

# SPIRIT OF THE XIX. CENTURY.

VOL. I.

JANUARY, 1842.

No. 1.

## EDITORIAL STATEMENT.

THE *Baltimore Literary and Religious Magazine*, has terminated its existence. It is the purpose of the present work to take its place.

The books of that concern have been placed in the hands of *D. Owen & Son*, Booksellers, No. 38, Baltimore street; and as it is necessary that its business should be closed with as little delay as possible—they will send out its accounts, without discrimination. It is hoped that these small bills, which are comparatively trifling to those who have them to pay, but in the aggregate, of serious importance to those to whom they are due, and which, to the last farthing, have been worked for—and to a heavy amount also paid to others in advance for the debtors; will be promptly paid. The proprietors of that Magazine will take the risk of the mail; and will receive, at par, any currency which is at par where the debtor resides. The proprietors are in advance to the work about \$1000; and their subscribers are in arrears to them more than double that sum. This is the pecuniary result of seven years of as hard work, as was ever performed in like circumstances.

It is not improbable that, in so many hundreds of accounts, errors of various kinds may exist; although great accuracy has been constantly aimed at. It may also occur that accounts, just, as to their amount, may be sent to persons who had not expected to pay any thing. In these, and similar cases, the concern must, in the first instance, rely on the books—and finally, on the justice and good faith of its former patrons.

The *Baltimore Literary and Religious Magazine*, has witnessed great changes, and perhaps has had some share in producing them. In seven years, estimating its regular issues, and the various extras from its press—it has distributed throughout this great confederacy, little short of a hundred thousand pamphlets. Every one of these has been devoted to the immediate and momentous interests of the living generation; the great mass of them have passed into the hands of men who exert an important influence in society; and very many of them have been pregnant with some of the finest productions of some of the loftiest, strongest, and richest minds of the age. It has been a work eminently devoted to *realities*. And in prosecuting these, it begged no-body—in an age of mendacity; it feared nobody—in an age of truckling; it flattered no-body

—in an age of self seeking. Now it is dead—it would not exchange that epitaph, for the inflated life of all the dilated and diluted humbugs of the age.

Some few of the patrons of the Magazine are in advance to that work. In all such cases the present periodical will be sent to the full amount of such advances.

There does not remain, for sale, a single complete set of the Magazine. There are on hand many odd numbers, and a few bound volumes of most of the years. The former will be given without charge to fill up sets; and the latter will be sold, in the same way, at half the subscription price.

The work which is now offered to the public, will occupy the same general ground and field—as the one to which it succeeds; and will be sent to all the subscribers to the former periodical—just as if it had been continued; and upon the same terms.

The undersigned as proprietor, publisher and editor of this work—appeals to those who desire to promote such an enterprize, and who confide in his ability to conduct it; to aid him in his present arduous, expensive, and responsible attempt to promote the growth of real knowledge, to extend the blessings of true liberty, and to strengthen and enlarge the reign of righteousness. His great aim is, to comprehend, to develope, and according to his ability to aid in shaping and directing the spirit of the age. He will follow with unfaltering step—the motto he has placed on his title page: *NON SINE LUCE*. Without light, he will do nothing: with light, he will shrink from nothing. Like the dial to the sun, so may his heart and life be, to the light of God, as it shines in the face of Jesus Christ our Lord.

It is proper to say, that the immediate cause of the arrangements now announced, was the voluntary withdrawal of the junior editor of the former publication—the *Rev'd Andrew Boyd Cross*, from that work; with which his connexion for about four years past—has been such, as hardly to justify his incurring the responsibilities, which the continuance of his name on the title page necessarily involved. A crisis having been thus produced, it has been determined, after much consideration, to adopt the course, which it is the main object of this statement to explain; and which, it is hoped will be met by a vigorous co-operation on the part of those to whom the present appeal is made.

And may the grace of God, attend and direct the whole.

ROBERT J. BRECKINRIDGE.

Baltimore, January 1, 1842.

ALLOCATION OF THE POPE OF ROME (of March 2, 1841) AGAINST  
THE ACTS OF THE SPANISH GOVERNMENT AND THE LAWS OF THE  
REALM.

THE present Pope of Rome is a very simple minded and garrulous old man. He seems to be entirely a bigot; and to believe, firmly, all the nonsense he has so often and so unreservedly poured forth in Bulls, Encyclicals, Allocutions, and what not.

The allocation printed below, was delivered to the Consistory of Cardinals at Rome, on the day of its date; and, as appears from the body of it, published by the Pope's order. It was translated into Spanish, and published in the *Diario de la Tarde* of Buenos-Ayres, of June 17, 1841; from which, translated into English, it was published in the Boston Recorder—and afterwards in several other American papers. Its authenticity has not, that we know of, been questioned.

It is a document of some importance, at the present moment; as illustrating the true character of that supremacy claimed by the Pope of Rome, and accorded to him by all the faithful. The reader of the Allocation will observe, that this temporal prince, calling himself God's vicar on earth—not only sets himself vehemently against the progress of freedom and reform in Spain—which is, as to him, a foreign and sovereign state; but absolutely annuls fundamental laws of the monarchy, by virtue of authority which he says is divine; and, indirectly calls upon the subjects of a foreign government, to revolt, because he, the Pope, disapproves some of the municipal laws of their country. Let us apply the light of these atrocious acts to our own country, and to the proceedings of unnaturalized foreigners in our midst—for instance, *Mr. Hughes*, who calls himself Bishop of some outlandish place; who, holding honours, offices, and emoluments, by the appointment of this blind, old bedlamite at Rome—are striving to subvert the very foundations of society and government, in this land of Protestant liberty. Will men never learn that Popery is not a religion; but that it is an organized conspiracy, for the ruin of man, and the dominion of the world? Its pretext of being a religion, is perfectly ridiculous. It is a league for the extirpation of light and mercy, purity and freedom from amongst men. We read with horror, of the conspiracy of the *Illuminati*, of the last century; but the conspiracy of the *Jesuits* is far more dangerous in all respects.

Popery has reigned in Spain with undisputed sway. Behold the condition to which it has reduced the most powerful state in Europe—and one of the finest portions of the globe!—Is this the result it promises us—in case the agitations of *Mr. Hughes*, *Dagger* *John Bishop*,—and the rest—should prove successful? Is it not better to trust the true God, who has made us what we are; than his pretended vicar, who has made Spain what she is—and who seems so anxious to prevent her regeneration?

For nearly a hundred and thirty years—popery has been *officially anti-Christian*; she has publicly and formally, in the Bull *Unigen-*

thus, published by Clement XI., in 1713, against the Jansenists, declared herself the enemy of the saving truths of the religion of God. That Bull, is the last confession of her faith, as it is the most precise, and will become, when the subject is understood, the most famous. By it, she formally renounces the religion of Jesus of Nazareth; makes grace, a heresy; faith, a scandal; the pardon of sin, a lie; the true love of God, a sedition and an outrage; assurance of salvation by Jesus Christ, an impiety; and the reading of God's word, blasphemy. Into this abyss has "Babylon the Great," plunged herself—in her God-forsaken folly and sin. She has become more and more corrupted and estranged from Jesus Christ; her origin, her history, her cruelties, her hierarchy, her doctrines, her aim, and her end—but more and more clearly prove her the mother of abominations; and every new act but the more clearly establishes the duty, obligatory on every child of God, to resist this great corrupter of the earth, to stop that mouth which speaks only lies and blasphemies against God and his truth, to break that horn which will not cease to war against the saints.

Talk of conversions to popery! Talk of the restoration of popery—to its ancient power to oppress the human race! It is true, her iron teeth, and claws of brass (*Daniel* vii. 19) may tear and devour the dead flesh of Protestantism. It will not nourish her; and its removal only strengthens us. Her efforts are great, at the present moment, especially in Britain, and with us. But in France, in Italy, and in Spain—her ancient bulwarks—how is it, with the drunken harlot? Let this Allocution testify as to Spain. No, no. Let our fellow soldiers, in the old world, take courage and stand firm. America will do her duty. The spirit of the church of Christ is roused to this mighty subject; the national mind is fully bent on sifting it to the bottom. Fear nothing; only be faithful: God will show us marvellous things—and that right soon.

—  
"ROME, March 2d, 1841.

"*Venerable brothers!*—It is already five years that in your assembly we have deplored the melancholy state of religion in Spain, and the innumerable attacks upon the church in that kingdom. We shall cause our address to be published, in order, if possible, to urge the government of Madrid to adopt more prudent measures, and to give to the world authentic proof of our disapprobation of its proceedings. From the beginning we have abstained from serious and public complaints, not because the church in Spain has not been sufficiently injured, but because we have observed from time to time that the reclamations of the Prelates had obtained at intervals partial success. It is for this reason that we continued to use only the most gentle means for the protection of the cause of the church. We have entertained the hope that our indulgence would, in time, open some easy way to cure the maladies of Israel and restore the holy things,—if not to primitive splendor, yet to a decent and deserving state. But the very opposite has occurred. Indeed, it seems that the Government of Madrid has only ended the civil war, and established peace, to gather new forces to tram-

ple upon the sacred rights of the church and the Holy See. Thus it is, that, the secular magistrates received orders by a Decree of 10th Dec., 1840, to carry into effect that of 1835, which prohibits, with a few exceptions, Bishops from making appointments to fill ecclesiastical benefices. By the Decrees of 6th and 13th Dec., it is declared, that the orders for suppressing the convents, shall be executed upon those which had made their submission, and which until then had remained in tact. Nor are the churches spared, for, a decree of the 9th Dec., 1840, ordains that all churches belonging to convents be sold at public auction, excepting those in which Divine worship was celebrated, notwithstanding *those* were the only ones where it could be performed, as the others had been pillaged of all they contained. Added to this, was the Decree of the 31st Jan., relating to the project of a Law to be presented to the last Cortes, proposing that the secular clergy (for a long time deprived of their income) be dispossessed of all their ecclesiastical property, reducing them like commoners to a mercenary existence upon a precarious stipend to be provided by the state.

" We complain of the bad treatment of our apostolical dignity, represented in the person of our Vice Nuncio, in the tribunal of the Rota, instituted by the authority of the Holy see to decide ecclesiastical causes, which, previously were carried by appeal to Rome. The Roman pontificate has exercised this right in Spain from the earliest ages, and in certain cases has confided it to legates. We complain because some of the most venerable men have been deprived of their diocesses, in which they had been placed as Bishops by the Holy Spirit, for the government of the church of God; and further, because many times their vicars have been hindered in the exercise of their duties. Prebends of the vacant churches have been urged or obliged to confer the office of the Vicariate upon men who had been appointed Bishops by the government, contrary to the rules laid down by the second council of Leon and other canonical constitutions confirmed by the letters of our predecessor, Pius VII.

" We complain of the expulsion of the religious orders from their convents, where they had retired to practice perfection according to the directions of the gospel;—of the bad treatment experienced by the secular clergy, and the censure which has even been passed upon them in matters concerning their religious duties.

" We complain of the usurpation of ecclesiastical property, consummated, as if this property belonged to the nation alone, and the immaculate spouse of Jesus Christ had no natural right to acquire and hold temporal goods; as if to fix blame upon our predecessors who enjoyed them even under pagan princes, and who, when the church was despoiled of them by the edicts of those princes, claimed restitution from succeeding emperors, according to the laws of Justice.

" We complain of the decrees and other measures adopted by the government, by which the immunities of the church and of the priesthood, established by the will of God and canonical rights, have come to be lightly esteemed, and by which, with unheard-of audacity the necessary faculties for the exercise of our holy religion, have been invaded;—faculties, which the church received from its

Divine Founder to exercise with perfect liberty, even in the face of the opposition of the princes of the earth.

"We complain that the temples of the God of Sabaoth—the images of the saints—the rites of the church, and even the sacred vessels dedicated to the sacrifice of the mass, (which should not be looked upon without respectful fear,) have been employed for profane purposes.

"We complain, in fine, that no impediment has been put in that Catholic kingdom to the propagation, (not always without the knowledge of the authorities) of impious books, and even the admission of heretical doctrines, to the upsetting of the faith of the simple, and which, while it increased the boldness of impiety, caused religious ceremonies to be frequently defiled by jest, noise, blasphemy, and even led to the assassination of the priests.

"We, therefore, inspired by the Divinity, impelled by the solicitude which we feel for all the churches, do declare in virtue of our apostolical authority, that we disapprove of all that has been done or attempted in these matters or in others, respecting the rights of the church by the government of Madrid or its subordinate authorities, and do annul and abrogate all the said decrees and measures in virtue of our said apostolical authority, with all their consequences, which we declare and pronounce as null, void and without value, for the past, present, and time to come.

"We conjure the authors of those decrees, who boast of the name of Catholic—we beg them in the name of our Lord, that they would open their eyes to the wounds they have given to their most merciful mother, and remember the ecclesiastical censures and penalties which the ecclesiastical and apostolical constitutions, and the decrees of the Oecumenical Councils pronounce against those who invade the rights of the church—that each one of them may have compassion on their souls, bound as they will be in consequence, by invisible chains, and that they do not forget, that the final judgment will be more severe for those who rule and govern, and that the most weighty responsibility rests upon those who in religious communities shall prevaricate or distort the truth.

"We congratulate the Arch-Bishops and Bishops of Spain for their pastoral zeal in remaining in their dioceses, or in protecting the cause of the church when obliged to retire—exhorting the faithful to the performance of their duties, and shewing the dangers of irreligion. The rest of our faithful clergy is also entitled to our highest praise for their co-operation and assistance.

"Finally, the great majority of the plebian Catholics have remained faithful to the Bishops who have been canonically instituted. We have then the strongest hopes that our most merciful Lord, will deign to cast a favorable eye upon his flock. Continue ye, venerable brothers, directing your fervent prayers to God through Jesus Christ, invoking the intercession of the mother of God—the holy patron of Spain, and all the saints, who, when on earth lived in that country which they sanctified and ennobled with their principles—their doctrines—their sufferings, and even their blood, as a testimony of their faith; that they, in these times of calamity, may be the guardians of their compatriots, and by their intercession may turn aside the evils that menace them."

## CONTROVERSY WITH THE DOMESTIC CHAPLAINS OF THE ARCHBISHOP OF BALTIMORE.—FINALE.

EARLY in the year 1841, a correspondence was commenced in one of those weekly periodicals called generically a *family newspaper*; and personally, the *Baltimore Saturday Visiter*; the object of which was to debate, on one side and the other, certain difficulties, real or imaginary, in the "*doctrine and practice*" of—holy mother church,—she of Rome.

Mr. White and Mr. Coskerry, priests of the Roman, Catholic, Apostolic church—so called—managed the controversy on that side; and, what they did, was with the full approbation of "My Lord Eccleston,"—"Archbishop of Baltimore," &c. &c. On the side of the Protestants, the correspondence was anonymous.

The article published below, will explain itself. It was the xxii. Protestant article in this aforesaid controversy; and tells what became of the priests, and how the Protestants having beaten them off, were in turn choaked off themselves, by a new editor of the *Visiter*.

It is hardly necessary to say, that the answer of the priests to the challenge of the Protestants, contained in the article below—gave a wide birth to that part of the subject. They had a world of nonsense about their victory, and about the good the controversy had done them, and about the efficacy of their retreat, even; BUT NOT A WORD ABOUT THE CHALLENGE! They and their superiors were afraid "*the hand of Joab*" was some how in the business; and so, took the hint in good time.

Some of the Protestant articles in this correspondence—possibly most of them—will be republished in this periodical; wherefore it is, that their concluding article—which explains the origin and end of the affair—is now inserted. It is taken from the number of the newspaper several times referred to, of Dec. 4, 1841.

## LAST ARTICLE OF THE PROTESTANTS—THEIR CHALLENGE.

THE individuals who have had the management of this controversy on the *Protestant* side, were the farthest possible from seeking the agency which they have had in this business, from first to last. The former editor of the *Visiter*, Mr. J. B. JONES, was induced, for reasons and under circumstances, of which we were ignorant at the time—to open his columns to a discussion of the principles and practices of the Roman Catholic religion; and to make a voluntary and public pledge of his pages at the rate of two columns a week, for one year, to the subject.

In this state of the case, a few Protestant gentlemen of several religious denominations—made a promise to Mr. JONES, and that upon his motion rather than theirs, to manage the Protestant side, and be responsible for the required articles, in their order. And they have until the present moment, gone on to fulfil this engagement. They might with all propriety have given up the controversy long ago; viz: when they drove the priests fairly off the field,—which they did before the year was half out. But, as they suppos-

ed they were under an honorary obligation to Mr. JONES; as they knew the public took some interest in the matter, and that the subscription list of the *Visiter* was favorably affected by it; and as they hoped to do good, by developing the real character of a most absurd and wicked superstition, they still continued their contributions, according to their engagement.

It is known to the readers of the *Visiter*, that Mr. JONES has lately retired from the control of the paper. And some of them may have observed, that the present editor has very unequivocally expressed his dissatisfaction—perhaps we might say, disgust—at the discussion, and his joy in the prospect of its early termination. In his last paper, he says, speaking of the “Catholic Question”—“*we have enough of the thing and to spare.*” And in the paper before the last, still less equivocally thus,—“*we cannot say we are sorry that the termination of this controversy as to time, is so near at hand. It is becoming positively too cold for this sort of reading—the weather we mean. We are aware that religious controvertists are the last to get cold. We verily believe some of them could write in the coldest weather, with a pen made of an icicle, and a rock on the bleakest elevation of the Alleghany, for a table.*”

We make no other observation than this,—that being first exonerated by the retirement of our adversaries—and now again, by the change of sentiment on the part of the paper itself; we feel ourselves at liberty to drop a controversy in which we originally engaged with a deep conviction that our opponents were unworthy of us.

In taking our leave of the readers of the *Visiter*, we sincerely commend them to the God of all truth; and declare in his presence, that we have conscientiously told them that only, which according to our best convictions—was true.

Those gentlemen who have managed this discussion on the Papal side—may be very worthy and estimable persons, after their fashion. But it is quite evident, they know almost nothing about their own religion, either in its history, or its principles. It has been reported to us that the *Reverend Doctor Moriarty*, of Philadelphia, during a late visit to Baltimore, did, once or twice, publicly challenge the Protestant clergy of this city, to meet him in debate on the relative claims of his and their religion. On this subject we have only a word to say. Some of the contributors of a part of these articles, have made a standing, printed, public offer, for *seven years*, before the whole nation, to meet any responsible and properly authorized advocate of the Papal cause—*any where*. We now repeat this offer. We will do this with joy; for we believe the honor of God, the good of the human race, and the best interests of our beloved country, are implicated in the spread of the false and bloody religion of Rome.

Let any Papal Bishop in America come forward, or let any one of them name those persons whom he is willing to trust with the defence of his cause; and we undertake to prove against him, or them, as God shall enable us, *That the Roman Catholic, Apostolic Church, (so called) is not the Church of God; nor its religion that of the Bible.*

Does the Archbishop of Baltimore know us? Does he wish to know us? There lies our glove—where it has lain for seven years.

[Continued from p. 535, of Balt. Lit. and Rel. Mag. for 1841.]

M O L I N I S M .

No. XII.

*Section XIX. (Of the Immoralities of the Jesuits arising from their doctrinal errors)—Continued. (2.) The rule of our duties in general.*

THE Romanists recognize two sorts of laws, viz: 1st, the natural law which prescribes what they denominate our essential duties, and which is founded on the nature and destination of man, and which consequently is invariable.—(Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and thy neighbour as thyself, is an example of this kind of law.) 2dly. Positive laws, such for example as fix and regulate the exterior of religious worship. This being premised—the Jesuits maintain that the natural or moral law, *considered in itself*, does not form the rule of duty, but only as it is known. Thus they say, if it be entirely unknown to a man he is not bound to obey it, and he may violate it without committing sin, properly so called—that is, a formal sin, a sin which deserves punishment, but only a *material* sin. Or if a man has a false idea of this law—if, for example, he believes it does not require of him all that it does in truth require, he is justified if he obeys it to the extent to which he believes its requirements go. Finally, if he is persuaded that it prescribes the opposite of that which it does in truth prescribe,—for example, that it requires him to kill another man, not only will he not sin by committing the homicide, but he will merit reward. Horrible as such a doctrine is, it was advanced by Casnedi, an Italian Jesuit, who taught theology a long time in his own country, and afterwards in Portugal, where his *Crisis Theologia* was printed, between the years 1711 and 1719—(See *Hexaples*, part V. XVI.)—Vide Tom. 2, Disp. 18, §. 3, p. 66. The practical effects of such principles may be seen in the act of *Jaques Clement*, who assassinated Henry III. of France. We are told that he was persuaded that God required the act of him—that he committed it with the full persuasion that he would thereby do a distinguished service to God and religion, and that the punishment he would bring down upon himself would be a glorious martyrdom.

The doctrine of the Jesuits on this matter amounts to this, viz: that there are two rules of human conduct—the law of God and the conscience—that the law is without force in itself, inasmuch as it can exercise only so much force as the conscience lends to it—that the law of God does not impose an obligation except so far as it is sustained by the conscience. Therefore whatever is not contrary to conscience may be done innocently, although contrary to the law of God. The reason which they give is, a man does not, according to the opinion of the Molinists, enjoy liberty except in respect to those things upon which the conscience is heard clearly and distinctly, and a man in their view is not responsible except in regard to those things to which his liberty extends. These principles change entirely the whole system of morals, and the law of

God is so construed as not to condemn them. According to the Molinists, it is written in the law that there is nothing bad, except that which the free will of the actor has a sovereign power to avoid, and this is a universal principle in their system of morality.—Whereas in truth every man's conscience, (if not perverted and seared,) tells him that certain things in themselves are bad—such as murder, theft, lying, slander, &c.,—and he who does them has a depraved heart. A man who has not the power of equilibrium, or liberty to forbear doing such things, or who is so blind that he cannot see that they are wrong in themselves, is not, therefore, excusable in the commission of them, but his want of power or liberty in this behalf proves him to be extremely depraved. In judging of the quality of the conduct of such a man, it is not enough to look at the *formal* consent which he gives to their commission, at the time, as the Molinists do; but we must look to the disposition of heart and mind out of which his consent springs.

According to the doctrine of the Jesuits, the law of God, properly speaking, is not the rule of a man's conduct, but what he imagines the law to be, is the rule; that is to say, his own ideas, his caprices, his prejudices. It is not God who prescribes the duties of men.—The man himself prescribes his own duties according to the idea which he conceives of the law of God. According as his idea changes, his duties change, and the man himself is not to be judged by the law of God, but by the idea which he forms of that law. The Jesuits do not indeed contend that God will change his law, but they say, He will not punish those who violate it, if they believe they are doing right. See the Romanstrance of the Jesuits to the Bishop of Auxerre, printed in 1726—a work in which they endeavour to give the most favourable representation of their doctrine. It is not, then, the law of God, according to their doctrine, nor even the truth itself, which forms the immediate rule of our conduct, but what they call the *dictamen conscientiæ*—the dictates of the conscience; and as it may happen, and often does happen, that the opinions of men in respect to duty are at variance with the will of God, the Jesuits, in fact, decide, in cases of contrariety, that the conscience of man, and not the law and the will of God forms the rule.

The Jesuit Casnedi, (who, as the reader has been informed, wrote at the beginning of the last century, and during the discussions occasioned by the bull *Unigenitus*.) starting from the principle that all the duties of man are regulated by his conscience, concludes that there is no precept in the Decalogue so inviolable, that a man may not innocently do the contrary, that is, when he is persuaded through ignorance, that what he is doing is permitted. Then developing the consequences of this principle, he observes that a man may also persuade himself in reference to each precept, that the contrary is not only permitted but commanded. In this case it is not the commandment in itself which is the rule—but it is the opinion the man has formed of the commandment. If then respect be had to the *disposition of the man*, and we reason with respect to his *disposition*, it is found that really and in point of fact the man is dispensed from the true commandment of God, which

he is ignorant of, and the man is bound to do the contrary, because he is persuaded, the *contrary* is what God requires of him.

From such conclusions it is easy to see, there arises a new order of commandments of God, which impose upon men, on the ground of their particular persuasion, obligations directly contrary to those which the Decalogue, understood in its true sense, imposes. A new name was needed for this new order of commandments, and accordingly they are called by Casnedi *reflex commandments*, in contradistinction from the commandments of the Decalogue, which he calls *direct* commandments. "There are," says he, "opinions which are probable though contrary to the Scriptures, and the infallible decisions of the church, which occurs when one is invincibly ignorant of these decisions of the Scriptures and of the church, after having made a diligent search for the truth, and when these opinions are founded on reason, or weighty authorities."<sup>\*</sup>

Again, this author says, "Whenever a man does not know, at the time he is acting that he is under obligation to rid himself of his ignorance, then his ignorance is morally invincible." And at the same place, page 130, No. 31, he says, "Ignorantia cujus vincendæ nulla hic et nunc cognoscitur obligatio dicitur moraliter invincibilis."<sup>†</sup>

From these two principles this Jesuit concludes, that all ignorance whether it be of the law, natural or divine—positive or human; and all ignorance of fact, and whether this ignorance precedes or follows sin, either original or actual, always excuses or exempts from sin the action or omission arising from this ignorance, in respect to that which he is ignorant of; provided at the time of the action or omission, he does not advert to the obligation he is under to rid himself of his ignorance,"—page 132, No. 41.

"Omnis ignorantia vel error sive juris, quodcumque illud sit nempe sive naturalis sive divini sive positivi aut humani, *ibid*, page 133, No. 42, sive facti antecedens at consequens ad peccatum tam originale, quam actuale cujus expellendæ nulla hic et nunc advertatur obligatio excusat semper à peccato, actionem aut omissionem ad illam sequentem secundum id quod ignoratur.

At page 163, No. 10—this author gives as a general rule, the following, viz: that the quality of our actions in respect to their goodness or badness—the gravity or the lightness of evil depends upon the object, in the quality of the object,—that is to say, in so far as represented by the conscience, whether the conscience be speculatively true or false—hence he who should believe, that every lie is a mortal sin, would sin mortally every time he told a lie. Likewise, he who should believe that a lie is not even a venial sin, would not commit even a venial sin in telling a lie. On the contrary, the lie which he should tell in such case, would be a virtuous act.† Thus we see that according to this author, the violation of

<sup>\*</sup> De facto dantur plures opiniones probabiles, licet sint contra Scripturam alias que infallibiles Ecclesiæ regulas, dummodo Scriptura et dictæ regulæ, post diligens veritatis examen sint invincibiliter ignoratæ, et dictæ opiniones habeant pro se grave rationis vel autoritatis fundamentum—(Tom. 1, p. 104, numb. 53.)

<sup>†</sup>Qualitas actus quoad honestatem et inhonestatem, quoad gravitatem vel levitatem, pendet ab objecto in esse objecti, id est ut per conscientiam propositio, sive

a precept of the decalogue, or an act contrary to the law of God, may not only be permitted or tolerated, but it may become even a good action—not only this action contrary to the decalogue is virtuous, it is even meritorious in the righteous. This Jesuit at page 167, No. 25, says, whenever a man is in ignorance (which is morally invincible) of the prohibition of an action, or of its sinfulness—moreover, when a man believes invincibly that the action is virtuous or even commanded—then the action done in this ignorance or in consequence of this error, is virtuous, if the other conditions accompany the act.\*

Casnedi is not the inventor of this accommodating system of morals; it is the common doctrine of the most celebrated theologians of the Society of Jesuits, see Hexaples, vol. 1, part 1, art. 2, §. 2 and 3, col. 6. De Rhodes, a French Jesuit, (cited at page 169 and 171 of that work,) about sixty years before the time of Casnedi taught that no one is obliged to obey God except at the time and in the manner which his conscience dictates—that God commands nothing except so far as the conscience approves it, so that God does not forbid falsehood, when the conscience judges that it is not forbidden. Hence it is, that if you invincibly believe that it is a virtuous act to lie, in order to save your friend, your lie is then an act of mercy. This father De Rhodes adds, that it is the same of homicide, of blasphemy, &c.

The reader must be referred to the Hexaples at the places already cited, for further developements of the doctrine of the Jesuits on this point. The consequences of this doctrine reach very far, as the reader will see by referring to the work just cited. A few observations only will be added, upon what the Jesuits denominate *material sin*, *philosophical sin*, and *probability*.

