering, and the most desolating war that ever passed over a country occurred about forty years after the event, changing everything save the everlasting hills round about Jerusalem. And yet, according to Roman traditions, all these minute articles connected with the crucifixion remain!

We have adverted to the relics of the three kings in the magnificent Cathedral of Cologne, and can as well use this case as an instance of this kind of idolatry as any other. For centuries these bones have been the principal attraction to the devout along the Rhine, and exist to this day an object of worship or curiosity according to the faith of the visitor. We give an extract from our note book, written at the time of our visit some four years since:

"The most remarkable of all the appurtenances of the Cathedral is the tomb of the three wise men that came to worship the infant Jesus. These relics were presented to Reinold, Archbishop of Cologne, by the Emperor Frederic Barbarossa, after the taking and pillage of Milan, in 1170. They are said to have been conveyed by Helen, mother of Constantine the Great, from Palestine to Constantinople; how they came from the latter place to Milan does not appear; however, here they are, and we need not trouble ourselves about their migration. The shrine containing these remains is behind the high altar, and is a chapel, constructed in the Ionic style. The guide first entered and lit up the lamps around the tomb, and then invited us in. The coffin occupies the centre of the tomb, and is divided into three compartments; one for each of the skeletons, which are supposed to lie side by side. A slide in the head of the coffin being raised exhibits the skulls, having gilt crowns decorated with pearls resting on their faces; they are said to have skeletons behind them, but of this we cannot testify. The skulls appear remarkably sound, and are of a reddish-brown color, looking as if they had been colored with something designed to preserve them. The name of each of the kings, it appears, has been ascertained, and they are here placed at their heads respectively, viz: CASPAR, MELCHIOR, BALTHASAR. The coffin is silver, elegantly wrought and gilt. The fine filagree work which ornaments it everywhere is gold, and the front, or head-piece of the coffin is said to be solid gold, weighing thirty-two pounds. The diamonds that once decorated it have disappeared, but the quantity of precious stones remaining, topas, rubies, amythists, sapphires, beryls, pearls, &c., &c., is immense, some of the topas larger than a hen's egg." Each unlocking of this tomb costs, if we rightly remember, about two dollars, and we are within bounds when we say, that hundreds of thousands have been realized by the owners of these remains of "the holy bodies" of the three kings.

Now, the great advantage Rome has in being the repository of traditions is distinctly seen in this case. Without this we should never have known that the wise men were kings; nor that they were saints, or believers in the gospel plan of salvation at all; we should never have known what were their names, and especially that they were Germans, as we now strongly suspect from the appellatives by which it seems they were known. Moreover, we should never have found out, that after they returned "into their own country," the East, they came back to Palestine and died, and were buried in some convenient place for the Empress Helen to find their bones and immediately recognize them, three hundred years after their burial,

The author of "Rome in the Nineteenth Century," says, "they show at Rome the heads of St. Peter and St. Paul, encased in silver busts set with jewels; a lock of the Virgin Mary's hair, a phial of her tears, and a piece of her green petticoat; a robe of Jesus Christ, sprinkled with his blood; some drops of his blood in a bottle, some of the water which flowed out of the wound in his side, some of the sponge, a large piece of the cross, all the nails used in the crucifixion, a piece of the stone of the sepulchre on which the angel sat, the identical porphyry pillar on which the cock perched when he crowed after Peter denied Christ, the rods of Moses and Aaron, and two pieces of the wood of the real ark of the Covenant!"

This is the arrant foolery that in this century of light and increasing knowledge Papal Rome is still playing off upon the world. "These are the memorials," says Mr. Brownson, "we value and treasure up." These are a part of the idolatrous system of that apostate Church. To these bones, this petticoat, this sponge and lock of hair, worship is offered, and from them miracles of healing expected. Some tell us these absurdities belong to a darker age, and Rome has since abandoned them. But we have a book written by the present Romish Bishop of this diocese, Peter Richard Kenrick, to prove that a certain old house, now to be found in or near the town of Recanati in La Marca Ancona, Italy, was carried by angels from Nazareth to Dalmatia and thence to its present scite! But to what end is this foolery practised? Well have the fathers of Trent said, "by them God bestows many benefits upon men;" for through these relics monks, and priests, and popes, have drawn millions from the pockets of their infatuated followers, to enrich themselves and carry out their schemes for enslaving the world. But every man of common sense and common honesty must feel indignant when an American, and a descendant of the Puritans—alas!—with these facts before him, attempts to hoodwink his own countrymen, by telling them the Church only pays to these relics the respect which you pay to a "snuff-box made from the wood of 'Old Ironsides.'"

---

*Worship of Bread.*

Mr. Brownson, in behalf of his Church, denies that Romanists adore the bread in the idolatrous service of the Mass. His words are, "the charge that Catholics adore 'the bread,' even Dr. Potts must be aware is not true,—not true, even if it were possible for us to be mistaken in the Catholic doctrine of transubstantiation. We do

not adore the bread, for we do not believe there is any bread there. What we adore is not what we see with our eyes, what we detect with any of our senses, but our blessed Lord himself, whom we believe to be, not *represented*, but *concealed* under the appearance of bread and wine."—p. 28.

It is to be remembered here by our readers, that Rome's quibble about degrees of worship, supreme and secondary, or *latria* and *dulia*, does not apply to this case. The Council of Trent, in chapter v. of the decree concerning "the most Holy Sacrament of the Eucharist," says, "There is, therefore, no room to doubt, that all the faithful in Christ are bound to venerate this most holy Sacrament, and to render thereto the worship of *latria*, which is due to the true God, (*latriæ cultum, qui vero Deo debetur*) according to the custom always observed in the Catholic Church." Here, then, the worshipper is required to offer to the bread the worship "which is due to the true God." We give also from the late Bishop England's work on "the Ceremonies of the Mass," what Mr. Brownson would call a beautiful extract:

"Catholics, knowing that the same victim who once offered himself in a bloody manner upon Calvary, *is now produced upon the holy altar*, and then in the hands of the priest offers himself to his Father on behalf of sinners, believe that it is a true, proper, and propitiatory sacrifice, and yet not a different one from that of the cross, for it is the same victim offered by the same great high priest. And the identity of the priest and of the victim constitutes the identity of the sacrifice. [We would have supposed that time and place had something to do with the identity of an act, as well as the priest and victim.] The difference consists of this, that on Calvary he was first immolated in blood, to take away the handwriting of sin and death that stood against us: upon the altar the immolated victim is *produced* under the sacramental appearance, and mystically slain by showing forth his death, in the apparent separation of his body from his blood; and the lamb thus placed as slain, is offered to beseech the application of his merits specially to those who make the oblation, or on whose behalf it is made."—p. 111. Here, then, the priest or "celebrant" has "*produced upon the altar*" the real Christ, and makes him the victim in a "true, proper and propitiatory sacrifice," every time Mass is celebrated. Because, though the sacrifice of Calvary took away "the handwriting of sin and death that stood against us," that sacrifice was good for nothing until the Roman priest had "*produced*" the body, soul and divinity of Christ, and offered it a second time "to beseech the application of its merits specially to those who make the oblation." True, Paul said, Heb. x. 14, "By *one offering*, he

(Christ) hath *perfected* forever them that are sanctified." But what of that? That only shows that Paul was no Romanist. And has not the Roman Church the right to believe the Bible means anything it pleases?—Has she not the right to say, that when the Bible says "one offering" it means two, or two hundred offerings? Away with your private interpretation—"the Bible is nothing to us, unless we attach some meaning to it; and if we attach a false meaning to it, then what we take to be the Bible is not the Bible." The Church has to tell us what the meaning is, and the Church says *one* means *two!*

But that we may be perfectly sure as to the kind of worship Rome requires to be paid to this piece of bread, let us see what is required by the Church in the communicant. In the "Instructions and Prayers before Communion" the communicant is required to repeat the following "*Act of Faith:* Is it possible, O my God, that I am about to receive thee! Is it possible that I am to receive that same body which was formed in the womb of the Blessed Virgin Mary, and born in a poor stable; which suffered so many insults, reproaches and blasphemies; which was cruelly scourged, covered with thorns, and condemned to the cruel death of the cross, through love for me! Yes, O my God, I firmly believe it, because thou hast said it: For it is impossible that thou shouldst deceive me. What other proof, O my soul, wouldst thou require of the real and actual presence of your Saviour in this adorable sacrament than his own infallible word, '*This is my body, this is my blood.*'—O Jesus, thou God of truth, *who hast the words of eternal life*, John ch. 6, behold I do openly confess and am inwardly convinced that it is thy real body, thy real blood, accompanied with thy soul and thy divinity, together with the eternal Father, and the Holy Ghost, who comes to reside in my heart through this most adorable sacrament I am about to receive." This goes still farther than the Council of Trent or Bishop England, for it here is asserted that the communicant receives the body, soul, and divinity of Christ, and the eternal Father and Holy Ghost besides. No wonder the heathen objected to this form of Christianity because its believers first worshipped their God and then ate him, for here the whole Trinity is received, not into the heart, for it would be difficult to get the substance of Christ's body and blood there, but into the stomach. Such, then, is the form of this idolatry and blasphemy combined, about which we have been the more particular, that our readers may have a distinct view at once of this most atrocious and barefaced attempt to impose on the common sense of mankind.

But Mr. Brownson attempts to avoid the charge of idolatry by saying, it is not the bread, "but the blessed Lord himself, whom we

believe to be, not *represented* but *concealed* under the appearance of bread and wine," that receives this highest kind of worship. That is, a man is no idolator if he worships that which to his senses appears to be a piece of bread, provided he believes the real Deity is concealed under that appearance. Then the same thing must be true, if the thing worshipped appears to his senses to be a piece of gold, or silver, or wood—for the appearance is nothing—provided he believes the real Deity is concealed under that appearance. This argument will justify all the idolatry that the world has ever known; for the heathen writers in the early ages of Christianity justified their worship with the very same pretext. Maximus Tyrius, a Platonic philosopher of the second century, says: "Images are only intended to help our memory, a kind of manuduction to the gods, but no more like to them than heaven is to the earth." And a few lines after, he says, "whether men worship God by the art of Phidias, as the Greeks do, or by the worship of living creatures, after the manner of the Egyptians, or by the worship of rivers, or of fire, as is practised by other nations, I condemn not the variety; let them only understand, love, and remember him whom they worship."—*Diss.* 38. The Emperor Julian, a zealous advocate for heathenism, as all know, says: "He who loves the king, takes pleasure in seeing the picture of the king; and he who loves his child, or his father, loves every representation of his child, or his father; in like manner he who loves the gods, loves every representation of the gods; and, beholding their images, secretly fears and reverences them." Again, he says, "The images of the gods were placed by our ancestors, as signs and symbols of their presence; not that we should believe them to be gods, but that we should worship the gods by giving worship to them."—*Julian Oper. pp.* 537, 539. The reader will perceive this is the very reasoning of Mr. Brownson in justification of the worship of images, of the Virgin, and of saints, and applies also directly to the case in hand. Neither were the philosophers of ancient Greece and Rome so stupid as to believe a piece of gold or stone could have life or give them any aid; but they believed that, after the consecration of the statue, the Divinity came into and was concealed under the appearance of the image, and it was this concealed Deity they worshipped. Such was the opinion of Cicero, of Symmachus, and of all the best of their writers. In like manner Mr. Brownson believes, that after the consecration of the bread the Deity comes into and is concealed under the appearance of bread, and it is this consecrated Deity he worships. If Maximus of Tyre and the Emperor Julian were idolators, so is Mr. Brownson and every communicant of the Romish Church.

Indeed, Mr. Brownson states the case still stronger than this, for he says it is not true "that Catholics adore 'the bread'"—"even if it were possible for us to be mistaken in the Catholic doctrine of transubstantiation." That is, if it is only bread and nothing else, and yet the worshipper means to worship the Deity, supposing he is concealed under the appearance of bread, there is no idolatry. Now, no one can doubt the sincerity of many a worshipper of the idols of Hindostan and Burmah, and that they really believe that the Deity resides in these consecrated images and rivers. Then, they are not idolators; or, according to Mr. Brownson's own showing, the communicants of the Church of Rome are just as much idolators as the Hindoos and Burmans of the present day.

When the Israelites directed Aaron to "make us gods which shall go before us; for as for this Moses, the man that brought us up out of the land of Egypt, we wot not what has become of him," they had no idea of having the golden calf in the place of the Jehovah, but something that should remind them of Jehovah in the place of Moses who had previously executed this office. This is evident from the fact that Aaron, when he had built an altar before the idol, "made proclamation, and said, To-morrow is a feast to Jehovah." Hence, it is plain, that the true God of Israel was worshipped under the appearance of the golden calf. Now, did the Lord accept this worship, or regard it as idolatry? Let the inspired narrative, Ex. xxxii., answer the question. And so certain as God rejected worship paid to him as concealed under the appearance of the gold Aaron fashioned, will he reject the worship Rome pays to him as concealed under the appearance of the bread her priests fashion. And as he consumed those that were called by his name in that day for their idolatry, he will consume this apostate Church of our day "by the brightness of his coming." Again, we say, in the language of that voice John heard from heaven, "Come out of her, my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues."

---

*Rome's Contradictions and Diversity of Faith.*

The infallibility of the Church of Rome is a fundamental point. If it is once admitted that she has changed or contradicted herself, her authority is gone. Hence we are not surprised that Mr. Brownson should be much offended that the author of the Sermon on the Dangers of Jesuit Instruction should have said, previous to the Coun-

cil of Trent "Councils had dealt very much in formularies, and they had defined and changed, affirmed and condemned in so many different ways, that it was no very unusual thing for that to be rank heresy in one section of the Church that was orthodox in another," &c. This is met by our Reviewer with the bold assertion, "The faith of the Church is always and everywhere the same; and never have individuals in one age or one country been authorized to hold what in another age or country has been accounted heretical."—p. 28. These statements are directly opposed to each other; now let us see, by a simple resort to facts, which is right.

1. The fourth General Council, held at Chalcedon, A. D. 451, in the twenty-eighth canon, grants to the see of Constantinople in general terms, and without restriction or limitation, all the rights, prerogatives, and privileges, that had ever been granted to, or enjoyed by, the see of Rome. Now, compare with this the decree of the seventeenth General Council, held at Florence in 1439: "We define that the holy apostolic see and the Roman pontiff have a *primacy over the whole world*, and that the Roman pontiff himself is the successor of St. Peter, the chief of the apostles, and true vicar of Christ, and that he is *head of the whole Church*, and the father and teacher of all Christians; and that to him in St. Peter was delegated by our Lord Jesus Christ full power to *feed, rule, and govern the universal Church;* as also is contained in the acts of General Councils, and in the holy canons." Here are two General Councils directly opposed; the faith of Chalcedon is heresy by the decision of Florence. Trent settled this point in favor of Florence, of course.

2. Gregory the Great, in an official letter addressed to the Patriarch of Constantinople in the year 594, at a time when the bishop of that city was distinguished all over the east by the title of universal bishop, says, that title is "vain, ambitious, profane, impious, execrable, anti-Christian, blasphemous, infernal, diabolical." "Whom do you imitate," says he, "in assuming that arrogant title? Whom but him, who, swelled with pride, exalted himself above so many legions of angels, his equals, that he might be subject to none, and all might be subject to him?" It is then the authoritative opinion of this Pope, that for any bishop to exalt himself above his brethren, and pretend all other bishops are subject to him, is to imitate the devil. Yet the Council of Florence, in the decree just quoted, decided that Pope Gregory was a heretic in this, and Trent confirmed the decree of Florence. That which was the very jewel of orthodoxy at Rome in Gregory's time, is rank heresy now.

3. Pope Leo I. in a circular addressed to all metropolitans, issued

in the year 458, requires that persons who have received their baptism at the hands of a heretic, should be confirmed by the invocation of the Holy Ghost, and the imposition of hands; that they may thereby receive the virtue and sanctification of baptism, having received nothing of that sacrament before, besides the *bare form*. Pope Nicholas, 866, in answer to inquiries of Bulgarians, decided that the validity of baptism did not depend upon the virtue of the minister, and that baptism administered by a Greek impostor, and by a Jew, must not be repeated, if they baptised in the name of the Trinity. Here, there are two Popes, both giving decisions in their official character for the government of the Church, directly opposed. One says, baptism by a heretic has nothing but the *bare form*, the other says it is *valid*. Now, Trent comes in to settle the faith, puts her curse on poor Leo, and tells Nicholas that he was wrong too, for there must be the "intention to do what the Church does." This is the canon of Trent on the subject: "Whosoever shall affirm that baptism, when administered by heretics, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, with the intention to do what the Church does, is not true baptism, let him be accursed." Jerome, one of the first of the Fathers in the opinion of Rome, looked upon it as a strange paradox, that a man should be made a Christian by one who was himself no Christian. But the Fathers of Trent have decided it is so, notwithstanding.

4. In the year 593, a difference arose between the sees of Constantinople and Rome, growing out of the trial at Constantinople of two presbyters, John, presbyter of the Church of Chalcedon, and Anastasius of Isauria. They were found guilty of heresy, and punished with great severity. The presbyters withdrew from Constantinople to Rome, where their cause was re-examined by Gregory the Great, and both were absolved. The cause of this discrepancy in the judgment of the two leading bishops of the Church is remarkable. The first Council of Ephesus was universally received by the Church, and the second universally condemned and rejected. But the Church of Constantinople received, as the first, that which the Roman Church rejected as the second; and the Roman Church received as the first, that which the other rejected as the second. In this both agreed, that the doctrine of the first was Catholic, and that of the second heretical. But as they did not agree which was the first, and which the second; nay, as what was the first with the one, was the second with the other, it thence necessarily followed, that what was sound doctrine with the one, was rank heresy with the other. Hence, the presbyter Anastasius was condemned at Constantinople as a heretic,

because he condemned the doctrine of their first Ephesine Council, and received that of their second; whereas he was, on that very score, absolved at Rome as a good Catholic. Such difficulties are peculiarly unfortunate where they occur in different branches of an infallible Church, and we suspect that our unfledged Romish Reviewer had never seen this piece of history, or he would not have pronounced so positively, "never have individuals in one age or one country been authorized to hold what in another age or country has been accounted heretical."