A *material sin*, is an action bad in itself, being contrary to what they call the natural—or what we call the moral—law; but which being committed by a person who does not know the sinfulness of it (or does not think of its sinfulness) will not be imputed to him as sin. This is what the Jesuits call a *material sin*, in contradistinction to a *formal sin*. A *philosophical sin*, is an action the sinfulness, or the evil of which is known by the person who performs it, but without the knowledge of God. Such an act so done would be a sin against the *natural order* or a philosophical sin, but not a *sin theological*, which is offensive to God. Now the doctrine of the Jesuits is, that a philosophical sin can never deserve the punishment of hell, however aggravated that sin may be, but only a punishment of an inferior degree—(See Hexaples.) A savage, for example, who assassinates another, commits a philosophical sin. He knows he does wrong. He feels that he is doing that which he would not willingly have done to himself. But this sin according to this sys-

ea conscientia sit speculative vera, sive falsa: et ideo qui putat quod omne mendacium sit mortale, peccat mortaliter: qui putat ne quidem esse veniale, nec venialiter peccat: Mendosium creditum—(ibid. p. 164, No. 14,) a creatura ut honestum, est honestum.

\*Quoties ignorantie moraliter invincibile prohibitionis et malitie, jungitur error invincibilis de honestate objecti aut de precepto actionis toties opus sub ea ignorantia et errore elicitum, est honestum et meritorium, si cætera adsint.

tem of morals, would not be a theological sin, nor an offence against God, properly so called, because the savage does not know God.

This doctrine concerning philosophical sin is closely connected with the distinction between the natural and supernatural states. Such a sin is, according to the system, a sin against the natural order, whereas the punishments of hell belongs to the supernatural order.

The doctrine of *probability* is also another consequence of their general principle, that the law of God is not the rule of our conduct, but the idea which we conceive of the law. It follows from this general principle, that if an opinion appears to me to be probable, I may in conscience act upon it, without embarrassing myself with the question whether it is true.

The Jesuits distinguish between *two sorts* of probability. One sort of probability is bottomed on reasons which appear—the other on authority. One they call *intrinsic* probability, the other *extrinsic*. A probability of either sort, according to the Jesuits, is sufficient to save the conscience of him who acts upon it. A principle of this sort is extremely convenient to a corrupt man in the affairs of life, and very great use has been made of it.—It is maintained by the Jesuits, that if there be two opinions both of which are probable, a man may adopt that which is the least probable of the two. In order to make an opinion probable it is sufficient that it should have been advanced by two or three grave authors, or even the authority of one author is enough to make it so, if he be very respectable.

In order to see how vast the operation of this principle is, and how much at large from the law of God it puts the consciences and the conduct of men, the reader must become acquainted with the great multitude of casuists which the Society of Jesuits has furnished—casuists who have reasoned on the duties of men with so much boldness, that scarcely a criminal act can be named, which some one of them has not believed, (at least *probably*), could be committed with a safe conscience—(See vol. 1, p. 201, of the Baltimore Lit. and Rel. Magazine, for some extracts from De Pradt's *Ancient and Modern Jesuitism* touching this subject.) Caramuel, though not a Jesuit, was greatly attached to their principles, and had the skill of a Jesuit in deducing results from them. This man congratulated Diana, another casuist of this order, because he had rendered many opinions probable which were not so before, and therefore a man would not sin in following them although previously he would have sinned. *Jam non peccant licet ante peccaverint*. Thus, according to these casuists, many persons will go to heaven although they should perform actions which in past ages would have deserved the damnation of hell because it was not *then* probable that they could be performed with a safe conscience. On this subject the reader may refer to the 6th Provincial Letter, and the notes of Wendrock.

Those who maintain that the truth ought to be the rule of conduct, are called *verists*, by Casnedi, and the sentiment he says is that of the heretics—(Tom. 2, sect. 2, §. 1; Tom. 3, sect. 5, §. 1.) One result of this doctrine of probability is this, that opposite opinions may both be probable, and in such a case a man may adopt

that which is most agreeable to him, as where two authors take opposite sides of the same question.

In such a case a man may choose that opinion which is most conformable to the law of God. This the Jesuits allow, provided others are allowed to follow the opposite opinion, which is also probable. Thus it is that by this doctrine of probability they accommodate themselves to the inclination of a dissolute man, without coming in collision with those who are inclined to an austere life. The doctrine fits in admirably with the theological system of the Jesuits, as also with their worldly policy. Their aim has always been to conciliate the whole world by accommodating themselves to the different inclinations of men, and by making them find salvation easy, whatever be the disposition of heart, or the outward conduct.

(3.) The rule of each duty in particular. Little need be said on this head. The Jesuits having established that an opinion is probable—and also the principle that a man may in conscience carry it out in practice when two or three authors maintain it, easily succeed in justifying most things which men desire to do. Finding it impossible to restrain men from doing what they are resolutely determined upon, it is much to their purpose, to devise means whereby men can do what they list without offending God. The principle that a probable opinion may be followed without sin, is the grand expedient to which they resort for this purpose. With this end in view, they resort to innumerable subtleties in order to justify the most criminal conduct—(See the 14th Provincial Letter.)—According to their doctrine, a man may kill an enemy who insults him, in order to repair his honour. A man may give money to another who gives him a benefice, provided the money be given not as the price of the benefice but as a testimony of gratitude. This is what they call *directing the intention*, and thus by an act of the imagination of this sort connected with a criminal act, they teach that the nature of the act itself is changed, and the act becomes innocent. In vain do the Jesuits search in the fathers whom they profess to revere, for any such principles, and therefore it is, they maintain that the modern casuists are preferable to the ancient fathers.—(See the 5th Provincial Letter.)

The reader must not suppose that these doctrines were entirely confined to the Society of Jesuits. Many Romanists took these Jesuit fathers as their guides upon the subject of morals,—those especially who adopted the leading principles of Molina. The Jesuits sometimes complained that they were attacked on the ground of these sentiments, while others, who did not belong to their society shared in them. Still the Jesuits were the chief propagators of these doctrines, and deserved the distinguishing censures which were passed upon them—(See the Apologie des Provinciales 3d letter.)

The Jansenists, however, opposed these doctrines of the Jesuits, not only with boldness, but with great ability, although by so doing they brought upon themselves unremitting persecutions, as will be shown in the next article. In the mean time the reader is requested to consider the influence which a body of (so called) religious

teachers, professing such doctrines as have been imperfectly discussed upon such institutions as our own. The safety of our republic, it is said, depends upon the virtue and the intelligence of our population. Do such doctrines as these tend to promote virtue? Are they such, as can be received cordially, without first perverting the understanding? Can any sane mind believe that an act contrary to the commandment of God may become an act commanded by God?—for example, the commandments, “thou shalt not kill,” “thou shalt not steal,” “thou shalt not commit adultery,” “thou shalt not bear false witness?” Yet Casnedi, by the imagination of reflex commandments, teaches, that what God thus prohibits, not only may be done, but *must* be done—that is, when a man invincibly believes that he is bound to kill, to steal, to commit adultery or perjury.—Again, what would be the effect of the doctrine that men are born with a double liberty—by the first of which they pretend he is the sovereign master of his own determinations, and this liberty they say he never loses: by the second he is independent of *all law*, and this second sort of liberty, the Jesuits say, he preserves until the law is clearly known by him; and until it is clearly known he is not obliged to practice it—and even when he does know it, he is obliged to practice it only in the manner and to the extent in which it is known, and if he has an idea quite contrary to the law of God, he will be bound to practice it only in conformity with his idea of it.

But this article is already quite too long, and the reader must be left to pursue these reflections. Hereafter the subject may be resumed.

[To be Continued.]

[Continued from p. 440, of Balt. Lit. and Rel. Mag. for 1841.]

CRITICAL REMARKS ON JOHN XII. 23, 31, 32; AND XVI. 8—11.

No. II.

The hour (*ώρα*) has come that the Son of man should be glorified. . . . Now (*νυν*) is the judgment of this world: Now (*νυν*) shall the prince of this world be cast out. And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all . . . unto me.—*John* xii. 23, 31, 32.

And when he (the Comforter) is come, he will reprove the world of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment:—of sin, because they believe not on me:—of righteousness, because I go to the Father, and ye see me no more:—of judgment, because the prince of this world is judged.—*John* xvi. 8—11.

By some, the words *ταυ ὑψωθη εκ της γης*, are translated, “when I shall be lifted up from,” &c. Beza thought that our Lord used a Syriac word of a double signification, and that he did so with a design to refer both to his crucifixion and exaltation, (*tollit in sublime—tollit in medio*). Tholuck, and many others, adopt this idea—see Tholuck on *John* xii. 32—viii. 28; iii. 14. One thing, however, is very evident, not only from the context, but from other parts of Scripture—(*Luke* xxiv. 26; *Acts* ii. 23,) viz. that no sort of contingency was intended by these words: nor were they understood by the people to intimate any doubt as to the event. The question of the multitude (in verse 34) indicates the sense in which

they understood them—"How sayest thou that the Son of man *must* be lifted up." (οτι δεῖ ὑψωθῆναι τον υιον του ανθρωπου.) This question can only refer to the words under consideration, and it shows that the people understood them rather as imparting a certainty arising from necessity than a contingency—see John iii. 14, upon which Tholuck remarks, δεῖ points to the fact that the whole work of redemption proceeds from a certain internal divine necessity. Assuming, then, that (δεῖ ὑψωθῆναι) "must be lifted up" (in verse 34) expresses the sense of (εαν ὑψωθω translated) "if I be lifted up"—the expression should be modified; and this we may do without violence or constraint upon the original. The particle εαν translated "if," often has the sense of *although*—(2 Cor. x. 8; xii. 6; v. 1) and the subjunctive of the verb may be properly rendered by *should* or *must*. Accordingly we may express the sense of verse 32 thus, "Although I must be lifted up from the earth—although the divine purpose connected with my mission requires that I should suffer crucifixion, which will seem to give the prince of this world a victory over me, and will for a time very much disappoint the hopes of my followers—Luke xxvi. 21—yet this will but accomplish the prediction that the serpent should bruise the heel of the woman's seed, while on the other hand, "I will draw *all* to myself." The Redeemer had already referred to the death of his body under the emblem of a corn of wheat which falls to the ground; and by its fruitfulness, to its glorious results in the risen and glorified company of the Redeemed. In this place he varies the expression so as to signify the manner of his death, and this seems to be the chief object of this second allusion: for the evangelist adds, "This he said signifying (i. e. to signify) (πειω θανατω) by what sort of death he should die. The word "this," does not refer to the whole of verse 32, but only to the interpolated clause "if I be lifted up"—"though I must be lifted up—(τουτο δε—εαν ὑψωθω εκ της γης—ελεγε σημαϊναι πειω. κ. τ. λ.) This expression, *to wit*, if I be lifted up from the earth—he used in order to signify by what kind of death he was about to die. The residue of this verse, "I will draw all . . . unto me," as has been intimated already, is expressive of the effects which his death would have upon the world; as we will now endeavour to show.

The final and complete expulsion of Satan and his hosts and his adherents from among mankind—of all those who destroy the earth, Rev. xi. 18, whether men or devils; the removal of the curse,—the destruction of the powers of death, Heb. ii. 14, and of every thing offensive to God or hurtful to man, will effectually prepare the way for a new allegiance—the institution of which it is suggested, is expressed by the words "and I will draw all unto myself"—(καγω ταυτας (vel παντα) ελκυσω προς εμαυτον.) The power of Christ will prevail against the prince of this world—(Istud ελκυσω referunt Græci ad potestatem principis illius mundi contra cuius voluntatem, et quo invito, dicit Christus se attracturum omnes, nimirum credentes et obsequentes. *Cam.*) An antithesis is stated between *hostile* powers. "Satan, the god of this world, shall be expelled from it. The curse which came in with his dominion and which has been inflicted through his agency shall be expelled with him. I will re-

store all things (Act. iii. 21,) by drawing all things to myself the Mediator." The reference is, it is apprehended, to the world, as a portion of God's creation and rightful dominion—as a dwelling or place of abode for holy, happy creatures; not merely to the race of man as such. Myriads, countless myriads of the race will no doubt share in this blessing, while those of mankind who continue to yield their allegiance to Satan will, with him, be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord and the glory of his power. The mystery is that these results should spring from the apparent victory which Satan would gain in compassing the death of the Lord Jesus, or as Paul expresses it, that the Lord should, through his death, destroy him that had the power of death; and thus remove the curse of death, Heb. ii. 14. These verses then, seem to be entirely parallel with Gen. iii. 15.

The word, *ἐλκυσω* "I will draw," occurs in several places in the New Testament.—(John vi. 44; xviii. 10; xxi. 6, 11; Acts xvi. 19; see also Acts xxi. 30; James ii. 6.) The sense of it in this place is figurative. The word *all*, it has been suggested, extends to and includes *all* that shall be restored to the allegiance and favour of God, whether men or things. As it respects *mankind*, the word *ἐλκυσω*, I will draw, is used in the same sense as it is in John vi. 44, where it is recorded that the Saviour told the murmuring Jews, "No man can come to me except the Father which hath sent me draw (*ἐλκυσω*) him," an assertion which he condescends to prove to them by Isaiah liv. 13—(see verse 45.) If we consider attentively this passage of that prophet, it will give us a sense which quite accords with the interpretation suggested. The passage with its context runs thus: "Oh thou afflicted, tossed with tempest, not comforted"—words descriptive of and in fact addressed to the church in her militant state, elsewhere symbolized by the bruised reed—(Is. xlii. 3; Matt. xii. 20;) and by an oppressed widow—(Luke xviii. 1-8;) "behold I will lay thy stones with fair colours, and lay thy foundations with sapphires, and I will make thy windows of agates, and thy gates of carbuncles, and all thy borders pleasant stones"—language which the apostle John refers to and enlarges upon in Rev. xxi., and which proves that the prophecy belongs to the future and eternal glories of the church—"and *all thy children* shall be taught of Jehovah"—(*θεοδιδασκτοι*, 1 Thess. iv. 19,)—that is, all the children of this future Jerusalem shall be taught of God: "for there shall in no wise enter into it any thing that defileth, neither any thing that worketh abomination and falsehood."—Rev. xxi. 27. The prophet Isaiah, therefore, informs us that the saved will all experience the saving influences of divine teaching. The apostle John informs us of the purifying effects of this divine teaching; at least by a necessary implication. The Saviour uses the passage to prove the necessity of divine influence, in as much as the prophet foretells that not one of the race shall ever enter into the New Jerusalem, of whom it shall not be said "he hath been taught of Jehovah." This fact involves the truth of our Lord's assertion to the Jews, "No one can come to me unless the Father which hath sent me draw (*ἐλκυσω*) him;" for Christ is the way by which all must enter who would share in the glories of the New Jerusalem. The force

of the proof may be stated thus: All who come to Christ shall infallibly enter into the New Jerusalem; for Christ is the way, the truth and the life. But none can enter into the New Jerusalem but those who are taught of God. Therefore none can come to Christ except those who are taught of God or drawn of the Father.

It may seem to the reader a slight circumstance, that the promise of the resurrection immediately precedes this citation from the prophet; yet if the sense of the passage and the force of the proof be that suggested, it would be natural to introduce them in the order in which they stand. To come to Christ, is to be aggregated to his mystical body which he will raise at the last day, and afflicted, tossed with tempest, and not comforted, as they now are, yet they have in prospect a glorious city, because they have learned of the Father, and so bear the description which all the children of the city will bear—"all thy children shall be taught of God."—The word (*ελκυσθ*) which (in John vi. 44,) is rendered "draw," imports the effectual influences of God's Spirit upon the heart, but it is applied in this place to those only who shall finally be saved, or to those who are "taught of God." The passage, therefore, does not teach that all men will be saved, but the proof being taken from the future state of holiness and glory, proves only that the saved shall be, (*θεοδιδακτοι*) without exception, taught of God. Indeed the object of the Saviour was to give a reason why the Jews, who murmured, did not come to him, and the reason would fail if all universally are taught of God. The sense of the word (*ελκυσθ*) "I will draw," in John xii. 32, it has been suggested, is the same, so far as it expresses the influence which the Saviour will exert upon men. But before proceeding farther, it may be useful to bring into view a passage believed to be parallel to this, in Col. i. 20, "And having made peace through the blood of his cross"—and to his cross the Saviour plainly refers by the words, *if I be lifted up*—"by him to reconcile *all things* unto himself," *απο καταλλαξαι τα παντα εις αυτου*—"by him I say whether they be (*τα επι της γης*) things upon earth, or things in heavenly places—(*τα εν τοις ουρανοις*.) The word translated to *reconcile*, denotes, according to its primary signification, a (*καταλλαγη* commutatio permutatio,) (see Acts vi. 13, Gr.) changing (*απο*) from the allegiance of the prince of this world unto Christ—(2 Cor. v. 18, 19, 20.) The words (*τα παντα*) *all things*, include every thing which in the language of Paul (Rom. viii. 21,) shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption—including the redeemed from among men: in other words, all the results of the Redeemer's work, whether they respect man or the earth itself. Let us compare John xii. 32, as it has been explained with this passage. "Now will I cast out the curse. Now will I expel Satan, the prince of this world, and through the blood of the cross I will draw all to myself, i. e. I will reconcile or change the allegiance, which this world has so long paid to Satan, the vanquished enemy, to myself." These considerations furnish a sufficient reason, perhaps, for preferring the reading of the Codex Beza, and of the early Latin fathers (*παντα omnia*) to the common text (*παντας omnes*.)—Mill Proleg. 370. According to this view, the word *ελκυσθ* (I will draw,) in this place, (John xii. 32,) has a mixed sig-

nification arising from the fact, that objectively it applies to things as well as men, viz., all the results of the Saviour's work, which Peter, in Acts iii. 21, denominates the (*ἀποκατάστασις πάντων*) restitution of all things, and which our Lord himself calls (in Matt. xix. 28) the (*παλιγγενεσία*) new creation. The sense of it should be applied distributively; as it respects the redeemed from among men, it denotes their effectual calling, or their being taught of God—as it respects the earth, it denotes the expulsion of Satan and the curse, and of all those malign influences which, by permission of God, have been the means of conveying to men the punitive effects of the first Judgment, and it denotes also, the restoration of that harmony between it and the rest of the holy dominion of God, which subsisted before sin entered into it.

We will now pause for a moment to remark that the words in John vi. 44, 45, were addressed to the Jews during the Mosaic economy, and during the ministry of our Lord as their Messiah. It was while he was preaching to that nation the gospel of the kingdom, and offering it to them for their acceptance. To the eye of man it was not at that time absolutely certain, that they would reject him, although it was quite otherwise to the eye of Him who looks upon the heart. The kingdom which the Redeemer preached, was the Messianic kingdom, or the glorious kingdom of Christ. This is proved by the fact that the disciples who were commissioned to preach it, were forbidden to preach it to the Gentiles. It is also proved by the fact that our Lord, near the close of his ministry, declared that the kingdom should be taken from them and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof,—Matt. xxi. 43; compare Matt. viii. 12; 1 Peter ii. 9; Ex. xix. 5, 6. This kingdom which our Lord said should be taken from them, was the kingdom which John the Baptist, and which he and his disciples preached. It was not the gospel dispensation, or Christian dispensation as we commonly call it, for that has always been open to the Jews as much as to the Gentiles, and in fact it was first preached to them by the Saviour's command—Acts xiii. 46; Luke xxiv. 47. Had the nation accepted the offer, and yielded to the Redeemer the obedience of faith, this promise (in Is. liv. 11, 12,) was theirs. Christ would have established his kingdom immediately—the curse would have been removed—Satan cast out—and all things restored to the favour of God. But it was not the purpose of God to draw the nation, as such, to the Saviour. This is intimated by him in the passage cited from John vi. 44. The depravity of the human heart is such, that under every dispensation it has uniformly rejected the invitations and offers of God. To the Jews, the kingdom was preached as brought nigh and ready to be established among them nationally and exclusively—yet all rejected it, but the few who were of the election of grace, Rom. xi. 7. To the Gentiles the gospel of the kingdom is preached as ready to be established so soon as all those embraced in the covenant of redemption shall be called, and the children or the subjects of the kingdom gathered, yet with the same results. The national election of the descendants of Abraham did not avail to their national salvation. A further and personal election was necessary to secure subjects for that

kingdom. It was God's purpose to leave the nation to itself—and that only was necessary to render their fall certain. It was God's purpose, through their fall, to open a door for the admission of the Gentiles—(Rom. xi. 11; John xii. 37, 41; Acts xxviii. 25, 28.)—The words, therefore, (in John vi. 44.) "No man can come to me except the Father which hath sent me draw him," though true of all men, were applied by the Lord to the Jews, and intimated the result of the Mosaic economy: but the passage (in John xii. 32,) was pronounced at the close of our Lord's ministry—when the results of it were obvious to the human eye, and it has respect to the new economy which was about to be established. As if he had said, "Though this nation, being blinded by the prince of this world, will reject and crucify me, yet my kingdom shall not fail of being established in all its glory. The bands of wickedness shall be broken, Satan and the curse shall be cast out, I will take to myself my great power and reign king over all Israel, and bind all things in the bonds of a new and holy allegiance to myself, which shall never be broken." The word, *ελκυσω*, in John vi. 44, should, therefore, be understood as referring to the Jews, and the results of the Mosaic economy, but as used in John xii. 32, as expressive of the results of the Christian dispensation. These results combining, as they do, the expulsion of all physical and moral evil, and the causes of it, and the restoration of men to their allegiance to God through the throne of the Mediator, will perhaps be found to be the realization of that scheme, and condition of things which subsisted between the creation and the fall of man, and which would have continued but for the transgression. Aye, and could we exalt our conceptions to a still more glorious condition, the superabounding grace and goodness of God, would perhaps transcend them by ever new and ever varying manifestations of his power.

But to resume, and conclude this topic. The reader has been informed that Michaelis understands the word (*judicium*) *κρίσις*, judgment, to refer to the judgment pronounced against Satan in Gen. iii. 15. This agrees with the suggestion before made, in so far as it refers to the judgment pronounced in Eden; but it differs in this, that it excludes that part of the judgment which affected man and the earth, which was chiefly, if not exclusively intended, because the next clause "now shall the prince of this world be cast out," refers exclusively to the judgment as it affected the serpent.

Beza supposed that the expression, "now is the judgment of this world," is equivalent to this, "the beginning of the restitution of all things is at hand—its usurper having been expelled"—(*initium adest *ωσο* καταστασις mundi ejecto ejus usurpatore*). This idea is not very dissimilar from that suggested in this essay; the difference is, that the expulsion of Satan and the curse is the preparation for the restitution of the world, but the *restitution itself* is formally expressed by the words "I will draw *all* to myself." This view avoids the objection of Tholuck, who says that the idea of the restitution of the world cannot be shown to be contained in the word (*κρίσις*) *judgment*. But if the (*κρίσις*) judgment intended, be the *first* judgment, or the curse pronounced at the fall, including

its punitive effects and all the means or agencies whether spiritual or physical, by which they are conveyed to man and the earth itself; and if that which is here predicated of this (*κρισις*) judgment, be that it shall be expelled, together with the prince of this world, *εμβληθησονται εξω*) as preparatory to the establishment of a new and holy attraction between the world, and Christ, the Redeemer and Mediator;—the whole expression (*κρισις του κοσμου τουτου εμβληθησεται*) connected with the explicit declaration that the prince of this world shall be cast out, does include the idea suggested by Beza, although it is conceded that the idea is not contained in the word (*κρισις*) judgment. This is an additional reason for preferring the reading of the Codex Bezae, (*παντα*) and of the Latin church (*omnia*) to the commonly received text.

One thought more upon this part of the subject. We are too apt to confine the import of the promises and predictions of the Scriptures to the church in its present condition. Perhaps it would not be too much to say that many passages are in this way quite misapplied, they being in truth wholly unfulfilled.

The present dispensation, although one of more light than the Levitical, is in fact but a seed time—a period allotted to the process of developement. The harvest, which is the end, is the epoch around which the promises and predictions chiefly cluster. Many of them, it is true, admit of a present application, though it is in a subordinate sense. "The totality of the New Testament economy, (says Tholuck,) almost constantly stood before the eyes of the prophets of the old covenant, and their intuition extended, now to the first point of it, and now to a subsequent one, but usually to the culminating point—the glorification of the kingdom of Christ, or the coming of the kingdom of God, at the end of time—Dan. vii. 13, 14, 22, 27. The same is also true of the predictions of Christ. His prophetic eye contemplated as one whole, the developement of the kingdom of God which he had founded. In this developement are two great periods." The commencement of the first of these periods was marked by the removal of the Jewish theocracy (which our Lord intimated would be done, in John vi. 44, 45, and plainly declared in Matt. xxi. 43,) and the establishment of a spiritual kingdom. This is denoted in the parable of the marriage—in Matt. xxii. 2-10). The guests first bidden were the Jewish nation. They refused to come to the marriage, and the king destroyed their city (verse 7). This represents the ending of their external theocracy. The bidding of other guests denotes the calling of the Gentiles, and the time it occupies denotes the continuance of this dispensation, in other words, the developement of the inward kingdom. That done, the other great period commences when, in the words of Tholuck, "the *κοσμος*, the world in which, and with which the inward kingdom of God has developed itself, under circumstances which preclude the possibility of observing its progress shall be removed, and the inward kingdom of God shall be externally glorified. Those who shall behold the wonders of that day, will understand the words of our Lord in Luke xvii. 20. The kingdom of God cometh not with observation. None will be found to have kept the count of time, so as to be

able to determine its nearness—none will be able to apprise another of its approach, saying lo! here, or lo! there, as they would, if it was to come so as to be a sign of its own approach. Yet when the Saviour uttered the words just cited, as well as when he uttered the words we have been considering, his eye rested upon that pre-appointed though unrevealed epoch, when amidst the convulsion of physical nature, and the conflict of spiritual powers, the curse, which has so long rested on this earth, shall expire, the prince of this world and his legions be cast out, and death itself will die; and the everlasting kingdom of God shall suddenly arise in glory ineffable at the same time, with external manifestation of all the sons of God—Rom. viii. 21.

How long, dear Saviour, oh how long  
Shall this bright hour delay;  
Fly swifter round, ye wheels of time,  
And bring the welcome day.

*Dr. Watts's Hymns, B. 1, H. 21.*

[To be continued.]

---

THE USE OF THE TITLE—BISHOP.\*

I observe, in the published minutes of our Church Courts this fall, that our Presbyteries and Synods have very generally adopted the title *Bishop*, when they intend what we formerly called *Ministers*. I remember also that the *Biblical Repertory* recommended this practice in a set article some months ago.—Before the practice is fixed, and the old one, so long used and so dear to our people, entirely changed, I desire to suggest a doubt or two on the matter.

I. Our Church government is a government by *Presbytery*, and therefore called *Presbyterian*. The generic name, therefore, of all who exercise spiritual authority amongst us, is *Presbyter*, not *Bishop*. The former is the name radical; the latter a name accidental: the one designates the office itself, the other merely a function, commonly, though not always incident to the office. Some, yea many Presbyters, were ordained *Evangelists*, and not *Bishops* at all.

II. The ground on which our Church rests its ultimate argument for one part of our system, is, that Presbyter and Bishop are, in the Bible, convertible terms, when used to designate persons exercising certain functions—for example, overseeing a flock, and for a case in point, take Paul's address to the Elders of Ephesus. But if this be true, then one of two results follows, viz: 1. The *Ruling Elder* is not Presbyter; or, 2, if he is, then is he also Bishop. But if he is not Presbyter, our whole system is false; but if he is Pres-

---

\*This article was printed in the *Watchman of the South*, of Nov. 25, 1841. It is re-published, in its original form, as containing, we need hardly say, the opinions of this Magazine. It is extremely remarkable, that so little is accurately known amongst us, in regard to some points fundamental in our system. For example—the matter of the *Ruling Elder*.—[Ed.]

byter, and as such Bishop, then the new nomenclature is fallacious in calling only our Ministers Bishops. I beg leave to add that Dr. Miller, in his work on the Ruling Elder, expressly asserts, and I think proves, that every Ruling Elder is properly entitled to the appellation of *Bishop*.

III. But not only are we likely to run off on a false scent, and make unscriptural distinctions, by dubbing 1500 Ministers, when we exclude 15,000 Elders as properly entitled; but let us beware that we do not commit a more ridiculous blunder still by making those Bishops who are, by our own principles, no Bishops at all, at the same moment that we exclude such numbers who are. Is there any warrant whatever either in our standards, or, what is far above them, in the Bible, for believing that any man is properly a *Bishop*, who has not the regular oversight of souls? A *Bishop* is that *Presbyter* who has the cure of souls—and if the *Presbyter* does not exercise this cure, he is no *Bishop* at all. Presbyterian Episcopacy is *Parochial* Episcopacy; and he who has no parochial duties, has no Presbyterian Bishopric. He may be a *Diocesan* for any thing I know.

IV. So plain and so particular are our standards on this subject, that when a man is ordained a Minister, *sine titulo*, he is not called a *Bishop* at all, but an *Evangelist*; that is, a *Presbyter* not bound to any particular parish or cure—a *Presbyter* like about one half of those in our church, for I presume at least that proportion were either ordained *Evangelists*, or are acting as such. It is supremely idle to call a man *Bishop* whose relation to a cure of souls is not sufficient to warrant our calling him, in any proper sense, even an *Evangelist*.

V. While I am on this topic, let me suggest a collateral doubt. If it is *bishop* that we all must be, then *Bishop* be it. But in this case none but *bona fide* Bishops can sit in our Church Courts. If Ministers sit in Presbytery by *inherent right* as Bishops, thus excluding the notion of a charge, it is not only arrant oligarchy, but Prelacy to boot. And where, then, is the so much boasted republicanism of our forms and principles? Whom does the Duke of Wellington represent in the British House of Lords? Himself. And whom does Mr. Bishop, without a charge, represent? The only question here is, *what is a charge?* That is an open question with us.

Let us not go too fast. Our fathers were wise men, and we shall find, if we will carefully examine, that their smallest doings had sense in them, and Scripture for them.—Some think we are all very wise too, and perhaps we all are. I only suggest doubts.

One thing I find, and I find it more and more as I get more in years, and therefore more wary: there is often more in a thing than one sees at first sight. So I am well satisfied it is here; and for one, I stand by old land-marks. Reading sermons, wearing gowns, and being Bishops, came in together, went out together, and are now trying to come back together. *I doubt all three.* Let us be *Ministers*, dress like plain men, and preach Christ.

R. J. B.

Baltimore.

## SHALL WE READ, OR SHALL WE PREACH?

JOHN HOWE, in his eulogy on the celebrated DR. WILLIAM BATES, who was one of the most learned men and eloquent divines of his time, (he died in 1699, aged 74,) has these words, "And his sermons, herein nothing could be more remote from ramble, he constantly delivered from his memory. And hath sometimes told me, with an amicable freedom, that he partly did it, to teach some that were younger, to preach without notes."

It seems strange that the great author of *The Harmony of the Divine Attributes*, and of the celebrated *Discourse on the Existence of God and the Immortality of the Soul*, should not have escaped the vulgar prejudice against reading the glad tidings, instead of preaching them. The universal yankee clergy—the whole prelatical succession—so far as it is Anglican and Anglo-American—and most of the dignitaries of the Presbyterian Church in this country; all these well know, that *Dr. Bates* was in error in this matter. Let us all, then, both great and small, pity him,—shun his example, throw the mantle of charity over poor old *John Howe*, for his folly in mentioning such an error with applause; and saving our strength and labour for other and higher ends—continue to read to the Gentiles the unsearchable riches of Christ. What an utter waste of time and labour it must be, to fill the mind with proofs, arguments, illustrations, and commendations of any Scripture truth,—so as to be able to preach pungently and earnestly about it? What a bore to be obliged to commit even the thoughts and sentiments of a sermon to memory; much less the words? How much more profitable and how much less laborious—just to write down our thoughts, and then read them off?—Alas! how does the conduct of multitudes speak this language!

If we must write sermons, why can't we at least commit them to memory? Is time so precious with us, that we can't spare a few hours to store our minds with that which is so easily laid up in them—even our own productions? Is labour such a toil to us, that we can't give ever so little of it, to save us from this miserable fingering of copy-books in delivering God's message to lost men? What would we say, if one came to us, and calmly taking a paper from his pocket or hat—should read from it—"your house is on fire, and your family burning up in it?"—And is it more in character to deliver in like form, such messages as these—"your soul is in danger of hell fire;"—"flee from the wrath to come?"—It is beyond expression surprising to us that ministers should ever have adopted such a practice; and that their hearers ever tolerated it.

We will publish in our next No. the pungent tract of PAXTON, entitled, *Reading no Preaching*, a manuscript copy of which, a friend has sent to us, at our request, for this purpose. We could not procure a printed copy. Without endorsing every statement in it, or approving every expression; we solemnly believe that the practice it condemns, ought to be efficiently and immediately resisted, and if possible, put an end to, in our church. We are fully

convinced that the practice of reading sermons in the pulpit, by ministers, is neither scriptural nor warranted by primitive usage, the practice of the best reformed churches, sound reason, or true policy. And yet it is evidently on the increase; and as far as we can judge, the most of our theological seminaries and religious journals, do not condemn the practice. Nay our principal denominational periodical, which is at least a semi-official organ of our principal seminary—condemns our General Assembly, in no doubtful terms, for even venturing to *advise*, even *young* ministers to cultivate a better and more scriptural method. Surely if there is any thing that ought to interest our highest church court—it is the whole subject of the preaching of the gospel; and a clearer proof that its warning and advice were timely, could hardly be imagined—than such a condemnation—from a quarter exerting so great an influence. We cordially approve the recommendation of the Assembly of 1840; and believe moreover, that the character of our ministry and of the church itself, is so deeply implicated in this matter, that our Presbyteries and Synods ought to take it up in good earnest, and by a timely and decided testimony, turn back the current of this slovenly, indolent, and insufficient ministration—which has increased, is increasing, and ought to be discarded. At present, the general habit and public sentiment of our church—are against it. But if things go on for another generation—as they have gone on for the past twenty-five years, it will perhaps be too late, to make a stand for our ancient and Scriptural methods. Does any considerable class of our people wish to see the style of cold sermonizing of the English pulpit, from the times of the Revolution of 1688 to the present—made the model of ours? Does any wish to see the essayism of the New England pulpit become the standard with ours? If not, let copy-books be turned out of our pulpits. For nothing is more inevitable, in our judgment, than that the broad, capacious, comprehensive, earnest presentation of the gospel—is not to be retained, in a church where either sermonism or essayism has mastered real preaching.

As to our older ministers—who have acquired this habit invincibly—we have nothing to say—except to beg all the young ones to take their counsel rather than their example; for the best of them are plainest in condemnation of their own habit. But for the younger sort, and especially those whose habits are only forming; we plead with them, most earnestly, to hearken to the voice of the Assembly, and permit nothing—*no, nothing*—to seduce them into the adoption of methods, which will rob them of half their strength—and cause them pungent sorrow, when sorrow will be unavailing.

[Continued from p. 568, of Balt. Lit. and Rel. Mag. for 1841.]

A SERIOUS REVIEW OF "A CALM DISCUSSION OF THE LAWFULNESS, SCRIPTURALNESS, AND EXPEDIENCY OF ECCLESIASTICAL BOARDS"—BEING A DEFENCE OF THE ECCLESIASTICAL BOARDS OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH.

PART THIRD.

*Ecclesiastical Boards are not contrary to, but in full accordance with the principles laid down in the Word of God.*

If the ends contemplated by our ecclesiastical organizations are necessary and all important—if to secure these ends some agency besides the authoritative legislation of our ecclesiastical courts is also essential—if the system of means proposed by the objectors to our present Boards is wholly insufficient to meet the difficulties of the case, and in itself seriously objectionable—then are our present Boards, in their essential principles to be retained, however they may be modified. That our standards empower the General Assembly to engage in those benevolent operations whose management is entrusted to our Boards, has been made apparent. That some such agency as our Boards is absolutely required by the Assembly, for their oversight and direction, has been also proved; while the futility of all objections against their constitutionality has been briefly exposed.

These Boards are, however, objected to on the very serious ground of their unscripturalness. "Now the total silence of the word of God in regard to such contrivances, seals their condemnation. Nay they are virtually prohibited by those plain directions of the Scriptures in regard to church government, which lead directly to a different system." "The church is to add nothing of her own, and to subtract nothing from what her Lord has established. Discretionary power she does not possess."

It is necessary, therefore, to show that such ecclesiastical Boards are in accordance with Scripture, and that in urging this objection, its authors proceed upon an entirely mistaken view of the real question in debate. In making this position clear, we might take two different methods. As we argue with those who acknowledge the perfect Scripturality of our standards, we might at once shut up the question. For as we have established the accordance of these Boards with our Constitution, they must necessarily be conformable to the word of God. This reasoning the objector himself admits. Or we may at once appeal to the word of God, and by exhibiting the conformity of these Boards with that word, thence conclude that they are certainly right, and must be supposed accordant with our ecclesiastical institutes.

Now that the Scriptures explicitly lay it down as the imperative duty of the church, to secure those ends which are contemplated by our several benevolent operations, we may assume as fully admitted. Indeed the furtherance of these objects, for the glory of God and the salvation of souls, is the one great design of the church as a visible and organized body. We may also assume that this commanded duty, for which our church (that we may

bring home our illustration) is responsible, can be best performed through that General Assembly which is her highest ecclesiastical court—in which all her churches and Presbyteries are represented—with which all can most conveniently co-operate—and to which the powers necessary for this purpose, are explicitly given in its Constitution. Our General Assembly, then, being, as the objector will admit, scripturally authorized and required, as the organ of the church, to prosecute to the utmost of its ability, these several branches of Christian benevolence—the only question is whether this work can be done at all, or at least done to any advantage, by the Assembly in its own person, or whether it is necessary by the Assembly, as supreme director, guide and legislator, and several boards or agencies, which may outlive the sessions of that body and continue in vigorous operation when that body is defunct and incapable of action.

Now we unhesitatingly affirm that our general principle is as applicable here as it is to any human constitution. God having imposed upon our General Assembly, as the organ of the church, and by the desire of the church, these necessary duties which it may not neglect, but must see performed, and not having prescribed in detail the plan and measures by which these duties are to be discharged, has most certainly empowered that body, under the guidance and controul of the general rules laid down in Scripture, to make use of every proper means for the successful prosecution of these Christian enterprizes. This principle we must affirm to be undeniably certain. Its rejection would lay the axe to many a fair branch of our ecclesiastical polity, and leave a bare and barren trunk behind it. It would tie up the hands and feet of our sacred polity and deprive it of all power of motion. It would emasculate it of all its strength and vigour and reduce it to a helpless and exanimate system. That which the church is required to do, she is empowered to do by all means not expressly forbidden, or implicitly countermanded, and it will not surely be pretended that the Assembly being scripturally ordained, an agency for the certain and efficient prosecution of its necessary duties, is any where so forbidden. The church is the converter of the heathen—the regenerator of our waste and ruined world. But as represented in her General Assembly, she can act in this matter only for a few days, and therefore most imperfectly. She must, therefore, employ in subserviency to this court, subordinate agencies or boards, which are, therefore, as plainly sanctioned by the divine word.

That “the total silence of the word of God in regard to such contrivances seals their condemnation,” or that “whatever could not be traced to them either directly or by necessary inference, is to be denounced . . . as mere will-worship, which God abhors”—this principle, we say, taken in its unrestricted and absolute nakedness, would subvert the foundations of every church on earth, and leave not a wreck behind of church polity, order or arrangements. It would wipe out, as with a sponge, nine-tenths of all that is laid down in our Form of Government and Discipline. These Standards declare that this form of Government, as there delineated and drawn out into all the details of management and business, rests

on the adoption of it by the church, as amended and ratified by the General Assembly in May, 1821—(See Form of Gov. B. 1, c. 1.) This whole form our church only claims "to be expedient and agreeable to Scripture," but not so as to be exclusive of those which differ from it.—(F. of Gov. c. viii. §. 1.) For many of its specific regulations, our Book claims no express testimony from the word of God; it bases them upon the fact that they are accordant with its general principles. This we might illustrate at any length, from a consideration of the provisions respecting church Sessions—(See Form of Gov. c. ix.)—Presbyteries—(c. x.)—Synods—(c. xi.)—the General Assembly—(c. xii.)—Ruling Elders—(c. xiii.)—the Forms of Licensure, Ordination and Installation—and numberless other points. To every one of these the "total silence of the word of God" might be objected, and their condemnation sealed. The objection is evidently untenable—unsound—and utterly subversive of all liberty of action beyond the mere letter of the law. It is Judaical. It would overturn the glorious liberty of the gospel dispensation. It would again subject us to the bondage of the law—whereas the objector states, "nothing connected with the worship or discipline of the church of God was left to the wisdom or discretion of man, but every thing was accurately prescribed by the authority of God." But from this yoke of rules and ceremonies the Son of God has emancipated his church. She is now under a dispensation of principles and not of rules. The church has passed from a state of pupillage to the age of maturity. God now speaks to her as to a full grown, reasonable person. He has given to her, general laws and great fundamental principles. He has enjoined upon her certain great and glorious duties. By those laws she is to be restrained and guided in the exercise of her own wisdom, in devising the ways and means for the accomplishment of the greatest good in the best possible manner. This is most assuredly the doctrine of our Standards, as has been already practically demonstrated, and as may be preceptively declared. In the opening chapter of our Confession of Faith, and while treating on one of the most essential points in the whole Book, the following principle is maintained: "There are some circumstances concerning the worship of God and government of the church, common to human actions and societies," as, for instance, the detailed plan by which any prescribed duty shall be best accomplished, "which are to be ordered by the light of nature and Christian prudence, according to the general rules of the word which are always to be observed"—(ch. 1, §. vi.) So also in treating of Synods, which include our General Assembly, our Confession teaches us that "it belongeth to Synods . . . to set down rules and directions for the better ordering of the public worship of God, and the government of the church"—(ch. xxxi. §. 2.)

Such, also, was the view taken of this matter by all the reformers—and by the non-conformists even, the most strict constructionists among them. Our objector is here certainly mistaken. He confounds things which differ. He confounds that which is necessary as an article of faith—or as a means of grace—or as an important and enjoined part of the worship of God—with that which is

necessary as a means for the accomplishment of a duty which is confessedly required in God's word or included under the general provisions of the church. The imposition of the former, the Reformers—the Puritans—the Non-Conformists, and our Presbyterian fathers, steadfastly resisted as a treasonable usurpation of the kingly prerogatives of the Head of the church. They contended against the assumed power authoritatively to interpret the Bible, and declare what is truth, and to decree rites and ceremonies as a necessary part of the worship of God—and to make forms and orders essential to the being of the church, in opposition to both Romanists and prelatists, when needs were—even unto blood. And right sure we are, that their spirit has not died with them, but is even now burning in the hearts of their honoured successors, who would exultingly bear testimony for this liberty of God's ransomed church, even on the scaffold or at the stake. But the framing of articles of faith—and the imposition of means of grace, with rites, orders and ceremonies, as parts of God's holy worship, is one thing, and the power to carry out the acknowledged provisions of the gospel and the commanded duties which are imposed by divine authority on the church—by the wisest and best means, is another and a very different matter. Did our church undertake to declare that her ecclesiastical organizations were of divine right—were in all their detail instituted by Christ—were to be received as his, and to be implicitly obeyed—and that they were a necessary part of her divine polity, and thus binding on the conscience of her members, not as a good means toward a necessary end, but as in themselves necessary?—then indeed would she jeopard her authority and prelatize the church—and call forth from every true-hearted Presbyterian the strong language of indignant rebuke, and stout and unyielding resistance. But when our Assembly, for the certain and successful accomplishment of duties devolved upon her by the Head of the church, and by us, its members—appoints these bodies, as in her wisdom, the best instrumentality through which she can achieve these purposes—then indeed we are at liberty to point out deficiencies, and to correct mistaken policy, and to adjust the system to a perfect accordance with the general rules of scripture and of our standards—but to say that the appointment itself is unscriptural and un-*Presbyterian*, is preposterous in the extreme.

Power may be attributed to the church in several aspects. Without going into particulars, we may observe that an original, inherent, or legislative power over the house of God, we as consistent Protestants, utterly deny to the church. But a power ministerially to declare the will of God, and to carry out the requirements of heaven, in accordance with the general rules of God's holy word—this the whole church in every age warrants; this, reason itself demands; this the scriptures certainly allow.

Such were the views of the immortal Calvin, as expounded with consummate skill, in his inimitable Institutes. Turn to his lengthened chapter on "The Power of Legislation," (—B. iv. ch. x.) and these principles will be found fully developed. "This power," says he, "is now to be examined, whether the church has author-

ity to make laws which shall bind the consciences of men." "Against such laws we contend, and not against the holy and useful constitutions of the church which contribute to the preservation of discipline, or integrity, or peace." "I only contend for this one point, that no necessity ought to be imposed upon our consciences on things on which they have been set at liberty by Christ." "If human laws tend to introduce any scruple into our minds, as though the observance of them were essentially necessary, we assert that they are unreasonable impositions on the conscience. For our consciences have to do not with men, but with God alone." "A second consideration . . . is, that human laws, I mean such as are good and just, whether enacted by magistrates OR THE CHURCH, THOUGH THEY ARE NECESSARY TO BE OBSERVED, are not on this account, binding on the conscience, because all the necessity of observing them has reference to the general object of laws"—as in the case before us, the accomplishment of the work of missions—"but does not consist in the particular things which are commanded. There is AN IMMENSE DISTANCE between laws of this description and those which prescribe any new form for the worship of God, and impose a necessity in things that were left free and indifferent." Again, in section xvi., he says, "if any one wish to have a simple statement of what are the human traditions of all ages which ought to be rejected and reprobated by the church and all pious persons, the direction we have already given is clear and certain, that they are all laws made by men without the word of God, for the purpose either of prescribing any method for the worship of God, or of laying the conscience under a religious obligation, as if they enjoined things necessary to salvation." And now hear him speak in section xxvii.: "But, as many ignorant persons, when they hear that the consciences of men ought not to be bound by human traditions, and that it is vain to worship God by such services, immediately conclude the same rule to be applicable to all the laws which regulate the order of the church, WE MUST ALSO REFUTE THEIR ERROR." Under this head, which is all in point, he remarks, "The laws, therefore, which promote this end, (order,) we are so far from condemning, that we contend their abolition would be followed by a disruption of the bands of union, and the total disorganization and dispersion of the churches. For it is impossible to attain what Paul requires, that all things be done decently and in order, unless order and decorum be supported by ADDITIONAL REGULATIONS," &c. Thus clear and evident was this distinction to the mind of this illustrious reformer. We are the more full and particular in the exhibition of his opinions, because we have reason to know, that the force of the objections urged against our Boards, is based upon the principles developed in this very Book of the Institutes of Calvin. Here, however, it is expressly taught, that while the church has no authority to impose new articles of faith, or new laws, binding on the conscience, she has power for the attainment of prescribed ends, to devise such laws and regulations as shall best secure them, restrained only by the general rules of God's word.

This distinction, and this power and liberty of the church we might, if necessary, further illustrate.\* But enough has been said to detect the fallacy of the objection—to clear this obscure subject from that cloudy mist in which it is involved—and to present the conformity of our ecclesiastical Boards, in their essential principles, with the word of God, in a light so clear as not to be resisted.

Where Scripture requires any thing to be done, without specifying the manner in which it is to be done, we are of necessity left to the guidance of its general rules and right reason. So where our Standards enjoin, or imply, any duty, but do not specifically declare the way in which it is to be discharged, here also, are we left to select such means as are best adapted to compass the end in accordance with its general rules.

Thus far are we, as Christians and as Presbyterians, at liberty to consult expediency, in carrying out any measures of Christian duty. Only it is to be carefully observed that just where expediency begins—there does the power of binding the conscience cease. So that it were spiritual despotism to enforce as necessary, that which is enjoined only upon the ground of expediency.

We will only further notice the allegation, that under the existing system, there is no security whatever for the dissemination of the truth. This is a most grave and serious allegation—involving the deepest interests—and demanding for its substantiation the most satisfactory evidence. “Those who contribute to our Boards do not, it is said, know, and cannot know, whether they are sustaining Arminians, Semi-Pelagians, or Presbyterians. They do not know, in other words, whether they are building up or pulling down the kingdom of the Redeemer.” Now when the magnitude of our missionary enterprizes is considered;—when the responsibilities under which our Boards, and through them our General Assembly and the whole church, are already laid, are realized—and the pressing necessities of the future are taken into account; when it is remembered how intimately associated are all the hopes of all our missionary stations, and of an unregenerated world, so far as the agency of our church is concerned, with our missionary Boards;—when these things are seriously contemplated, we cannot but deplore the utterance of such sentiments as these. Is it in truth so? Are these criminations borne out by the facts of the case? Then is it high time to abandon operations which instead of con-

\*This principle of Protestantism is thus laid down by Dr. Owen, in his *Answer to Stillingfleet*, (Works, vol. 20, p. 282,) and he might be supposed to present it in its strictest form: “The first general principle the Protestants pleaded, was that the Scripture, the word of God, is a perfect rule of faith and religious worship; so as that nothing ought to be admitted, which is repugnant unto it in its general rule or especial prohibitions, nothing IMPOSED that is not prescribed therein, but that every one is at liberty to refuse and reject every thing of that kind.” And in illustrating the evils which arose from the neglect of this principle, he says, “this persuasion in some places made further progress, namely, that it was lawful to impose on the consciences and practices of men such things in religious worship, provided that they concerned outward order, rites, rule and ceremonies, as are nowhere prescribed in Scripture, and that on severe penalties, ecclesiastical and civil. This almost utterly destroyed the great fundamental principle of the reformation whereon the reformers justified their separation from the church of Rome.”

veying the glad tidings of salvation to men perishing for lack of knowledge, are only channels through which the bitter waters of pestiferous and soul-destroying error diffuse their baneful influences. We cannot but say, that there is a most heavy responsibility involved in the publication of such bold and confident denunciations. Charity at best, is a feeble and sickly grace. It is so rooted in the soil of selfishness, and so surrounded by all the blighting influences of earthly passions, as to attain, in the large majority even of Christians, but a stunted growth. It requires little to repress its budding desires, or to wither its opening blossoms, or to dry up its ripening fruit. And when any argument is offered which wears any semblance of holy zeal, by the admission of which some excuse may be given for the withholdment of liberality, it is, alas, too easy, for the very best of us to yield to its influence. Now to hold up to the view of our churches, that system of benevolent operation through which its bounty is conveyed to the objects of its sympathy, as "fraught with nothing but mischief and disorder"—as what is to be "denounced as a human invention—as mere will-worship which God abhors so deeply that an inspired apostle has connected it with idolatry or the worshipping of angels"—as affording no security to their supporters, "whether they are sustaining Arminians, Semi-Pelagians, or Presbyterians"—or "whether they are building up or pulling down the kingdom of the Redeemer"—what is this, but at once to make it the duty of every truth-loving man, to withdraw his charity, and to shut up his bowels of compassion? Is there, then, that sufficient ground of terror and alarm for the truth as it is in Jesus, which could alone excuse denunciations so unqualified, and consequences so disastrous as these? We boldly say, that no such ground for any reasonable fears, on this account, can be pointed out. We confidently affirm that our Boards increase, and may be made still further to increase, and that they cannot possibly decrease, that security which would be afforded to the church for the orthodoxy of her missionaries sent out by their respective Presbyteries. Respecting, as we do so highly, the eminent talents of our objector, we wonder with an increasing amazement, at the strange and paradoxical conclusions to which he has been led. When missionaries are sent out by our Boards of Missions, we have no means, it is said, of knowing whether they are Pelagians, or Arminians, or Presbyterians, but when sent out by a Presbytery, or even by a neighbouring Presbytery, then we "have full security for the soundness of the man whom (such Presbytery) was called on to assist"!!

What then is this infallible security? What can it be, in the first case, but the examination of the party by such members of his Presbytery as happened to be present? and in the second case, the report of such an examination, as made by one Presbytery to another. But our objector has himself told us, "*that Presbyteries are sometimes as mischievous as any other bodies.*" What if the majority of such a Presbytery are disposed to countenance error, or are incapable of discovering its latent springs? Or what if any individual is inclined to disguise his sentiments, and to assume a character of temporary orthodoxy? Absolute security we never

can have, by any conceivable process, for the perfect correctness in every necessary doctrine of our licentiates or ordained ministers. And even if such certainty could be attained to day, by what means is such a condition of perfect orthodoxy to be perpetuated, in every such individual? It is perfectly idle, as our objector would say, to tell me that as a member of a Presbytery, I would have perfect security for the soundness, and for the continued soundness in the faith, of every missionary sent out to foreign lands, by that or by any neighbouring Presbytery. I would have no such thing. Probable and sufficient grounds of confidence I would have, but full and perfect security I would not possess, since even our objector teaches that "*we must have no confidence in the flesh, and that Presbyteries are sometimes as mischievous as any other bodies.*"

But as the matter now stands, there is, I contend, every security given, for the character and views of our various missionaries, that could be obtained by the limitation of their appointment to a single Presbytery; and an additional security, which on the plan proposed, never could be given. That the former proposition is correct, is evident from a moment's consideration of the facts of the case. Every missionary, employed either by the Board of Domestic or Foreign Missions, before he can come before them as a suitable candidate for any appointment whatever, must give evidence that he has been received and licensed or ordained, by some Presbytery in good standing in our church. This is a first principle in the organization of the Boards. They know nothing, as such, of the trials or licensure of candidates for the ministry. This whole business remains in all its entirety with each several Presbytery. Every Presbytery, therefore, and every neighbouring Presbytery, has, as it regards every employed missionary connected with either of our Boards, precisely that "full security from their position for the soundness of the man whom they are called on to assist," which the objector demands. This is, and must be the fact, in every single instance. And if our objector cannot extend the limits of this security beyond a single Presbytery, and its neighbouring associate, then our Boards render it perfectly open for any one or any two Presbyteries to unite in the particular support of any one, or of any number of men, in whose soundness they have this full and sufficient confidence. Thus to illustrate: the Presbytery of Charleston sent forward to our Board of Foreign Missions, a year ago, a very worthy and esteemed young brother, who received an appointment as missionary to China. Now I ask the objector whether during all the stages of his progress towards the ministry—or in his final examinations, trials and licensure—any member of that Presbytery was in any measure hindered from attaining that "full security, which from his position he might easily possess, of the soundness of the man whom he should afterwards be called on to assist?" Most assuredly not. Of his soundness and qualifications, therefore, every member of the Presbytery of Charleston, and so also, of the Presbytery of Harmony, on the one hand, and of the Presbytery of Georgia on the other, had the "full security from their position." Such, also, as our objector teaches, is the case in reference to other missionaries belonging to that same honoured

Presbytery, which has representatives in China, and in Asia, and in Palestine, and in Persia. What then, is to hinder these Presbyteries from contributing their funds through the Board, supposing these missionaries all to be connected with it, and for the special support of such beloved brethren? Nothing whatever. Our objector, then, is evidently mistaken in his apprehensions of the real state of the case. Whatever the Boards have to do in the matter, they can, in no way, interfere with that full security which our objector requires, and which certainly should be possessed.

But there is, we contend, in the organizations of our Boards, a security for the perfect propriety and soundness of our several missionaries, additional to that which is enjoyed, in undiminished fulness, by every separate Presbytery. It is a very possible and supposable thing, that any single Presbytery might be itself lax in its doctrinal views, or that it might be mistaken in its estimate of any given man. Now in this case, the Board may have come to the knowledge of the facts in the case, and while it cannot institute any process against the party, it may dissuade him from the work—it may impede his immediate entrance upon it until the Assembly shall have been consulted—and the church shall have an opportunity of preventing the commissioning of such an unworthy herald of the cross. The Boards, as far as their authority extends, act not for any particular Presbytery, but for the entire church, as the organ of the Assembly. They leave, therefore, to each Presbytery, and to the church, the full security given by our constitutional provisions, and they superadd to this a further measure of security in that vigilant circumspection they are required to exercise for preventing the introduction into any field under their care, of any unworthy candidate. These Boards, being representatives of the General Assembly—which is itself the annually delegated representation of every portion of the church—and being annually elected by, and subject to, the entire controul of that body—cannot be supposed so likely to be generally corrupt as any single, isolated, independent and permanent Presbytery. And while it is very possible that in any given case, these Boards may err, and may transcend the bounds within which they should be certainly confined, their mis-management can, at most, extend only to the period of a single year. For whatever may be the present arrangement as to the term of office of each member, the whole matter, in all its bearings is in the hands of every single Assembly, and subject to its unlimited controul.