5. In 634, Pope Honorius addressed a letter to the Patriarch of Constantinople, in which he declared that he entirely agreed with Sergius, the leader of the Monothelites; and recapitulated the leading points of their doctrine, asserting that the contrary had never been taught by the Fathers. The Emperor Constantine Pogonatus assembled a General Council in 680, at Constantinople, to settle the orthodox faith. This Council was attended by one hundred and sixty-six bishops, three legates of the Pope and two deputies from his Council being present. In the seventeenth session they proposed, and in the eighteenth, held on the 16th Sept., 681, they approved and signed the definition or decree of the Council. In this decree they anathematized "the impious and execrable doctrine of one will in Christ, and one operation, with which the devil had attempted to poison the minds, and kill the souls of the faithful, employing for that purpose, as his organs, Theodorus of Paran, Sergius, Pyrrhus, Paul and Peter of Constantinople, *Honorius of old Rome*, Cyrus of Alexandria, and Macarius of Antioch." Here a Pope is anathematized by a General Council, and the doctrine delivered, *ex cathedra*, by him, declared to be impious and execrable, and he a tool of the devil used to poison the faithful!

6. The conflicting and opposite decisions of Romish Councils on the subject of image worship, constitutes another very remarkable chapter in the history of this infallible Church. The ancient Council of Elvira, which sat during the reign of Constantine, and therefore in the early part of the fourth century, strictly enjoined, that neither paintings nor images, representing the person whom we adore, should be introduced into Churches. In 754, the Emperor assembled a Council at the palace of Hiera, opposite Constantinople, to settle this question. Three hundred and thirty-eight bishops assembled. In the decree of faith they say, we, "adhering to the word of God, to the definitions of the six preceding Councils, to the doctrine of the approved fathers, and the practice of the Church in the earliest times, pronounce and declare, in the name of the Trinity, and with one

heart and mind, that no images are to be worshipped; that to worship them, or any other creature, is robbing God of the honor that is due to him alone, and relapsing into idolatry. Whoever, therefore, shall henceforth presume to worship images, to set them up in the Churches, or in private houses, or to conceal them, shall be degraded, if a bishop, a priest, or a deacon; and if a monk, or a layman, excommunicated and punished, as guilty of a breach of God's express command, and the imperial laws:" (that is, of the very severe laws issued by the Christian Emperors against the worshippers of idols.) The fourth canon anathematized all who should introduce new words, or new-coined distinctions (of absolute and relative worship, of supreme and inferior, of latria, dulia, and hyperdulia, &c.,) to elude or subvert the determinations of the present holy and œcumenical synod. Now, it was heresy to worship images.

In 787 the second Council of Nice was assembled, through the agency of the Empress Irene. This Council was first assembled at Constantinople, and its sessions were concluded there. Three hundred and sixty-seven bishops were present. In the seventh session, held on the 13th October, they came to the definition of faith; it was decreed that images, not only of Christ, but of the Virgin Mary, of the holy angels, and of all the martyrs and saints, should be set up in places of worship, on the highways, and in private houses; that they should be used on the sacred utensils, to put us in mind of those whom they represented; that they should be worshipped and adored, not with that adoration and worship that was due to God alone, but with an honorary worship; and, lastly, that all who disapproved or opposed such a worship as unlawful, should be deposed, if ecclesiastics or bishops, and excommunicated, if monks or laymen. Now, it became heresy to oppose image worship.

In 794 the Emperor Charlemagne assembled a Council, with the approbation of the Pope, at Frankfort on the Main. Three hundred bishops from France, Italy and Germany, and probably from England, assembled. Two bishops attended as legates of the Pope. In the second canon, they say: "The question concerning the new synod of the Greeks, that was held at Constantinople, about worshipping images, was then debated; in that Council it was written that they should be anathematized, who did not pay that service or adoration to the images of the saints which they paid to the divine Trinity; hereupon our most holy fathers, refusing by all means to pray to them, or pay them service, despised and unanimously condemned it." Now, again, it was heresy to worship images. The second Council of Nice, as it is now called, is here said to have been held in Constantinople, from

the circumstance before stated; it was commenced and closed in that city, though its deliberations were held at Nice, in Bithynia. Trent settled the matter of faith in favor of Idolatry; and it is held, at this day, to be heresy to oppose image worship.

We might multiply cases of similar contradictions, to almost any extent; for nothing can be more supremely ridiculous, to any one acquainted with the history of the Church of Rome, than her claims to infallibility, but the length of this article forbids further quotations. In the cases stated we have councils contradicting and anathematizing councils and Popes; Popes contradicting Popes; that which is heresy in one age made orthodoxy in another; and the same doctrine heretical or orthodox at the same time, according to the section of the church in which the holder of the opinion happened to be. When the great reformation commenced, and the decrees of the councils and the decisions of Popes were quoted against Rome, it became necessary for her to determine what her own faith was, and which of these councils she was to defend. The digest of doctrines turned out by the Council of Trent, though done at the expense of everything like consistency, saved her from impending ruin, by enabling her forces to see around what articles of faith they were to rally. And we may fairly retort on Mr. Brownson his own language,—for any one to say that the faith of Rome *was settled* before the Council of Trent closed its sessions, in 1564, "betrays either an ignorance or a recklessness which is by no means creditable to him who says so."

---

### *Rome's Explanation of the Trinity.*

Exception is taken, in the "Sermon on the Dangers of Jesuit Instruction," to Rome's explanation of the doctrine of the Trinity, as found in the Catechism of the Council of Trent, *first*, because it makes "a love of charity" the Holy Ghost; *second*, because it makes the Son of God a representation of an idea in the mind of God; and, *third*, because it denies the humanity of Christ. Mr. Brownson's defence of the Catechism, so far as he has attempted any, makes the matter still worse. It is in vain, in this case, that he resorts to the "unknown tongue," in which Rome delights so much, and lugs in the original Latin of the Catechism, seeing the sermon quotes from the authorized translation of Rome, which, being infallible, is surely as good as the original Latin. Neither does it avail, in this defence, to say: "If the Doctor has any

doubts as to the soundness of our faith, in these respects, in which he seeks to impugn it, we refer him to the Athanasian Creed, which he knows is authoritative for all Catholics."—p. 32. The Doctor also knows that the teachings of the Council of Trent are authoritative for all Catholics. Now, when the Council contradicts the Athanasian Creed, which are we to believe is the true doctrine of Rome? In a Church, whose teachings are infallible, it does not answer to say, if we fell into an error here, we are right in another place. The sermon expressly states: "It is true that in other places Rome, in her teaching, presents a more sound view of these doctrines, if we rightly understand her words; but when these teachings are coupled with the above authorized explanations, doubt, to say the least, is cast over the whole."—p. 7. The question is, how comes it that rank heresy is taught concerning the Trinity in the authorized standards of Rome?

The statement of the Fathers of Trent, to which the first exception is taken, is the following: "*A love of charity* in both, [the Father and the Son,] entirely the same and equal, *which is the Holy Ghost*, proceeding from the Father and the Son, connects the begetting and the begotten by an eternal and indissoluble bond." Mr. Brownson says: "The objection to the first extract is, that the Holy Ghost is said to be the 'love of charity'—*charitatis amor;* but why this is objectionable the preacher does not tell us, and we do not know. The Father loves the Son with an eternal and infinite love, and the Son loves the Father with an eternal and infinite love, and from their mutual love *proceeds* infinite and Eternal Love, which is the Holy Ghost." Again: "The Catechism merely terms the Holy Ghost, in plain English, Charity, or most perfect love, proceeding from the charity or most perfect love of the Father for the Son, and of the Son for the Father. This is the worst that can be made of it. But what is there objectionable in this?"—pp. 29, 30. We are not surprised that an ex-minister of the *Unitarian* Church should see nothing objectionable in this, whilst we are perfectly satisfied that every real Trinitarian will see in it a distinct denial of the personality, if not the very existence, of the Holy Ghost. Now, if Rome be as orthodox on this doctrine as is stated, it is her first duty to repudiate the heresy found in her Catechism; and her second, to make her champion recant, or throw him over the wall to his former friends, the Unitarians. This we can safely promise, that if teachings similar to the above can be found in the writings or preaching of any one in our branch of the Church, upon his being pointed out, he shall be arraigned before his peers, and, if found guilty, excommunicated, as denying essential truth.

The second exception to the explanations of the Catechism, Mr. Brownson meets by saying, the extract is not fairly made, because "the Catechism of the Council of Trent is designed, mainly, to guide, direct and assist pastors in the instruction of their flocks. It not only lays down what is of faith, but suggests the explanations which theologians adopt to enable the mind to conceive them with less difficulty."—p. 31. A very marvellous explanation! Does the Reviewer mean to say that the explanation which the theologian gives, to enable the mind to *conceive* a matter of faith, is of less importance than the matter of faith itself? Will not the thing believed be according to the conception obtained from the explanation? The matter of faith here is the personality of the Son and his eternal generation. Rome says to her pastors, explain that doctrine in this way: "As the mind, in some sort, looking into and understanding itself, forms an image of itself, which theologians express by the term 'word,' so God, as far, however, as we may compare human things to divine, understanding himself, begets the eternal Word." But, the Catechism proceeds to say, "it is better to give no explanation about it, but simply contemplate what faith proposes, and, in the sincerity of our souls, believe and confess that Jesus Christ is true God and true man," &c. This is a very bungling business. The Fathers of Trent first tell pastors how to explain the doctrine, and then tell them it is better not to explain it at all. But, suppose a pastor takes the first advice of the Council, and tells his flock that the manner of the eternal generation is thus: as a man looking into his own mind and understanding an idea that is there, expresses that idea by a word which is the image of the idea, so God, "understanding himself, begets the eternal word," what notion will the flock get other than that the Son is the image of an idea in the Divine Mind? Suppose the flock receive the explanation of the pastor, or, rather, of an infallible Council, and are thus led to deny the personality of the Son, as they had previously been taught to deny the personality of the Spirit, what then? Why, the Athanasian Creed says, that flock "cannot be saved." But to all this our new Unitarian defender of the Roman Catholic faith says: "The idle objection of the preacher is not worth answering."

The third exception taken by the Sermon is to Rome's explanation of the manner of Christ's birth. The Catechism of Trent says: "As the rays of the sun penetrate, without breaking or injuring in the least, the substance of glass, after a like, but more incomprehensible manner, did Jesus Christ come forth from his mother's womb without injury to her maternal virginity, which, immaculate and perpetual, forms the just theme of our eulogy." "The third objection will vanish," says

Mr. B., "the moment the preacher shall learn to distinguish between *conception* and *parturition*. The illustration is brought to enable us to conceive the possibility of the birth of our Lord without damage to the virginity of his mother, not to teach the silly heresy the sagacious Doctor deduces from it."—p. 31. The Reviewer is truly sagacious if he can conceive of a conception and parturition in which the mother has nothing more to do with the thing born than the glass has with the rays of light that pass through it, and yet the child be in any sense *her seed*. If Mary's perpetual virginity is to be preserved, it is just as necessary she should have nothing to do with the conception, as with the parturition of the child. The doctrine of Rome makes Christ's birth the simple miraculous passage of one substance through another substance; nothing more, and nothing less; and hence denies, by necessary inference, the humanity of Christ, which our Unitarian reviewer styles a "silly heresy." The Scriptures tell us, it is *the seed of the woman* that shall bruise the serpent's head. Paul tells us, Heb. ii., 14, "Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same;" and in verses 16, 17, "For verily he took not on him the nature of angels; but he took on him the seed of Abraham. Wherefore in all things it behooved him to be made like unto his brethren." But Rome says the Bible is all wrong; he was most unlike his brethren; slipped into the world like light through glass, leaving his reputed mother a perpetual virgin.

This doctrine of the perpetual virginity and the immaculate conception, which figure so largely in all the devotional books of Rome, it will be perceived, is no harmless error. It is not only absurd in itself, but leads to dangerous errors in reference to the person of Christ. The whole thing is an invention of men, utterly contrary to the plain teaching of Scripture. In the close of the first chapter of Matthew, it is said of Joseph, that he "took unto him his wife, and knew her not *till* she had brought forth her *first*-born son." Again, in Matthew xii., 46, "While he yet talked to the people, behold his mother and his brethren stood without, desiring to speak with him." Also, in John vii., mention is made of his brethren, and of the fact of their not believing in his divine mission, as being a remarkable circumstance. No other inference can be drawn from these passages, than that Joseph and Mary became the head of a numerous family. Rome, to serve her own purposes has deceived, and still deceives, her followers upon this subject.

## *The Rule of Faith.*

It is said in the Sermon Reviewed: "There is nothing more important, in this inquiry into the opinions of the instructors of our children, than *what is the rule of faith held by them.* The motto of Protestants, since the dawn of the reformation, has been 'the Bible alone.' The moment this is departed from, we open the flood-gate to all manner of error."—p. 7. Whenever we cease to require "thus saith the Lord," for every part of our faith, we accept "thus saith corrupt, fallible, prejudiced man," for our guide, or "thus saith the church." But what is the church? At best a party composed of partially sanctified men, still liable to prejudice, to be swayed by ambition or self-interest, still with much remaining corruption. Hence we are exposed to all manner of error. But Mr. Brownson denies that "the Bible alone" is the Protestant's rule of faith. He says: "The pretensions of Protestants in this respect are arrant nonsense or rank hypocrisy, with which they humbug themselves or seek to humbug others. Where, in the Bible alone, does this Presbyterian Doctor find his doctrine of infant baptism? his obligation or his right to keep the first day of the week, instead of the seventh, as the Sabbath day?—nay, his doctrine of the Trinity itself? Separate the Bible from the commentary on it, furnished by the belief and practice of the church in all ages, leave merely the naked text, with grammar and lexicon, and there is not a man living who can maintain any consistent system of doctrines from it without doing violence to its letter and its spirit. It would be a book of riddles, and no one could make anything out of it, except here and there a portion of it."—p. 32. If this be true, there is no rule of faith in the world. For the Protestant Church has never given any rule but the Bible; and no man who reflects, and is acquainted with the lives of the Popes and the composition of the Roman general councils, could for one moment consent to commit the keeping of his faith to their hands. The violence and strife for power, which has ever characterized their councils, has shewn that the Holy Spirit was not there.

But the objection that the Bible is unintelligible, "a book of riddles," we have already shewn, by the argument *reductio ad absurdum*, is untrue.* Mr. Brownson's argument, as previously stated, would prove not merely that the Bible cannot be understood, but that *no book* can be understood; nay more, that there is no way in which one mind can convey its ideas to another. What is said of doctrines held by Protestants, which they do not get from the Bible, is untrue, and, we were about to add, as Mr. B. well knows—but perhaps not. He may be

* See pp. 52, 53.

giving here his own experience when a Unitarian preacher—but he should be careful how he "measures other people's corn by his half bushel." Presbyterians defend their doctrines from "the Bible alone," as he *ought* to know.

When Mr. Brownson charges Protestants with humbugging themselves, or seeking to humbug others, by making the Bible their rule of faith, he should have reflected that he charges Christ and the prophets with the same. To the Jews the Saviour said: "Ye have not his word abiding in you—search the Scriptures; for in them ye think ye have eternal life."—John v., 38, 39. When the rich man, in the story Christ told of Lazarus, requested that something additional to the Bible should be sent to his brethren—the testimony of a saint—Abraham said: "They have Moses and the prophets; let them hear them."—Luke xvi., 29. When our Saviour conversed with the disciples, on their way to Emmaus, it is said: "Beginning at Moses and all the prophets, he expounded unto them in *all the Scriptures* the things concerning himself."—Luke xxiv., 27. Though himself the divine teacher, he makes the Bible alone the Rule of Faith. So Isaiah viii., 20, says to Israel, concerning those who professed to be teachers: "To the law and to the testimony: if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them." Nay, says Mr. B., Moses and the prophets, the law and the testimony, is all "a book of riddles," no man living can get any consistent system of doctrines there. Christ and Isaiah do but "humbug themselves, or seek to humbug others."

When our Saviour was in the world, he found the Jewish Church in precisely the same condition, in regard to the Rule of Faith, in which the Roman Church is now. They had added to the inspired books, the decisions of their great Council, the Sanhedrim, and also the opinions of their learned teachers, which were their traditions; and these they accounted of equal authority with the inspired books themselves. They used in their justification the same argument that Mr. B. now uses: the Old Testament is, "in itself considered, a dead letter, and cannot speak till made to speak by some living authority;" but where is that living authority to be found, unless it be in a General Council, and in the writings of the fathers? This argument of the Jews, Rome is compelled to admit as sound, for it is her own. Well, what did Christ think of it? He said to them, "Thus have ye made the commandment of God of none effect by your tradition. Ye hypocrites! well did Esaias prophesy of you, saying, this people draweth nigh unto me with their mouth, and honoreth me with their lips; but their heart is far from me. But in vain do they worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men."—Mat. xv. 6–9.

Mr. Brownson says: "The Bible alone is not and cannot be the rule of faith. A rule of faith is that by which controversies concerning faith may be decided. But the Bible alone cannot decide controversies; for it is, in itself considered, a dead letter, and cannot speak till made to speak by some living authority; and because nearly all the controversies which arise, are controversies concerning what is the faith as contained in it."—p. 33. All this is the merest nonsense that a man could pen. The reason the Bible cannot decide controversies, here stated, is, because it cannot talk itself without somebody reads it. Well, that is true concerning every constitution under the sun, and every statute book. But, in the case of the Bible, according to our Reviewer, if A. B. and C., being private persons, read it, it don't talk yet, but if the Pope, or the prelates of a General Council read it, it begins to talk immediately. Now, why does it speak in the latter case, and not in the former? If it speaks at all, as we both agree it is the Word of God, it will speak with authority. If Mr. B. says it is because the Holy Spirit that indited the Word is with the Pope and Councils, Protestants claim the very same thing for A. B. and C., and every man who reads the Bible with a sincere desire to know God's will. There is some sense contained in the words of which the Bible is composed, or there is not. If there is no sense, then the Creator has imposed upon his creatures, by professing to give them a revelation of his will, when in reality he gave them a book of unintelligible nonsense. But if there is a sense in the words, a man possessing equal capacity with the Pope and his prelates, can get it out just as well as they can. Such was the opinion of our Saviour, when he said to the Jews, who were neither Popes nor prelates, but mere men, and unconverted too, "Search the Scriptures"—what nonsense to send them to a book that would not let its meaning out to them. He should have said, wait till Peter is appointed Pope, and then he will read the Bible and tell you what it means!

But Mr. Brownson says, the Bible cannot be a rule of faith, because controversies arise about what is the faith contained in it. Then the constitution of the United States is no rule in our government, for there have been controversies about its meaning ever since its adoption, and the country is divided into several great parties now upon the proper interpretation of that instrument. And Mr. B., during his brief political career, discussed these points with all the ardor and dogmatism peculiar to him, without once suspecting that the existence of controversies about the meaning of the constitution destroyed it as a *rule*. Controversies daily arise about the meaning of the laws in the statute book of every State. Nay, there never was a rule in politics or morals laid down in our world, about which there were not differences of opinion.

and nonsense; the Bible never was and never can be the Rule of Faith for anybody. Well, Mr. B. agrees with us that there is a Rule of Faith somewhere, and we are a little surprised at his modesty in not telling us where and what it is. It must be something infinitely better than "the Bible alone," and not chargeable with humbug and nonsense—something that speaks in such plain language as to forbid the possibility of all misunderstanding and misinterpretation—something that makes everybody think precisely alike. What is it? Though Mr. B. has not enlightened us upon the subject, the Council of Trent has given us the important information, which we find in a condensed form in the Creed of Pope Pius IV., published in December, 1564, and which is considered in every part of the world as an accurate and explicit summary of the Roman Catholic faith. We quote from an authorized translation of the creed, found in one of their Books of Devotion. The capitals and italics are their own.

"I most stedfastly admit and embrace Apostolical and ecclesiastical *Traditions*, and all other observances and constitutions of the Church.

"I also admit the holy *Scriptures*, according to that sense; to which our holy Mother, the Church, has held, and does hold, to which it belongs to *Judge* of the true sense and interpretations of the Scriptures: neither will I ever take and interpret them otherwise than according to the unanimous consent of the Fathers."

"I acknowledge the *Holy*, *Catholic*, *Apostolic Roman Church*, for the Mother and Mistress of all Churches; and I promise [*ac juro*,* and swear] true obedience to the *Bishop* of *Rome*, successor to St. *Peter*, Prince of the Apostles, and Vicar of *Jesus Christ*.

"I likewise undoubtedly receive and profess all other things delivered, defined, and declared by the Sacred Canons, and General Councils, and particularly by the Holy Council of *Trent*."

Here is the luminous mass!!

Suppose a plain Western man, famous as such men are for independence and hard sense, should say to Mr. Brownson, "Well, as the Bible I have been accustomed to use is all humbug and nonsense, and not the Rule, will you be so kind as to tell me what is?" "Certainly," says Mr. B. "*First*, The unwritten Apostolical and Ecclesiastical Traditions; *Second*, The Scriptures with the Apocrypha, as contained in the Latin Vulgate; *Third*, The true sense of these as the holy Mother Church has held and now holds; *Fourth*, The Fathers from Apostolical times down, and mind, it must be their unanimous consent; *Fifth*, The opinions of all the Popes, past, present, and to come; *Sixth*, The Sacred canons, containing the observances and constitutions of the Church; *Seventh*, All the Decrees

---

* These words are in the original Latin, but thought, we presume, too strong for Republicans, and hence omitted by our American Archbishop.

of all General Councils. That is the only true Rule of Faith." "Whew," says the Western man, "Stranger, is it a big book? Where can I get it? Do you carry one in your pocket, just to let me see?" "Ah," says Mr. Brownson, "you are a very ignorant man. Part of it is not written yet; and of that which is written, part has never yet been brought over the waters from the old country; and if what is written were all brought together, it would make more books than you could haul with your ox team."

The reader will perceive, by comparing the above summary with our extract from the Creed, (and may further satisfy himself by referring to the Decrees of the Council of Trent) that this precious mass of perverted Scripture and rubbish is the Rule of Faith of the whole Roman Church, and is placed in contrast with that of the Protestant, as so much plainer and safer. We ask your patience while we turn over briefly its several parts, that we may form some idea what the musty heap contains.

*First.* The Roman Catholic stedfastly admits and embraces "*Apostolical and Ecclesiastical Traditions.*" For an explanation of their traditions, when we turn to the Decree of the Council of Trent, we are informed that "this truth and discipline (meaning the gospel) are contained both in written books and in unwritten traditions, which have come down to us, either received by the Apostles from the lips of Christ himself, or transmitted by the hands of the same Apostles, under the dictation of the Holy Spirit." That is, the conversations, sermons and directions, spoken by Jesus Christ and the Apostles, have been told over and over, from one Pope to another, and from one bishop to another, for eighteen centuries, and are now in a pure, unadulterated state, in the possession of the Romish Church. A statement which, as it requires us to believe a miracle, no sane mind can receive without an express declaration from God that it is so, or that the person asserting that he is the keeper of such truth should himself work a miracle in attestation of his declaration.

*Second.* The Roman Catholic says: "I also admit the *Holy Scriptures.*" These form a part of the Rule it is true, but much the most inconsiderable part, and these held under such circumstances as utterly precludes their being any guide. With their Scriptures are included the Apocryphal books, never received as Scripture by the Old Testament Church, and the writers of which did not themselves profess to be inspired. Further, though these Holy Scriptures were written orignally in Hebrew and Greek, the Council of Trent rejects the original, and makes a Latin translation, called the Vulgate, the copy that "shall be held as authentic, in all public lectures, disputa-

tions, sermons and expositions," and declares "that no one shall dare or presume to reject it, under any pretence whatsoever." Thus the book indited by the Holy Ghost is rejected, and Rome's translation substituted.

*Third.* The meaning of these Scriptures is to be "according to the sense, to which our holy Mother, the Church, has held, and does hold." No individual member of the Roman Church dare say what the Bible, or any text in it, means. It belongs to the Church to judge of the true sense and interpretation of Scripture. But how shall he find out what the Church says it means? What is the Church? Is it the whole of the members? Then he can never get any interpretation. Is it the whole priesthood? He is no better off. Is it the prelates? Is it the General Councils? or is it the Pope? The Fathers of Trent do not say; the Church is not defined in their acts; and nobody knows—nor does Rome intend that any one ever shall know.

*Fourth.* Then, as the next part of Rome's Rule, comes in *the Fathers.* "Neither will I ever take and interpret them (the Scriptures) otherwise than according to the unanimous consent of the *Fathers.*" Here is another difficulty. Who does Rome mean by the Fathers? Of the scores of ancient writers in the Christian Church, on heathenism, on Gnosticism, on Arianism, on Peligianism, on the doctrine of one will, &c., &c., which does Rome mean to select? She has never told, and never will. The writings of the earlier fathers are in fragments, as they have come down to our times. Often it is very doubtful what they mean. These writings have been grievously interpolated, and it is impossible to say with certainty which part was written by them. But the *unanimous* consent is required! Whilst it is certain that there never was an age in which there was anything approaching to unanimity amongst these doctors and teachers. Augustine, Chrysostom and Ambrose, with all the ancient fathers, held that the Virgin Mary was conceived in original sin, which Trent denies. Melito of Sardis, Origen, Cyril of Jerusalem, Gregory Nazianzen, St. Hilary, Epiphanius, Athanasius, Rufinus and Jerome, fall under the anathemas of Trent in their opinion of the canon of Scripture. Then how can unanimity be obtained? and yet, without this, Rome has no Rule of Faith, and the Scriptures can never be interpreted.

*Fifth.* The Roman Catholic also "promises and swears true obedience to the *Bishop of Rome.*" This oath binds the obedience of the subject to all opinions officially expressed by any one who ever has held that office, or ever shall hold it. There are two hundred and

fifty-four Popes recognized by the present Pope as his predecessors. But if any of these were not canonically ordained, they were not Popes. Yet this is a question no mortal can decide. There have been twenty-nine schisms dividing the Church into different heads; which were true Popes and which anti-Popes in these divisions? The mode of electing a Pope has been fundamentally changed thirty times. How do we know there has been a right Pope since the first change? At the time of the Council of Constance there were three Popes all reigning at once; which was right? "From John VIII. to Leo IX., a space of one hundred and fifty years, there were fifty Popes pronounced by their own historians to have been monsters of iniquity. John XII. was convicted by a Roman Synod of blasphemy, perjury, profanation, impiety, simony, sacrilege, adultery, incest, constupration and murder. Boniface VII. is called by Cardinal Baronius, a thief, a miscreant, a murderer." Stephen VII. is called by Baronius, "the atrocious;" he says, "he entered the fold like a thief, and died by the halter." Benedict IX. became Pope at ten years of age. Of him Pope Victor II. said, "he was rather a successor of Simon Magus than of Simon Peter." That "his life was so corrupt, depraved and horrible, that he would never attempt the writing of it." Gregory VII. is pronounced by Cardinal Bruno and the Councils of Worms and Brescia, guilty of simony, sacrilege, magic, sorcery, treason, impiety, fornication, adultery, heresy, perjury and murder. John XXIII. has come down to us, black with every crime and villany, proved upon him by the General Council of Constance. Alexander VI., by the general consent of historians, made Rome the sink of filthiness, prostitution, rapine and blood, and was himself the horror and execration of Europe. This list could be greatly enlarged. Such are the men, if found to be canonical Popes, whose opinions are to be placed on a level with the holy Scriptures, as constituting part of the Rule of Faith.

*Sixth.* The Roman Catholic further promises undoubtedly to "receive and profess all other things delivered, defined and declared by the *Sacred Canons.*" What are they? The canons of the Greek Church formed the basis of the Roman code. About the beginning of the sixth century the code of *Denys le Petit*, with the Decretals of Popes, from Siricius to Anastasius, became the body of the Canon Law to the eleventh century. But so great had become the confusion and discrepancy, that in 1151 it was found necessary to have a digest, and Gratian published his "Concordance of Discordant Canons"—this was henceforth the foundation of the Code of Rome. The Decretals of Popes, from 1150 to Gregory IX., 1229, was then added as

a second part. In 1297, Boniface VIII. continued his collection of Decretals to his own times. John XXII. added the constitutions of Clement V., his predecessor, in five books, which he called *Clementines*. Subsequently were added twenty constitutions of his own, under the name of *Extravagants*. This is the precious mass of rubbish entering into the Rule of Faith, under the title "Corpus Juris Canonici."

*Seventh*. The Roman Catholic also receives and professes all that has been delivered, defined and declared by *General Councils*. How many Councils were general, in the Roman sense, has never been determined. Whether any dependance can be placed upon the decrees now exhibited as genuine, is greatly doubted; the different branches of the Church, in the early time, accused each other of the most shameful forgeries and alterations, and no means now exist for deciding the matter.

Here, then, is that beautiful, simple, plain guide to the unlettered man, who desires to know the will of God and what his duty is. There is no humbug or nonsense about this; no, not a bit of it. This is the rule Mr. Brownson and his Romish coadjutors propose and laud in the place of the Protestant's Rule, "the Bible alone," and every man's own judgment for the interpretation. But does Mr. Brownson suppose himself that any man could get a knowledge of his duty out of this written and unwritten contradictory mass? Not at all. Rome never intended anybody should understand it. The intention was to destroy God's rule, without giving any other. Then Holy Mother Church becomes the law-giver, sits a despot over the consciences of men, and tells them what she pleases for the rule. The Pope, with the bishops and priests for his subalterns, becomes God, "sitting in the temple of God, and showing himself that he is God."

---

*Rome pronounces the Apocryphal Books inspired.*

The Council of Trent decreed, that *Tobit*, *Judith*, *the additions to the Book of Esther*, *Wisdom*, *Ecclesiasticus*, *Baruch with the Epistle of Jeremiah*, *the Song of the Three Children*, *the Story of Susannah*, *the Story of Bel and the Dragon*, *and the First and Second Books of Maccabees*, are to be received with equal piety and veneration with the Word of God. This is making Holy Scripture by wholesale.

Mr. Brownson has the effrontery to ask of the author of the sermon reviewed, "Will he tell us on what authority he denies the canonicity

of these books?" The fathers of Trent admitted, that, in the time of Ezra, these books formed no part of the Rule of Faith. It is Mr. B.'s business to show how, after that time, they came to be a part of that Rule. The burden of proof lies with him. Yet there is no attempt at proof adduced, unless it be found in the following: "Is not, even humanly speaking, the authority of the Council of Trent equal to any authority he can bring against it? We do not recollect any Protestant synod, that has ever assembled, more respectable for their numbers, their learning, their ability, or their piety, than were the fathers of the Council of Trent. These decided, as the church had previously decided and held, that the books in question were canonical."—p. 33. We deny that the church or any council, however numerous or respectable, has the power to make any book it pleases the Word of God. The very enunciation of the proposition shows its absurdity. In order to any book or writing being admitted as inspired, it must first be proved that the author worked miracles, or in some other equally conclusive manner showed that his mission was divine; and, secondly, that the writing is authentic; that is, was really written by the person whose name it bears. This proof failing, all the human councils that ever assembled avail nothing. God must attest his own work, before any man is at liberty to receive it as his.

But if we were disposed to concede any such right to a council, Trent's claim is a very feeble one. We would be very sorry to think that there had ever assembled a General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, on this side of the water, to say nothing of other Protestant synods, that was not greatly more respectable in numbers, learning, ability and piety. The Council of Trent opened with twenty-eight prelates and five generals of Orders. There were present at the fourth session, when the Rule of Faith was adopted, forty-nine prelates, three abbots, and six generals of orders. These fifty-eight voting members, principally from Italy and Spain, many of them in the pay, and the mere creatures of, the Pope, professed to be the representatives of the Universal Church! Robertson, the historian, referring to the histories of the council, by Father Paul, Pallavicino and Vargas, says: "Whichever of these authors an intelligent person takes for his guide, in forming a judgment concerning the spirit of the council, he must discover so much ambition, as well as artifice, among some of the members; so much ignorance and corruption among others; he must observe such a large infusion of human policy and passions, mingled with such a scanty portion of that simplicity in heart, sanctity of manners, and love of truth, which alone qualify men to determine what doctrines are worthy of God, and what

worship is acceptable to him, that he will find it no easy matter to believe that an extraordinary influence of the Holy Ghost hovered over this assembly and dictated its decrees." So much for their piety. Father Paul, himself a Roman Catholic, tells us, in his History of the Council: "Neither was there, amongst these prelates, any one remarkable for learning: some of them were lawyers, perhaps learned in that profession, but of little understanding in religion; *few divines but of less than ordinary sufficiency;* the greater number gentlemen or courtiers; and for their dignities, some were only titular, and the major part bishops of small cities; that, supposing every one to represent his people, it could not be said that one of a thousand in Christendom was represented. But particularly of Germany, there was not so much as one bishop or divine." *Cajetan* was reputed to be the most eminent man among them, "unto whom," says Father Paul, "there was no prelate or person in the council who would not yield in learning, or thought himself too good to learn of him;" yet this *learned* divine knew not a word of Hebrew. What minister, in this day, would be deemed a scholar, who could not read the Scriptures in the original? Thus, we have evidence that the Council of Trent was a body insignificant in numbers, and composed, for the most part, of ignorant, corrupt, and ambitious men, met to do the Pope's bidding. How much is the naked opinion of such men worth, in deciding upon the question whether a book is inspired or not?

Farther, Mr. B. tells us: "These decided, as the church had previously decided and held, that the books in question were canonical." If he means that Trent decided as all the previous general councils of the church had decided, it is untrue. There is evidence that the Council of Nice, held 325, did not receive the Apocrypha; the Council of Laodicea, held 80 years after, published a list of canonical books, from which the Apocryphal books are excluded; and the sixth general council at Constantinople, held in 681, approved the canon of Laodicea on this subject. This is some of the unanimous consent of Romanism. These councils were all, in the opinion of Mr. Brownson, infallible, and under the special guidance of the Holy Spirit. Then Trent, in deciding against these ancient councils, either was without the Spirit's guidance, or the Holy Spirit has contradicted himself. Let Roman Catholics decide which horn of the dilemma they will take.

But, although the Reviewer has failed to produce one plausible reason for admitting the Apocryphal books as part of the Holy Scriptures, we will tell him on what *very sufficient* authority Protestants deny the canonicity of these books.