Our objector, then, has allowed himself to be deluded, by an ignis fatuus in his just zeal for the purity of the gospel; and while seeking for the church greater security, would actually deprive her of that which she now enjoys. Most certain it is, that no warrantable pretext has been afforded him, for publishing such a sweeping condemnation, on such serious grounds, of these appointed agencies of the church. He has inflicted a wound, it may be very difficult to heal, and whose festering sore may long continue to give uneasiness and pain to the body spiritual. The objector and his colleagues in this work of opposition, have talents, influence, and power. They may carry their views with irresistible force to

many minds. They may thus alienate the resources of the church, while she is but commencing her glorious course of heavenly charity. We would beseech and entreat them as brethren, to pause, before they advance further in this career, and not to hazard the peace, union, and prosperity of the church, and the successful prosecution of our benevolent operations.

That the ends contemplated by these brethren are holy, we believe. That their aims are high and Christian, we also rejoice in admitting. With these aims we desire to sympathize, and for these ends we would also strive. The glory of God in the salvation of men, through sanctification of the truth—let this be our only object. If in our present instrumentality, for the accomplishment of this purpose there be aught superfluous or wanting, let it be retrenched or added. We advocate no abuses. We patronize no existing evils. We may be found uniting with these very brethren in many of their proposed amendments. But in their responsibilities in thus publicly holding up to reprobation, the whole machinery by which every benevolent operation of the church is conducted, we would not partake. And in the spirit of the most affectionate kindness, (and towards one, of the most respectful deference and regard,) we would entreat them to remember that while it is easy to destroy, it is most difficult to restore, and that over the ruins of our present noble charities, we may all have cause to weep in bitter lamentation.

The lawfulness and scripturalness of ecclesiastical Boards, have we trust, been now demonstrated; and the untenableness of all objections urged against them exposed. There are many things in this "Calm Discussion," to which we might advert, but as we have no wish to cavil or oppose, we pass them by. Neither is it necessary for us at any length distinctly to consider the objection against the expediency of such organizations. This subject has been already necessarily considered in its principle, and the true source of the objector's difficulties pointed out. Expediency is unquestionably a necessary and lawful guide—not to the discovery or the determination of duty—but to its accomplishment, in every case where a detailed plan has not been prescribed. The duty of the church is, in the case under discussion, imperative. The specific mode in which that duty is to be carried into full effect, is not laid down—and therefore, while any wise plan which is accordant to the general rules of Scripture, is lawful, experience and prudence must determine which is most expedient.

Were any thing wanting to confirm the truth of these conclusions, it might be found in the fact, that while the Presbyterian church has ever been accustomed, both in this country and in Scotland, to the appointments of commissions, of more or less extent, with the full powers of the body constituting them, and for the execution of given trusts; so have the Presbyterian churches in Ireland and in Scotland been led to the organization of similar Boards or Committees for the very same purposes as our own, and with substantially the same powers. The church of Scotland has now her several committees, (who are not benches of deacons,) for the entire management of each of those five great schemes of be-

nevolence in whose prosecution she is embarking with such commendable zeal and liberality. So also has the Presbyterian church of Ireland her Educational and Missionary Committees or Boards for the management of all the business connected with these several objects of Christian philanthropy. And while it is true of our own branch of the church, that her zeal and activity in all the departments of benevolent enterprise have been increased a thousand fold, by means of her various Boards, it is not less certain that with the stirring impulse of enlarged charity, our sister, or rather mother, churches in Ireland and Scotland, have been at once, and without hesitation, led to the organization of substantially similar agencies. And what, I ask, has been the teaching of experience as delivered to our own churches? I will refer to the case of the Southern Board of Foreign Missions, with whose operations I am most familiar, and which may be taken as a fair criterion in drawing our conclusions. During the past two years, no general agency has been in this field. The churches were fully apprized that no agency might be expected, and that they must voluntarily put forth their strength. Our Synod passed resolutions encouraging such liberality, and our ministers made willing promises of co-operation. And yet during the last year, out of some one hundred and seventy churches, within the bounds of that Board and of the Synod of S. C. and Geo., not more than twenty, did any thing at all for foreign missions, and a still fewer number observed the monthly concert for prayer, at all. Strange, too, as it may appear, yet it is a fact, that the amounts raised in even these few churches were in more than half the number, collected through the assistance of some extraneous agency.

The perfect consistency of such ecclesiastical Boards or Agencies, therefore, with Scripture, and with our Standards; and their absolute necessity to the conduct of such extensive schemes of Christian charity, are thus made to rest upon the certain ground of universal experience—as well as upon the most clear, evident, and irrefragable arguments. Such Boards and Agencies are absolutely required for the furtherance of such benevolent operations. The one cannot exist and thrive where the others are wanting. They are, in the present state of the church, correlative the one to the other; so that where the one is necessary, the other must be introduced, and where the means are wanting, the end will never be secured.\*

[\*We think it probable that the author of the "*Calm Discussion*," &c., whose paper has been so elaborately discussed, in this "*Serious Review*," &c., now completed—will reply to the reviewer, in due time, through our pages; on which account we have not thought it necessary to add any notes to this, or the two preceding parts, pointing out, as the argument progressed—what appeared to us inconclusive, what unsound, and what Scriptural and Presbyterian. A great deal that has been said, we agree with; a good deal has appeared to us fully to sustain our views, while apparently adduced to confute them; a portion, has seemed to us devoted to points purely speculative, and not going to the gist of the question; and some things, we have been obliged to dissent from entirely. This much, with all respect for the excellent and able author, we feel it our duty to say.

In regard to the questions of practical interest, put at issue, in these and similar discussions—our own opinions have been deliberately made up, upon careful, and

A LETTER TO THE PRESBYTERIES, PARTICULARLY OF THE WEST.—  
BY AN OLD SERVANT OF CHRIST.

*Rev'd and Dear Brethren:*—The person whose name is appended to this address, surely feels himself greatly inferior to many of those to whom he would speak; yet from his long acquaintance with the condition of the Presbyterian church of these United States, and particularly with the West, he would flatter himself that the present effort will not be deemed presuming. My reason for making this effort at this time is, that should the thoughts be considered as worthy of regard, they should be distinctly before the Presbyteries at their spring sessions, that united consent might be obtained, and efficient action and advice secured at our Assembly of 1842. Permit me to present a few facts.

I. The present is acknowledged to be a day of peculiar interest to the world, and especially to the church. We know that this is a trite remark. But its being in every mouth, is a proof that it is not only a general belief, but also that it is true. We think he must be greatly blinded, who does not see the hand of God stretched out in mercy over our world. It is true, it some times appears as a portentous hand. But putting the whole dispensation together, it resembles a wide-spreading cloud, surcharged with a copious and fertilizing shower. Half a century ago, it was but as "the little cloud" that appeared to the prophet's servant, "like a man's hand, arising out of the sea." Already has it almost overspread the heavens, and refreshed the whole earth. What graphic pen can describe the changes that have taken place in Asia and the islands

long continued observation and reflection. We consider our system of Agencies, an absolute failure—in every view of it, whether reference be had to our individual or to our organized operations,—to Agents, properly so called, or to Boards as agencies for the church. We look on this as matter standing in *proof*—and not in *argument*; and are ready to maintain our opinion by *facts*—of the most complete and distressing character—covering a period of years. We are convinced, moreover, that the whole operation is founded on principles which it is extremely difficult to reconcile with the true nature of Presbyterianism and with the grand system of the gospel; and that a reform is equally obligatory and practicable. This is matter standing in argument, and to be made good by the word of God, and by our standards, as contrasted with the principles, the powers, the acts, and the influences of our Boards and Agents; and we are ready to maintain our convictions—by what appears to us a conclusive demonstration of the evils to be corrected and the method of cure.

Meantime, our pages are free for the full discussion of the subject. A discussion, the importance of which they alone can appreciate, who believe that the Presbyterian church has a great and glorious work to perform; who remember that after years of effort, not more, perhaps, than one-third of its congregations have ever been reached at all; who reflect that on the present plan, it seems nearly if not absolutely impossible ever to reach them all steadily, and rouse them to regular and zealous effort,—even if the plan itself was otherwise unobjectionable; and who consider, that from the enormous expensiveness of this decrepit plan, from the scrapes of many as to the principles on which it proceeds, and from various other difficulties, which we cannot here enumerate, its hold on the churches, instead of strengthening daily, is scarcely and with great difficulty maintained *in statu quo*.—[Ed.]

of the sea? While millions are still treading the dark paths of idolatry and death, there are tens of thousands who are walking in the footsteps of the Saviour, with their faces Zion-ward. And Africa, poor, oppressed Africa, though far in the rear of civilization and Christianity, does she not begin to lift herself from the dust, and to change her deserved curses of the Atlantic and the white man into blessings? Does she not begin to feel her long lost energy of character, and to hope that the country that gave birth to some of the early Christian fathers, may again send forth an army in the Lord's hosts? That though black, she is nearly, and will yet be, as "the curtains of Solomon." The wise men (or magi,) of the East saw a star, (westward) "it stood over the place where the young child was." If it be not the very star of Bethlehem, is it not its corona, and in its ascendent? Who can doubt that the morning star of the gospel has risen upon Africa, and that the blessedness of its western shore is soon to be the blessedness of the whole continent? How has the light of science, humanity and Christianity progressed in the world, since the time when the celebrated John Newton was connected with a company deeply engaged in the slave trade, and that in which Wilberforce and Sharp enlightened the British Parliament on the sorrows of the black man. The former was but as the twilight of policy and the gospel, the latter as that same sun distinctly above the horizon. How changed is the condition of things in America. Once, Rhode-Island especially, and indeed all the eastern states, yearly enriched themselves by the slave-trade, before the revolution, when we were but few. Now we are multiplied to twenty-six states, and in only half of these, is slavery, in any form, tolerated; and even in the slave states, the hand of oppression is often changed into a hand of blessing. Our object in laying these facts before the Presbyteries, is that, in their official capacities they may learn that God's providence forms a sure index to our duty. And that while, on the one hand, the state of the world calls loudly upon the church to wake up from her slumbers, and to hail the coming of the day of the Lord; on the other, we ought never to attempt heartily to snatch the reigns of government from the hands of those whose right it is to rule; or attempt that, by the power of the church courts, to which they are inadequate.

Permit me to present another assemblage of facts to your minds. Who does not see that the Pope of Rome is at this time committing suicide, though he does not intend it, nor does it once come into his mind? What but madness could have induced the present Pope to depart from the dark pathway of his predecessors, and establish three or four colleges in Rome itself, and, bearing the names of the most literary kingdoms of Europe? Have things changed? Can darkness dwell with light, even the light of science? Can creation itself,—can the heavens and the earth, be rightly read without the Bible? Will not the common people look through the stone walls of their colleges, and learn to despise the "man of sin," clothed in the patch-work of heathenism and Christianity, and labouring to exclude the light of the Bible from the world? Will not Italy wake up from her slumbers of fifteen centuries, and dispise the mummeries of Popery, as France has done, and is

doing? And supposing she too, like France, (to a great extent,) becomes infidel. Will there be no colporteurs in Italy? Will not the long obscured, but the rising light of Geneva, do for Italy what she has already done for France? Will not the light shine over the Alps?

What has given Popery its overwhelming power? Simply an appeal to some of the weakest and basest principles of our nature, and combining their belief, with some of the highest and holiest hopes and destinies of man. What is it that has clothed the popish priesthood with almost unlimited power, but the watchwords, *holy Father and Catholic church, the celibacy of the clergy, with the desires that every man has to have his sins forgiven, and to obtain a place in heaven, on easy terms?* What has robbed sin of almost the whole of its terrors, but the absurd and unscriptural doctrine of purgatory, with the confessional, making the Romish church in all ages nothing but a sink of pollution? Will not these delusions waste away like mist before the rising sun, if facts, and nothing but facts, be placed before the public eye?

We have said the Pope is at this time committing suicide. The adage of antiquity, "whom God intends to curse, he first makes mad," seems to me to be accomplished in the present conduct of Popery. Can any thing but madness account for the papacy attempting to set its cloven foot upon American soil, and labouring to re-build that rotten fabric, which is falling to pieces in Europe, in this land of free inquiry, and Bible-reading? The transfer of immense, jeopardized fortunes, during the late turmoils of Europe, has filled the Roman Catholic coffers with money, has built cathedrals, nunneries, and colleges in America, but is this a perennial fountain? Is it not rather like a summer-shower rivulet, that will soon run dry, and its existence will only be known by its rocky, barren bed. Another temporary cause has operated to promote popery among us. Our demand for day-labourers upon our canals, turnpikes, and rail-roads, has filled our country with the mere dregs of European society, chiefly Roman Catholics. This also is an affair but of a day. It has already, or must soon pass away. These and other similar causes have combined to call forth the talents and the efforts of some of the faithful watchmen on Zion's walls, such as the worthy and ever to be lamented Dr. John Breckinridge, and others. Many tongues have been employed to expose the horrid blasphemies of Popery, that would have been silent, but for the great swelling words of the 'beast.' We have many facts in the history of the church, that this is one way by which God has confounded errorists and caused them to work their own overthrow.

Suffer me, dear brethren, to suggest that the efforts made against Popery ought always to be made by *individuals*, not by *ecclesiastical bodies*, such as Presbyteries, Synods, or the Assembly. It may be well questioned whether the effort made by the last Assembly, by appointing two of its ablest men to deliver each a discourse on Popery, was not unwise. To marshal a whole army of giants to contend with an army of pigmies, has something ridiculous in it. But if the contest were between individuals, though unequal, it would not be so ridiculous. It may be doubted whether the effort

of the Assembly, though the duty assigned to the brethren was admirably executed, did not with the great mass of the Catholic people of the country, elevate rather than depress their cause. While our ecclesiastical courts, from the Presbytery up to the Assembly, ought to feel themselves above entering into a contest with the Pope, knowing that they have higher and holier work to do, the personal efforts that have been made against the beast, cannot be too highly estimated; and watchfulness on the part of every minister and private Christian, is nothing but a duty. Under the watchful care and the control of heaven over all human events, we would feel safe, perfectly safe. As soon would we expect to see the slimy toad deposite its spawn in the chrysal fountain, or the bird of night build her nest, and nurse her callow brood, in some focal point of the sun, or the prince of darkness bask in the sun-shine of heaven, as that the Pope, with his seven heads and ten horns, will ever build his throne in America. The very attempt is a proclamation of his weakness at home.

By similar means has popery defeated itself in Great Britain. Would ever the truth have had so many advocates in England, or popery been so much exposed, but for the Oxford Tracts? Would the truth of God ever have found so many able advocates in England and America, had not Socinianism and then Transcendentalism found so much favour in Germany and Boston? Would ever the Presbyterian church have been what she now is, had not Pelagianism and Semi-Pelagianism, claimed to be the truth of God's word, by many of our former brethren. This has always been one of God's methods of sustaining the truth in our world, by making the wrath of man to praise him. By bringing light out of darkness, and wisdom out of folly. The history of the Reformation is a proof of this remark. These facts, with many others of a similar character, call loudly upon all the office-bearers in God's house, to see to it, that they be not idlers in the time of God's harvest. Such is the present time, if we are not greatly mistaken.

Dear brethren, I trust you will still bear with me, while I endeavour further to lay before you what I deem to be the present aspect of the world. To me it is imposing, and ought to be so to every Christian, but especially to the Presbyterians of these United States.

**THE FALSE PROPHET.** Go to Constantinople, and you will see the Christian and the Mahomedan labouring together to build the same ship—sitting together on the same beam of timber, in social converse, walking together to the same table, in all respects treating each other as fellow-beings. Their very nomenclature is changed, when speaking of Christians. "Christian dog," is now found in the mouths of none but the vulgar. If there have been no remarkable conversions among the followers of the false prophet, the way seems to be preparing. Already "the wolf and the lamb feed together." Already the nations of the whole earth seem to be flowing together, and saying to each other, come "and let us exalt his name together." Look at Syria. Look at Egypt. Long have the words of Ezekiel been verified upon Egypt, "and there shall be no more a prince in the land of Egypt." Look at that old man, Mahamed Ali, now bordering upon four score years. With

all his Mahommedism and cruelty does he not look like a prince of Egypt? Is he not a second Joseph? If five cities do not yet speak the language of Canaan, surely a better day begins to dawn upon Egypt. Let us ascend a step higher and look around us.—Has not the time already commenced, when the “nations shall hear war no more?” when they shall beat their swords into ploughshares, and their spears into pruning hooks? Upon subjects of this kind, facts and the Bible are the only arguments to be employed. The Bible assures us there shall be such a time. Existing facts, are the only guides we have, as to the time when this state of the world shall come. Let us for a moment look at facts. Ever since Europe has been known to history, it has been like a troubled “sea that cannot rest.” This has been especially true respecting war. For three hundred years, war has been the great trade or profession of Europe. Every other character or profession succumbed to the military. And we have imported and cherished the same spirit in America. But have we not reason to hope that the world has imbibed a better spirit? Did ever Europe before present twenty-five years of profound peace? There has been no war in Europe since the battle of Waterloo. The eight or nine years of civil strife and butchery in Spain, did not in the slightest degree disturb the tranquillity of the rest of Europe, which is in itself an evidence that a spirit governed the powers of Europe, that they were strangers to even fifty years ago. And as it respects America, not all the efforts of some of the most popular men in our country, could break the bonds of peace in this happy land. Let no one object to this doctrine, by bringing to mind the present unjustifiable war of Great Britain with China. The demon of war finding no longer any resting place in civilized Europe, has retired to semi-savage life. It retired by the way of Syria, and is now exerting its fury upon China. No person deprecates, more than I do, the unjustifiable principles of this China war. But even war is God’s servant, and always has been. When nations cannot be governed by milder means, he removes his restraining hand, and human blood flows like a torrent. But he still makes the wrath of man to praise him, and it will be so in this war. The grandest results for man and for the gospel, that were ever produced by any war, except that of the American revolution, will be produced by this China war. Without it or a miracle, China must have remained what she has always been, a loathsome excrescence upon the human family. By it, in all probability, the one-third of the human race will be thrown into the common current of mankind, and the widest door be opened for the extension of *commerce*, that great cement of society—of truth, civil, political, moral and religious. Perhaps it would be going too far to predict that this is England’s last war. Shall that nation, which has been foremost in aiding to convert the world, be the last to catch the genuine spirit of the age, the spirit of peace and of Christ? Shall she always have power only to abuse it? To achieve the grand purposes of infinite wisdom, God has given England power. She has often abused that power. But God has her in his hand. Leviathan as she is, he can put a hook in her nose and a cord about her tongue, and wind her up. For

he leadeth counsellors away spoiled, and maketh judges fools. He looseth the bond of kings, and girdeth their loins with a girdle.

The constantly increasing wealth and dominion of England, for centuries, forms one of the most astonishing facts in God's government of the world. Never has there been any thing like it, since the Romans gave law to the whole earth. That was permitted that a suitable theatre might be prepared upon which the triumphs of the gospel in the first ages might be displayed. This, that the same gospel might be published in China, to every land, and that the kingdoms of this world might become the kingdoms of the Lord and his Anointed. For who is prepared to deny, that to England, in conjunction with America, may be applied the words of Isaiah, when speaking of Egypt, "That sendeth ambassadors by the sea, even in vessels of bulrushes upon the waters, (reeds as light as bulrushes,) saying, go, go, swift messengers, to a nation scattered and peeled, to a people terrible from the beginning hitherto, a nation melted and trodden down?" Who is so blind as not to see that to Great Britain and America, God has to a great extent, committed the civilization and gospelizing of the whole world? I ask again, has he given power to England to be perpetually abused, and liberty to America, to put her light under a bushel? I trust not. The high morality and justice of the Bible, is yet to be the law of England. And the liberty of America, the boon of the world.

My dear brethren of the Presbyteries, I hope I shall neither weary you, nor excite your disgust, while I endeavour "to stir up your pure minds by way of remembrance." Surely the present is not a time when the wise virgins may slumber. Is it not a time when the Presbyteries, these fountains of all authority in our church, should be stirred up to their duty? When their united voice should be heard in our grand council, the Assembly? Are we not as Presbyterians, far behind the spirit of the times, and the leadings of God's providence? Is it not true that the physical, the philosophical, the moral and the religious world, have already began to move? Is not the command of God, especially to the Presbyteries, as it was to Moses, "Speak unto the children of Israel, that they go forward?" God is saying to the Presbyteries, "Go on before the people."

Is it not true that the present state of things proves, that the physical and moral worlds are bound together by ligatures that are indissoluble? The whole world lay in perfect barbarism, when the physical energies of Greece and Rome called into action the moral powers of man. Hence Plato and Socrates, struck out the first glimmering of the science of man. And Demosthenes and Cicero, enlightened Greece and Rome. Artificers in brass and iron, taught the Israelites the use of the metals, and how to construct the tabernacle of testimony, and to adorn the magnificent temple of Jerusalem, where the evening and morning oblations were offered up to God, where Christ taught, and Paul and Peter preached and wrought miracles. The noble art of printing, just and only just preceded the glorious reformation. And what shall we say of the late waking up of physical science and the applica-

tion of the arcana of nature to the wants of men. Has it no connection with the coming conversion of the world? Have wise and good men bestowed their time and energies upon fire, upon air, upon water, and upon light in vain? Have they not compelled those substances to yield up their hid treasures, for the use of man, both as a physical and moral being? INTERCOURSE; sometimes in the form of ordinary commerce, sometimes in the form of books, sometimes in the form of personal converse, is the great current of society. Without daily *intercourse*, the whole mass would become as a stagnant pool. Now we cannot look around us, but for a moment, and not see how this all-moulding principle has been facilitated and increased within the last half a century, yea, within twenty-five years. Already is there "no more sea." The broad Atlantic is reduced almost to the size of one of our American lakes.—Liverpool and New York are almost daily neighbours. The most distant parts of our globe are approximated, and approximating more and more. The sweat and labour of hundreds and thousands of our fellow beings, are committed to iron and steam. The food and toil of almost a countless number of animals are now dispensed with, and performed by the same agents. Africa is about to add another mart for the commerce of the world. She has seen steam boats ascending her rivers. She announces to the Christian world, that the time approaches, when "Ethiopia shall stretch forth her hands to God."

These views might be extended indefinitely. Enough has been said to convince us of two things, that the world is but in its youth, and that this is the time when God is calling upon all Christian ministers, more especially still, upon the Presbyterian ministers of these United States, to put on the whole armour of the gospel. The Captain of our salvation is marshalling his troops, and says to them, "What man is there that is fearful and faint-hearted? let him go and return unto his house, lest his brethren's heart faint as well as his heart." Am I asked, why I *especially* call upon Presbyterian ministers? I answer, because they have hitherto been placed by the leader in the fore-front of the Lord's host. And while their piety, their learning, and their love of the truth, continue what they now are, this ought to be and will be their position.

Some of our theological students may have been lectured into the opinion, that were it not for the fact that the Jews were not yet brought in, "the end of the world might well be looked for to-morrow." We think it were well if such lectures had never been delivered. Are the various forms of the declaration, that before the end, "the world is to be converted to God," less pregnant or less specific, than that the Jews shall be brought in? I hope my information on this subject has been a mistake. Are not all our theological schools, Presbyteries, Synods and the General Assembly, bound to stir themselves up to take hold of God in his promises, and to believe that this is God's accepted time, and the day of his salvation?

Many of our notions respecting the world and divine providence, are wrong, arising from improper ideas respecting God. All the works of God are like himself, perfect in their kind, though not

imperishable. No world that God has ever made will perish, till by constant use it be worn out, or be no longer fit for the purposes for which it was made. Even animated nature does not die till its energies are by some means exhausted. Death itself is not of God's production. It came by sin. Because we see the pious young man die, that he may have an earlier entrance into heaven, the "righteous being taken away from the evil to come," as the youthful debauchee stricken down in the morning of life, that he may not contaminate those about him, we are not, therefore to infer that this youthful world with its but yesterday-discovered treasures, its still uninhabited, and perhaps unknown regions, its boundless forests, untouched by the foot or by the axe of man, waving their majestic heads, as it were in adoration to their Creator—millions of fertile soil, unmet by the plough-share of industry. Are these, all these to perish, to be burned-up, having answered no valuable purpose at all? Who is prepared, then, to charge the Almighty with folly; making and unmaking, to no purpose? The earth itself, is at this moment, with all its appendages, in a rapid state of development. She is like the opening rose, unfolding itself leaf by leaf. The earth, the air, the water, the fire, and even the light, are all of them obeying the voice of man, as their master. And all this that the promise of the Father to his Son might be fulfilled. "Ask of me, and I will give thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession." All are God's, in heaven, earth, and hell. All are God's. Not a Newton, with his telescope; not a Leibnitz, with his differential calculus; not a Stewart, or a Brown, with their mental science; not a Rittenhouse, with his orrery; not a Good nor a Franklin, with their portraits of nature, or an Owen and Witherspoon with their Truth of the Bible—not a gale that blows, or a shower that falls, nor a wheel that revolves, not a policy that blesses the nations, or a war that desolates the land, but all are sustained or controlled by him who has said, "in that day shall the branch of the Lord be beautiful and glorious, and the fruit of the earth shall be excellent." Shall nature, and science, and talents and piety, the promises of God, and the present state of the world, all conspire to proclaim the same truth; "Behold the Bridegroom cometh, go ye out to meet him?" and shall the church slumber? Particularly, will not the ministry of reconciliation be aroused? More particularly still, will not every Presbytery, and every Presbyterian minister, cluster round the descending Saviour, and hail him Lord of all?

The world near its end! The human race to be presently extinct! Who can believe it? Why, dear brethren, much grander events are yet to take place on this globe, than any that have ever transpired since he cried with a loud voice, "It is finished, and gave up the ghost." What are the rise and the fall of empires, the discovery of a new world, the glorious reformation from popery, when compared to the *conversion of the world*. *The glory of his kingdom that shall be righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Ghost*. America is the political beacon of the world. And the Presbyterian church, the only church on earth, that in her form of government exhibits the true spirit of representative republicanism.

She is destined to be, and is now, a city set upon a hill. You, brethren, of the Presbyteries, are stationed upon her walls. To your hands much is committed, much is expected of you. You are called to activity by the present state of your country, of the world, and the voice of God's providence distinctly announced.—Suffer the present writer to admonish you by his painful experience; though he has not been a perfect idler in his Lord's vineyard, how much of his time has run to waste. You will do better than ever he has done. Take to you the whole armour of God. Watch ye, stand fast in the faith, quit ye like men, be strong.

Dear Brethren. There are two questions which I am anxious to lay distinctly before the Presbyteries, before the meeting of the next General Assembly. I humbly, but earnestly, crave your attention. An answer to these questions will form the subject of a second number for this Magazine.

I. By what means shall we be able, as Presbyterians, to preach the gospel more extensively in our own country, than we have ever yet been able to do?

II. By what means may money be most easily collected, to carry on the great enterprizes of the day?

JAMES BLYTHE.

---

NECROLOGY.—MRS. ANN CHAPMAN.

DIED, on Sunday morning the 31st Oct., MRS. ANN CHAPMAN, wife of William Chapman, Esq'r, of Baltimore County, in the 39th year of her age.

Our object in this communication is not so much to announce to the world the death of this lamented individual, as to record for the encouragement and imitation of others, the great amount of good she was permitted to accomplish, although encumbered with the cares of a large and increasing family. With the history of her early life, the writer is not personally conversant; he has understood, however, that at the age of 16, she made a public profession of faith in Christ, and that her life was consistent with that profession.

On her marriage with Mr. C., she removed from New Jersey, her native state, to the neighbourhood in which she died, and which was for a number of years the scene of her self-denying and unremitting labours.—She here found herself the only member of the Presbyterian church, cut off, not only from the pleasures of Christian intercourse, but also from the ordinances of the house of God. This she regarded as a real affliction. "Her soul thirsted for God in a dry and thirsty land where no water was, to see his power and his glory, so as she had seen him in the sanctuary."—Unlike many others placed in similar circumstances, she did not lose her interest in religion, nor permit her affections to be weaned from the church of her choice. She seemed to feel a great responsibility resting on her, not only to hold fast her profession, but to do all in her power to remove the desolation by which she was surrounded.