1. Because these books formed no part of the canon of the Jews, in the time of our Saviour. The Jews, ancient and modern, have always regarded them as uninspired books. Josephus does not embrace them in the list he has given of the inspired writings of his people, but, on the contrary, says, the books composed since the time of Artaxerxes "were not so worthy of credit, because, after that time, there was no regular succession of prophets."

2. The writers of the Apocryphal books laid no claim, themselves, to inspiration, but speak of their own work as a matter of painful labor, and of the imperfection of their performances. The author of Maccabees speaks of his work as the "painful labor of abridging;" and in the conclusion says, "If I have done well, and as is fitting the story, it is that which I desired; but if slenderly and meanly, it is that which I could attain unto." They contain, also, internal evidence of their lack of inspiration; "to say nothing of their silly and ridiculous stories, these books notoriously contain palpable lies, gross anachronisms, flat contradictions, and doctrinal statements wholly irreconcilable with what we are taught in the oracles of God."

3. Christ and his apostles appealed to the Jewish Scriptures, as containing the Word of God. They nowhere charge them with unfaithfulness in the preservation of the Divine Oracles, much less with having excluded one-third of the sacred writings from their canon. Yet this Divine Teacher was sent expressly into the world to reveal fully the Divine will. Could he have been faithful to his duty, and omitted the correction of so important an abuse?

4. Melito, bishop of Sardis, who flourished little more than half a century after the death of the last of the apostles, gives a catalogue of the canonical books of the Old Testament, from which the Apocryphal books are excluded. Origen also gives a catalogue, in the third century, from which the Apocrypha is excluded. Athanasius, in the fourth century, has left a similar catalogue, and adds: "There are also other books besides these, not indeed admitted into the canon, but ordained by the Fathers to be read by such as have recently come over to us, and who wish to receive instruction in the doctrine of piety." The Wisdom of Solomon, the Wisdom of Sirach, and Esther, and Judith, and Tobit, are amongst those enumerated. We have also, in this century, the catalogues of Hilary, bishop of Poitiers, in France; Cyril, bishop of Jerusalem, a prominent member of the second general council of Constantinople; Epiphanius, bishop of Salamis; Gregory, bishop of Nazianzen; Amphilochius, bishop of Iconium; and of Jerome and Ruffinus, all concurring in the exclusion of these books from the number of inspired writings; and, lastly, we have, in the canon of the

Council of Laodicea, to which reference has been previously made, the very same list of books, excluding the Apocrypha; this canon was afterwards confirmed at Constantinople, in the close of the seventh century.

The testimony here is perfectly conclusive. These books were rejected by the Jews, rejected by Christ and his apostles, and rejected by the Christian Church for at least four hundred years after the advent. What higher authority can any one ask for rejecting them as constituting any part of the Rule of Faith? The writers of the books themselves, far from claiming any inspiration, declare their work imperfect, and only claim the credit of having done the best they could. But, notwithstanding the implied protest of the writers, and the concurrent testimony of antiquity, it suited the purposes of the Fathers of Trent to make them Holy Scripture, and, accordingly, Scripture they become. If Holy Scripture can thus easily be made, we see nothing to prevent any fifty prelates of Rome, at any future time, incorporating Robinson Crusoe, or the Arabian Nights, into the Word of God.

---

*Doctrine of Justification by Faith.*

There is no part of this remarkable Review in which the disingenuousness of the writer is more apparent than in his labored defence of the Romish doctrine of Justification. He seems to have felt that the Roman ground was difficult of defence; for, after occupying a page with silly twattle, and then most grossly slandering the Protestant doctrine upon this subject, he resorts to Bishop Hughes to help him out of his trouble, by giving a long quotation from this famous sophister. This is the prelate who obtained, in New York, so great celebrity for dabbling in politics, and trying to banish the Bible from the Common Schools of that State. He has much experience in the work of glossing over the errors of Rome, as well as in covering up her designs. There is a wide difference, however, between the two men: Mr. Brownson is as reckless as Bishop Hughes is cautious. The one attempts to gain his point by effrontery, the other by a smooth-faced deceit. It is not a little amusing to find Mr. B., in the tangled state of his ideas on this subject, asserting one thing concerning the Protestants, and then quoting the Bishop, asserting the opposite. Mr. B. says: "Luther's doctrine of justification by faith alone is rejected by many Protestants themselves. Swedenborg sends Luther to hell for teaching it; the Unitarians, Universalists, Quakers, some Anglicans, the Genevans, the majority of the French Protestants, and a

great part of the German Protestants, virtually, if not avowedly, reject it. It is hardly true of any Protestant sect, at the present day, that it really holds it as it was taught by Luther and his brother innovators." —p. 34. Then he quotes Bishop Hughes as saying: "The error of Luther has been incorporated, with but slight modifications, into the theology of all the other Protestant denominations. Hence the doctrine of salvation by 'faith alone.' "—p. 36. A marvellous man is this Mr. Brownson; he utters a falsehood, and brings in his bishop to convict him of it! The bishop here is right; the doctrine of justification, as taught by Luther, is the doctrine of all *Evangelical* Protestants, and it is of them the bishop is speaking.

Here follows the Reviewer's account of the Protestant doctrine of justification. "Moreover, the doctrine in question is a very bad doctrine. As originally set forth, by the Reformers, it is, Believe firmly that God remits your sins for Christ's sake, and you are justified, without any respect to a moral change which may be effected in you. The justified man, morally considered, or considered in relation to his actual intrinsic character, is just as much of a sinner as he was before justification. The only difference between the justified and the unjustified is, that the sins of the former are not imputed, while the sins of the latter are. Thus you may sin as much as you please, but so long as you believe firmly that God remits your sins for Christ's sake, not one of the sins you commit will be imputed to you, or reckoned as sin."—p. 34. This, he says, was Luther's doctrine. In order to show to our readers how much dependance can be placed upon Mr. Brownson's statements, we will place Luther's own words beside this account of his doctrine. Luther, in his Commentary on Galatians, on chapter iii., verse 10, says: "Wherefore, to do, is, first of all, to believe, and so through faith to perform the law. We must first receive the Holy Ghost, wherewith we being lightened and made new creatures, begin to do the law, that is to say, to love God and our neighbor. But the Holy Ghost is not received through the law, (for they which are under the law, as Paul saith, are under the curse,) but by the hearing of faith, that is to say, through the promise." "Therefore, before all things, we must hear and receive the promise, which setteth out Christ, and offereth him to all believers: and when they have taken hold upon him by faith, the Holy Ghost is given unto him for his sake. Then do they love God and their neighbor, then do they good works, then do they carry the cross patiently. This is to obey the law indeed; otherwise the law remaineth always undone." Here the doctrine is, that no man, unless renewed—his moral nature changed—can do anything that will be in conformity to the law of God; but that in every man that believes

on Christ, the Holy Ghost is given, the heart is renewed, and he offers daily to God the homage of his heart and the obedience of his life. Mr. Brownson says, it was Luther's doctrine, that men are justified without any respect to a moral change being effected in them; they may sin as much as they please, if they only believe that God remits their sins for Christ's sake, not one of their sins will be imputed to them. While Luther says his doctrine is, that a man must first be enlightened and made a new creature, that is, his moral nature changed; that this is done in believing, then he is justified, and his new moral nature produces a real obedience to the law. Was Mr. B. ignorant of what Luther taught, or is this false statement willful? Neither alternative is creditable to Mr. B.

Nay, Luther expressly condemns, as counterfeit and worthless, that which Mr. B. charges him with holding as justifying faith. "The counterfeit faith is that which heareth of God, of Christ, and of all the mysteries of his incarnation and our redemption; which also apprehendeth and beareth away those things which it heareth, yea, and can talk goodly thereof: and yet there remaineth nothing else in the heart but a naked opinion and sound of the gospel. For it neither reneweth nor changeth the heart; it maketh not a new man, but leaveth him in the vanity of his former opinion and conversation; and this is a very pernicious faith. The moral philosopher is much better than the hypocrite having such a faith."—*Com. on Gal.*, p. 264.

But it is not merely Luther whose doctrine is maligned by this veracious Reviewer. The *travesty* which he has given of the doctrine of justification, he says, is that "originally set forth by the Reformers." Calvin was one of these, holding no inconsiderable place. And, as early as his day, this stale calumny, of which Mr. B. is now the trumpeter, was put forth by Rome. Calvin says: "They allege that justification by faith destroys good works. I forbear any remarks on the characters of these zealots for good works, who thus calumniate us. Let them rail with impunity, as licentiously as they infest the whole world with the impurity of their lives. They affect to lament that while faith is so magnificently extolled, works are degraded from their proper rank. What if they be more encouraged and established? For we never dream either of a faith destitute of good works, or of a justification unattended by them: this is the sole difference, that, while we acknowledge a necessary connexion between faith and good works, we attribute justification, not to works, but to faith." "Christ, therefore, justifies no one whom he does not also sanctify. For these benefits are perpetually and indissolubly connected, so that whom he illuminates with his wisdom, them he redeems; whom he redeems, he justifies;

whom he justifies, he sanctifies."—*Institutes*, bk. iii, ch. 16. Let Mr. Brownson show, if he can, from the writings of any of the great men who constitute the original reformers, a single one that advocated the doctrine he places to their account.

When the Reviewer says, "the doctrine in question is a very bad doctrine," he makes that assertion of the doctrine concerning justification as *now* held by Protestants; it is their present views on justification that is the doctrine in question. He then leaves the inference to be drawn that Protestants now hold that men are justified without any moral change, and that "you may sin as much as you please, but so long as you believe firmly that God remits your sins for Christ's sake, not one of the sins you commit will be imputed to you, or reckoned as sin." Mr. B. seems to use Protestant in a very wide sense, as including all who differ from the Church of Rome, for he enumerates Swedenborgians, Unitarians, Universalists, Quakers, &c.; he should have added, Jews, Mohammedans, Mormons, Infidels, and divers others. Now, as Mr. B. has himself belonged to some half dozen of these denominations, he would seem to be well qualified to tell what their views are. But as those named, together with, as we presume, the Rationalists of England, Geneva, France and Germany, are said by him to reject the above view of the doctrine, we must suppose that he levels his accusation against the evangelical Protestant denominations. Now, Mr. B. is either grossly ignorant of the doctrine of the Christian people around him, and he says he has been a Presbyterian, or he has been guilty of willfully misrepresenting them. For we challenge him to produce, from the Articles or Confession of Faith of any one of these denominations, anything to countenance his assertion.

Evangelical Protestants hold, that being depraved by nature, it is impossible that man should ever *merit* the forgiveness of his sins. But Christ having suffered and died in the sinner's stead, by believing in him he is united to Christ, and made a partaker of the benefits of his righteousness. Thus he is acquitted by God, not on account of any merit of his own, nor of an infused righteousness, but on account of the merit of Christ's obedience and death. This is the doctrine of justification, as taught in the Augsburg Confession, drawn up by Melancthon, under the Direction of Luther, and presented to the Emperor Charles V., by the Protestant princes of the empire, at the Diet of Augsburg, in the year 1530. In this Confession, they farther say: "That our adversaries do accuse us to neglect the doctrine of good works, it is a manifest slander; for the books of our divines are extant, wherein they do godly and profitably teach, touching good

works, what works in every calling do please God." Again, under the head "Of Good Works," the Confession says: "When as we do teach in our Churches the most necessary doctrine, and comfort of faith, we join therewith the doctrine of good works, to wit, that obedience unto the law of God is requisite in them that be reconciled. For the gospel preacheth newness of life, according to that saying, 'I will put my laws in their hearts:' this new life, therefore, must be an obedience towards God. The gospel also preacheth repentance, and faith cannot be, but only in them that do repent, because that faith doth comfort the hearts in contrition and in the fears of sin, as Paul saith, 'Being justified by faith, we have peace;' and of repentance he saith, Rom. vi.: 'Our old man is crucified, that the body of sin might be abolished, that we might no more serve sin.'" Again: "When as once we do acknowledge his mercy through faith, then we fly unto God, we love him, we call upon him, hope in him, look for his help, obey him in afflictions, because we do now know ourselves to be the sons of God, and that this our sacrifice, that is, our afflictions, doth please God. These services doth faith bring forth. Very well, therefore, said Ambrose, 'Faith is the mother of a good will, and of just dealing.'"

These same views will be found in every Confession of evangelical Protestants, from the Diet of Augsburg to the present day. They are those of the first and second Helvetic Confessions of the years 1536 and 1566; of the French Confession in 1559; of the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England in 1562; of the Belgian Confession in 1563; of the Bohemian in 1573; and of the Westminster Assembly in 1643. Thus the slander of Mr. Brownson, that Luther and the original Reformers held, and that Protestants now hold, that men are justified without a moral change, and that they may sin as much as they please afterwards, is fully refuted.

---

### *Romish Doctrine of Justification.*

Mr. Brownson tells us, that "to justify signifies to make just, and no man destitute of justice is justified. The error of Protestants is in placing justification in the simple remission of sin. Sin may be remitted, and yet the man want justice. Consequently, the remission is not alone justification. God is a God of truth, and can call no man just who is not just."—p 34. Mr. B.'s error here arises from his taking a Latin translation of the word of God instead of going to

the Hebrew and Greek originals. Justification is a Latin word, not of classical authority, but manufactured by ecclesiastical writers, so that its etymological meaning, on which the Reviewer relies, proves nothing as to the real nature of the doctrine. The Greek word *dikaioö*, as used in the New Testament, rarely, if ever, has the meaning to *make just*. For example, Rom. iv. 5, 6, "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*." Here Paul directly contradicts the Reviewer's assertion, and tells us that to justify is not to make righteous by an infusion of holy habits, but to *pronounce* just, or righteous on valid grounds, namely, because of a righteousness that is imputed or reckoned to the sinner's account, without any works of his own. The Scriptures use the word justification in a *forensic* sense, as denoting not a change of a person's dispositions, but a change of his state in relation to law. This may be readily seen by any one who will take the trouble to examine the places in the Bible in which the word occurs; our limits forbid the multiplication of examples. Then all the argument Mr. B. has advanced, of his own, grows out of his ignorance of the Scriptures, and falls to the ground.

Another mistake, willfully, or ignorantly, made by the Reviewer, in the few lines we have quoted, is, that Protestants are said to place "justification in the simple remission of sins." Protestants hold, that in pronouncing a sinner just, two things are necessarily involved: first, that he is acquitted from every charge of transgression brought against him by the law; and, secondly, that he is accounted to have fulfilled, or on some ground is treated as if he had fulfilled, its demands. This Bishop Hughes acknowledges in the quotation made from him by the Reviewer, when he asserts, "It is only by a certain fiction of thought and language that such a person can be considered innocent; or that his intrinsic guilt can be conceived of as still existing, but as imputed to the one who interceded for him, and the justice [righteousness] of that intercessor imputed to him. Such is the exact likeness of justification, as taught in the theology of Protestantism."—p. 35. We turn the bishop over to Paul, as seen in our quotation from the Epistle to the Romans, seeing that the very doctrine here sneered at by this Romish prelate is that which Paul, by an extended argument, proves in the fourth chapter of that epistle. But we would admonish Mr. Brownson to be careful how he contradicts, so flatly, his ghostly superiors, even in slandering Protestants.

We turn now to Bishop Hughes' account of Justification as held by

Rome, which is as follows: "Justification is that action or operation of Divine Grace on the soul by which a man passes from the state of sin; from an enemy, becomes a friend of God, agreeable in the Divine sight, and an heir to eternal life. This act of transition from the one state to the other, with its operating causes, is called 'justification,'"—p. 34. Thus far, it will be perceived, that what the bishop calls "justification" is identical with what Protestants denominate "conversion," or what in the Westminster Confession is termed "effectual calling." But the Bishop proceeds: "In the Catholic system, this justification, occurring in the modes of the Saviour's appointment, is not only the imputation, but also the *interior application*, of the justice of Christ, by which guilt is destroyed, pardon bestowed, and the soul replenished by the *inherent* grace and charity of the Holy Spirit."—p. 35. This is rather misty, but seems to be what Protestants mean by "sanctification," which is thus described in the Westminster Confession: "They who are effectually called and regenerated, having a new heart and a new spirit created in them, are sanctified, really and personally, through the virtue of Christ's death and resurrection, by his word and Spirit dwelling in them; the dominion of the whole body of sin is destroyed, and the several lusts thereof are more and more weakened and mortified, and they more and more quickened and strengthened, in all saving graces, to the practice of true holiness, without which no man shall see the Lord." But then, if the first part of the bishop's definition applies to conversion and the second to sanctification, where is justification, or that act by which God accepts the sinner as just on account of the obedience and death of Christ? We answer, the doctrine of justification as taught in the word of God, and held by Protestants, forms no part of the Romish system. The Scriptures teach, that through the operation of the Holy Spirit men repent of their sins, and believe in Jesus Christ, this is being *born again;* that by this faith they are united to Christ and become partakers of the merits of his death and obedience, on account of which God is reconciled: this is *justification;* that henceforth the word and spirit dwelling in them, they are enabled to mortify sin and grow in grace: this is *sanctification.* Now, make the new birth baptism, and omit justification, and you have a system by which man is saved through "the interior application of the justice of Christ, by which guilt is destroyed, pardon bestowed, and the soul replenished by the *inherent* grace and charity of the Holy Ghost"—in other words, by an *infused* righteousness which enables him by works to merit heaven. Thus, to get clear of the doctrine that men are justified through the merits of Christ alone, Rome has taken the

doctrines of regeneration and sanctification, omitting entirely the middle link of justification, and, after pow-wowing over them in the jargon of the schools, exhibited them to the world as the true doctrine of justification. Then, because Protestants have kept these doctrines separate and made Christ's merits one thing, and the "interior operation" of the word and spirit another thing, she has been loud in her accusation that Protestants denied the necessity of good works, never breathing a syllable of her own sleight of hand manœuvres, or that she had ever heard of such a doctrine as sanctification belonging to the Protestant creed.

But lest it should be supposed that Bishop Hughes has not fairly represented the Romish doctrine upon this subject, we turn to the highest authority in that Church. We quote from chapters vii. and xvi. of the Decree of Trent on Justification. "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 who was unrighteous is made righteous, and the enemy becomes a friend, and an heir according to the hope of eternal life." In enumerating the causes of justification they say, "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 Spirit bestows on each as he wills, and according to our respective dispositions and co-operation." In chapter xvi., these fathers say, "It must be believed that the justified are in no respect deficient, but that they may be considered as fully satisfying the divine law, (so 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." This is a system of salvation by works. Christ by his death merited, that we might merit by our works eternal life. He alone is *formally* just who has that form inherent in himself. And all the parade, consequently, of Christ as being the cause of our salvation, and of his death as being the meritorious cause of our justification, amounts to nothing, for the system explains it all away. The two systems then are directly opposed. In the one, the sinner, emptied of all self-righteousness, relies solely on the obedience and death of Christ; in the other, he rests upon an inherent righteousness, properly his own, which Christ's death enables him to work out.

It may be of service to show the opinions of some eminent Pro-

testants concerning the difference between Rome and us upon this subject. Bishop Hall says, "What can be more contrary than these opinions to each other. The Papists make this inherent righteousness the *cause* of our justification; the Protestants the effect thereof. The Protestants require it as the companion or page; the Papists, as the usher, yea, rather as the parent of Justification."—*Hall's Works, vol.* IX. *p.* 46. Archbishop Usher says, "The question between us and them is, whether there be any justification besides sanctification; that is, whether there be any justification at all? We say sanctification is wrought by the kingly office of Christ. He is a king who rules in our hearts, subdues our corruptions, by the sceptre of his word and spirit; but it is the point of his priestly office which the Church of Rome strikes at; that is, whether Christ has reserved another righteousness for us, besides that which as a king he works in our hearts; whether he hath wrought forgiveness for us? we say he hath, and so said all the Church till the spawn of the Jesuits arose."—*Usher's Sermons, No.* XVI.

Now, let it be remembered that this is no contest about words or non-essentials. Rome strikes at the very core of the whole plan of salvation, and sweeps away God's method of Justification. Her adherents refuse to submit themselves to the righteousness of Christ, and go about to establish their own righteousness; they are thus confiding in a refuge of lies, and must expect to lie down in sorrow. "Other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ."

---

### *Romish Sacraments.*

The Decree of Trent on the Sacraments is an important addenda to that on Justification. In the one, the Council swept away the righteousness of faith, or God's method of Justification; in the other, the fathers manufactured a righteousness of works, yet so artfully that no one could work out that righteousness without the help of the priest at every step. The decree commences thus: "In order to complete the wholesome doctrine of justification, published in the last session by the unanimous consent of the fathers, it hath been deemed proper to treat of the holy Sacraments of the Church, by which *all true righteousnees is at first imparted, then increased, and afterwards restored, if lost.*"

To all this Mr. Brownson simply says, "Well, what then?"—p. 37. Why, just this: if by the Sacraments "all true righteousness

is at first imparted, then increased, and afterwards restored, if lost," the administrator of the Sacraments, that is, the priest, holds in his hands the power to regenerate and sanctify the soul—the power to give heaven and to consign to hell. And it does not matter, according to Rome, what may be the character of the priest himself, though he be the vilest wretch that ever breathed, if he has regularly received orders, he possesses this power over the souls of men. "The Council further teaches, that even those priests who are living in mortal sin exercise the function of *forgiving sins*, as the ministers of Christ, by the power of the Holy Spirit conferred upon them in ordination;" and further, to put the capstone to this enormity, we are informed that the act of such a priest is not "to be considered as merely a ministry," "but as of the nature of a judicial act, in which sentence is pronounced by him as a judge."—*Decree on Penance, chap.* vi. To all this we presume our imperturbable Reviewer will still say, "Well, what then?" To him the opposition of Scripture, of common sense and common decency, to a dogma of Rome constitutes no perceptible obstacle.

It is singular enough that the Fathers of Trent gave no definition of a Sacrament in their decree upon the subject. The Catechism, however, supplies the deficiency. It teaches that "the Sacraments of the New Law are signs instituted by God, not invented by man, which we believe, with an unhesitating faith, to carry with them that *sacred efficacy of which they are the signs.*" That is, they are not signs at all, but the very thing itself;—we would hardly say that food was the *sign* of something to satisfy hunger. Again, the Catechism says: "In order, therefore, to explain more fully the nature of a Sacrament, the pastor will teach that it is a thing subject to the senses: and possessing, by divine institution, at once *the power of signifying sanctity and justice*, [*righteousness*] *and of imparting both to the receiver.*"—p. 102.

Concerning the author of the Sacraments we have the following: "Justification comes from God; the Sacraments are the wonderful instruments of justification; one and the same God in Christ must, therefore, be the author of justification and of the Sacraments. The Sacraments, moreover, contain a power and efficacy which reach the inmost recesses of the soul; and as God alone has power to enter into the sanctuary of the heart, he alone, through Christ, is manifestly the author of the Sacraments."—p. 108. The argument to prove God the author of the Sacraments seem strange to Protestants, who, in their simplicity, would merely have quoted the warrant from Scripture. Besides, we can see no propriety in their mode of proof;

the Council might just as well say God is the author of the Sacraments, as say justification comes from God, and the Sacraments being the instruments of justification must come from the same God. The regard they exercised towards God's institution we have already shown, in that they cast out of their system the *thing* justification, whilst they retained the *name*; and we may reasonably expect that they have dealt with an equal freedom with the Sacraments as God gave them. The second argument is sound, if the premises be true. If an external sign can "reach the inmost recesses of the soul" by any other means than the medium of the understanding, it must be by a miracle, of which, truly, God alone can be the author.

But to proceed, the Catechism tells us that the number of Sacraments is *seven*, and in proof presents the analogy that exists between natural life and spiritual life. "In order to exist, to preserve existence, and to contribute to his own and to the public good, seven things seem necessary to man—to be born; to grow; to be nurtured; to be cured when sick; when weak to be strengthened; as far as regards the public weal, to have magistrates invested with authority to govern; and, finally, to perpetuate himself and his species by legitimate offspring. Analogous, then, as all these things obviously are, to that life by which the soul lives to God, we discern in them a reason to account for the number of the Sacraments."—p. 107. It proceeds then to trace that analogy, showing that in the spiritual life we are born again in baptism; grow up and are strengthened in confirmation; nourished in the eucharist; when we have caught the contagion of sin are cured by penance; the traces of sin are obliterated by extreme unction; the sacred magistry is perpetuated by orders; and the conservation of the spiritual race is secured by matrimony. Here is a beautiful system of physical salvation. The spiritual life is begun, carried on, restored if lost, perfected, by what? Faith? No. The obedience and death of Christ? No. The influences of God's Spirit? No. But by the Sacraments—certain external ceremonies—at the option of the priest to be performed or not in each individual case. Let it be remembered, Rome makes justification the making of men *inherently* righteous, and declares that the Sacraments are "the wonderful instruments of justification;" that is, of that *inherent* righteousness. Mr. Brownson, it is true, attempts to deny that this effect is produced by the power of the Sacraments themselves. But that denial is the mere Jesuitical trick which abounds throughout the whole of the acts of the Council of Trent. He says: "'The Sacraments confer grace by their own power;' but what is its own power? Simply the power of God who instituted

them. He is himself the *causa efficiens* operating in the Sacrament." —p. 37. Well, food nourishes our bodies by its own power, but what is its own power? Simply the power of God, who appointed it for that end, and endowed it with the necessary properties. God is the *causa efficiens* operating in all nature. Hence, this is a mere subterfuge; Mr. Brownson has used language designing that it should be misunderstood by Protestants, and the same charge lies against the Fathers of Trent.

But there is further evidence that this is the sense of Rome. The Eighth canon of the Council on the Sacraments is, "Whoever shall affirm that grace is not conferred by these Sacraments of the new law, by their own power, [ex opere operato;] but that faith in the divine promise is all that is necessary to obtain grace: let him be accursed." Now, what is meant by the words, "by their own power," or, "*ex opere operato*?" "In the scholastic language of Romanism," says Bishop M'Ilvaine, "there are two technical expressions with regard to the efficacy of the Sacraments, viz: *opus operans*, and *opus operatum*. The expression that the Sacraments confer grace *ex epere operante*, means, that their efficacy requires in the recipient a preparatory state of inward piety; that is precisely what we are accustomed to understand by the repentance and faith required for the baptism of adults. Such was the efficacy of the Sacraments in the *Jewish Church*, according to the Church of Rome; Abraham having been justified by faith, while in uncircumcision. But the efficacy of the Sacraments of the Christian Church is exalted above that of those which went before, in this, viz: that they confer grace *ex opere operato*; by which is meant that no previous preparation of internal piety, such as that of a living faith, is required in the recipient; so that, says Chemnitz, (a Lutheran divine of the time of the Council of Trent,) the schoolmen made a general rule, that, in order to receive the grace of the Sacraments, unto salvation, it is not necessary that you have faith, that is to say, a good internal affection of heart, (a living faith,) but it is sufficient that you place no obstacle in the way. The *opus operatum*, then, is simply the efficacy of the Sacraments, without respect to the state of the recipient, except, that he do not shut up his soul against them."—*Oxford Divinity*, p. 215.

Aquinus, the Angelic Doctor of Rome, defining the faith required for baptism, says, that "though a person should not have a right faith as to other articles, he may have it as to baptism; and thus he may have the intention to receive baptism. But even though he should not think correctly concerning this Sacrament, a *general intention* is sufficient for its reception; because, though he knows nothing

correctly about it, he intends to receive it as Christ appointed, and the Church has handed it down."—P. 1, 2, Q. 67, Q. 8. This is the faith necessary to baptism in an adult, and baptism is that which translates the soul 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. Thus a mere profession of faith in whatever may be asserted by the Church, without knowing anything about it, is all that is required of the recipient in order to his regeneration.

We have then regeneration effected in an adult without any interna change of heart, simply by means of the external ceremony performed by the priest. This is in the language of Rome the *first justification*, and the subject is completely righteous, and dying the moment after the administration would go safe to heaven. But suppose he lives and commits sin, then what is to be done? Baptise him again? That would be the shortest method, but Rome says no; she has provided a way far more profitable to the priesthood. Penance is a "second plank after shipwreck." The second canon on penance is, "Whoever, confounding the Sacraments, shall affirm that baptism itself is penance, as if these two Sacraments were not distinct, and penance were not rightly called 'a second plank after shipwreck:' let him be accursed." In this Sacrament, so called, there are three parts: contrition, confession and satisfaction. The first is narrowed down to a simple fear of eternal death in consequence of his sin; the second is a mere external act of telling the priest at the confessional what may be remembered of sinful acts; and the third is performing the penance laid upon the devotee by the priest. So that having made shipwreck of righteousness once, when fear comes upon the Romish devotee, he goes to the confession, and then performs the enjoined penance, and is duly absolved by the priest acting as Jesus Christ, not merely as a minister or agent, but "as a judge." Now he is upon the second plank after shipwreck, this is the *second justification* of Rome, and, to make assurance doubly sure, the Sacrament of the Eucharist comes in, and he, by partaking of the real body and blood of the Lord, becomes one of the number who, according to the Catechism of Trent, "receive, no doubt, the Son of God into their souls, and are united, as living members, to his body."—"The eternal Word, uniting himself to his own flesh, imparted to it a vivifying power; it became him, therefore, to unite himself to us after a wonderful manner, through his sacred flesh and precious blood, which we receive in the bread and wine consecrated by his vivifying benediction."—*Cat.* p. 165. Thus being one, and part and parcel of the same flesh and blood of Christ, his salvation is sure. Was there

ever a system contrived with equal Satanic wisdom to divert the minds of men from the only method God has given for the salvation of the soul?

We deny that Rome has any Sacraments in the Scriptural sense of the word. It is essential to a Sacrament that it be a *sign* of an invisible grace.—Rom. iv. 11. Rome, by declaring that her Sacraments contain the "efficacy" of the thing signified, and have the power of "imparting both sanctity and righteousness to the receiver," denies that they are signs, but the grace itself. Hence, while five of her Sacraments are perfectly worthless as such, because without the shadow of any Scriptural warrant; by making baptism *regeneration*, or rather *justification* itself, and the Lord's supper a real sacrifice, and the actual eating of the body and blood of the Saviour, she destroys the essential feature of a Sacrament in both these ceremonies.

---

## *The Jesuits.*

There is a short and happy way, in a controversy, of getting over an array of troublesome facts, which is to deny them in bulk, and plead want of room to reply to them in detail. In a sermon upon the "Dangers of Jesuit Instruction," the History of the Jesuits must be a somewhat important item; and it is very remarkable, that in a Review occupying twenty-eight octavo pages, this part happened to be crowded out. We quote the words of the Reviewer. "After these charges, the preacher proceeds to sketch the history of the Jesuits, and to show what an intriguing and dangerous set of mortals they are. We have no room to follow him through this part of his discourse. He falls, of course, into almost as many errors as he makes assertions."—p. 38. Mr. Brownson's dependence here, is on the ignorance of his Romish readers. Taught, as they are, by their priests, that everything from a Protestant pen about their Church is false, and kept in profound ignorance of true history by their own expurgated Historical productions, which they modify from year to year, a good deal may be ventured upon their known incapacity to correct the falsehood. Mr. B. knows that the "assertions" are authentic history, and so does every reader of *real* history. But we have long since shown that our veracious Reviewer is not troubled about such "venial sins" as he has here committed.

To frighten us from any resistance of these "Janisaries of the Pope," our Reviewer finds room to make a very important communication. He says, "we cannot forbear expressing our full conviction

that the Society of Jesus is under the special guidance of Almighty God, and that he will avenge himself on its persecutors. France warred against the Jesuits and expelled them; she had her reward; —Spain warred against the Jesuits and expelled them; she is now reaping her reward. We want no better proof of the sanctity and utility of the Order than the fact, that Protestants, infidels, and tyrants, are everywhere opposed to it."—p. 38. It seems after all, that all that part of the sermon having reference to the expulsion of the Jesuits from the Roman Catholic countries of Europe, is true. Mr. B. ought to have included amongst the opposers of the Order, as still further evidence of its sanctity, the Roman Catholics; seeing it has been the beloved sons of the Church in every instance that drove them from their countries, and a legitimate successor of St. Peter that suppressed the Order. But we have as full a conviction as Mr. B. can possibly have to the contrary, that the Society of Jesus is *not* "under the special guidance of Almighty God," and for that conviction we will state our reasons.

1. The founder of the Society, Ignatius of Loyola, was a bigoted fanatic, and such are not the instruments usually guided by Almighty God. We give, in proof of what we state, some extracts from the Life of Ignatius, by Father Bonhours, a Jesuit: "Rising one night according to custom, and prostrating himself, with sentiments of extraordinary piety, before an image of the Blessed Virgin, he offered himself through her intercession to Jesus Christ, and consecrated himself to serve the Son and the Mother with inviolable fidelity. At the conclusion of his prayer, he heard a mighty noise; the house was agitated; all the windows of his chamber were broken; and a great rent was made in the wall, which remains to this day to be seen. God did, probably, thereby manifest that the sacrifice of Ignatius was agreeable to him."—*Life of St. Ignatius*, p. 60. This is the account of his conversion, as reported by himself, of course. At the hospital of Manresa, where his saintship first took up his abode, the following account of his manner of life is given: "He fasted the whole week, except on Sunday, when he eat a few boiled herbs, *over which he first sprinkled ashes*. He girt his body with a pointed chain; under his coarse habit he wore a hair shirt; and thrice a day he applied the discipline. He slept little and lay on the ground."—*Ib.*, p. 69. The father further describes him on the succeeding page: "His appearance was strange and almost revolting—his face was dirty, his hair clotted, his beard and nails grown to an inordinate length—so that when he would appear in the town of Manresa, the children pointed at him, and followed him through the streets with shouts and

outcries." These hissings, which he received for his filthiness, he was pleased to call "the share he had in the contumelies of the cross." Finally, the saint found about half a mile from the town a cave, for which he conceived a very strong affection, it being the abode of toads, and slime, and lighted only by a cleft in the rock, and hence as filthy as he was himself; here he fixed his abode. "He chastised his body, four or five times a day, with an iron chain; and remained three or four days without taking any nourishment. When his strength began to fail, he ate some herbs which he gathered in the valley, and some bread he had brought from the hospital."—*Ib.*, p. 72. The same author tells us, that when Ignatius was about to leave Spain for Italy, the master of the ship gave him a free passage, dirty as he was, but required him to bring his provisions for the voyage. This he declined, for fear of violating "the spirit of evangelical poverty." The difficulty was gotten over in a very remarkable manner, and is characteristic. "To rid himself of this scruple, he had recourse to his confessor; and being ordered by him to accept the condition imposed on him, he readily did, through obedience, what he would not do of his own free will."—*Ib.*, p. 98. The sight of the Saviour was a common occurrence to him: once he saw him bearing a heavy cross, and was presented by him to God the Father. He once saw the Trinity, and wrote a most wonderfully sublime treatise upon that subject, of eighty pages, which Father Bonhours thinks was inspired, because the saint at that time could barely read and write—but which nobody seems ever to have seen. He cast out devils and healed diseases. The man thus described by his own followers is either a base deceiver, or one whose imagination has been cultivated beyond the bounds of sanity, and is a fanatic. Any man in our day who would make such statements before a competent jury sitting on his sanity, would be pronounced at least a mono-maniac. Such persons are not thought to be under the special guidance of Almighty God.