By many earnest and importunate appeals, she interested several ministers of the gospel in her plans of usefulness, and thus succeeded in attracting the attention of the Presbytery to a large and promising field which had long escaped its observation.—By diligence and perseverance in prayer and effort, she was instrumental in the erection of a neat and comfortable house of worship, and thus permanently secured to the neighbourhood the regular ministrations of the word. A few weeks previous to her death, a church was organized, an event to which she had long looked forward with great anxiety. Her cup of earthly happiness seemed to be full when she sat down, for the first time in that house, at the sacramental table, accompanied by the partner of her bosom and a few neighbours, who had been won by her example to the cross of Christ; "it was," to use her own expression, "the happiest day of her life." With her soul filled with the peace and joys of the Christian, she retired from that solemn and interesting place to return no more.—The work assigned her here below being finished, after a tedious illness, which she bore with patience and resignation, she fell asleep in Jesus—and has gone, we doubt not, to worship God in that house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens.

Her piety was peculiarly ardent and equable—yet devoid of all ostentation. If one grace predominated, it was humility. While she faithfully discharged the duties of a wife, mother and mistress, in superintending the affairs of a large family—she did not neglect those which were due to the common family of man. She would find time to seek out and relieve the distresses of the poor and afflicted. From the Sabbath School and Bible class, she was never absent unless providentially, and the writer does not recollect that he ever saw her seat in the house of God vacant, except during her last illness. Living and acting the Christian, both at home and abroad, she gained the confidence of all, and the love of many who knew her. Few have gone down to the grave leaving behind them a name associated with purer and fonder recollections,—no one more sincerely mourned and esteemed.

J. B. S.

The excellent lady, whose character and successful efforts are the subject of the foregoing remarks, joined the Second Presbyterian Church in Baltimore, (by certificate,) in the month of April, 1833; and from that time to the period of her death, we had an intimate acquaintance with her. The remarkable peculiarity of her Christian life was this; that without pretension, and with very limited opportunities for exerting influence—she performed greater works for her Master—than any other person we have ever known in like circumstances. The hand of God was more clearly with her, in all her efforts to serve him; and her reward more immediately and more evidently followed; than in the case of any private Christian, perhaps,—certainly of any female, it has been our fortune to know. God made this good woman the means, remotely, of gathering a congregation; of having it kept from division and schism, when the person who preached to it became a Pelagian and a schismatic; of having a house of worship built; and of organizing a church of Christ there. This was all done in the compass of a few years, and under very discouraging circumstances. She lived to see her worthy husband converted to God in this church, and become its first ruling elder. Oh! what a blessed service is that of the King Eternal! What a glorious company is that waiting for us, on the other side of the river.—[Ed.]

ACCOUNTS OF THE BALTIMORE LITERARY AND RELIGIOUS MAGAZINE, UP TO DECEMBER 25, 1841.

P. M. of Pittsburgh, directs *Mr. Robert Campbell's* copy to be stopped; by our terms, if our books are correct, this *patron* only owes us \$18, for *six years'* (deferred) subscription: we are glad it was not *seven years*.—*Wm. L. Hasebrouch*, Burlington, Iowa,—P. M. stopped for him; due us \$9, for *three years* (deferred) subscription: this is better than the foregoing.—*Wm. Kerr*, West Hill, Pa., by the hands of N. W. \$5, (Mr. K. has paid, *in all*, \$9,50—his subscription from January, 1837, till December, 1841, is \$12,50; due us \$3,00.)—*Rev. J. Bocoock*, of Va., Magazine stopped by order of *Rev'd Dr. R.*; \$3 paid to our agent, *David Owen* of Baltimore; *Mr. B.* has paid heretofore, \$2,50, and has had the Magazine since January, '39—three years, \$7,50; due us, if we are correct, \$2,00.—*Rev'd John Dorrance*, of Pa., by the hands of *J. N. Lewis*, \$3; which pays to the end of 1841, and 50 cents over.—*Dr. Duncan Brown*, of Tenn., \$5, in full to end of this year.—*Jackson Duff*, by the hands of *J. L. P.*, of Richmond, Ky., \$6, which pays to end of 1842; and direction changed to *Oxford, Ohio*; *J. L. P.'s* account (we state at his request,) is for four years, viz: 1838—41, \$10.—*Judge Hepburn*, Carlisle, Pa., \$5, in full to end of 1841.—*Rev'd D. McKinley*, \$5, in full to the end of 1841, and direction changed to *Chambersburg, Pa*—*John Ralston*, Rockville, Pa., \$5, in full to the end of 1841.—*Rev'd Wm. J. Gibson*, \$5, which pays to end of 1840; and direction changed to *Philadelphia*.—*Rev'd J. D. Paxton*, \$3, which pays to the end of this year, and leaves a credit of \$1, to him.—In reply to the P. M. of *Danville, Va.*, we have to say that the only credit on our books to *Rev'd Mr. Anderson*, is \$3, paid us by *Mr. John Dunn*, January 1, 1841; the receipt of *Rev'd Dr. S.* to him, is good—and we now give the additional credit of \$2,50; leaving \$2 due from him, at the close of 1841; the letter spoken of, containing \$5, never came to hand; but as we take the risk of the mail—if it was sent by mail—the loss is ours; direction changed to *Danville, Va.*—*Rev'd John G. Shepperson*, *Otter-bridge, P. O. Bedford Co., Va.*, name added from November, 1841—*John Milton*, *Lexington, Ky.*, \$5, which pays to the end of 1842.—*John Todd*, *Paris, Ky.*, \$10, in full to the end of 1841.—*Wm. F. Todd*, *Lexington, Ky.*, \$5, for 1841 and 1842.—*James Stonestreet*, *Clarke Co., Ky.*, \$5, for 1841 and 1842.—*John Graham*, *Louisville, Ky.*, \$5, for 1841, and '42.—*John Curry*, *Harrison Co., Ky.*, \$5, for 1840 and '41.—*David Humphries*, *Woodford Co., Ky.*, \$15, in full to the end of 1841.—*J. B. Cambden*, *St. Louis, Mo.*, name added from January, 1841, \$2,50 paid for that year, and back numbers sent; an apology is due to *Mr. C.* for the delay of sending the numbers for September and October, 1841.—*Rev'd George Marshall*, *Pittsburgh, Pa.*, see our letter of November 29, 1841.—*Dr. Michael A. Finley*, *Williamsport, Md.*, \$2,50, by P. M., which pays till *June, 1842*.—*Thomas H. Morehead*, *Danville, Ky.*, name added from January, 1842, and all the numbers for 1841 sent, by order of *Mr. Youce*.—The number heretofore sent to *John N. Waddel*, to be sent from January, 1842, to *Rev'd Henry McDonald*, *Philadelphia, Nashoba Co., Mississippi*, by order of the former.—*Mr. James A. Sloan*, *Mount Hill, S. C.*, stopped, owes \$3.—*Mr. Samuel Weir*, of *Columbia*, remits \$10, of which \$5, to the credit of *John Kyle*, for 1840 and 1841; himself, \$2,50 for 1841: and \$2,50 for *Rev'd Dr. Hazelins*, for 1841.—*Rev'd Matthew McKinstry*, of Pa., paid in full and stopped.—*Rev'd R. Johnson*, *Columbia, S. C.*, stopped by order of P. M., owes \$5.—*Mr. R. T. Leech*, of *Pittsburgh, Pa.*, began with 1837, stopped at the end of '41,—five years, \$12,50; he paid \$2,50 in March, 1839, and \$5 in December, 1841, leaving \$5, for which a bill will be sent him, as per his letter of December 3, 1841.—*Rev'd T. R. Owen* of *Washington, N. C.*, stopped; owes \$2,50.—*Rev'd W. W. Bobertson*, direction changed to *Fulton, Mo.*—*Rev'd R. S. Bell*, direction changed to *Washington, Rappahannock Co., Va.*—*Rev'd A. T. McGill*, of Pa., \$5, in full, and stopped.—*Rev'd Wm. H. Harris*, of S. C., \$5 in full, and stopped.—*Rev'd James Stafford*, *Greenville, Illinois*, stopped, owes us \$5,50.—*Rev'd D. R. Preston*, direction changed to *Lewisburg, Va.*—*Richard Irvin, Esq.*, city of *New York*, \$5, by the

hands of S. George, Esq'r, of Baltimore, which overpays his account by \$3,75.—Rev'd Mr. McCluskey, of West Alexandria, Pa., stopped; and in his letter says all arrears are paid, which is no doubt correct; but as our books give no credit for 1840 or '41, a line explaining the matter, would be a favour to us.—Dr. Beckett and Mr. Hugh Wilson, of Edisto Island, \$5, each, by the hands of the F. M. of Charleston, S. C., which pays for each, for 1839 and 1840.—Mrs. Duke, Georgetown, Ky., \$10, in full to the end of 1841; and \$2,50 in advance.

ACCOUNTS OF THE PRESENT WORK.

James Lenox, Esq'r, of City of New York, \$3 for 1842, which overpays by 50 cents.—Wm. J. Bingham, Hillsborough, N. C., \$5, of which one-half for 1841, to B. L. and R. Mag., and the other for 1842, for this work.—Rev'd H. R. Wilson, of Philadelphia, \$2,50 for 1842.—Names of Rev'd R. Happersett, Havre-de-Grace, Md., and Rev'd N. A. Pendland, Somerville, Ala.—added to our list.—Miss Torrance, Frederick, Md., \$2,50, for 1842.

A careful perusal of the list herein published, of the accounts of the Baltimore Literary and Religious Magazine—will show that the following persons have paid the sums annexed to their names respectively, over and above all their dues to that work. They will be credited accordingly, on the books of this office; viz.: Rev. John Dorrance, of Pa, 50 cents.—Jackson Duff, Ohio, \$2,50.—Rev'd J. D. Paxton, Ky., \$1.—John Milton, Ky., \$2,50.—Wm. F. Todd, Ky., \$2,50.—James Stonestreet, Ky., \$2,50.—Dr. M. A. Finley, Md., \$1,25.—Richard Irvin, Esq., city of New York, \$3,75.—Mrs. Duke, Georgetown, Ky., \$2,50. There are other persons who have done the same; their accounts will be carefully settled on the old books, and the overplus transferred to their credit on those of the present work.

Correspondents and exchange papers will be so good as to observe the change in our title.

# SPIRIT OF THE XIX. CENTURY.

VOL. I.

FEBRUARY, 1842.

No. 2.

## READING NO PREACHING.

*The Fashionable mode of Delivering Sermons considered as opposite to Scripture, the Practice of the Primitive Church, Reason, and the Common Sense of Mankind, in a Letter to a Clergyman of the Church of England.*

"To preach the acceptable year of the Lord. And he closed the book."—Luke iv. 19, 20.

"And for me, that utterance may be given unto me, that I may open my mouth boldly to make known the mystery of the gospel."—Eph. vi. 19.

R. D. S.

THAT due regard and modest distance which age and grey hairs demand and claim from youth, forbid me to address our reverend and aged fathers in the ministry concerning the subject of this paper; nor dare I indulge myself the freedom of directly attempting to instruct my teachers in the manner of preaching the gospel; because, as I almost resign my hope of being able to redress what I judge amiss in their manner, so I firmly trust, that the Lord-Christ, the brightest ingredient in their matter, will cover their defects with a mantle of love; and meet them now in the evening, to assist in gathering home their little flocks to his own land.

And though I am apt to doubt, that the too frequent practice of *reading* Christ instead of *preaching* him, gives some umbrage to the free Spirit of Grace, yet I fear not, but some of these same readers will, under a covert of mercy, return from the harvest, "bearing their sheaves with joy," (Ps. cxxvi. 6.) for the Bishop of Souls can easily over-leap all *paper walls*.

But notwithstanding the charitable sentiments I would entertain of *reading preachers* in the general, the respect I owe to the aged among them, and the experience I have had of the learning and piety of some of them, I apprehend it my duty to avow my dissent from the disagreeable circumstance of *reading* their sermons from the pulpit. But if I am altogether unqualified to argue that point with them, I would plainly and honestly give you my present sentiments relating to it, with this view, that if they are wrong, you would instruct me; and if they are just, you would forbear reading your discourses to the people; a circumstance in preaching the Gospel which I think has no precedent in sacred or profane history, in divinity or philosophy; it carries nothing desirable, but is offen-

VOL. I.—7

sive to thousands, and profitable to none. And if I should only make it appear probable, that so far from answering any valuable purposes, it naturally tends to bad ones, I have such a good opinion of your sense and piety, as to hope you will drop it. You are in the vineyard—it is the Lord's, who claims your innocence and prudence; by the one to do no harm, and by the other to *do good*:—your wisdom and will; the one to direct your measures, the other to *work earnestly*. You are entered on your labour, (an awful task); your work is great, your strength but small, and your time short; therefore every circumstance promising success, ought to be embraced; and every appearance of indolence and inactivity guarded against; because he that works, if he works deceitfully, is threatened with the curse—consequently, if *reading* your notes, instead of preaching the Gospel, should, upon examination, appear to carry an air of sloth and indolence; or even create a suspicion in others that it does, I am persuaded, that you will not only avoid it, but judge it a pardonable presumption, when I say, that all who know the use of language, know also, that the terms *reading* and *speaking*, convey two distinct ideas or notions; and have been in all ages, in all places, and by all persons, applied to distinct purposes.

The term *speaking*, when used in sacred or profane history, so far as I remember, never includes the notion of *reading*. If this be granted, which I think it must, it follows, if *speaking* the Gospel, and *preaching* the Gospel, in Scripture language, convey to us but one and the same idea or notion, as to the manner of delivery; and if that one idea or notion excludes the notion of *reading*, or is quite distinct from it; then those who introduce the notion of *reading* into *preaching*, or practically make them one and the same, introduce a notion into *preaching* which God has totally omitted.

That *speaking* the Gospel, and *preaching* the Gospel, convey to us but one and the same idea, appears from the following Scripture passages: "Praying that God would open unto us a door of utterance, to *speak* the mystery of Christ"—(Col. iv. 3)—"Grant unto thy servants, that with all boldness they may *speak* thy word"—(Acts iv. 29)—"And they *spoke* the word of God with boldness"—(v. 31)—"We were bold in our God to *speak* unto you the Gospel of God"—(1 Thess. ii. 2.)

Thus it is clear that the phrases *speaking* and *preaching* the Gospel are synonymous; and it is equally clear from the historical and natural difference between *speaking* and *reading*, that the one idea these two phrases convey to us, excludes the notion of *reading*; for, when God gave the law from Mount Sinai, it is said he *talked* or *spoke* with the people; when that same law was committed to tables, it was always said to be *read*, not *spoke* or *preached*. What Moses by command from the Lord, *speaks* to the people, he does not read; but what the Lord commands him to write, that he and all successive prophets, priests and Levites, are said to *read* in the audience of the people—(Ex. xx. 22.) When Baruch had wrote on a roll of a book, all the words of the Lord, from Jeremiah's mouth, he is not commanded to go *speaking* or *preaching* that which he had writ; but to go "*read* in the roll, in the ears of all Judah."—(Jer. xxxvi. 6; Neh. ix. 3.)

Christ's standing up to *read* the law in the synagogue of Nazareth according to his custom; and his closing the book and *preaching* the Gospel according to Isaiah's prophecies, are accurately distinguished in the fourth of Luke's Gospel. The sermons that the Apostles committed to writing, are said to be *read* in the churches, but never said to be *spoke* or *preached*.

In short, *speaking*, *prophecy* and *preaching*, is recorded as a distinct manner of delivering sacred messages, from that of *reading* them. And I think, though they were in their own nature the same, God's making them two, by report only, obliges us to keep them so; if we do not assign unanswerable reasons for their being one and the same, which we can never do, because they are also distinct in their own nature—For

*Speaking*, *prophecy* and *preaching*, is a person's uttering, or pronouncing words or sounds with his mouth; his judgment regulating the characters of those words, on his memory and imagination, not on a roll before his bodily eyes, as Baruch tells the princes of Judah (Jer. xxxvi. 18,) concerning Jeremiah. This distinct notion, the term *speaking*, &c., throughout the sacred history, naturally conveys to us. And, I believe, we cannot find in all the Scripture, one instance where the term *speaking*, includes the notion of *reading*, or conveys any other notion to us, than that exclusive one described, except when it is used in a figurative sense. But what clears up to us this natural distinction is, that in our experience, we know *reading* to be performed by importation of a flux of images, by mediation of the eyes, to the imagination only; and *speaking* to be done by exportation of a train of ideas, picked up by the judgment immediately from the whole soul. Now if this distinction between *reading* and *preaching* be really in nature, and stated in Sacred Writ, surely making the one include the other, or making them the same, is a blending together, for conveniency, what nature and grace have for conveniency put asunder; which composition, I am persuaded, no real or pretended weakness of memory, can sufficiently justify, in regard God does not deprive us of judgment too.

Having said, that *speaking* and *preaching* the Gospel convey to us but one idea, and this idea exclusive of *reading*, the difference between them being stated, both in sacred history and natural philosophy, I would farther inquire, whether it appears in the practice of Moses and the prophets, of Christ and his apostles, that *preaching* includes *reading*; or in other words, whether these ambassadors from God delivered their messages by word of mouth.

That Moses and the prophets, Christ and his apostles, delivered their messages without notes, will be readily granted, with this weakening limitation of their example, i. e., that they were extraordinary persons, of extraordinary abilities, to enable them to perform extraordinary services. That they were extraordinary persons, &c., is very true; but it is by no means so, that delivering their discourses to the people, without the present help of written rolls, was a piece of extraordinary conduct too: because the whole Jewish and Christian clergy, with the ordinary assistances of nature and of grace, did so likewise. That the Jewish clergy did so, ap-

pears from their *reading*, first in the roll, in the law of God distinctly, and then, "giving the sense, and causing the people to understand the reading," *by the speaking or preaching*, not by the *reading* itself; unless we suppose they had weekly and monthly rolls, or tables, in which they read the sense of other *reading*; which notion, I think, will find but little credit, with the greatest lover of *reading*.

That the primitive Christian clergy did follow the paperless method of preaching, appears from their having two distinct orders of church officers; the one appointed to *read* the prophets and apostles, with the writings of other eminent and godly men, and the other, to explain or expound a part of, or the whole of what was *read*, this being their usual way.

Justin Martyr (Apol. II., p. 98.) tells us, *when the reader had ended, the minister made a sermon agreeable to those excellent things which had been read*. Now if the one was always called the *reader*, and that he frequently read the writings and sermons of godly men, why not the weekly writings of his own *minister*, if they were at all to be *read* in the pulpit? The case was, though the minister should have writ his sermons, which he rarely did, they were never *read* in public, by himself, or by another person in his hearing; but when the lecturer had read part of the Holy Scripture, and sometimes other pious writings suitable to the occasion, the *minister* succeeded and pronounced his mind agreeably to what was read. Tertullian (De Anim. c. 3, p. 530.) tells us, *that Scriptures were read, Psalms sung, and then Sermons pronounced*; or more literally, *speaking to the people uttered, not read*—"Scripturæ leguntur, Psalmi canuntur adloquutiones proferuntur.")

I am apt to think that these primitive servants of Christ would judge it a mis-management of their time, to write down, every week, some times one, two, or three whole chapters, with the distinct exposition of every portion interspersed; which they must have done, if they were to read them; or, if they should not write the scriptures, but the exposition only, they must have judged it pretty indecent, to be shifting their eyes from right to left, and back again, from their Bibles to the notes, &c. And I cannot help suspecting, that the apprehension of this indecency, has greatly contributed to turn that laudable practice of expounding the scripture, out of favour with us; because if a person is resolved to *read*, it is certainly more easy, as well as decent, to write from a single text, all the scripture passages that naturally occur in course of studying; and consequently to hold his eyes steady in the pulpit, to one book only. But be that as it may, it is certain, that all the accounts we have of the clergy and worship of the primitive churches do not furnish us with the remotest suspicion, that the practice of reading sermons was known in those days.

And as the primitive fathers knew nothing of it, so their successors in all after ages knew as little of it; and even in this age, as far as we know, there is no denomination of clergy, Greek or Latin, Papist or Protestant, in any nation, (England excepted,\*)

\*And, unhappily, these United States.—[Ed.

that gives into this unprecedented method of *reading* their discourses to the people for *preaching*. And by the way, we may observe, that whatever errors, doctrinal or practical, teachers of Christianity have fallen into, the mentioned practice carried too much of the childish air with it, to find access to their schemes. Nothing, I think, could have prevented the lazy, temporizing priests of Rome from embracing that circumstance, but either that they did not think of it; or which is more probable, discovered something ridiculous in it, consisting neither with their character, nor common sense. But to go on,

If no denomination of teachers since the commencement of the Jewish or Christian religion, to this day, have, or do use the *reading* way, excepting the clergy of England, one should be apt to think, that a secret necessity arising from the climate, the constitution, the natural and religious taste of the inhabitants, must be fixed on, to warrant this peculiar practice, were it not, that we experience the climate of England to have no pernicious influence on the bodies or intellectuals of the inhabitants; on the contrary, they may justly compare with their neighbouring nations, for health of body, soundness of judgment, clearness of reason, fruitfulness of imagination, *strength of memory*, and application of thought.— So that the *reading* method can never be warranted from the climate, &c., and as little from the natural or religious taste of the nation; not from their natural taste, which we are to judge of by the practice of the bench, bar and stage, where *readers* of harangues, debates and plays, would be judged none of the most graceful performers, according to the natural taste of the hearers; not from their religious taste, both because *reading* of the gospel has never obtained among them till of late years, and because at this day there is scarce a judicious person in the kingdom, who would prefer hearing a sermon *read*, to hearing that sermon *preached*, with equal accuracy, less childishness, and more life.

I own there are multitudes better judges of expression than of matter and manner, who are apt to think every thing orderly that is *read*, and every thing that is preached, quite reverse; because their minister once told them, he could never preach right without *notes*, and therefore they imagine no person can; or, because they were eye and ear witnesses when Mr. W. missed a *thou*, a *the*, and an *and*; yea, said the same word twice over; whereas their intellectuals did not serve them, when Mr. B., through mistake, missed half a page, and when Mr. G. turned over two leaves instead of one. But these I turn out of the argument, as stripped of both the natural and religious taste of the whole; calculated more by use and want of thought, to hold any notion, than to judge whether it be just and reasonable. I therefore conclude, that this singular practice did not proceed from the causes mentioned, but must owe its birth to other parents.

I am of opinion that fear and vanity begot it upon laziness, by occasion of some tolerated, though undesirable incidents; such as masters of universities indulging students to read their philosophical lectures in public, and classical meetings of the clergy indulging candidates for the ministry, reading their exegetical and homi-

titical exercises; especially congregations, in complaisance to a popish persecuting reign, indulging their ministers to write and read every word they spoke from the pulpit; though necessity, arising from a principle of self-preservation, did make that and other acts of obedience justifiable in them, which can by no means be so in their successors, the cause being removed unless we apply the scripture metaphor to a bloody female persecutor, and say, "though she is dead, she yet speaketh," &c. But she is gone to her place; and I should think that *reading* of sermons, an effect of her cruelty to souls, ought to drop along with her, to eternal forgetfulness.

However, though the civil enemy be no more, the moral ones of slavish fear, vanity, and self-praise, laziness and distrust of God continue to nurse it; use and custom have given it a sanction; so that now it is esteemed such a universal polite thing, such a fashionable sleight of hand, that the very use of it occasions such a transformation of pulpit-men, as scarce to leave room for judgment to distinguish the man of parts and piety, from the musical *reader*: because it alone gives such a magically false, yet more advantageous lustre to the latter, than all his gifts and graces give to the former. And thus it reigns without control, though in some degree at the expense of precept and example, of nature and grace, of reason and good sense, that a person who would be hardy enough to attempt stopping its course, runs a great risk of being stigmatized with the odious epithet of *accuser of the brethren*. But for my part, it is a light matter to me to be judged of men; he that judgeth me is the Lord, and therefore I submit the decision of this point to Jesus of Nazareth the living Witness, and the living Judge; yea, in this case, the Judge and Party, the Rule of Righteousness, and the righteous Judge, I fear not, but he will graciously distinguish my defects and pardon them, from my intention, and justify it, both in what I have said, and in what I am humbly to suggest farther. Such as

That humanly, yea scripturally speaking, *reading* of sermons from the pulpit, leaves not that freedom of access for the Spirit of Grace, which alone makes *preaching* the Gospel effectual to the salvation of souls; because their being in the method of grace, an orderly series of means connected with the end, viz: salvation, which in its *order* and *manner* of using it, is wisely appointed of God; not only ministers are confined to use those means as they lie in order by divine institution, and to use them in the appointed manner, but the Spirit of God makes them effectual in the same *order* and *manner*, and no otherwise, in his ordinary way; and if ministers should take from, or add to that train of means so divinely ordered, or use one or all of them in a different *manner*, from that which is appointed, their so doing is always to be suspected as a *nuisance* to the Spirit of Grace, who ordinarily applies the means to their end, in the wisely framed *order* and *manner*. Hence so many cautions from heaven, not to add to or diminish from what the Lord commanded, (Deut. xii. 32,) and a curse threatened to the guilty, (Rev. xxii. 19.)

Hence, in particular, are so many cautions from our Lord to his disciples (Matt. vi.) concerning the *matter* and *manner* of praying,

with an intimation, that the pharisaical prayers were not owned of God, by reason not only of their self-glorious intention, but also of the manner of performing them; and I think it cannot justly be denied that the generality of our teachers do actually vary from the scripture *manner*, with regard to that ordinance of *preaching*; consequently we may justly fear, that their so doing, occasions a *leanness of soul* in our solemn *assemblies*. Again,

While ministers are in the body, they are on a level with their brethren, in not knowing *but in part*, not seeing *but in part* those truths, that in the method of *grace*, are most adapted to the various cases of saints and sinners; it is therefore that the Comforter is promised, not only to apply the truths they know, but to lead them on all proper occasions, to those necessary ones they know not; consequently, if ministers should confine the Spirit of God, to suggest to them in *private*, all that they were to *read in public*; and in fact to deny him access to lead them to one fresh thought in time of action, only ask a blessing from him, on what he is said to give in *private*; I think it were but just, that he neither should give them in *private*, nor bless what he gave not; because *vanity*, and the ensnaring *fear of man* prevailed with them to rob him of his public work, in order to perform their own the better.

It is true, the Lord may and does direct to that in *private*, which he may and does bless in *public*; but for a minister, so to order his discourses, as to leave no room for any fresh intelligence from heaven, is in fact, to say, "Lord, hitherto shalt thou come and no farther, here shall thy directions be stayed." How provoking this conduct, and how inconsistent with the character of those who would otherwise live according to the Spirit, I leave themselves to judge. As for those who seem neither to believe nor feel any supernatural direction in their *public* or *private* ministrations, with their leave, I speak not to them, but to those who believe and on some occasions experience the promised *light* of an invisible God; such only will understand me, yea bear with me when,

I say farther, that the practice of *reading* sermons, puts the *reader* under a strong and almost unavoidable temptation, to use several petitions in public prayer, that carry an air of *impertinence*, irony, or both, such as, "that God would direct and lead to truth, and enable to speak the truth as it is in Jesus, speak as the oracles of God, strengthen in the inner man," &c. These and the like petitions are in my opinion worse than unintelligible from one who writes all he *preaches*, and preaches none but what he *reads* from the pulpit. What direction to his judgment, what light to his *understanding* does he ask? He is resolved to judge and see no more to-day, than he writ in *puro*, the day before. Does he want that the Spirit of God should inform his *judgment*, refresh his *memory*, and guard the doors of his lips, from uttering falsehoods? It cannot be, because every truth, necessary on that occasion, is seen and judged of already; the images lying in due form on the paper, the *memory* has no concern in the matter; the *tongue* can act its part, naturally on *that* as well as on all other occasions. Does he only want that God should preserve the regular use of his *judgment*, *tongue* and *eyes*? This is certainly a good prayer, but *impertinent*,

because it has no more relation to the minister's public work, than to his private occasions. What hazard do his reason, tongue and eyes run, when in pulpit, more than at other times? And are not the whole congregation as much concerned in that prayer as he? Why then is it put up for the minister peculiarly, and why in time of *preaching* particularly? Does he want to be directly inspired, to throw away his papers, and leave himself quite destitute of matter? It can not be, because this were a tempting of God, and because without a plain miraculous compulsion, the minister will not part with his papers; and the Spirit of God engages not in such instances of open violence. If so, then the minister must pray, not with the understanding, and doing so is sinful, as it is shameful; or have a secret meaning, making these petitions consist with *reading*.