2. Our second reason for believing the Order not under Divine guidance, grows out of the way prescribed for making Jesuits. Ignatius having worked himself into and out of these raptures so many times, determined to lay down a set of rules, a material process, by which raptures could be manufactured. This is his book of "Spiritual Exercises," and is the soul of the Order—by it the first members were all cast in the same mould. This curious process is thus described by Prof. Quinet, of the College of France: "To arrive at the state of sanctity, we find in this book rules such as these—*first*, trace upon a paper lines of different size, which answer to the greatness of sins; *secondly*, shut yourself up in a chamber, of which the windows

are half closed, sometimes prostrate yourself with your face to the ground, sometimes lie upon the back, rise up, sit down, &c., &c.; *fifthly*, break out in exclamations; *sixthly*, in the contemplation of hell, (which comprehends two preludes, five points and a colloquy,) see in spirit, vast conflagrations, monsters, and souls plunged into gleaming prisons, imagine you hear complaints, vociferations, fancy also, a putrid odor of smoke, sulphur, and cadaverous cloaca, taste the most bitter things, such as tears, gall, and the worm of the conscience, &c. But it is not the visions alone which are thus prescribed; what you would never suppose, the sighs even are noted; the aspiration, the inspiration is marked; the pauses, the intervals of silence, are written in advance as upon a book of music."—*Jesuits*, p. 132.

The whole process requires *thirty days*, in perfect seclusion, and filled up with these efforts to excite the imagination, fastings, groanings, weepings, prostrations, suffocations and sighs, all performed according to the book. "His education thus prepared," says Prof. Quinet, "how is the Christian automaton completed? By what degree does he raise himself to the dogmas and mysteries of the gospel? You shall see. If it is a question of a mystery, the prelude, before every other operation, is to represent to himself a certain corporeal place, with all its dependencies. For example, is it a question concerning the Virgin? the way is to figure to one's self a little house; of the nativity? a grotto, a cavern, disposed in a convenient or inconvenient manner; of a scene of preaching in the gospel? a certain road, with its windings more or less steep. Is it concerning the bloody sweat? It is necessary, first of all, to figure to one's self a garden of a certain size, to measure the length, breadth, and area. As to the reign of Christ? to represent to one's self country houses, fortresses; after which, the first point is to imagine a human king among his people; to address one's self to this king, to converse with him; little by little to change this king into Christ; to substitute one's self for the people, and thus to place one's self in the true kingdom."—*Jesuits*, p. 134. Ignatius is quite original in all this. It is the way to make sight seers and enthusiasts. He first befooled himself in this way in his *nasty* cave, and then made a book to show others how they could make themselves as ridiculous as he was himself. *Spiritual exercises*, forsooth—he ought to have called it Rules to produce mental hallucination. Now, as we have no evidence that God has given to men judgment and understanding merely to have them torn up by the roots and their place supplied by wild fancy, we deny that an order founded upon that principle can be under his guidance. To suppose this, would be to make God a deceitful Jesuit.

3. We are fully satisfied that God is not the guide of this Order, because of the wily arts laid down in their second fundamental book, the *Directorium*. This was prepared by Aquaviva, a general of the Order, and is supposed to unite the personal experience of the principal members, made upon the application of the method of Ignatius. Amongst these precious directions we find the following: To attract any one to the Society, one must not act abruptly. It is necessary to wait for some good opportunity; for example, when this person experiences some chagrin, or fails in business; also, an excellent advantage is found in vices themselves, (*etiam optima est commoditas in ipsis vitiis.—Direc.*, p. 17.) In the case of persons of consideration, or nobles, the complete exercises are not to be given, and the instructor is directed to go to the houses of these persons; the thing is thus *more easily kept secret.—Ib.*, p. 17. But, with the greater number, the first thing to be done is to reduce to the solitude of the cell him who is destined for the exercises. There, removed from the sight of men, and especially of his friends, he ought only to be visited by the instructor, and by a taciturn *valet*, who will only open his mouth upon the objects of his service. In this absolute isolation, put into his hands the Spiritual Exercises, and then abandon him to himself. Every day the instructor shall appear for a moment, to interrogate him, to excite him, to push him on in this way, from which there is no return. Finally, when this soul is thus misled and broken, and in the language of the *Directorium*, is as if suffocated in this agony, (*in illa quasi agonia suffocatur*—p. 223,) it is good to let him then breathe a little; when he has recovered his breath to a certain point, it is the favorable moment, and he is left to his own choice; he may return now, if he wishes, into the world, or enter another order. That is, just as the torture has wrung the last portion of self-control from him, and the instructor can see his work is perfect, in the imbecility of his victim, he is to withdraw the torture, and then ask him to choose freely whether he will alienate himself forever. The inquisition exerted its ingenuity to find out the most exquisite means for torturing the body—the Society of Jesus the most exquisite tortures for the mind. God is not the guide of men who devise such infernal racks, nor of the fanatics who are reduced to machines of obedience under them.

4. The Constitutions of the Society, "*Regulae Societatis*," are a further evidence, to our mind, that God is not the guide of the Jesuits. The first object of Loyola was to make every member of his Society work, in order to aggrandize, gild, and glorify his prison. Hence, he labored to cut off all hope of promotion out of the Order. No one was to be either bishop, cardinal or pope, but all were to have their part in the

immortality of the Order.* Perfect obedience is made the road to consideration, is the *chief good* of the Order. "The will of the Superior is to be taken as the expression of God's will. In obeying him, they obey Jesus Christ, to the guidance of whose providence, manifested by the orders of the Superior, each one is to commit himself with a perfect indifference, equal to that of a *lifeless corpse*, which is insensible to all impressions, or that of a *staff in the hands of an old man*, which obeys all the impulses it receives."—*Int. to Life of St. Ignatius*, p. 14. Let Americans reflect on that rule, and remember that the head is at Rome. "In all the founders of Christian institutions," says Prof. Quinet, "what I first perceive is the Christian, the man in him, the creature of God; in the law of Loyola I see nothing but provincial fathers, overseers, rectors, examiners, consultors, admonitors, procurators, prefect of spiritual things, prefect of health, prefect of the library, of the refectory, watcher, economist, &c. Each of these functionaries has his particular law, very clear, very positive; it is impossible for each one of them not to know what he must do every hour in the day."—*Jesuits*, p. 148. These are good regulations for the government of a body of soldiers, who have no business to think, but simply to obey their leader; but God's Word is not the fountain whence such a system flows. The Bible is not a system of rules for working slaves, but the book of liberty, in which the highest powers of an active mind are called forth to glorify the Creator. Man's freedom is guaranteed, and his service only accepted in proportion as it is unconstrained by human rules. God is not the guide of an order composed of *lifeless corpses*, but of a living, voluntary church, whose whole obedience is the gushings of the fountain of love in the heart to Christ. The very essence of Jesuitism, consequently, forbids the supposition that the "Order is under the special guidance of Almighty God."

5. Lastly, we deny such guidance, because of the doctrines of the Jesuit writers on Morals. An order that can sanction murder, lying, perjury, rape, incest, and adultery, are guilty of blasphemy in talking of being under the guidance of God. That their casuists have done this, and their writings have been approved by the order, they dare not deny. The Provincial Letters of Pascal, filled with quotations from their fathers, has, for almost two centuries, been before the world, the standing record of their shame.

---

* The ambition of the individuals of the Order did not suffer this rule to continue long. The Society soon numbered Bishops, Archbishops, and Cardinals, amongst its members, and there is no position in the Church, now, that may not be occupied by them.

*The Jesuits.—(Continued.)*

Having shown that from the origin, constitutions and doctrines of the Society of Jesus, it is impossible to suppose it is under the "guidance of Almighty God," without stripping God of all holiness of character, we have a word to say concerning the judgments which Mr. Brownson says have fallen upon France and Spain for warring upon the Order. France, he says, "has had her reward"—we suppose, in the Revolution. It might have occurred to the Reviewer, that what he regards as the judgment of God, for expelling the Jesuits, was, much more probably, a judgment for tolerating such a body in the kingdom. Where were Voltaire, D'Alambert and Diderot, the French Encyclopedists, educated? Let him look to the rolls of the Jesuit Colleges. There the disgust with Christianity was first conceived; for they felt, if the Bible makes such a race as the Jesuits to curse the earth, to chain the mind, and exclude all light and science, the Bible itself is a curse, and could never have emanated from the Creator. That revolution was caused by the very policy of Rome, in keeping the mind in darkness. Spain, he says, "is reaping her reward." How? We suppose in her unsettled state, and being left to tear her own entrails. But how has this happened? When the light of the Reformation broke forth, in the sixteenth century, and Science and Literature awoke from their long sleep, all Europe heaved under the influence of the new element. Spain participated. But the order of the Jesuits sprang up in this, the home of Ignatius and Xavier, of Laynez, Salmeron and Bobadilla. Under their influence the people and king resolved that, for two hundred years, not a new idea, not a new sentiment, should pass its frontier—and the resolution was kept. The stakes were prepared, and the fagots brought, and every man that transgressed, by showing an affection for Protestantism, for philosophy, for science, was reduced to ashes. Seville, alone, boasts of having, in twenty years, burned sixteen thousand men. The great king Philip II., of Spain, dug his cell at the foot of the Escurial, collected around him four hundred monks of the Order of St. Jerome, who were engaged day and night in the work of separating him from all that was living. From that sepulchre and that "soul of ice" came forth the chill that froze the Castillian heart, till then so passionate. Increasing light burst in, at last, upon this country; but it came from Revolutionary France, and with the soldiers of Napoleon. The people defended the country, and kept in league with the church; but when the invaders were repelled, they sought from the church, and from the monarch, light and liberty. They were repulsed by the powers for which they had wasted their treasure and their blood—poor, naked, enslaved, the pity of the

nations, Spain became the prey to anarchy. And does the Jesuit now turn to his bleeding victim and say, *it's good for you*—"*you are now reaping your reward*" for your unfaithfulness to me! Shame on the Roman Catholic that can revile this nation, whose woes are traceable alone to its inviolable attachment to the Papacy.

But Mr. B. touches, next, another key. Just now he spoke of the dreadful consequences of warring on the Jesuits, and his appeal was to our fears; now he assures us they are so few and poor and weak that all this noise about them is ridiculous. He says: "It is remarkable, now, what dread the word *Jesuit* inspires. Who are the Jesuits? Simple priests, vowed to poverty, devoted chiefly to educational and missionary labors, without power or influence, save what is in their faith, talents, learning, zeal, and sanctity."—p. 38. The Order has obtained for itself the reputation of being the most crafty, unprincipled race that ever lived; with no conscience; no will; bound to commit murder, treason, any thing that the General in Italy may choose to order "for the greater glory of God." Who would not feel a dread in having such a neighbor? They are dreaded, it is true, not in a fair, open, manly contest, but because their mode of operation is secret, underhand, in the dark; by deception, falsehood, eaves-dropping; they are like the stealthy assassin in the dark, with the dagger beneath the cloak. No wonder the word *Jesuit* has every where inspired dread. He says they are simple priests. Yet Mr. Brownson knows better. The three vows of chastity, poverty and obedience, make a Jesuit, and the single vow of obedience makes an affiliate of the Order. He may be, besides, just what his superiors direct—a lawyer, merchant, mechanic, laborer, servant, any thing that will promote the Order. One of their own number says: "As they are to go every where, and bear the fruits of their zeal and the good odour of Jesus Christ to every creature, its members should not be distinguished by a peculiar costume, or those multiplied observances which in all other religious communities regulate the employment of time, in a fixed and irrevocable manner: provided they do not omit the duties of prayer and meditation, when their duties to their neighbor and the greater glory of God leave him leisure, they are dispensed with other religious exercises."—*Life of St. Ignatius*, p. 11. It is this that makes them more to be dreaded. They have neither peculiar costume nor peculiar employment. They are in our houses, in our work-shops, in our counting rooms, in our schools and our churches; yet always spies, reporting the most confidential conversations, watching every unguarded action, and forever eaves-dropping. Yet Mr. B. would make the impression that they are like the Ecclesiastics of other churches, standing in their true character before the pub-

lic, and relying upon "their faith, talents, learning, zeal and sanctity," for their success.

Again, Mr. B. tells us they are not only "simple priests," but "vowed to poverty." Now, that they take the vow of poverty, as individuals, is true, for it is part of the system that these *corpses*, or *slaves*, in the hand of another, bound to a blind obedience, should be entirely dependent on the head. But their poverty is a mere name. When was the Order poor? When they would deceive piety they talk of their poverty. When they would influence the powerful they tell of their riches. According to the rule submitted to the Council of Trent, the Society is composed of two sorts of establishments—of houses for the brethren, or *professed houses*, which can possess nothing as their own; and of *colleges*, which may acquire, inherit and possess. Thus, they have one hand to refuse, and another to accept. Now, see how the rule works. At the end of the sixteenth century the Society had twenty-one *Professed Houses*, and two hundred and ninety-three *Colleges;* that is, twenty-one hands to refuse, and two hundred and ninety-three to accept and seize. This order of poor priests, besides having open to them the usual methods of enriching themselves, had, in former times, one that was peculiar. Under the pretext of promoting the success of their missions, and of facilitating the support of their missionaries, they obtained a special license from the court of Rome, to trade with the nations they wished to convert; in consequence of this, they engaged in an extensive and lucrative commerce, both in the East and West Indies; they opened warehouses in different parts of Europe, in which they vended their commodities. The immense amount of money involved in the failure of the Jesuit Lavalette, and which the Parliament of France compelled the Order to liquidate, shows something of the transactions of these "simple priests, vowed to poverty." In 1842 the annual income of the Order, in France, was estimated at 540,000 francs. But let any citizen of St. Louis look around him at the property held by the Order in this city and vicinity, and ask himself how much short of half a million of dollars it is worth. Yes, they are "simple priests, vowed to poverty, without power or influence!"

We have, succeeding the above, another, as we suppose, gross misstatement. It is in reference to the number of members of the Order. Mr. Brownson says: "The Order counts, in all, less than five thousand members, dispersed on missions among infidels, or employed in the quiet and simple business of education."—p. 39. Prof. Michelet states, "according to a person who thinks himself well informed, there should be now, (1843,) in France, more than 970." The Rev. Jules Delaunay stated, a few weeks since, in a public lecture in Cincinnati, that "last

year there were, in the world, twenty-two thousand one hundred and eighteen Jesuits, eleven thousand four hundred and thirteen of whom were priests." These two statements agree; for to suppose that one fifth of all the Jesuits in the world were in France in 1843, is, to say the least, exceedingly improbable, whilst according to Mr. Delaunay's statement, that the number exceeds twenty thousand, the proportion to France does not seem excessive. We believe, then, that this is another of Mr. B.'s "venial sins." He has stated a deliberate falsehood.

To what is stated in the sermon reviewed, viz: "they [the Jesuits] will involve this land in troubles and conflicts," the Reviewer seems entirely to assent. "But," he says, "we would rather have war than peace with error, with sin, with the world with the flesh, with the devil."—p. 40. It is well for the citizens of these United States to know, from the mouth-piece of the Order itself, what they are to expect; we shall at least have the consolation of knowing, when it comes, that we were duly apprised. The people of this country fled from the religious oppression of the *quasi* Jesuit Archbishop Laud, to a wilderness, and endured the hardships of defending themselves from savages, and founded an empire, where liberty, civil and religious, might be enjoyed. We, in the spirit of genuine charity and liberty, sent back the invitation to the oppressed of Europe, to come and partake of the asylum provided by our sweat and blood. Our artful enemies, not satisfied to see our happiness, and their victims thus escaping, avail themselves of our hospitable spirit, and press to our shores. Unsuspecting ourselves, we receive and foster them, till, warmed in our bosom and feeling their strength, they openly tell us, your freedom is error, your religion sin, your acts are of the world, the flesh and the devil, and it is part of our religion, and the very business for which we came, to make war upon you, and deprive you of your religious freedom, and destroy your institutions if we can. We have solemnly sworn that the Pope is "Christ's vicar-general, and is the true and only head of the Catholic or Universal Church throughout the earth; and that, by the virtue of the keys of binding and loosing, given to his holiness by our Saviour, Jesus Christ, he hath power to depose heretical kings, princes, states, commonwealths, and governments, all being illegal, without his sacred confirmation, and that they may safely be destroyed." Poor, silly sheep—the American people still lick the hand of their future murderer, even while he shows them the knife, and tells them it will soon be red in this war of liberty. A President of the United States appoints Jesuit Chaplains for our army, to conciliate the Romanists, and show the

Mexicans that we do not war on their religion! Let Americans remember, the rule of the Society published by themselves is, "I must look on myself as a dead body, which of itself has no motion; or as a staff in a man's hand, which he takes and leaves aside, as he finds convenient, so that the Society may make use of me in what manner it shall judge necessary."—*Father Bonhour's Life of St. Ignatius*, p. 370. Then let them remember that the despotic head of that Society is in Rome, closetted with the Pope and the ambassadors of all the despots of Europe.