This indeed is probable, because man is prone to invent a reconciliation where there is none, between his beloved practice, and its opposite. When a Romish priest was asked how he could reconcile saying, "*Our Father which art in heaven,*" &c., to a saint, with his duty of saying it to God alone, he answered, it was easily done, because in good manners we called any old pious man on earth *our father*; and when such old man was in heaven, we might warrantably say to him *our father which art in heaven,* &c. And as warrantably, I think, can a minister put up the above-mentioned petitions under the circumstance of *reading*; for whatever his secret meaning is, if it be not the scripture meaning, it is unwarrantable, and therefore sinful; and whatever manner of preaching occasions such sinful meaning, ought to be avoided as a snare; and whatever conduct in praying or preaching, exposes one to the necessity of sinning, cannot be of God; and that the practice of *reading* does so, is to me past doubt; for on the one hand, if a *reading* minister does not address God in public prayer for the direction of the promised *Spirit*, he, so far, practically disowns all such direction and influence, consequently sins; on the other hand, if he addresses God as already mentioned, his so doing carries something impertinent and sinful in it; on the first conduct he is never right, and on the last ever wrong. For my part, if I were a *reader*, I should rather embrace that exhorting, prayerless form in use with some of our established clergy, *let us pray*, and *let us pray*, and *let us pray*, for *this*, for *that*, and for the third class of mankind; and I would add, *let us pray* for the minister, i. e. I would mention and exhort to what should be done, but never do it for fear of sinning; even though upon reflection, I could not help finding this same form unscriptural.

But further, as this practice of *reading* carries such an air of provocation in preaching, impertinence and irony in prayer, as may justly offend the Spirit of God, so it offers a murdering violence to the spirit of man, in time of preaching; the imagination is checked, having little to do, all the necessary images being already ranged, in the due successive order, on the paper before it, by mediation of the eyes. The understanding having acted its part yesterday, and no business for it to day, but only permit a successive flood of stale ideas to pass through it as water through a pipe—

the affections untouched ; for when the judgment gets no fresh circumstance of a thought from the memory and imagination to work upon immediately, the rational affections never move. The will has nothing to choose or refuse, having chosen every necessary word and phrase, as well as necessary matter and manner the day before, only the general choice of reading the paper gracefully rather than slovenly—the memory is quite barren, wild and useless as a bullock unaccustomed to the yoke—the whole soul is overwhelmed with a species of *sleep* while reading, and forced to produce outward emotions, without inward materials, which though it argues a man to be awake, never shows him to be in earnest.

[To be continued.]

[Continued from page 15.]

M O L I N I S M .

No. XIII.

XX. *The Provincial Letters of Pascal, and the opposition of the Society of Port Royal to the Moral Theology of the Jesuits.*

It has already been observed that the controversy between the Dominicans, the Jansenists, and the Society of Port Royal, with the Jesuits, turned at first mainly upon the doctrines of grace. This discussion involved the doctrine of Christian morals, although the controversy had proceeded to a great length, before the morality of the system of the Jesuits was made a chief point of discussion. In 1626, the Jesuit father Garasse, published a book which was attacked by the Abbe S. Cyran, on the ground that it contained propositions unworthy of a Christian. In 1643, a collection of propositions derived from Jesuit authors, was published under the title *Theologie Morale des Jesuites*, the authorship of which was ascribed to Arnauld, but it was not until the publication of the Provincial Letters in 1656, that the dispute on this point reached its height. Blaise Pascal, it is well known, was the author of these letters, under the assumed name of Louis de Montalte. In the first three letters, he defends the cause of Arnauld, whom they were endeavouring to exclude from the Sorbonne—a college of the University of Paris. In the fourth letter, he introduces a Jesuit who maintains the proposition that an act cannot be imputed to us as sin, unless God previously gives us the knowledge of the evil there is in it, and an inspiration which excites us to avoid it, which is founded on the idea that the law of God, in itself considered, is not the rule of our duties. This Jesuit is then represented as relying for authority upon Father Bauny. Pascal then introduces a person who opposes this maxim with warmth, and proves that it is contrary to the scriptures, and then shows its pernicious effects.

In the following letters, Pascal continues to introduce his Jesuit, and represents him as speaking the sentiments of his Society, by citing, exactly, their authors.—The author's drift is to show the prodigious aberrations of the Jesuits from sound morals (5th letter). He discusses the doctrine of probability and shows its consequences.

He shows that the Jesuits excuse simony and domestic theft. In the 10th, he comes to the subject of the necessity of love to God. Up to this point the author manages to suppress his own feelings, but now he represents himself as urged beyond endurance, and he declares openly and broadly the sense which he entertains of the doctrines of the Jesuits on this head.

The authority of these letters against the Jesuits is impeached, and Voltaire is cited, who says that the work rests upon premises totally erroneous, attributing the insane opinions of some Spanish and Flemish Jesuits to the whole order.—(Encyclopedia Americana, vol. vii., p. 210, art. *Jesuits*; written by a Jesuit.)

An answer is given to this by De Pradt, in his history of Jesuitism, some extracts from whom, on this point are given in vol. 1, p. 201, of the Balt. Lit. and Rel. Mag. But a single fact is sufficient to show that the premises of the Provincial Letters are well taken, and that fact is the following: the book of Escobar, a famous casuist and a Spanish Jesuit, was printed *thirty-nine times as a good book*, and after the publication of the Provincial Letters, it was printed the *fortieth* time, as the most abominable of all the books, and solely to satisfy the curiosity of those who wished to search out the passages cited from it by the author of the Provincial Letters.—*Thirty-nine* editions of a work, would seem to be evidence of its popularity with some portions of the community. Can it be doubted that this book was used and approved by the Society of Jesuits at large? What other book on casuistry was ever more frequently printed? The reader also, may be referred to the Table of the Jesuit authors, cited in the Hexaples I vol. xcii. extending through thirteen quarto pages, double columns. De Pradt enumerates 326 publications made without interruption from year to year, and approved by a committee of three theologians of the Society, appointed for the purpose.—But in addition to this, the tendency of the doctrines of the Jesuits upon the subject of grace, free will, the obligation of the law of God, &c. &c. necessarily leads, as has been already shown, to a corrupt system of morals. Whether the Society of Jesuits, at the present day, still adheres to the system of the founders of the society, is another question. There is no reason to believe that they had changed their system previously to 1773, when Clement XIV. attempted to abolish the Society; and since their revival in 1814, by Pius VII., (according to De Pradt,) they have given no evidence of a change either of their religious or political principles. But to resume.

The Provincial Letters were translated into all, or nearly all the languages of Europe, and were universally admired. Nicole translated them into Latin, and added notes under the assumed name of Wendrock. One effect of them was to induce the curates of Rouen and Paris to verify the citations in those letters from the Jesuit casuists, and thereupon the former brought the subject before the Archbishop of Rouen, and the latter before the Assembly of the clergy, and both required the condemnation of numerous propositions which they had extracted from these casuists; and it should be remembered that this same Assembly of Clergy, manifested, as has been seen, their aversion to the Jansenists of Port Royal. This

was followed by an *Apologie des casuistes, contre les calomnies des Jansenistes*, printed at Paris in 1657. This apology aroused the curates of Paris, and it was afterwards condemned by the bishops, or several of them, and even by Pope Alexander VII., the 21st of August, 1659. Thus the Society of Port Royal were victorious in this controversy with the Jesuits. "Yet," said Mr. Nicole, "the great service which these theologians rendered to the church, did not diminish the persecutions which they had suffered so long;—on the contrary, it increased them, by exciting the Jesuits to greater violence. And so many censures passed upon the morality of the Jesuits, did not in the least, diminish their temporal power. It is known that they persisted in the same maxims, which had been condemned, and although they did not conceal themselves, yet they were left in the administration of the Sacraments . . . . But it is an effect of the depth of the judgments of God, which gives graces to his church by measure only; and which limits them in view of the sins of men. It was a very great grace to the church to cause the morality of the Jesuits to be condemned by so many bishops—thus giving cause to all persons who are sincerely in search of salvation to distrust their guidance; but he did not complete entirely this grace. He permitted, that the Jesuits should still maintain themselves in the same authority and in the same credit which they had before, to the end that they might be the ministers of his wrath, to deceive those who deserve to be deceived, and by their persecutions to prove those who deserve to be tried. It is their employment and their office in the church: much like that of the king to whom God in the Scriptures, addresses these words, "Vae, Assur, virga furoris mei." Woe, Assur, the rod of my fury.

This last remark is very striking, and when compared with subsequent events, seems almost prophetic. Let the reader trace the interval from that time until the time of the suppression of the Society, in 1773; or to the epoch of the French revolution. Let him search carefully for the causes which found vent in that awful catastrophe. There can be no doubt that infidelity was rife in France for many years preceding the French revolution, and that the writings of such men as Voltaire, Diderot, D'Alembert, Rousseau, contributed greatly to hasten the crisis. But there was a cause lying behind this, of which the infidelity of these men was the effect, and that was the corruption of the Roman Catholic church. To this, there can be no doubt, the Jesuits were the largest contributors, and the awful scenes of the French revolution were the fruits. During this period, as the reader doubtless knows, the Christian religion was abolished, and thousands of the priesthood of the Roman church were put to death.\*

The Society of the Jesuits, it is true, had been suppressed as far as the bull of a pope could suppress them in 1773, but the effects

\*From the year 1617 to 1824, inclusive of both years, there were printed in France, of Voltaire's entire works, 31,600 sets, amounting to 1,598,000 volumes. Of Rousseau's entire works, 24,500 sets, amounting to 480,000 vols. Of the detached works of Voltaire and Rousseau, 81,000 vols. Of the works of Diderot, Condorcet, and other leading infidel writers, 207,900 vols.—*The Foreign Quarterly Review*, article "The Jesuits."

of their teaching were by no means spent, nor have they yet lost their force. The events of the French revolution taught the Court of Rome and the despots of Europe that, dangerous as was the Society of Jesuits, none could do them such effective service, and it was because their power and influence were needed to sustain despotism in church and state, that their order was revived in 1814. Since then the Society has been the most powerful arm of the Roman See, and it bids fair to merge the church (by which is meant the ecclesiastical as well as political and temporal power of the Roman see) in its own body. Evidently Romanism in its old form, is on the wane, at least on the continent of Europe. That it has revived in any degree in England and in the United States, is owing mainly to the exertions of the Society of Jesuits. Some writers upon prophesy suppose that the judgment (spoken of by Daniel) began to sit upon the papal form of Antichrist at the commencement of the French revolution. Others anticipate another and an infidel form of the antichristian power yet to come; and if the providence of God should permit the power of the Roman See to be virtually merged in this Society, and if it be true, that this Society still persist in the doctrines which their founders taught, is it incredible that the papacy in the hands of the Jesuits will constitute the infidel power, upon which the judgments (which are to usher in the millenium), will descend? It is with this view of the subject, that some commentators apply to that Society the second chapter of the second Epistle of Peter, and the Epistle of Jude.—Unquestionably these chapters have a strong reference, both to false teaching and infidelity. Peter alludes to a community under the description of “false teachers.” Jude stiles them “ungodly men, who creep in unawares.” Their doctrines are termed “damnable heresies”—“ungodly men turning the grace of God into lasciviousness”—“filthy dreamers.” They are described again as those who “despise dominion and speak evil of dignities.” One fact in the history of the Jesuits may be mentioned (in connexion with the last badge) which is without a parallel. Such has been the insubordinate conduct of this Society, that since 1555, they have been, either generally or partially, expelled from different countries and cities *thirty-seven* times, and finally, for that reason, the Society was suppressed by the Pope in 1773. See De Pradt's History of Jesuitism, p. 154, 5. But we must leave this topic and conclude this part of the subject, with one more remark.

The effect of this victory of the Jansenists over the Jesuits, was confined to France and the Netherlands, and even there it was temporary. In other parts of Roman Catholic Europe, these pernicious writings retained their credit. This very fact served them as a means for regaining their ascendancy in France. One reason why the bull *Unigenitus*, which authorized the bad morals of the Jesuits, did not excite opposition throughout the other kingdoms of Europe, was that the Jesuits had pre-occupied and retained the ground unmolested. In France, however, that bull excited a great commotion, because the discussions to which we have referred, were still fresh in the minds of the clergy.

**XXI. The practice of the Jesuits in regard to penance and absolution.**

It is worth the while to bestow a little attention on the principles and the practice of the Jesuits in the matter of penance and absolution. The reader knows, doubtless, how much importance is attached by Romanists to auricular confession and priestly absolution, and how important is the influence which this part of their system has upon the power of their clergy and the morals of their people. It is unnecessary to say, that this portion of their system is deemed by Protestants, upon very abundant reasons, an invention, without the slightest warrant in Scripture, or in the practice of the apostolical church. It grew out of the heresy of Novatianism, (see Socrates l. 5, c. 19, Sozom. l. 7, c. 16,) and like some other inventions was made subservient to the power of the priesthood. Waving, however, this topic, there was a dispute between the Jansenists and Jesuits upon the principles which ought to regulate the priest in performing this part of his functions, and it is easy to see that a bad institution may be made more pernicious in its effects, by making it the means of applying, in the concerns of actual life, principles of an immoral or irreligious tendency.

On this part of the subject we will be brief. The Jesuits, then, hold, that the priest ought always to give absolution immediately to those who confess their sins, without inquiring whether the heart of the individual is changed, or whether there is really any ground for believing that he will not immediately relapse into the same sins. They hold, also, that absolution ought not to be deferred in order to prepare the penitent for participating properly in the sacrament. They hold that every sinner is ordinarily in the condition proper to receive absolution when he presents himself to the confessor, and consequently that it is an ill judged severity to defer it, and thereby deprive him of the advantages which he would receive by more frequent communicating.—In the 4th vol. of the Hexaples, part 10th, (*Discipline de la penitence,*) there is a large collection of passages from the Jesuit authors on this subject, showing the application of these principles to particular cases. These passages show their opinion to be, that the conversion of the greatest sinners ordinarily takes place very suddenly and in an instant—that ordinarily it is proper to give absolution without delay to sinners who have lived in crime, though no hope of amendment is seen. It will appear, too, that some of their authors go so far as to say that no interval should be required to elapse between the commission of the most detestable crimes and participation of the Eucharist. This is the opinion of Mascarenhas, who is cited, 6th vol. Hexaples, page 471.

The Jesuits hold, indeed, that when absolution is given without the necessary disposition, it serves rather to condemnation than pardon, but then again they pretend that the necessary disposition to receive absolution *usually exists* in those persons who confess. This opinion harmonizes with their doctrine that a man has always a power of equilibrium to form in himself all that God requires of him. It agrees also with the opinion, that fitness for the worthy receiving of a sacrament consists in certain exterior actions, or at

most in certain religious thoughts; and superficial acts of the will, which may be performed by those whose hearts are unaffected by contrition. A system like this is admirably suited to the great desire and design of the Jesuits, to accommodate themselves to the various inclinations of men, so that they may gain the esteem, the confidence and protection of all sorts of persons. The subtleties which they have introduced into their system of morals, however numerous and various, do not extend to all sins. Some sins still remain, for which provision must be made in some other way. This exigency is met by the doctrine that such sins will be remitted provided they confess them and practice certain exterior acts of easy performance—so easy that the pollution of them is as easily effaced as contracted. *Plurimi vix citius maculas cotrahunt quam eluunt.*

The fact that such penitents relapse into their sinful practices, surprises the Jesuits as little as it does any one else. Their doctrine is, that righteousness may be lost and recovered with extreme facility—that most men pass their lives in a perpetual vicissitude between the state of grace and the state of sin. The great mass of Christians are, in their view, righteous, during the more solemn festivals, and for some days afterwards—then they sin mortally and remain in that state until their first confession. And such a result as this is in perfect unison with the religious system of the Jesuits: for if righteousness is the product of man's free will, we should expect it to be as vacillating and unstable as man's will is; and if righteousness consists in outward practices, we should expect that a man would put it on and put it off as often as he does his coat. But who that knows any thing of the righteousness which God has revealed, can believe in this system of the Jesuits?

It is no part of our purpose to enter into the views of the Janesists upon this subject. It is sufficient to say that they insisted upon evidence of sincere repentance and sorrow for sins committed, before they would grant absolution. They maintained that such was the practice of the church previously to the eleventh and twelfth centuries, when the papal practice of granting indulgences sprung up, and which were granted with a prodigal hand especially during the Crusades. The idea was that the joining in a crusade was a substitute for penance, and according to the notions of the popes, there was this reason for relaxing the rigour of their former practice, *namely*, that the crusader was about to expose himself to great perils, by which he might lose his life. The Jesuits, therefore, were not the first to relax the practice of the papal church, but finding it relaxed, they adopted it as being quite in harmony with the principles of their religious system. They engrafted upon it, however, errors peculiar to themselves, and they made use of the loose practice of the church on this subject, as so many proofs or authorities for their peculiar errors.

The Jesuits held, for example, that to be reconciled to God, in this sacrament, as they call it, it is sufficient to fear the pains of hell, or even the temporal punishment which God may inflict for sin, but it is not necessary to love God. They call that sorrow for sin, which is caused by fear *without love* to God *attrition*—and this

attrition joined with the sacrament, in their opinion justifies the man and restores him to a state of grace. *Contrition*, they defined to be, that sorrow for sin which has the love of God for its principle. This *contrition*, they say, is not necessary. It follows from this doctrine, that absolution need not be deferred until signs of sorrow for sin are manifested. For there are very few men that do not fear the pains of hell, unless they be downright infidels who would not be likely to present themselves for absolution. The sufficiency of fear, for this purpose, is a natural consequence of their notion of Christian righteousness, which is, that it does not consist essentially in the love of God. And both these opinions flow from their doctrine concerning grace, viz: that a man has always a power of equilibrium to fulfil what God requires of him. And if God requires a man to be reconciled to him, the man has, according to their doctrine, the power of equilibrium to be reconciled to him,—that is, it is as easy for him to become reconciled as to remain in the state of alienation, because they say if it were not so, it would not be his duty to be reconciled. But because it is his duty to be reconciled, therefore he has the power of equilibrium to become reconciled. It is, however, an experimental fact, that a man has not a power of equilibrium to turn his heart from the objects of his passions and yield it up to God; consequently, in order to be reconciled with God, it is not necessary that a man should have this disposition; and further, it follows, that the fear of punishment, or *attrition*, is sufficient, and this fear may co-exist with hatred to the law of God. As Augustin says, *Inimicus ergo justitia est qui pœna timore non peccat; amicus ergo, si ejus amore non peccet*, Epis. 145, *ad Anastasium*. With such principles the relaxed practice of the church, which has been referred to, and which was justified in the case of crusaders, by the perils to which they were exposed, is justified for very different reasons—reasons which, if of any weight, go to prove that no other practices should have been pursued from the beginning. It is easy to see, too, that the tribunal of the confessor—whatever its influence or value formerly was—under the administration of the Jesuits, has ceased to serve any other purpose than to increase and perpetuate the power of the clergy.

The reader must not suppose, from what has been said, that the doctrine of the sufficiency of attrition, is confined to the Jesuits. Alexander VII, in 1667, forbade that any should pronounce the doctrine erroneous, and it was the fact, that the Abbe S. Cyran denied the doctrine, which caused his imprisonment. Cardinal Richelieu, who ordered his imprisonment, affected to regard it as an insupportable temerity in this Abbe, to deny a sentiment which was so common, and which the Cardinal himself had learned from his Catechism. The doctrine, too, was advanced before the Council of Trent, by *Victoria*, who died in 1546. Melchior Camus adopted the sentiment of *Victoria*. At first, the doctrine was advanced problematically and cautiously. The Council of Trent was chiefly occupied with condemning the doctrines of Luther, and did not act formally upon this doctrine, except so far as it could be connected with Luther's opinions. But without entering into

minute particulars, the origin of the doctrine may be assigned to the period of the reformation, and it is one of those errors which serves to mark the farther apostacy of the Roman church at that time. In itself it was a most enormous error, and it seems hardly possible that the spirit of piety can exist in a church which adopts it.

[To be Continued.]

[Continued from page 22.]

CRITICAL REMARKS ON JOHN XII. 23, 31, 32; AND XVI. 8—11.

No. III.

The hour (*ωρα*) has come that the Son of man should be glorified. . . . Now (*νυν*) is the judgment of this world: Now (*νυν*) shall the prince of this world be cast out. And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all . . . unto me.—*John* xii. 23, 31, 32.

And when he (the Comforter) is come, he will reprove the world of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment:—of sin, because they believed not on me:—of righteousness, because I go to the Father, and ye see me no more:—of judgment, because the prince of this world is judged.—*John* xvi. 8—11.

WE now come to the interesting passage recorded in *John* xvi. 8—11. The somewhat diffusive explication of *John* xii. 23, 32, will conduce to great brevity in what remains.

In the verse preceding the passage now to be considered, the Redeemer promised to the little company of disciples collected around him, the mission of the Holy Spirit, (*ὁ παρακλητος*) called in our version, the *Comforter*. He assured them that this event was of more importance to them than his personal presence, and yet it could not occur simultaneously with it. "It is expedient for you that I go away: for if I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you." Why this matter was so ordered in the divine counsels is a mystery; yet there was a divine necessity that the Redeemer should be glorified before the Holy Ghost could be given—(*John* vii. 39; *Acts* i. 5.) In the passage under consideration, the agency of the Spirit is described. This we are informed would consist in reproving or convincing the world of or concerning three things, viz: sin, righteousness, and judgment. The word (*ελεξιμι*) translated reprove, says Tholuck, embraces the kindred conceptions of conviction, reproof, and instruction. The gloss of Michaelis is, *firmis argumentis docebit—in conscientia per demonstrationes convincet et instruet mundum de hisce tribus, etc.*

But what are we to understand by *sin*, (*αμαρτια*) *righteousness*, (*δικαιοσυνη*) and *judgment* (*κρισις*)? What sin especially is intended? Is it specifically the sin of unbelief? Or is there not an allusion to the first sin—the prevarication of Adam, by which he fell, the consequences of which were the loss of original righteousness—the corruption of our whole nature, and out of which, in a certain sense, all the actual transgressions of men spring? In one word, does not *αμαρτια*, in this place, mean original sin, or the total depravity of human nature? And what is the sense of the word

righteousness? Different meanings have been suggested. Some say the idea is, that the Spirit will convince the world of the reality of the righteousness of those who believe in Christ;—others say that it means the righteousness of God; that is, the Spirit will convince the world that God is righteous, because he granted to Christ an entrance into heaven, who though innocent, was persecuted. Others still say that the word is taken in the sense in which it is used by Paul, that is, as signifying the true mode and manner of justification before God: but to this sense it is objected that John does not use the word in this sense in other places—(See 1 John ii. 29, iii. 7, Rev. xix. 11, the only places in which it occurs in his writings except in this gospel, xvi. 8, 10.) This objection will not appear to have much weight, however, if we recollect that the evangelist records merely the discourse of our Lord. The word *judgment*, (*κρίσις*) and in fact the whole of verse 11th is commonly understood to be parallel in sense to John xii. 31.

Some find it difficult to perceive a connexion between the *truths* of which the Spirit will convince the world, and the assigned reasons or grounds of the conviction "of sin, *because* they believe not on me." "The *ὅτι*," says Tholuck, "may be best understood ætiologically, *forasmuch as, since*, although it may also stand in the sense of *that, namely*. It is plain wherein the sin consists."

Undoubtedly *unbelief* is a sin, and a great sin. The unbelief of the Jews led to the rejection of Christ, and called down upon them their national destruction. We see the just displeasure of God against them for this sin, in their present dispersion; and it is a remarkable fact, that *state policy* was the avowed motive of the High Priest, in advising the course which the Sanhedrim adopted in relation to the Redeemer—"If we let him thus alone, all will believe on him, and the Romans will come and take away both our place and our nation."—John xi. 48. Eighteen centuries have witnessed the bitter fruits of this policy, and wrath still abides upon them, and will abide (*ὡς τάλος*, 1 Thess. ii. 15, 16,) upon them to the end of this dispensation of the Gospel to the Gentiles—(Luke xxi. 24; Rom. xi. 25, 26.)

The suggestion of Tholuck, however, does not remove the difficulties, as will presently be shown. Again, (to proceed to the 10th verse,) how is the departure of the Lord Jesus Christ to the Father and his disappearance from the earth, a proof or argument fitted to convince the world of righteousness? Tholuck says, "a redeeming element is attributed by Paul to the resurrection of our Lord, (Rom. iv. 25,) and therefore," he says, "it cannot be urged as an objection to the Pauline sense of the word righteousness," which he adopts, "that Christ does not speak of his death as the cause of righteousness, but of his glorification as such a cause."

Then again as to verse 11th; how does the fact that the prince of this world is judged, tend as an argument or proof to convince the world of judgment (*κρίσις*)? Who is this prince of the world? Is it Satan? If so, how is he judged? Or is the sense of the word (*κρίσις*) *has been judged* against, that is, *has been condemned*, and is (now) condemned? But how does the judgment or condemnation of Satan tend to convince the world of judgment? Of

what judgment? Of the judgment of the last day? Of the judgment pronounced at the fall, or the curse? Or of some other judgment then or now present?

A few suggestions will now be offered with a view to explain the passage. The writer is by no means confident they will be entirely satisfactory to the reader, but they may indicate a course of inquiry which some one better qualified, can pursue with advantage.

The discourse in which the passage under consideration occurs, was delivered after our Lord had closed his public ministry to the Jews, and he appears to have taken a tacit retrospect of the results of that passage which was first considered, (John xii. 23, 32,) was pronounced publicly, to the Jews, just before the close of his ministry. In the 23d chapter of Matthew, we have the conclusion of his last discourse, in which he assures the Jews they should see him no more until their hearts were entirely changed towards him. The objects and the result of his mission had been copiously foretold by the prophets, but the most minute of the predictions, in some respects, is that contained in Dan. ix. 24.

Seventy weeks are determined upon thy people (the Jews) and upon thy holy city (Jerusalem) to finish the transgression, (του συνταλασθηναι αμαρτιας, lxx.—Cohibenda defectionem illam, Junius and Tremellius—ut consumetur praevaricatio *Vulgate*—per il terminare il misfatto *Diodati*) and to make an end of sins, (και του σφεραγισαι αμαρτιας, lxx.—et obsegnando peccata, Junius and Tremellius—et finem accipiat peccatum *Vulgate*—e per far venir meno i peccati *Diod*)—and to make reconciliation for iniquity, and to bring in everlasting righteousness—(του αρχαιου δικαιοσυνη αιωνιος) and to seal up the vision and prophesy, and to anoint the Most Holy.”

Such were the predicted objects of the mission of the Redeemer. Gabriel, who was sent to communicate this prediction to the prophet, also informed the prophet, that “from the going forth of the commandment to restore and build Jerusalem,” which was then in ruins, “unto Messiah the Prince,” there would be “seven weeks and three score and two weeks, after which the Messiah would be cut off, but not for himself.”

The predicted epoch had now arrived. The Messiah was about to finish the *transgression*—*prevaricatio*, *defectionem illam*, *il misfatto*, or as it is in the lxx. αμαρτιας, the very word used in John xvi. 9, and to bring in everlasting righteousness—(δικαιοσυνη αιωνιος, the very word which is used in John xvi. 10.)—It is evident that the translator of the *vulgate*, as well as Junius Tremellius and *Diodati*, and perhaps the translators of the English version, understood by the word which they render *transgression*, *prevaricatio*, *defectio illa*, *il misfatto*, the sin of apostacy, or Adam's first transgression. This is a strong argument from authority, that the word αμαρτιας, in the lxx., may be understood in the same sense—and we have only to suppose (and why may we not safely admit it,) that our Lord had this message of the angel in mind, when he pronounced the words in John xvi. 9, 11, in order to find a sense which will relieve the passage under consideration of its principal difficulties.