Mr. Brownson thinks there is something very incompatible in what is said in the Sermon, concerning the expulsion of the Order of Jesuits from such despotic countries as Spain, Portugal and France, in former times, and the charge made that they are the enemies of the liberty of this republic. Because "tyrants are everywhere opposed to the Order," he infers it must be friendly to liberty. But tyrants are very apt to be opposed to each other. Just now, Nicholas, of Russia, and Gregory XVI., the two most despotic princes in nominal Christendom, and the on'y two that systematically persecute for conscience sake, are very friendly. Nicholas wanted to form a matrimonial connexion with a papal state, and this required a dispensation from the Pope. Gregory wanted assistance to keep down his rebellious subjects in Romagna, and the powerful Emperor of the North might be depended on where light was to be kept from the mind and freedom from the country, and thus they joined hand in hand in their work of iniquity, because they can be mutually helpful. But let Nicholas see, that, by a thrust at the vitals of the Pope, he can serve himself, who supposes that he would hesitate? Let Gregory see that he can extend the spiritual power of his see, by thundering his anathema at the Russian heretic, and who supposes he would pause a moment? They are both robbers of men's rights, and, consequently, can have no other regard for each other than that which mutual fear inspires. The Jesuits are essentially despots—it is interwoven with every feature of their constitutions. They seek universal empire, and it matters little to them whether the government be free or despotic, so long as they are not the kings. Hence it is that they have been as inimical to the republic of Venice as to the monarchy of Spain. Only in Paraguay, where they reigned absolute, and where they labored to keep the poor Indians in ignorance of the language of every civilized nation of the world, lest they should be dethroned—only there they were satisfied. They will profess to love liberty, or to love tyranny, just as may be most useful, and "for the greater glory of God," in eir sense. They will crawl upon, and slime over, any institutions,

from the tribunal of the Inquisition down to a Jacobin club, but it is only in order to the more easily swallowing down the whole.

---

### *Jesuit Education.*

It was stated in the sermon reviewed by Mr. Brownson, that the wonderful assiduity of Rome, in establishing schools all over the country, could not arise from the desire to sustain our republican institutions, because she chooses despotism as the best government for her own subjects in Italy; neither could it be because she supposed education essential to the progress of pure religion, for, if so, she would surely educate her own children; but the children in the ecclesiastical states, under her sway, are kept in ignorance. To which the reviewer, in his off-hand way, replies: "The population of the ecclesiastical states is about two and a half millions. In these states there are seven universities; and in the city of Rome, with a population of one hundred and fifty thousand, there are, for the children of the poorer and middle classes, at least three hundred and eighty schools, the greater part supported by private munificence."—p. 39. This statement, so far as appears, rests upon the *ipse dixit* of Orestes A. Brownson, which, our readers are by this time aware, is not the best authority. That there are seven colleges, or universities if he chooses, in the ecclesiastical states, we believe is true, containing, says Malte Brun, two thousand two hundred and fifty pupils. But, suppose a man should design to prove that there was no ignorance in Oxfordshire, England, and present this argument: the population of Oxfordshire is one hundred and fifty thousand, and in this county there are twenty-two colleges. Would it prove anything to the purpose? The question would immediately arise, does Oxfordshire furnish the pupils of those colleges, or are they drawn from the three kingdoms of Great Britain and all the world besides? The priests and sons of nobles are educated in these colleges of the ecclesiastical states, but it remains to be shown that the rest of the population profit by them. One of these universities, that of Bologna, once drew students from all parts of Europe, and numbered ten thousand pupils, but it was before Rome felt the necessity of shutting out the light from her colleges; now it numbers scarce five hundred and fifty. Thus, these ancient seats of science mark, distinctly enough, the decay of learning where Rome holds the power. But, that the city of Rome contains at least three hundred and eighty schools, for the poorer and middle classes, is—mysterious. We can only meet figures with figures.

Malte Brun, in his Statistical Tables of the Population in Rome, gives "Pupils in Seminaries, in 1825, four hundred and sixty-eight;" whilst the number of "children at the age of communion was ninety-seven thousand two hundred and forty-nine." This, it is true, is twenty-five years ago, but we have yet to hear of any very recent revival of the spirit of universal education in that region.* But we will give still further testimony from the author just cited. He says: "A government wholly pacific, like that of Rome, might console itself for its political nullity, by encouraging and protecting letters, sciences, and arts, but an intellectual deadness seems to pervade the Roman States. The sciences are less cultivated than in the rest of Italy, and the town, which contains inexhaustible treasures for the archæologist, possesses no antiquarian worthy of being compared with many in Germany or France." "The people in the upper classes are as indolent and ill-informed as the present Venetian nobles; the reading of the young people is mostly confined to the romances of Voltaire; and the girls, in order to make up for the time lost in a convent, read frivolous and dangerous works. The lower orders of the town can read and write; but such knowledge is by no means common in the rural districts." —*Un. Geog.*, vol. v., p. 293. This account is the more reliable, because it is the calm statement of a standard work on Science, where there could exist no conceivable motive for misrepresentation.

Our Reviewer's next remark looks a little spiteful. "To assert," he says, "that the Church holds that 'ignorance is the mother of devotion,' betrays more ignorance than malice. If it were so we should have fewer Protestants in the world. The Church undoubtedly holds that there may be false learning, false philosophy, deceitful, vain, that puffs up, makes its possessors wise in their own conceit, indocile, and unwilling to bow in meekness and humility to the Word of God, (viz: to the Pope and Councils,) and such learning and philosophy she unquestionably does not encourage; for she holds and teaches what her invisible Spouse has said: 'Blessed are the poor in spirit, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven.' But real knowledge, but true learning, that knowledge and learning which make men 'wise unto salvation,' she does her best to impart and diffuse."—p. 39. Now, this seems at last but a candid admission of what Mr. B. denies at the outset of the quotation. He makes real knowledge and true learning to consist in that

---

* It has been suggested to me, by a gentleman for several years resident in Rome, that Mr. Brownson makes up his number by counting the labours of very ignorant priests, or a class of ecclesiastics still lower, called *Abbates*, who, having no other employment, peddle instruction. For a few copper coins they teach reading, bad penmanship, and the first rules of arithmetic. Many of these schools (so called) have not more than three or four pupils.

which "makes men wise unto salvation." That is, with him, a knowledge of the Romish rites and superstitions, constituting her religion, because Rome believes these save without any other knowledge. Hence, this is what "she does her best to impart and diffuse." Then all other learning and philosophy, not subservient to these superstitions and dogmas, she holds to be "false learning, false philosophy, deceitful, vain," &c. Well, we are entirely agreed, but if that is not teaching that "ignorance is the mother of devotion," we do not know what is. But let us take the rule of Scripture, "by their fruits ye shall know them." What is the learning Rome has condemned? When Galileo published his series of dialogues, demonstrating the motion of the earth round the sun, the infallible Pope, Urban VIII., charged him with heresy, and handed him over to the Holy Inquisition. Here, after eight long years of imprisonment, and, according to the published judgment of the inquisitors, being put to the "rigorous examination," (*al rigoroso esame,*) which always means, in the books of the Inquisition, *the torture*, they forced him to sign, on the 22d July, 1633, an abjuration, of which the following is a part: "But whereas, notwithstanding, after I had been legally enjoined and commanded by this holy office, to abandon wholly that false opinion, which maintains that the sun is the centre of the universe, and immoveable, and that I should not hold, defend, or in any way, either by word or writing, teach the aforesaid false doctrine; and, whereas, also, after it had been notified to me, that the aforesaid doctrine was contrary to Holy Scripture, I wrote and published a book, in which I treated of the doctrine which had been condemned, and produced reasons of great force in favor of it, without giving any answers to them, for which I have been judged by the holy office to have incurred a strong suspicion of heresy, viz: for believing that the sun is the centre of the world, and that the earth is not the centre, but moves. Being, therefore, willing to remove from the minds of your eminences, and of every Catholic Christian, this strong suspicion, which has been legally conceived against me, I do, with a sincere heart, and a true faith, abjure, curse, and detest, not only the aforesaid errors and heresies, but generally every other error and opinion which may be contrary to the aforesaid holy Church; and I swear that, for the future, I will never more say or assert, either by word or writing, any thing that shall give occasion for a like suspicion; but that if I should know any heretic or person suspected of heresy, I will inform against him to this holy office, or to the inquisitor or ordinary of the place in which I shall then be." This, then, is the kind of learning that makes men "indocile and unwilling to bow in meekness and humility to the Word of God," as interpreted by the holy mother church, and hence is "deceitful, vain,

puffs up," and to be condemned. On one side is the book of the ecclesiastical canons and decrees of the Holy See; on the other the book of the Universe, and the eternal laws of geometry. The Church is in conflict with the brazen law of Creation, and dooms the hapless believer in the evidences of that law, as reported to him by his own senses, to the prison, the punishment of the cord, the wooden horse, or the iron buskin, until, when seventy years of age, and blind and worn out by suffering, he exclaims, "*una tristizia e melancolia immensa me opprezzan,*" (an immense sadness and melancholy overwhelms me,) he signs the abjuration which gives the lie to his senses, in order to escape being burned at the stake. He was indocile, and puffed up with vain, deceitful philosophy, says Mr. Brownson. This false learning and vain philosophy make heretics, says the Church. Yet she does not teach that "ignorance is the mother of devotion"—oh, no! She believes in *true* learning! Galileo was guilty of doing just what Copernicus had done before him; what has been done by Kepler, Newton, Boyle, Pascal, Linnæus and Lord Bacon—looked further into the laws of the Universe than others had done before him; and this was heresy, and for it he was punished, compelled to abjure his discoveries, promise neither to teach nor write any more, and become a partner in the holy office by promising to inform against all men of Science. Such is the patronage Rome has extended to Science. In this day she has decreed, no railroads shall penetrate the Ecclesiastical States, and even gas-lights she protests against, it seems, lest they should dispel her moral darkness. A few years since, Cardinal Lambruschini, Minister of State, forbade all professional men of the Ecclesiastical States attending any scientific Congress of Italy. Can any one be so blind as not to see that Rome has herself declared her divorce from Science? And why? Is it not because she is afraid of her system—her devotion? Science makes men think for themselves; hence they become indocile, untractable, not willing to yield to the Holy See their common sense, and hence, with her, ignorance is blessed, and is the mother of devotion.

---

*Jesuit Education.*—(*Continued.*)

Mr. Brownson affects great surprise that whilst we charge Rome with being in league with darkness and the enemy of learning, we should at the same time be afraid of Jesuit education. He asks, "Is Protestantism not proof against light? We thought it was the boast of its friends that it was born of the advanced intelligence of the human race, and had the capacity to expand and adapt itself to every

change of the human intellect. A moment ago the Doctor upbraided us with our love of ignorance, accused us of not educating our children; and now he is afraid, if we educate, it will be all up with Protestants."—p. 40. We answer, there is a way of educating people into darkness. Mr. B. has told us in the preceding paragraph, "For ourselves, we do not suffer ourselves to be humbugged by the cry about education. Give us the right sort of education, and the more of it the better; give us the wrong sort, and the less of it the better." Here, we think, he has answered himself, and all in the same breath. But Mr. B. likes the "right sort of education"—now, let us see what that "right sort" is. He says, "we ourselves have our sons in the colleges of the Jesuits, and, in placing them there, we feel that we are discharging our duty as a father to them, and as a citizen to the country."—p. 41. Then Jesuit education is *his* "right sort." The reader is prepared to expect that the education Mr. B. has sought for his sons is one that will abjure all that science which Rome has opened a crusade against. He has told us that he abjures the learning and philosophy that make men "indocile and unwilling to bow in meekness and humility to the word of God," as interpreted by Holy Mother, for it will be remembered that the Bible is a book of riddles, in his opinion, if taken alone. But what is this Jesuit education? Let Cerutti, a Jesuit of Turin, speak: "As we swathe the limbs of an infant in the cradle to give them a right proportion, it is necessary from his earliest youth to *swathe*, so to speak, *his will*, that it may preserve, through the rest of his life, a happy and salutary suppleness."—*Apologie de l'Institut des Jesuites*, p. 330. That is, educate away his will, so that he will not think for himself, but be a supple tool in the hands of the Church. This destroys all "indocility" and untractableness. Again: the Society, in rules intended to be secret, has arranged the constitution of science under the title of *Ratio Studiorum*. One of the first injunctions met with is this: "Let no one, even in matters which are of no danger for piety, ever introduce a new question." This is to educate the young into darkness. The design of Jesuit colleges is to seize on science and strangle it by education. That which Mr. B. says sneeringly of Protestantism is true: it "was born of the advanced intelligence of the human race, and has the capacity to expand the human intellect." The Jesuits organized a system of education to prevent that expansion, and thereby arrest the progress of Protestantism, for Rome saw the two things were inseparable. The following passage from Prof. Quinet, of the College of France, sets their education in the proper light: "The founders of the Order perfectly understood the instincts of their times; they are

born in the midst of a movement of innovation which seizes upon all souls; the spirit of creation, of discovery, overflows everywhere; it attracts and carries away the world. In this sort of intoxication of science, poesy, philosophy, men felt themselves precipitated towards an unknown future. How to stop, suspend, freeze the human thought, in the midst of this bound, is the inquiry. There was only one way; it was that which the chiefs of the Order of Jesus attempted; to make themselves the representatives of this tendency, to obey it, in order the better to arrest it; to build over all the earth, houses of science, in order to imprison the flight of science; to give to the mind an apparent movement, which should render impossible for it all real movement; to consume it in an incessant gymnastics, and, under the false resemblance of activity, to arrest the curiosity; to extinguish in its beginning the genius of discovery; to stifle knowledge under the dust of books; in a word, to cause the unquiet thought of the sixteenth century to turn upon a wheel of Ixion; this was, from its origin, the great plan of education followed with so much prudence, and so consummate an art. Never was set so much reason to conspire against reason."—*The Jesuits*, pp. 203, 204.

We appeal now to our readers and to our fellow-citizens throughout this land of light and knowledge, where science has hitherto been unchained, is this in your estimation the "right sort of education?" Are you willing to suffer yourselves to be humbugged by a parade of names of sciences which it is the fixed rule of the Jesuits never to teach, but to deceive your sons by impressing them with the belief that their castrated books and lectures contain them? We say with the Reviewer, "give us the right sort of education, and the more of it the better." But God forbid that the people of these United States should fall into the snare the Jesuits have set for them, by supposing that a system of education designed to *swathe the will*, and strangle free inquiry, is the "right sort of education."

Mr. Brownson thinks the author of the sermon has erred in saying that the Order of the Jesuits has not produced a single name above mediocrity since its restoration in 1814. He says, "It is possible that he is not acquainted with all the names the Order has produced since its restoration, for we could mention some of the names which are at least above mediocrity."—p. 41. We would have been glad to have seen these names known to science, and wonder that Mr. B. did not think fit to silence all caviling by mentioning them. It is true, that it is very hard to know "all the names the Order has produced," for it works too much in the dark to let the world know who are its members. But there is good reason to believe that the mod-

esty of the Order never required it to hold back a name that it had the most remote idea could reflect any lustre upon it. It is some evidence at least of mental paucity that where a "not very remarkable Sermon on the Dangers of Jesuit Instruction" is preached within the very shadow of the walls of one of their Universities, it becomes necessary to send all the way to Boston and procure the services of such a man as Mr. Brownson to reply to it. That the Jesuits did not think it beneath their notice, as they at first alleged, is manifest from the extraordinary notes of joy that burst from their organ, the "News Letter," when the Review made its appearance here; from their zeal in reprinting it, and from their subsequent dispersion of that reprint, on the wings of the wind, from the University buildings. Besides, if the author has erred, it has been in very good company. Professor Michelet, whose opportunities to know the *men* of the Order Mr. B. will scarcely question, goes much further; he says, "The machinery of the Jesuits has been active and powerful, but it has made nothing living, there always has been wanting to it, what for all society is the highest sign of life, there has been wanting *the great man*. Not a man has it produced in three hundred years." —*Jesuit*, p. 22.

We return again to the subject of Jesuit Schools. The Reviewer says: "As educators, the French University seems to stand in awe of them. The Doctor would do well to become acquainted with their schools, before undertaking to discuss their merits. Perhaps, were he to do so, he would not hazard the assertion, that 'a graduate of one of these Universities is not qualified to enter the Junior Class at Princeton, Yale, or any of the more respectable Protestant Colleges of our land.'"—p. 41. The gentlemen of the French University would be amused with the idea of standing in awe of the Jesuits "as educators." From every thing we have seen of the difficulty between them, the awe has been on the other side. It was the power which the University possessed that led the Jesuits to intriguing with the Government that they might have the control of the subject—that led them to create disturbances, and send their creatures to the Lecture rooms of the Professors to create confusion. Who can suppose that they would have resorted to such disgraceful tricks if engaged in a *successful* competition? No—the French University had no fears of them "as educators;" but, as dark, designing intriguers, seeking the destruction of science and human liberty, they felt called upon to expose their machinations and whole system, and the result has been seen. The Government gave them notice, for the third time, to leave the kingdom.

Without boasting any peculiar competency to judge of the merits of their system of education, we beg leave to say that we have lived some eighteen years beside one of the Jesuit Schools. We have been through its halls; examined its facilities for imparting knowledge; conversed with its Professors; been intimate with its students and graduates; and compared the course of studies taught, and the actual knowledge acquired, with similar facilities and acquirements in other colleges, and therefore we suppose we have had *opportunity*, at least, for coming to a correct conclusion. What has been said in the sermon concerning the qualifications of graduates from *more than one* of these Universities, is not an opinion hazarded, but the statement of a fact, notorious in this community, and which Mr. B. can have verified by addressing the Faculty of the College of New Jersey, or of Yale.