If we consider the circumstances in which our Lord then was, we shall see some probable grounds for this suggestion. His pub-

lic ministry to the Jews was closed—they had rejected him. His expiratory sufferings were just at hand. What sin beyond all others was it which created, so to speak, the exigency of an atonement such as he was about to offer? Was it not the sin of the apostacy? What sin had called down the curse of God upon the world, but the sin of revolt, rebellion? This sin, then, was to be finished, the rebellion destroyed, and all things restored according to the suggestion before made upon John xii. 32. Adam was created upright—he was righteous in a sense, but his righteousness was mutable, and he lost it by his prevarication or apostacy. But the Redeemer was to bring in a righteousness (*δικαιοσύνη αἰώνιον*) not mutable like Adam's, but everlasting—(Dan. ix. 23, lxx.) Hence our Lord by using this word in John xvi. 10, alludes to this everlasting righteousness, by way of contrast or contradistinction to the righteousness of Adam, which did not avail to secure his own happiness or that of his posterity. As Christ is the Second Adam, it was apposite to the circumstances in which he then was, to contrast the righteousness of which he was the author, with the righteousness of the first Adam,—and when we consider that the ascension of Christ, is referred to as the great argument or proof by which the world was to be convinced, concerning the righteousness he spoke of,—we see still more clearly, that it was a righteousness connected with his expiatory sufferings, because his death must precede his ascension; and this consideration also gives importance to the *time* and occasion on which these words were uttered. They are as full of meaning as if they had been uttered from the cross, in reference to which he had just before said, “and although I must be lifted up from the earth, yet will I draw all to me”—that is to say, in all this passage our Lord had in view his own work in effecting the restitution of those things which Adam destroyed by his apostacy.

This largeness of view of course includes the personal and actual sins of men, and these perhaps are alluded to in the subsequent clauses of Dan. ix. 24—(See the versions before cited.) Yet as these sins, in a sense, flow from original sin and the depravity of nature, our Lord may be supposed to have compressed under the one word *αμαρτια*, sin, in John xvi. 8; 9, all those offences from which men must be justified by his righteousness—viz: “the guilt of Adam's first sin, the want of original righteousness, the corruption of their whole nature, which is commonly called original sin, together with all actual transgressions which proceed from it.”

If the reader is prepared to adopt the suggestion, that our Lord tacitly referred to the apostacy and fall of man, in the passage under consideration, he will find no difficulty in understanding (*χεριστος*) judgment (in verse 11,) of the curse pronounced at the fall. This sense will make the passage harmonize with John xi. 31. The observation already made upon that passage, need not be repeated here. The eighth verse, then, according to these suggestions may be understood thus: “And when he,” the Comforter, “is come, he will convince mankind concerning sin,” *to wit*, the sin of Adam's apostacy, of the depravity or corruption of their nature consequent upon that sin, as well as of their actual transgressions—“and con-

cerning righteousness," viz: the mutable, transient righteousness of Adam, and the utter want of original righteousness in all his posterity, in consequence of Adam's prevarication, and the enduring righteousness of Christ, the second Adam,—“and concerning judgment,” viz: the judgment which God pronounced against the serpent, and the progenitors of the race, as well as the earth itself.

We now proceed to submit a few observations upon the other words of the passage.

*He shall reprove—(ἐλεγξει).* Our Lord thus expresses the office of the Holy Spirit, which was not given during his personal ministry. Man's need of Divine influence to restore him to holiness and eternal life, is here taken for granted. In fact, it is upon the ground of this need that we account for the fact, that the Jewish nation rejected their Messiah, and the glories of his kingdom. This thought we shall return to presently. The absolute need which man has of the Spirit's influences is one of the effects of the apostacy—[*prævaricatio, defectio illa, αμαρτια, Rom. v. 12,*—and the allusion to it in this place, is of itself an argument to prove that our Lord primarily refers to that first transgression. In John vi. 44, our Lord expressly declared to the Jews that no one could come to him except the Father drew him. This declaration, although applied particularly to the Jews, is equally true of the Gentiles. Much has been written upon the nature of man's inability, and the extent of it, as well as of the nature and the degree of grace which God gives to sinners of mankind. Theophylact, (on John vi. 44,) denies that the power of the human will is taken away by these words. Our Lord (he says,) teaches only that he, (*ὁ μὲλλον πιστεῦσαι*) who is about to believe, stands in need of much co-operation from God—(*πολλὴ δέεται συνεργίας παρὰ θεοῦ*). Camerarius says upon the same passage, “at all events this is taught, that no man can of himself, however much he may strive, come to Christ the author of salvation; but all have need of the present help of the kind and merciful God to draw them thither, in which the effect of the assent of the will first appears . . . so that we must understand and take it as a settled point, that this willingness is the peculiar grace or benefit of the Divine clemency alone, conferred upon those who receive salvation.” It is not necessary to enter into this question here, for whatever be the kind or the degree of this defect of power, it was that which led to the rejection of our Lord and of his kingdom. In fact, as Adam is an example of the frailty of human nature in its incorrupt state, so the Jewish nation is a proof by way of many examples, of what depraved human nature would do under an economy of law. God had elected that people—he had given them exceeding great and glorious promises—(Ex. xix. 5.)—He sent them prophets to teach and to warn and guide them. He gave them, in fact, every advantage which He could bestow consistently with the nature of an economy of law—yet it was not enough to secure their salvation. This proves that if men are to be saved, they need some other election than a national election, and some other economy than such an one as that people enjoyed. That is to say, nothing short of an economy of grace, and a personal election to its benefits, applied by the Spirit of God, will meet

the exigency. Hence the issue of the dispensation given to the Jews, proves the doctrine of original sin and the total depravity of human nature, and the doctrine of salvation by grace without works. For unless the Gentiles are by nature better than the Jews, we may see in their history and their present condition, what we ourselves of the Gentiles would have been, had God been pleased to have selected some progenitor of ours, and subjected him and his posterity to the same economy, in all respects, which he established over the Jewish nation.

And herein is a mystery, that God should bring the kingdom nigh to the Jewish nation—offer it to them freely, and all the glories of it, without giving them such influences of his Spirit as should effectually incline them to accept of it. It was absolutely certain, that they would reject it, if left free to do so. Why then did God offer it, without giving them the grace to accept? He designed to show the dreadful depravity of the human heart, and that salvation is and must be by grace. This has been suggested. He had also designs of mercy to the Gentiles; for if God had inclined that nation one and all to accept of the kingdom of Christ, their king, we cannot see how the Gentiles could be saved. It is unnecessary, however, for our present purpose, to pursue this inquiry. Enough has been said to elucidate the meaning of the word *reprove* or *convince*, and suggest the sense in which the next clause of the verse must be understood.

“He shall convince the world concerning sin, because they,” namely, the Jews, “believe not on me.” Many suppose that the pronoun *they*, used in this place, refers to the world, which is understood in the sense of mankind,—men in general,—the word, being expressive of multitudes. The word rendered *world*, is *κοσμος*, and the expression translated “because they believe not on me,” is, *οτι ου πιστευουσιν*. The objection to the sense of the passage just stated, is that the word *κοσμος* is not in any instance joined with a verb in the plural number—(See John i. 10; iii. 17; vii. 7; xii. 19; xiv. 17, 19, 27, 31; xv. 18, 19; xvi. 20, xvii. 14, 21, 23, 25.—See, also, 1 Cor. i. 21; Gal. vi. 14.) Besides this, the word *they*, in verse second, of this chapter, must refer to the Jews, as the worship of the synagogue was established only among them. But a stronger reason against this interpretation is, that the gospel had thus far been preached only to the Jews. Christ was the minister of the *circumcision*, for the truth of God to confirm the promises to the fathers, Rom. xv. 8. Accordingly, he confined his public ministrations to that people, saying that he was not sent except to the lost sheep of the house of Israel. In fact he forbade his disciples to go among the Gentiles during his personal ministry. How, then, should the world at large have believed in Christ, of whom they had not heard? And how should the world hear, when the Redeemer confined his ministry to the Jews, and commanded his disciples to do so? No; it was the unbelief of the Jews, which our Lord referred to.—It was their unbelief in him, which opened a door to the Gentiles. The Jews stumbled and fell, through the depravity of their hearts, and God permitted it in order that by their fall, salvation might be offered to the Gentiles,

Rom. xi. 11. As concerning the gospel, they became enemies for the sake of the Gentiles. The administration of the Spirit, therefore, would not be confined to that single nation as was the personal ministry of Jesus—it would be world wide. The kingdom which had been offered to the Jews was to be taken from them and given to a nation which should bring forth the fruits of it, Matt. xxi. 43, and this substituted or subrogated nation, was to be gathered from the Gentiles, as well as the Jews, by the Spirit's agency acting according to the predestination and purpose of God in the election of individuals, to the benefits of the covenant of grace in Christ. But we will pass on to the next clause.

*Concerning righteousness*, because I go to the Father, and ye see me no more. The righteousness here intended, is the righteousness of God, which when once attained can never be lost. It is not like that of Adam, which was transient, but it is (*αιωνιος*) everlasting. This has been suggested already.—*Because I go to the Father, &c.*, alluding to his ascension into heaven, after he had endured the pains of death, and thereby destroyed him that had the power of death. The pertinency of this fact, as a means to convince the world concerning righteousness, may appear by the following considerations.

The creature, i. e. man, as well as the earth itself, was made subject to vanity and corruption, in consequence of Adam's transgression, death entered the world as the penalty of sin, and passed upon all, because all have sinned. Had man never sinned, he would not have died. Could we suppose a perfectly righteous man to appear upon earth, without sin, either original or actual, such a man could not die except by some divine and mysterious appointment, and if he should die, he could not be holden of death; for death being the penalty of sin, where there is no sin, there can be no death, or at least death has no power.

Upon this ground, the resurrection and ascension of Christ, is a fact which proves the perfection of Christ's righteousness. Hence the apostle lays such stress upon the resurrection, "If Christ be not risen, your faith is vain, you are yet in your sins."—1 Cor. xv. 17. The fact that he died at all, arose from the mysterious and gracious purpose of redemption. He was voluntary in laying down his life; for none had power to take it from him. But having laid it down, he arose from the dead, and departed from the world to the Father, and this was a testimony that he pleased the Father and had fulfilled all righteousness. Hence when Paul says "he was raised for our justification," he means, probably, that his resurrection proved that his righteousness was perfect and pleasing to God, and sufficient for our justification. For if Christ had not risen from the dead, he would have lain under the power of the (*αρκτου*) curse pronounced upon the apostacy, which would not be possible if he were perfectly holy, and herein consists the point of the argument in 1 Cor. xv. 14, 18.

The remaining clause will be disposed of in a few words. The (*αρκτου*) judgment referred to, is the curse. The prince of this world, is Satan. The curse, as it respected Satan, was unconditional and irreversible. As it respected man and the earth, the subjection to

the curse, was in hope of deliverance from the bondage of corruption and the dominion which Satan had acquired over the world and its inhabitants. The office of the Spirit would be to convince the world concerning this curse—its reality and its extent, by the argument or proof furnished by the fact that Satan had been condemned, and the sentence of condemnation was about to be executed, by his expulsion from the earth—and by the expulsion of the curse itself from the earth, thus delivering it from his dominion, and by the reclaiming of multitudes of men, thereby delivering them from Satan's bondage into the liberty of the children of God. The Spirit was to commence his work upon the day of Pentecost. Thousands of the slaves of Satan would from that time be set free, and this would be the earnest and the pledge of the entire destruction of Satan's kingdom, in fulfilment of the first prophesy and promise, "the seed of the woman shall bruise the serpent's head." This realization, therefore, of *some of the things* promised in the passage just referred to—this incipency of the work of the Spirit in destroying Satan's dominion, thereby beginning to execute the curse of God originally pronounced against him, is a fact, which proves the reality of the curse, the reality of its effects upon men and the earth, and the certainty of its final execution upon sinners of mankind, unless they flee to the cross of Christ and obtain reconciliation through the blood shed thereon: for this is the hope which alone distinguishes the condition of man from his seducer; and he who does not lay hold of this hope will continue under the effects of the curse, as we may be convinced by the fact that the judgment against the prince of this world, has already begun to be executed under the agency of the Holy Spirit.

---

"DOCTRINES AND PRACTICES" OF THE CHURCH OF ROME.

No. 1, of the *Controversy with the Domestic Chaplains of the Archbishop of Baltimore.*

To the Editor of the *Saturday Visiter*.—WE think you have rightly interpreted the present state of the public mind, in regard to that society which calls itself, the "*Roman, Catholic, Apostolic Church*;" when you consider it one of eager curiosity and intense anxiety.—There are, in our judgment, abundant reasons, why the whole world, and especially the people of the United States, should feel deeply on this subject; and unhappily, there are reasons operating here with peculiar force, which may account for the remarkable degree of ignorance, in regard to it, which pervades so large a portion of our citizens. Not the least of these, is the complete and long continued silence of the newspaper press; a silence which neither the importance of the subject, the state of the times in which we live, nor the position of the press itself, ever justified; and which, we sincerely believe, public sentiment, will not much longer tolerate. We look upon your movement in the premises, as a wise and patriotic act; and while we renounce all claims to

the expressions you have been pleased to use publicly of us; yet, such as we are, we will not stand back when Providence presents before us a door of entrance like this, to the minds and hearts of our countrymen.

Let us set our object in a perfectly clear light. You open your paper for a year—allowing two columns a week, to the general discussion of the character and claims; the faith, morality, discipline and opinions; in one word, "*the Doctrines and Practices*" of the Roman, Catholic, Apostolic Church; Protestants to occupy these two columns one week, Roman Catholics the next; and so on, till the year is out. Preliminary to this, you publish in two numbers of your paper, six to eight columns of explanatory matter, furnished, though not written, as the public understands, by Mr. Eccleston, the present Roman Catholic Archbishop in this country, on "*the Doctrines and Practices*" about to be questioned; to which is prefixed a note from two of his Priests, in which they "*disclaim all intention of entering into a direct discussion with any one,*" &c.; but express a readiness "*to attend to such objections as may be stated in a respectful and decorous manner,*" to the matter contained in the aforesaid six or eight columns.

Now, Mr. Editor, be pleased to understand us. (1.) We know, and Mr. Eccleston knows, that he has no more power, authority or right, to settle "*the Doctrines and Practices*" of his church, by an ultimate and categorical statement, than you or we have. We shall go for those "*Doctrines and Practices*" directly to the fountain head; where, if it suits his convenience, we shall be always happy to meet him; or if he comes not to reply to us, let the public judge our work, and judge also between us and him. (2.) The expose published by you, as above stated, we will reply to *separately* and point by point, if you can spare us as much space to do it in, as it occupies; that space not to be counted as of our present series; for if you will consider that our whole *twenty-six* numbers will not occupy quite two entire copies of your paper, you will see that we cannot bestow a seventh part of all our space on such "*an explanation*" as that. (3.) When we enter into controversy with Mr. Eccleston, we intend it shall be directly and personally; we will not accept "*the Right Rev. Dr. Baines, Bishop of Siga,*" &c., nor yet "*CHAS. I. WHITE, and H. B. COSKERY*"—as his substitutes. (4.) Whenever he desires such a controversy, orally or in print, he can have it with us, under our proper persons. And we here offer to prove against him, in such a discussion, this proposition, viz.: *That the Roman, Catholic and Apostolical Church, is corrupt and apostate, in its head and its members*; or if he prefers the opposite form of the question, and will undertake to prove this proposition, viz.: *That the Roman, Catholic and Apostolical Church, is the true Church of Jesus Christ*; then we will take the negative of it. These two propositions contain the marrow of the whole dispute; any discussion that does not cover them, is idle.

We shall, therefore, proceed, in a manner rather didactic than controversial, to state what seems to us proper and necessary to give the public a clear, just, and accurate impression, of this *Roman, Catholic, and Apostolical Church*. We shall use perfect

plainness of speech ; but shall not intentionally depart from the most formal propriety. We undertake the duty in the fear of God ; may his infinite grace be sufficient for us, while we humbly but faithfully attempt to perform it.

I. Of "the Doctrine and Practice" of the Church of Rome, is regard to the holy word of God.

We charge the Church of Rome, with being in fundamental, if not fatal error, in her doctrine and practice touching the revelation which God has made of himself to man ; an error which lies at the foundation, and which necessarily involves error on every succeeding point and step.

1. That Church is in radical error, as to what is the Word of God. She has, in the IV. Session of her "most holy, œcumenical and general Council of TRENT," on the 8th day of April, 1546, solemnly decreed that various books, "are Sacred Books," which never were inspired by the Holy Ghost ; and which are not Divine Scripture. Thus polluting the very fountain of life. The Books alluded to, are commonly called the *Apocrypha*; such as *Tobias*, *Judith*, *The Book of Wisdom*, &c., &c., which make an addition to the word of God, larger than one half the New Testament ; an addition made, under and against some of the most terrible denunciations of God's holy word.

2. That Church, has equally, and at the same time erred, on the same subject, by decreeing that "UNWRITTEN TRADITIONS" of a certain character, are to be received and revered with equal piety and veneration, with the "WRITTEN BOOKS" divinely inspired. Thus still further polluting the fountain of life ; and putting into her own power, the abiding means of making as much new revelation, under the name of "unwritten tradition," as her necessities may, at any time, suggest.

3. That Church has, at the same time, in the same formal and irrevocable manner, and upon the same all-important subject, fallen into still further and fundamental error, by solemnly decreeing, the *Latin version* of the Scriptures, instead of the *Hebrew and Greek originals*, to be "AUTHENTIC." Thus making the ultimate appeal, to that which is not Scripture at all. The reader will find these facts fully set forth in *Tom. XIV. pp. 746-7, SACRO-SANCTA CONCILII, &c., Studio Philip Labbei, et Gabr Cossartii, MDCLXXII*; and every man who disputes the errors alleged, handed over to damnation, by the whole force of the Roman Church.

4. But we still further charge this Church of Rome, with still further error of the like enormous kind, on the same fearful subject ; in that she has bound the souls of her people, by the most solemn oaths, that they will admit the Sacred Scriptures, (1.) *In that sense and no other*, in which the Church of Rome holds them ; thus putting that Church into the office of the Eternal Spirit, and thus enslaving the human conscience ; (2.) *In that sense and no other*, which is "according to the unanimous consent of the fathers ;" it being till this hour unsettled, even who the fathers are, or what they agree on ; but absolutely certain that they differ on all sorts of subjects ; and whether they differ or not, they are to man-

kind at large, merely as so many dead sinners. (See *Tom. XIV.* as above, pp. 945-6, and the *creed* printed below.)

5. Not content with these awful encroachments upon the province and the honor of Almighty God; the Church of Rome has set a final hand to the work, in this department, by throwing the greatest obstacles in the way of the circulation of the word of life—even when thus bound and hampered by her. She has, by her highest authorities, in the *first* place, prohibited *Translations* of the Old and New Testaments except to learned and pious men, and then at the discretion of the Bishop; *secondly*, she has prohibited the *printing* of any book, and of course of the Bible, except by permission of her Bishops, (in this city for example, without permission of "† Samuel, Archbishop," &c.); *thirdly*, she has disclosed her experience to be, that "the Holy Bible translated into the vulgar tongue," will be made an instrument of "*more evil than good*;" and has, consequently, forbidden her people to have or to read, "*the Bible translated into the vulgar tongue by Catholic authors*;" even; unless they have "PERMISSION IN WRITING" from a "*Bishop or Inquisitor*;" who is to grant it "*by the advice of the Priest or Confessor*;" *fourthly*, all this is backed, not only by a declaration of mortal sin and a denunciation of *Anathema* against the disobedient; but a threat of severe and obviously temporal punishment, "*at the will of the Bishops*," is also added. For proof of what is stated in this section, we refer the reader to *Regulæ Indiis Sacro-sanctæ Synodi Tridentinæ, Jussu Editæ*, making pp. ix-xiv. of the INDEX LIBRORUM PROHIBITORUM, *Pii. vii. Romæ*, 1819.

Our limited space, and the extreme clearness of the case, induce us to forbear from comment. But let us demand of every serious person, what doth he judge of a church—which has, (1) presumptuously added many uninspired books to God's holy Scripture; (2) which has daringly heaped up *traditions* as of equal authority with revelation; (3) which has obstinately substituted a mere human version, as the *authentic*, original word of Jehovah; (4) which has audaciously set forth her own sense and that of those she has chosen, of what the Scripture means,—as the only sense, in which it shall ever be received; (5) and has added to all these dreadful errors, the final impiety of obstructing, as far as she could, the circulation of the light of life! Have we not abundant reason to dread and to shun a church, which begins at the root of our salvation, with strokes like these?

II. Of "*the Doctrine and Practice*" of the Church of Rome, as held forth in her own *Creed*.

In the xiv. vol. of *Labbius* and *Cossart*, already quoted, and on pp. 944-6; as well as at the end of every edition of the decrees of the Council of Trent,—(which as scholars know, is the last great Papal Council, held to suppress the Reformation of the XVI. century;) will be found the Bull of *Pius IV.* entitled "*Super forma juramenti professionis fidei*," and commencing, "*Injunctum nobis, &c.*" The Bull is dated in December, 1561; and sets forth the true and authorized creed of the present Roman church.

We pass by the remarkable fact that this creed is much younger than all the principal Protestant creeds of the Reformation; a fact

pregnant with fruits, and too much neglected. Nor can we stop to inquire by what authority *Pius IV.*, more than any Pope before him, or since, undertook to make creeds and swear the people to them. So it is; this is the universally received creed of the church of Rome. We may often have occasion to refer to it; and it is moreover a matter of deep interest and importance to the public; we therefore print it entire, in an English dress, following the translation of *Cramp*.

“I, N., believe and profess, with a firm faith, all and every one of the things which are contained in the symbol of faith, which is used in the holy Roman church, viz.:

“I believe in one God, the Father Almighty, maker of heaven and earth, and of all things visible and invisible; and in one Lord Jesus Christ, the only begotten Son of God: *born of the Father before all worlds; God of God; Light of Light; true God of true God; begotten, not made; consubstantial to the Father, by whom all things were made; who, for us men, and for our salvation, came down from heaven, and was incarnate by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary, and was made man; was crucified also for us under Pontius Pilate, suffered and was buried, and rose again the third day, according to the scriptures, and ascended into heaven; sits at the right hand of the Father, and will come again with glory to judge the living and the dead, of whose kingdom there will be no end: and in the Holy Ghost, the Lord and Life-giver, who proceeds from the Father and the Son; who, together with the Father and the Son, is adored and glorified, who spoke by the prophets: and in one holy catholic and apostolic church. I confess one baptism for the remission of sins; and I expect the resurrection of the body [of the dead—*mortuorum,*] and the life of the world. Amen.*

“I most firmly admit and embrace apostolical and ecclesiastical traditions, and all other constitutions and observances of the same church.

“I also admit the sacred scriptures, according to the sense which the holy mother church has held, and does hold, to whom it belongs to judge of the true sense and interpretation of the holy scriptures: nor will I ever take or interpret them otherwise, than according to the unanimous consent of the fathers.

“I profess also, that there are truly and properly seven sacraments of the new law, instituted by Jesus Christ our Lord, and for the salvation of mankind, though all are not necessary for every one, viz.: baptism, confirmation, eucharist, penance, extreme unction, order, and matrimony, and that they confer grace; and of these, baptism, confirmation, and order, cannot be reiterated without sacrilege.

“I also receive and admit the ceremonies of the Catholic church, received and approved in the solemn administration of all the above-said sacraments.

“I receive and embrace all and every one of the things which have been defined and declared in the holy Council of Trent, concerning original sin and justification.

“I profess, likewise, that in the mass is offered to God a true, proper, and propitiatory sacrifice for the living and the dead; and that in the most holy sacrifice of the eucharist there is truly, really, and substantially the body and blood, together with the soul and divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ; and that there is made a conversion of the whole substance of the bread into the body, and of the whole substance of the wine into the blood, which conversion the catholic church calls transubstantiation.

“I confess also, that under either kind alone, whole and entire, Christ and a true sacrament is received.

“I constantly hold that there is a purgatory, and that the souls detained therein are helped by the suffrages of the faithful.

“Likewise, that the saints reigning together with Christ, are to be honored and invocated, that they offer prayers to God for us, and that their relics are to be venerated.

“I most firmly assert, that the images of Christ, and of the mother of God, ever virgin, and also of the other saints, are to be had and retained; and that due honor and veneration are to be given them.

"I also affirm, that the power of indulgences was left by Christ in the church, and that the use of them is most wholesome to Christian people.

"I acknowledge the holy catholic and apostolical Roman church, the mother and mistress of all churches; and I promise and swear true obedience to the Roman bishop, the successor of St. Peter, the prince of the apostles, and vicar of Jesus Christ.

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

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

The reader will at once perceive a division in this creed; and he can easily see that the two grand portions of it, have nothing akin to each other. The body of the fore part of the creed, omitting the introductory paragraph, and taking in all to the first "Amen;" that is, rather more than the first fifth of this creed, is in substance the creed of the ancient council of Nice, held under *Constantine the Great*, in 325. That creed is believed, to this day, by all evangelical Christians in every Protestant country; and if the church of Rome only wished to restore Christian unity, and was but fit to do it; her first step should be, to get back on the basis of that creed, which was the authorized one commonly used by her people, till *Pius IV.* added out of the *Trent* decrees, *fifteen new articles* to it, and thus fabricated the one now in common use.

Now we assert, that each and every of these fifteen new articles added to the creed, by *Pius IV.*, in 1564, contains gross and palpable error, and that several of them contain several such errors. But for the sake of distinctness—we will repeat some of the worst of these errors; and for the sake of brevity will take, for the present, the summary of *Isaac Barrow*, printed at the end of his *Treatise on the Pope's Supremacy*. So we charge the church of Rome with corrupting the faith of God's church so far as in her lay—by setting forth in her authorized and sworn confession of faith, these novelties and heterodoxies, viz.: 1. *Seven Sacraments*. 2. *Trent Doctrine of Justification and Original Sin*. 3. *Propitiatory Sacrifice of the Mass*. 4. *Transubstantiation*. 5. *Communicating under one Kind*. 6. *Purgatory*. 7. *Invocation of Saints*. 8. *Veneration of Reliques*. 9. *Worship of Images*. 10. *The Roman Church to be the mother and mistress of all Churches*. 11. *Swearing Obedience to the Pope*. 12. *Receiving the Decrees of all Synods and of Trent*.

Upon the ground of these novelties and heterodoxies, we make three general and distinct allegations against the church of Rome. (1.) That she has not and never had a particle of authority from God to add these articles of belief to the faith of his people; she has therefore first usurped and then abused the divine authority. (2.) There is no evidence, either in Divine Revelation, in natural religion, in right reason, or in the primitive uninspired records of Christianity, that a single one of these things is true; but much

from all, that they are all false: so that the church which holds them, is fallen away from the truth, and her people in danger of destruction. (3) There is not a particle of proof, that the belief of any one of these things thus insisted on by Rome—can be necessary to salvation; therefore her making them, and things like them, terms of communion, is schismatical; her daring to excommunicate other Christians for not believing them, is presumptuous bigotry; her denouncing eternal death against all who reject them—is most daring impiety; and her persecuting unto death those who testify against them, is not only a gross usurpation of power, not vested in any church, but is a shedding of the blood of the martyrs of Jesus.

Having thus made a small entrance into "*the doctrines and practices*"—for whose examination you have opened your columns; and not knowing how our manuscript may run with your type in filling up the allotted space, we may pause here as appropriately, as any where else.

Beseeching God to give strength and triumph to his own glorious truth, and to confound every attempt to dishonor, to pervert, or to bury it; we remain, Mr. Editor, your obliged and obedient servants.

*Baltimore, February 1.*

---

A NARRATIVE OF GOD'S DEALINGS WITH A FEW POOR CHILDREN OF  
HAM—IN BALTIMORE.