The system of education in Jesuit Colleges is radically defective, and must ever remain so, from the very character of the Order, which requires a division of learning into *suspicious* sciences, and those *not suspicious*. Latin is preserved, but no Latin literature, except in the editions arranged by the Jesuits. Modern Literature and Philosophy belong to the class suspicious, and are almost entirely heresies. Mathematics may be trusted, and so may Rhetoric and Logic. But History must come through a Jesuit purgation; and Political Economy, Political Ethics, Geology and its kindred Sciences, will make men "indocile;" that is, heretics. The course of learning laid down by the founder of the Order, shows the incapacity of the masters in these institutions to instruct in our day. "Ignatius ordains, that, after two years of noviceship, they apply themselves to study, and points out those branches in which they are to engage; namely, the learned languages, poetry, rhetoric, philosophy, theology, ecclesiastical history, and the Holy Scriptures."—*Bonhour's Life of Ig.*, p. 231. In this wretchedly meagre list, let no one suppose that philosophy means anything resembling the sciences which are included in the term in our day; it is philosophy as understood in the sixteenth century. It is the remark of Michelet, that "their method of education, even in its judicious parts, is spoiled by the petty spirit; by the excessive divisions of time and of different studies. Everything is meanly cut up; a quarter of an hour for four lines of Cicero, another quarter for Virgil, &c. Add to this their mania for arranging authors, of mixing up their own style with them, of giving the ancients the dress of Jesuits." Then the whole establishment is governed and ruled like a parcel of automatons; at the pulling of the wire they all get up, and they all lie down; they come in and they go out, they study and

they play; things the most minute as well as of the utmost moment are all governed by inflexible rules. The external is well cared for, the internal may come if it can. But worst of all, the whole system is one of mutual surveillance, mutual denunciation. "The Superior is surrounded by his consulters; the priests, novices, pupils, by their brethren or comrades, who may denounce them"—who are encouraged to do so. Go where you will in a Jesuit Institution, and you may be assured that your most secret act or word is known. If ever there was a system to make a child mean, low-spirited and *sneaking*, it is this.

It is a common deception practised by the officers of these Institutions upon Protestant parents, to assure them that they do not interfere with the religious opinions of their pupils. They at the same time knowing that the rules of the Society, which they are sworn to comply with, requires the contrary. One of their own number says: "Ignatius wished that the colleges of the Society should be so many temples, where the *Science of Salvation* should be no less an object of study, than the acquisition of worldly knowledge." Then he gives the following quotation from the *Ratio Studiorum*: "Let the principle design of each professor be to form the youthful mind to veneration for the Supreme Being, and to instill into it, both in class and elsewhere, the virtues by which He is to be pleased. The scholars are to assist each day at the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass. They are to receive, from time to time, pious exhortations; *they are to be excited to the frequentation of the Sacraments*, and practice of prayer. They are to be familiarized with all the practices of piety, and habituated to a tender and sincere devotion to the Holy Virgin. By means of frequent catechetical instructions, they are to be solidly established in the principles and duties of religion."—*Inst. of the Jesuits*, p. 17. Again, in the "Life of St. Ignatius," Father Bonhours says, "Ignatius ordered the students daily to hear mass, to go monthly to confession, to begin their studies by making a short prayer, and to attend once a week to instructions in the Catechism, and in the rules of a good life. He also prescribed to the masters, on every seasonable occasion, both in school and out of it, to speak familiarly to them of heavenly things."—p. 269. Now, we have shown in a former number that the summit of virtue among Jesuits is found in obedience; what hope, then, can a parent have, that when the rules of the Order and the authoritative command of the founder stand on the one hand, and a deceitful promise made in the face of the rules and that command on the other, that the oft repeated assurances will be complied with. No; their colleges are "so many temples to teach the (Romish)

Science of Salvation;" and hence every clandestine art to make the child abjure the religion of his fathers, and curse his parents as heretics, will be resorted to.

Concerning female instruction in the Convents, Mr. B. says, "we want no better proof of their excellency than the simple fact, that Protestants, notwithstanding their prejudices against the religious orders, send, and are eager to send, their daughters to them."—p. 42. We are sorry to say that the fact stated here, we believe, is in many places true, and many are the Protestant parents who have bitterly repented their folly subsequently. Such has been the case in this city; but we rejoice to know that a great and salutary reform has taken place and fully believe, that, as this subject is brought more fully before the public, the time is not distant when parents will shun these schools as they would so many pest-houses. It may be well here to remind our readers, that one of these Orders, "the ladies of the Sacred Heart," are a branch of the Order of Jesuits; they are not only directed and governed by them, but since 1823 they have the same constitutions. The pecuniary interests of the two branches must be common to a certain extent, since the Jesuits, on their return after the Revolution of July, in France, were aided from the chest of the Sacred Heart.* The Ligorians, Sulpicians, Lazarists, and the Sisters of Charity and ladies of the Visitation, are also affiliated Orders, under the direction of the Jesuits. Loyola prohibited the Society from governing women; he having tried the experiment in his own person, came to the conclusion, "that the direction of these pious ladies was more troublesome than that of the whole Society;" but his wiser successors have revoked this regulation. It has been found by the Order that the simple and natural means was to catch wild birds by tame ones. These polished, gentle, adroit and charming Jesuitesses generally go before the Jesuits, put everywhere oil and honey, and smooth the way. They delight women by making themselves sisters, friends, whatever they wish, but especially they appeal to mothers, touching the tender point—the poor maternal heart. From true friendship, they consent to take the young girl; and the mother, who otherwise would never have been separated from her, confides her very readily to heir gentle hands. Thus the Jesuits get into their hands the daughters of the influential families of the place. In

---

* Only last February the Roman Catholic citizens of Pisa resisted, by violence, an attempt to introduce ladies of the Sacred Heart into that city, and a protest, signed by one hundred and thirty of the most eminent citizens of the place, and thirty-six Professors of the University, they being ecclesiastics, was addressed to the Government, solely on the ground that these ladies belong entirely to the "Company of Jesus."

a few years these little girls become wives and mothers. Whoever has the woman, is sure to have the men in the long run.

In speaking of the excellency of these schools, Mr. B. falls into an exstacy. We give an extract as a beautiful specimen of rodomontade. "There is something in the very atmosphere of the Catholic schools that gives an inexpressible charm to the female character, which we have never found in a Protestant, not brought up in some degree under Catholic influence. There is a purity, a delicacy, a sweetness, a gentleness, a grace, a dignity, about a Catholic lady, that you shall look in vain for in a purely Protestant lady, however high-born or well-bred. It is only in the Catholic lady that woman appears in all her loveliness, worth, and glory. It is Catholicity that has wrought out woman's emancipation, elevated her from her former menial condition, rescued her from the harem of the voluptuary, and made her the companion, and not unfrequently, more than the companion of man."—p. 42. Poor, unhappy Protestants! You can never possess true purity, delicacy, sweetness, gentleness, grace and dignity. Your religion is constantly throwing you back into a state of barbarism. How ought you to sigh for the return of the days of the thirteenth, fourteenth and fifteenth centuries; the return of the dark ages, when the glorious Roman Church elevated females from their menial condition, and the pure nuns and priests rescued them from the harem of the voluptuary. Your daughters can never reach that purity attained by Lucretia Borgia, and others, who were reared in the very sunshine of the Roman Court. We learn also from this piece of enlightenment, why it is that the females of such Roman Catholic countries as France, and Italy, and Spain, are so much more chaste and pure, and free from the very appearance of gallantry than those of such unhappy Protestant countries as England and the United States. But to be serious, if this degenerate scion of a Puritan stock is disposed to revile the mother that bore him, and the sisters that were nourished at his side, as those in whom the purity, loveliness, worth and glory of the female character never appeared, we cannot make reprisals upon the females who may adorn society in the communion he has embraced. It is enough for us to know they would scorn to adopt the sentiments he has unblushingly printed. We rejoice to say we have found delicacy, loveliness and dignity amongst females of the Roman Church, but they were possessed of too much good sense ever to reckon it to the account of their convent education. We have heard Roman mothers frequently apologize for the rudeness of their daughter's manners, on the ground that they were just from the convent. They have looked to a mother's influence over their young hearts for

the purity and delicacy they desired to cultivate, and to the influence of society, mixed with Protestantism as it was, for the grace and dignity they wished them to acquire. Mr. B. should be particularly careful how he touches upon conventual purity and harems. Has he ever heard of a Roman Catholic Bishop called Scipio de Ricci, and of a work he wrote on that subject? A word to the wise is sufficient.

*Protestant Civil Government contrasted with Papal.*

The concluding paragraph of the Review is too remarkable to be passed without some notice. The Reviewer says of the Roman Church, "It is now firmly established in this country, and persecution will but cause it to thrive. Our countrymen may be grieved that it is so; but it is useless for them to kick against the decrees of Almighty God. They have had an open field and fair play for Protestantism. Here, Protestantism has had free scope, has reigned without a rival, and proved what she could do, and that her best is evil; for the very good she boasts is not hers."—p. 43. In the vocabulary of Rome, resistance offered to her claim of universal spiritual empire, by reason and light, is persecuting her. When *she* has the power, as in Italy and Spain, subjecting dissenters to the dungeon, the tortures of the Inquisition and the *auto de fe*, is merely a little salutary discipline. The only persecution Romanists have ever experienced under this Government, or ever can experience, is moral suasion. They are a sect of religionists, and as such have rights, which, so long as they do not interfere with the rights of others, the Government is bound to protect. Would that we could say the same of the Governments where she rules. So long as Rome confines herself to truth and moral force, we shall never charge her with persecution. We are not of the number who, when beaten in an argument, put up this cry to excite sympathy or cover our defeat. But the species of persecution she most dreads, that of light and truth, she must experience in this land of freedom. She has ventured upon a hazardous experiment in this country; one totally unknown in her past history. Her course heretofore has been, even as now in the Ecclesiastical States, to shut out light, to draw an impassable cordon around her subjects. Her plan now is to rush them into an ocean of light, with such rapidity, that it shall be extinguished by the foreign masses before her own material has time to kindle. She has freely ventured upon the experiment, and must expect that every resistance

truth can make will be offered, that her most secret designs will be ripped up and exposed to the light of day, and no cry of persecution or whinings after the sympathy of nominal Protestants can save her. And if, instead of the bright visions that now dazzle the eyes of Mr. Brownson, the experiment should result in freeing her subjects, sent to these shores, from spiritual as well as civil despotism, she may at least console herself with the reflection, that the battle was not lost for lack of boldness in the conception of the plan.

Mr. Brownson has the courage to present the issue growing out of the comparative claims of this free Government and those of Roman Catholic countries, and we cheerfully accept it. "Here," he says, "Protestantism has had free scope, has reigned without a rival, and proved what she could do." And what has she done? We answer, everything that in reason could have been proposed, and greatly more than a chastened expectation could have anticipated. The United States have afforded a safe and happy asylum to the oppressed of all nations, for more than half a century. Have increased from thirteen to twenty-eight free and independent States. The population has been constantly augmenting since the organization of the Government; then the people numbered but three millions, and in little more than half a century they are twenty millions. Their prosperity has been marked no less strikingly by the increase of wealth and capital, invested in all the industrial arts; more than three hundred millions of dollars are invested in manufactures, and her commercial capital exceeds four hundred millions. The progress of education has been commensurate with her progress and wealth; common education is placed within the reach of every child, and her halls of science are accessible to all; her people are emphatically a reading people, and half the periodicals published in the world are the product of this country. Every guarantee of freedom known in the world is here enjoyed: trial by jury; habeas corpus; full and free representation; and the rights of conscience secured by having all religions equally protected. Her prosperity is the result of her institutions; no chance hits, or meteoric periods occur in her history, but her march has been a steady progress to prosperity and power, showing that it results from the expansive character of her fundamental institutions. And as the surest proof of the excellent working of her institutions, and the happy results in those governed, she has no standing army, save a few men to garrison out-posts and keep her fortifications in repair; no direct tax; and no national debt. Abroad, her flag commands the respect of every nation, and her power is feared. The friends of human rights and civil freedom, in all lands, have hailed her

government as the dawn of universal liberty to the oppressed of the earth, whilst her example is hated by every despotic prince. This is the only country, since the name was adopted, in which there has been "an open field and fair play for Protestantism," and this is what it has done. Now, let the annals of the world be searched, and any nation produced, Pagan, Mohammedan, Jew, or Christian, where similar results have been worked out. Protestantism in the United States, then, stands upon a proud eminence, and fears comparison with no nation upon the earth. Now let us see what Romanism has done for the freedom and happiness of the countries she has governed.

Italy is the country where the national policy and national institutions of Romanism are to be studied, because there she has been without a mistress; there is the seat of her temporal power; all other nations over whom she has had any control have been used to enrich the patrimony of St. Peter. Here, then, we are to expect a development of all her wisdom and benevolence, in showering upon the people the blessings of freedom, of national wealth, of intelligence and holiness. What is the history of Romanism in Italy? The Lombards, to whom this country fell a prey in the general division of the Roman Empire, however rude and unpolished when first they came into Italy, divested themselves, by insensible degrees, of their native barbarity, and, after they became a Christian people, were marked for their justice, humanity, and good government. "Under the government of the Lombards," says Paulus Diaconus, "no violence was committed, no man was unjustly dispossessed of his property, none oppressed with taxes; theft, robberies, murder and adultery, were seldom heard of; every one went, without apprehension of danger, whither he pleased." Under such a government Italy ought to have taken a place among the nations of the earth commensurate with the extent and importance of her territory. And what prevented this? Pope Stephen II., sighing for temporal power, invited a foreigner, Pepin of France, to enter Italy and wrench from the Lombards a portion of their territory, to be bestowed upon St. Peter. The Dukedom of Rome, the Exarchate of Ravenna, and the Pentapolis, (now Marca d'Ancona,) became the temporal kingdom of the Pope. But the Lombards were neighbors still too powerful for this Ecclesiastical King, and again the Pope beckoned to the foreigner, and the son of Pepin crushed the Lombards, and established himself. From that day onward, to divide into petty states the whole country, in order to extend their own power, has been the unvarying policy of the Popes. Too weak themselves to accomplish their aims, they have never hesitated to embroil, impoverish, lay waste their country, by inviting the

sovereigns of the surrounding countries to burn the cities and rob and murder the inhabitants; and, so soon as these invaders were seated in their new possessions, to turn traitors to their allies, and draw another foreign horde upon them. Thus Italy has been for ages the battle ground for France, and Germany, and Spain. This has been the first benefit derived from the meekness, holiness and benevolence of the sovereign pontiffs, as reaped by Italy. Though her vales are beautiful, her soil luxuriant, her climate unsurpassed, and her sky is cloudless, Italy is dismembered, trodden under foot, impoverished, ignorant and cursed, through popish policy.

And what has been the government in the states over which the church has held civil rule? The government is an elective monarchy, but only the cardinals are electors, and these are created by the Pope; hence the people in no way participate in his election. His counsellors and officers of state are cardinals, depriving the people as entirely of all control or influence in the government as if they were serfs. The cardinals being all eligible, each election becomes a scramble who shall succeed; and as but one can occupy the seat at a time, the usual policy has been to put that man in who will be likely soonest to vacate the place by his death, and thus give the members of the college another chance. The cardinal elected, having no successor in whom he is interested, finds his interest in enriching his family while he lives. Thus have the Popes usually acted the part of robbers to the State and aliens to the country. The most unjust monopolies are held by the cardinals; they only are permitted to sell the necessaries of life; oil, groceries, corn, flour and bread. The grocers and bakers are mere agents, or, if any wish to exercise their industry on their own account, they are exposed to vexatious oppression. Government regulates the price of bread, ostensibly that the people may not pay too dear for it; but if any baker attempts to sell it *under* the price paid by the holy monopolists, he is liable to a severe penalty. The country is unsafe, being infested with banditti, and the government has been accustomed to negotiate with, instead of suppressing them. There is no trial by jury, and no single guarantee is given to the citizen for his liberty; he may be arrested, thrown into a dungeon, and kept in suspense as long as the judges please. Under such a government it is not surprising that the population does not increase. These States are less populous at this day than they were under the Empire of Rome. The taxes are oppressive, and yet the whole revenue is scarcely sufficient to pay five per cent. interest on the public debt, leaving nothing for current expenses. A standing army, composed of hired foreign soldiers, is kept continually in the country, to remind the people, with the points of their bayonets, that they

are living under the best Government in the world; and hence ought to be quiet and submissive. The sovereign holds that salvation out of his communion is impossible, and that it is his duty to extirpate heresy from the earth, hence no toleration in religion can find a place. The rights of conscience are unknown, and civil liberty is a heresy as great as religious liberty; they are both proscribed subjects throughout his dominions. This, then, is the Government that is compared with what Protestantism has done in the United States! The man that dares to raise such an issue is either insane, or wishes to try how far he can venture upon the ignorance and blindness of his Romish readers; for no sane man could ever have expected that any American could do other than smile at his folly.

Now, when Mr. Brownson tells us "a new day is dawning on this chosen land; a new chapter is about to open in our history, and the Church to assume her rightful position and influence"—that, "our hills and valleys shall yet echo to the convent bell; the cross shall be planted throughout the length and breadth of our land," and that "this is to be a Catholic country;" it is saying to us, let us alone in our work of darkness a little longer, and your free institutions shall be exchanged for the despotism, poverty and darkness of oppressed and down-trodden Italy. Or, if we should take any other Roman Catholic country—you shall be placed beside Spain, or Portugal, or Austria, or Mexico! And he who thus writes is a descendent of the Pilgrims! From that band of noble martyrs whose blood was shed on Bunker Hill! Men who sacrificed their all, that their children might be free from the oppression of a Government whose loins were not so thick as Rome's little finger. This degenerate son stands on their ashes, and, beneath the shadow of the very monument erected by grateful posterity to their memory, traitor like, is beckoning to these tyrants, and lending himself, a willing tool to Jesuits, that his country may be undone.