In the winter of 1833—shortly after the writer of these lines became a resident of Baltimore,—his attention was arrested, as he returned home one dark and cold night, in passing along one of the obscurest streets of the city; by noises so extraordinary and distressing—that he turned aside to ascertain their cause. They proved to issue from a small house used as a place for religious meetings by a portion of the free coloured population of the city—then numbering about sixteen or eighteen thousand souls. The scene of disorder, riot, excess, and superstition; screaming, shouting, groaning, jumping, dancing, clapping hands; all this, late at night, in a place dimly lighted by a single lamp, and filled with squalid and ghastly looking actors—made an impression which it would now be as difficult to describe, as it was at the time hard to shake off.

The immediate effect of it was to lead us to a careful and detailed examination of the condition of the free coloured population of the city; the second step was, to attempt to found a church amongst them, in which they should be taught more perfectly the way of the Lord. So we commenced a service, in the afternoon of the Sabbath, in the lecture-room of the church we served;—and without much difficulty collected a congregation of coloured persons, large enough to fill it.

At this stage of the matter we ascertained that there had once been a small Presbyterian church of coloured persons in Baltimore;

and the former pastor of it, (a black man, by the name of *Ward*, a West-Indian,) came and made himself known to us. He was a shallow, conceited, unstable man; had turned to the Episcopal church, under some allurements held out by *Bishop Kemp*, (who, by the way, had taken the same track before *Ward*;)—and had dispersed and ruined the little flock, he had been placed over. One of the ruling elders of the little church, also hearing of our proceedings, came to us. His name was *Samuel Douglas*; and, in all our knowledge of men—we have seen few who had more grace than this humble and simple hearted follower of Christ. His whole soul seemed alive with joy, at the prospect of seeing again—a gathered people to serve God, according to his pure and faithful word; and he praised, without ceasing, the right hand of the Majesty on high, who was thus, as he said, answering prayers, he had never ceased to put up, since the defection of *Ward* and the ruin of their church. We also found a man of colour who had once been under care of Presbytery, studying for the gospel ministry; but had been advised to give up his hopes in that respect. Him, we induced to return, and the Presbytery, was with difficulty persuaded to review its former decision in his case. But the result was the same, and after, perhaps a year of trial, the man was dropped. He is now residing in the city of New York, a regular-practitioner of medicine, and has also been ordained to the ministry by the Presbytery of New York. His name is *Wm. Lively*.

In the summer of the year 1833, the REV. S. GUILTEAU, came to Baltimore, at our solicitation, in part to look into the field of usefulness thus opened amongst our coloured population. He laboured for some time, and with much acceptance. Afterwards, the REV'D MR. MCGIMSEY, was with us, as a missionary of the Assembly's Board; and was, first and last, a year or two, here.

Some time in 1834, if our memory is correct, a church was organized with three ruling elders, and about thirty members; a place was hired for them to worship in; the Presbytery seemed interested in the subject; and our prospects, fair for great good. In addition to the direct effort through the church thus organized, there were two large and interesting sabbath schools, for coloured persons, under the care of members of the First and Second Presbyterian churches; the former of which had been some time in operation.

But just here, in the height of our hopes, our troubles began; and surely, a righteous God, has seen us to be in need of a sore trial of our faith, on this subject.

Some members of Presbytery found out, to their dismay, that in receiving this church of poor Africans, a great outrage had been committed, in calling it, merely, the *Fifth Presbyterian Church* (or whatever the number was); instead of calling it, *African*, or *Black*, or *Free Coloured*, or some such thing. The original naming had passed *sub silentio*; and the whole thing was of no consequence except that the poor blacks, were no wiser than the touchy whites; and an uproar was raised—which ended, in changing the name, and for a time, turning the hearts of the very people we wanted to benefit—into perfect bitterness. We remember with great tender-

ness, the noble stand taken by the late DR. NEVINS, on that trying occasion; and that he was the only clerical member of the body present, who acted with us. It is woful to what an extent men's passions and jealousies do some times blind them; and how much harm may be done, under the guise of a zeal for what is right.

Some time after this, *Samuel Douglas*, the elder mentioned above, was called to his rest. This was a great blow to the church.—Afterwards, one of the two elders remaining, left us, and joined the Episcopal church, and subsequently became a Baptist, and a follower of *Mr. Alexander Campbell*. All this was the more remarkable, as this man was raised in our communion, thoroughly indoctrinated in our principles, and seemed zealous and pious. It was the more hurtful also, as he was a man of sense, character and substance. His name was *Draper*, by trade a tobacconist; and he assigned as the principal reason of his withdrawal, the troubles in and concerning the church.

This leads to another part of our trials. A deacon of the 2d Presbyterian church, had put himself under the care of Presbytery, as a student of theology; and being a man of mature age, and the poor coloured people without a minister—he was allowed by Presbytery to take charge of them, and keep them together as well as he could. But afterwards, the Presbytery saw fit to tell this deacon, he had better give up all views of being a minister; and so at one blow, took away his hopes, and the principal spiritual instructor of the little church. It may be, this was, in itself right; we are sure most of those who did it, thought it was right; but it was a heavy blow to this already tottering cause; and was one of the things that disheartened and drove away *Draper*, and other influential persons. Another cause was singular; we will explain it.

We are at the best, poor, short-sighted mortals. Those who laboured and prayed for the success of this humble enterprize, were constantly hoping that God would raise up a man of colour to preach to his brethren. In the case of *Lively*, they hoped they had found the man; and after that mis-carriage—when God converted a man by the name of *Chase*, and he came to the Presbytery as a student of theology—then they were sure the time was come for a large increase. This man was a teacher of youth—well educated, sensible, and with uncommon gifts of public speaking. He was of unmixed African blood; and he no sooner began to rise to some consequence in the little congregation, the most influential of whom were mulattoes—than the same jealousies between those of pure black and those of the mixed race which have constantly manifested themselves elsewhere, broke out—and had nearly finished the remnant.—The result of *Chase's* case was also discouraging. While still under care of Presbytery, he received a call to a church in New Hampshire—which he accepted; was licensed and ordained at the north, lived there a few years, got into trouble, and returned to Maryland, a Congregationalist. If he had only been a licentiate, there was a door open here for him; but being ordained, and under such circumstances as to excite the fears of some—it was supposed that if he should be taken into full standing in the Presbytery—difficulties might arise which it would be

very troublesome to manage. He is now a teacher in Baltimore, and preaches, as he has opportunity.

This brings up the history to about the end of the fifth year of the enterprise—counting from the winter of 1833. About that time—say about four years ago—a young man, who was a journeyman in the dressing room of *Thomas Green*—one of our most respectable men of colour, professed to have experienced a change of heart; and after a time expressed a desire to preach the everlasting gospel. God seemed once more to remember us; and some took courage. But there were many circumstances to cause fear. The young man was poor; not of very robust constitution; had a small family; and what was worst of all, his business was unsuitable to his plans and hopes, and he had no other means of support. But he went resolutely forward. Some times he made one shift, some times another. Now he kept a boarding house; then drove a trade in pickled oysters; afterwards kept school.—Finally, by the kindness of Presbytery—and chiefly by the friendly aid of the REV'D MR. BACKUS, he finished his studies; was licensed to preach the gospel; was elected and ordained a ruling elder of our little "*First African, &c.*," and set to work, faithfully and earnestly, in his new vocation.

After he had thus laboured for a year or such a matter, he said to several friends, that he saw no fruit of his toil; and that it was strongly borne in upon his mind that he must emigrate; and British Guiana was the place, to which it seemed to him, God required him to go. After much meditation and consultation with friends, he opened his mind to the Presbytery.

Here was a new trial for our little church. And some felt it so strongly, and felt so much convinced that the duty of the man was to stay with it, that they expressed their decided opposition to his whole plan. Others, and they those who had done most, both for this church and this man, said no;—the Master's hand may be in this thing. It is indeed a new and serious trial for this little church; but, God is over all,—he will provide. And for the man himself—there are many reasons which lead to the conclusion that he is well qualified for the field he wishes to go to;—and many things make that field incomparably more important than this ever can be to him. To mention no other, it is the only foot-hold of Protestantism on the continent of South America; and it is precisely so situated as to be most available in operating upon the entire mass of the vast negro population of that immense region. So thought the Presbytery; and the man was ordained and sent forth; not empty—nor yet without believing prayer; but not otherwise than as an humble, obscure, and simple hearted man—following what seemed to be the guiding hand of God.

The letter which follows, is his own modest account of what his Lord and Master has done for him, in South America, up to the latest accounts from him. The communication is official, and therefore proper to be made public; and, as it seems to us, presents a case, which we might call one of romantic adventure, if it were not more proper to recognise and confess in it, the wonderful dealings of the ever blessed God.

ST. MARK'S PARISH, DEMARARA, NOV. 16, 1841.

*To the Moderator of the Presbytery of Baltimore.*

REV'D SIR,—Through you I have the honor to address the members of Presbytery, on a few topics in reference to my ministerial aspect in Guiana.

I arrived here on the 10th of January, 1841. On the 25th of that month I received an appointment by his Excellency, the Governor, to a missionary station under the Scotch Presbyterian church. Subsequently I was admitted into communion with that church, under the care of the Demarara and Essequibo Presbytery. After preaching for some weeks in the parish churches, I entered upon the duties of my missionary field of labour, which was large and white already to harvest. Indeed, it was said, I was the first minister who had preached there. In a short time the congregation numbered hundreds; and of not a few of them, I have reason to believe, the Lord has savingly blessed their souls. I continued to labour as a missionary, at a salary of \$700, (which the emoluments arising from baptisms and marriages made about \$1000) until the 4th of September, when I received an appointment from his Excellency, the Governor, to a parochial charge, at a salary of \$2,700 a year. The whole of British Guiana is divided into parochial districts, and held by the English and Scotch Presbyterian churches—which being the established churches, are supported by the civil government. Here the ministers of the established churches are allowed to charge two dollars for every certificate of baptism or of marriage. It being the custom, the people will not do without the certificate. Whilst a missionary, I alone have baptised upwards of a hundred, (besides the marriages,) in some cases receiving treble the price of a certificate; for such is the liberality of the people.

In justice to the clergy, I must say, (excepting a few who have turned to be my opponents)—they have treated me with great respect and Christian kindness.

Brethren, I feel that under God, I owe my present elevation to your generosity and Christian liberality. Yes, to the Presbytery of Baltimore, I am under great obligations for my present standing in society,—for the sphere in which I am now acting under God as a minister of the gospel.

My parish is about a hundred miles in extent, and six miles from Georgetown, the metropolis of British Guiana. I have an extensive house, with stable and out houses, five acres of ground, all inclosed. Each parish has a vestry constituted of gentlemen of the first standing in society. We also have a board of Elders; their duties are similar to those of the Presbyterian church of the United States. Here the white and coloured people indiscriminately sit together in church. But in society, gradation of rank seems to be founded on education, wealth, and moral worth. Nine-tenths of the population are coloured; many of them wealthy and highly polished, having been educated in Scotland by their fathers, who were white and wealthy planters. But the greater mass of the population are labourers of African descent, who are improving rapidly in the scale of morality and religion, and in the acquisition of property. Some have purchased whole estates. They pay a great regard to religion, and especially to the proper training and education of their children. Education is cheap; thirty three cents per month in rural districts. In my parish I have a catechist and four schools in active operation.

The ministers of the Scotch church, like the clergy of the church of England, officiate in bands and a gown. Perhaps it may appear strange to you, that I am quite a novelty in Guiana, from the fact, that I am a coloured man, and found competent to preach in an established church. The like was never known before in this colony.

In regard to my family, we are certainly very comfortably situated. Though we have been very sick, at present we are improving in health.

wish you individually and collectively great prosperity.

I have the honor to be your most humble and obedient servant.

JOHN WATTS.

Private letters, to several members of the Presbytery—breathe the same general spirit, and communicate additional particulars; all going to show, that this man, thus raised up by God, is in some important respects remarkably fitted for the station he fills; and that the station itself is one of extraordinary interest and importance.

It is when God permits us to look back along a series of providences, like these we have been recording—and plainly to see his hand at every step; that the heart most rejoices in the blessed and often unhopèd-for issues, to which he conducts us. It is when we are thus permitted to rejoice in the tokens of divine approval, shed upon toils which for a long time seemed to yield only tribulation; that the spirit most tenderly and most deeply feels, how sweet it is, to be enabled to be found faithful in the time of trial, and the day of small things. And are there no more poor children of Ham in our broad land, to be gathered up, watched over, borne with, and ministered to, by the dear children and ministers of Jesus? Is there not another poor *John Watts*, now pining in obscurity and poverty, or it may be, groaning under the load of his sins—that the great King, hath need of—and hath a place in store for—where he may be far more useful than we ever dared to hope? Yes, there are hundreds of just such cases—which, if we would but observe the leadings of providence, and humbly, diligently and faithfully follow them, would result in blessings—oh! how rich!

These things appear small—often mean—in their beginnings. But they are not so. We greatly doubt, if the Presbytery of Baltimore ever did a more important work, than to train *John Watts* for the parish of St. Marks. We much question, whether the greatest events of our own life, will have a more permanent consequence, than that accidental, night visit to the negroes' meeting house in East street.

Our little church is still held together—chiefly by the occasional services of a licentiate of the Presbytery. It is very feeble—but it has great and precious promises—and a high and mighty Saviour. Its trials have been neither few nor small. But that voice, at which heaven awakes to joy, and hell shudders with dread—has said '*fear not little flock.*' There hath been, assuredly, a blessing in it; God grant there may be yet a blessing for it. For our own part, we feel convinced that if it had a respectable place of worship—its permanent establishment might be considered as safe. Who will give the means for this? The least sum required would be about two thousand dollars.

---

PRESENT ASPECT OF THE TEMPERANCE REFORMATION.

*J. and H. G. Langley* of New York, have published a volume of 512 pages, with the title—"*Bacchus.—An Essay on the Nature, Causes and Cure of Intemperance*, by Ralph Barnes Grindrod, &c."—*Scofield* and *Vorrhees*, of the same city, have published—"*Anti-Bacchus.—An Essay on the Evils connected with the use of Intoxicating Drinks*. By the Rev'd B. Parsons, &c., pp. 360."—And *John Bogart*, Princeton, has published "*An Examination of the Essays, Bacchus and Anti-Bacchus, &c.*"—pp. 142, by the Rev. Dr. Maclean, of the College of New Jersey. Here are a thousand pages, of disputation on "*total abstinence*;" of which at least nine hundred—in our poor judgment—had better have been burnt than

printed. For, as it appears to us, such discussions have a far greater tendency to distract and divide the friends of the temperance reform—than to enlighten any body's mind, convince any body's judgment, win any body's heart, reform any body's life, or confirm any body's principles.

Here is in the world a great—an admitted—a horrible evil. The friends of God and man, to a certain extent begin to see the nature and cause of this dreadful scourge; and to combine for a concerted and efficient opposition to it. God smiles on their work, and they begin to reap the first fruits; when, lo! they fall out by the way—and instead of fighting the common enemy, turn their arms against each other. This is the simple truth, about all this '*tetotal*' controversy. Who ever may be most in fault about it—none, we fear, who have promoted it, have failed to do harm.

We have fought hard, in the ranks, for twelve years and upwards, in the great cause of *temperance*. During that time, we have seen a great deal to condemn, both in the principles and spirit of many of those who have been contending for the same general end, as ourselves. But we express our sense of the line of conduct, which it becomes the real friends of this great movement to adopt, in such circumstances, when we say—we have no doubt, the authors of the first two volumes named above, would have done far more good if they had bestowed their strength in labouring against the common foe, rather than in covertly attacking a large and efficient body of their fellow-soldiers; and that their reviewer, also, would have done far more for his generation, by using the time employed in setting forth all this show of learning, in some form at once direct and unequivocal—for the great cause.

It is not to be disguised that this division in the temperance ranks, have done harm—great harm; and it is to be found, that its harm is not done to the cause of temperance alone. Principles, whose importance, to say the least, is equal to any upon which the temperance cause rests its claims, have been involved in these discussions;—and, unless the great body of the sober-minded, who favour our cause, can be united in discountenancing the excesses of some, the whole movement will ultimately become tainted.

We take it to be an intolerable outrage, and to be placed in the fore-front of all these unhappy excesses—that men and bodies, having no sort of warrant from God—should set themselves to discussing and settling, the nature and form, of fundamental principles of Christian doctrine and discipline.—What have temperance lecturers, agents, newspapers, books, or societies, *as such*, to do with the Sacrament of the Lord's supper, the holiest rite of our divine religion?

Again; we are pained to see and hear, and that not unfrequently, attempts made to establish principles of scriptural interpretation—which are supremely ridiculous; principles, which involve the overthrow of some of the clearest and most important doctrines of the Bible, and even implicate the personal character of the Lord Jesus. It is hardly a sufficient excuse for the impiety of such principles, that those who adopt them,—are, through ignorance or inconsiderateness,—not aware of their scope.

About this question of the use of wine. It seems to us, he must be a bold—and if not an ignorant, a bad man, who pronounces that to be immoral, or even unlawful—which is sanctified by the first miracle, and involved in obedience to the last command of Jesus of Nazareth. But on the other hand, is there not absolute proof that *all wines* in common use in America, are adulterated with distilled spirits; and is there not just as good an argument for brandy and water, as for brandy and grape juice? And again, is not the argument which Paul puts about the use of meats, absolutely conclusive against the use of wine,—even pure wine—in similar circumstances? Then why need there be any strife on this matter? Is there not a broad enough platform for *total abstinence*, as a *fact* to be agreed in,—without so much effort to force men into the admission that this duty, which all are ready to admit—rests upon this or the other basis? As *temperance men*, the *abstinence* is all we have a right to require; and therefore all that need be discussed: for even an infidel may be a member of a temperance society, of the strictest sort.

It seems to us, moreover, that this *learned* method of arriving at the true principles of Christian liberty or duty, by turning aside from the plain word of God and its general current, into disquisitions on profane authorities, is never happy; and on questions essentially practical, and peculiarly requiring to be treated in a popular manner—is quite useless. Moreover, even for the learned, the thing, if done at all—should be done with more care and less ostentation.

We are ready to place the learning and fidelity of Dr. Maclean, above the standard of either of the men whose volumes he reviews; but in the only two instances in which we have taken the trouble to consult his authorities, we find his citations leaving something to be demanded—that more labour would have supplied. Thus as to Heroditus; he says (p. 14) that the “grossly licentious scenes witnessed” at “the yearly feast in honor of Diana at Bubastos,” recorded in Heroditus ii. 60, prove that the *οἶνος ἀμπελίνος*—was not “the fresh juice of the grape.” But the fact is, that scenes equally indecent and more violent, are recorded in 48 and 63—in cases where no intimation exists, that any thing was drunk; and those mentioned by Heroditus, in the very place cited, occurred, as he clearly states, *before the drinking began*; and surely, the *quantity* of drink used, is sufficiently accounted for by the fact, that in the same paragraph, the author quotes the number of men and women present, exclusive of children—at seven hundred thousand. It is clear that the wine used was not “fresh juice” in any proper sense; for Heroditus asserts, (ii. 77,) that the Egyptians “*have no vines*,” and therefore could hardly have fresh grape juice enough to gorge seven hundred thousand persons, every year, at a single one of their numerous divine feasts; but still, neither the place cited, nor the mode of criticism proves this; and to prove such things is one great end of the Review.

So of *Philo Judæus*; who is quoted on pp. 83–4, to show that *οἶνος*, (*wine*) in his vocabulary meant an intoxicating drink; and a long, and we think, hardly conclusive extract, is made from his

Treatise on *Drunkenness*, to prove this. If any extraneous testimony is important to show the sense of words in our Saviour's age, that of Philo is; and that for reasons, so well known to the learned, that we will not take time and space to record them here. And Philo's testimony is not only precise, but it is to be found in the tractate next before the one cited by Dr. Maclean. Our edition of Philo's works, is that of 1554, Paris, folio,—in Latin, by Segismund Gelenius. In the second book, *De Plantatione Noe*, p. 154, he asserts, that as *sagitta, telum, spiculum*, all mean a thing shot from a bow; as *palmula, remus*, both mean a thing used in navigation instead of a sail, &c. &c.; so also, *merum, vinum, temetum*, are all names of the same drink,—whether it be called *pure wine, wine, or strong wine*. Nay on the very page quoted from by Dr. M., Philo asserts that Moses did not mean a *single thing, by merum, (pure wine,)* but many things; viz.: "madness, stupidity, stupor of all the senses, insatiable desire," &c. &c. From which, it must be confessed, that *pure wine*, allowed by God in his holy word, to be used by many persons, on many occasions,—was of a highly intoxicating nature; a fact, which no plain man who reads his Bible ever doubted: but at the same time, it is equally clear, and on the same proof, that to contend too strenuously for the use of this liberty, may be contending for that, which others will use, to enormous sin and folly; and therefore every plain man, who follows Christ, or even Paul, should take care, not to be found doing so. Indeed Philo himself, in another tractate quoted by Dr. M., uses as forcible language against all use of wine, as any moderate man could desire. After saying—not as Dr. M. understands him, that the restriction to Aaron and his sons, was expressly "limited to the time during which the priests were engaged in the discharge of their sacred functions,"—but rather that *while so engaged, they were thus prohibited*—and that for reasons which he gives; he uses these remarkable words, "wherefore the use of wine is considered, in all respects, unprofitable to life, seeing that it oppresses the mind, blunts the senses, and finally burdens the body," &c.—*Philonis Judæi. &c., De Monarchia, Lib. Pri, p. 517.*

There is one extremely striking aspect of this temperance reformation, which was manifested nearly two years ago, and which has imparted a new interest to the subject, and infused a new energy into the great movement. We allude to the Baltimore movement amongst the reformed drunkards, and its fruits. We have attended carefully to the progress and effects of this singular underplot in our great drama; and have taken some pains to know the origin of the extraordinary impulse. We believe there is no doubt, that a club of six regular and hard drinkers,—impelled, they hardly knew how—did spontaneously resolve, in the very house to which they had long resorted, to form themselves into a temperance association; and from that moment, have laboured with an energy, an eloquence, and a success, before that, unknown in this cause, or almost any other, of merely human origin. On the first anniversary, of the formation of this society, we saw about five thousand persons walk through the streets of Baltimore—under their banners; of which number fifteen hundred, were said to be reformed drunkards.

There is doubtless something to object to, and perhaps oftentimes, in the sayings and doings of these men. Habitually, perhaps, there is too much disposition to celebrate what they have accomplished—rather than to mourn over what they have been; to consider that there is great merit in being sober, rather than that there is great sin in being drunken. We have also observed, with pain, that too much emphasis is given to the wonder-working power of the *pledge*—any pledge; and that too little attention is paid to the fact, well known to all the old workers in this field—that all pledges are very slender holds upon an unsanctified conscience. And we remark, as a very curious commentary upon the strife about the nature of the pledge, and even the nature of the reasons, that shall incline us to take it,—yea, and the duty even of putting the reasons, in the pledge; that these reformed drunkards put into their pledge—nothing against making, nor even selling spirits; so that keepers, even of tippling houses—might be, and were members of this *total* society; their pledge being only against *drinking*. Yet with this, and God's blessing, they have moved the whole nation.

Some of their speakers are, no doubt, eloquent men. But the secret of their success, and of the profound emotion they excite—is not that. This is it; they just get up and tell, each man his own case. His temptations, his vices, his sufferings, his misery—his degradation—his reformation, his present state. And every such story, presents a leaf in the book of human wo—which no sober man had ever read before—no virtuous man had imagined—no drunkard had supposed would ever be written. Wherever these things are set before society,—men stand appalled; and it is inconceivable that such things should not be followed, by instantaneous and tremendous results. It is a new mode of concentrating an overwhelming public sentiment, and pouring it in a stream of light, down into the very darkest depths of the stews, the kennels, the gutters of society. We have no doubt, that one speech of *Jack Hawkins*, or *Pollard*, or half a dozen others, would produce more effect, than *Philo* and *Heroditus* could unitedly produce in ten years, if they were back in the flesh, and talked just as they wrote. As a *temperance* affair, then, what a perfect farce is it, in so plain and so practical a matter, for Mr. Grindrod and Mr. Parsons to pother a question like this, with attempts to prove by scraps of second-hand learning, that *sweet must* would keep from the vintage in the end of summer, till the celebration of the passover next spring—without fermenting, and without having latent alcohol in it? And, as a *temperance* affair, how needless for Dr. Maclean to “fash his beard” in an attempt to prove that the pure wines of Palestine were in fact, intoxicating; when the practical question with us is, whether *our* wines which are known to be mixed with distilled spirits, are not in fact, obnoxious to every pledge of every society that condemns the drinking of brandy?

How far the church of God is authorized to go, in dealing with her members, in order to put an end to drunkenness, and the train of horrors that follow it;—is a question of great importance, and some difficulty. We suppose it is very clear that drunkenness is a

sin; and if so, all connivance at it on the part of the church, is sinful; and all countenance given to it, much more, all temptation held out to provoke it, by church members, is sinful too. Then the only question left is, what shall be considered connivance, countenance, temptation? This, we take it, is a point on which the church courts must be left to decide, in each particular case—by the facts of it and the light of general principles; and these decisions, as they are successively rendered, will form the body of special rules governing the subject. So that if our system were faithfully carried out, its own action would furnish a perpetual stream of light, shed forward upon its own advancing steps.

It is certainly a most deplorable thing, that even unconverted men, yea, men long degraded by vice—should have more light, and act more righteously on this subject, than many old professors of religion—nay, than many office-bearers in the kingdom of God! Alas! that while reformed drunkards are striving to make men sober—Christ's servants should be recklessly making them drunk! What a reflection for a dying bed, this will be—"There would have been fewer drunkards and more sober men in the world—if I had never lived."—We could not face the king of terrors, with that fearful truth brunt into our heart.—Reader have you yet to experience the luxury, as you enter the restored home of the reformed drunkard—of hearing his little ones, shout your name with boisterous delight—of seeing his wife's eyes fill with tears as she looks upon you,—of having his honest grasp wring your hand convulsively? Now believe us—if there were no crown beyond Jordan—the good these things will do your soul here—is more than you have any idea of,—if you never tried it. Make the experiment—for the sake of your own peace.

---

SOME ACCOUNT OF THE LATE REV. JOHN H. REDINGTON, WITH PARTS OF HIS CORRESPONDENCE, AND ILLUSTRATIVE NOTES THEREON.

*Article First.*

THIS holy man, ceased from his labours in the church below,—at Moscow, Livingston Co., New York, on the 15th of September, 1841. If he had lived to the 22d of the month, he would have completed his forty-first year. Having been licensed to preach the gospel in April, 1834—and ordained in August, 1835, his service was short, and his release early. But the work to which God called him, and the manner in which he was enabled by divine grace to perform it, were such, as to entitle him to the lasting admiration and grateful remembrance of his brethren.

What immediately follows, is nearly the whole of an article published in the *Presbyterian*, of Philadelphia, shortly after his death; it was evidently written by some friend at Moscow, familiar with his history, and having access to authentic sources of information.

"His early death, I need not inform you, has filled us with the most poignant grief, for he was a most devoted servant of the Lord Jesus, and

firm as a rock in the maintenance of Bible truth. He has been singularly useful as an instrument in God's hand, in this region of our land, in arresting the prevailing influence of error and ungodliness. How his loss can be supplied, I know not; for his wonderful activity, his fervent zeal, his unceasing labours of body and mind, his faithfulness, prayerfulness, and manly courage, made us reckon him our right arm, when pure and undefiled religion was at stake.

I do not know a more valuable service that could be rendered to our church in this interesting region than to publish his memoirs, select sermons, and extracts from the copious and beautiful diary, which he regularly kept.\*

He was born in the town of Madrid, St. Lawrence county, New York, on the 22d of September, 1800, and for nearly twenty eight years he lived a prayerless man, without hope and without God in the world. In June, 1828, he first began in earnest to search the Scriptures, to pray and to seek after God and Christ. In the following November, he united himself to the church in Troy, New York, over which Dr. Beman presided; having lived in that city for the two preceding years. Respecting that important step, he writes in his journal, April, 1835, "From that day to this, by the same grace of God which induced me to begin, I have continued to seek for salvation. It has pleased the Lord to lead me in a way which I knew not.—Yea dark and perplexing have been most of my passages hitherto; yet I am bound to give eternal thanks to the ever blessed name of God through Christ Jesus, for all His unspeakable goodness and mercy to me a miserable sinner, ever since I have lived a being upon earth; and particularly for what He has taught me, and done for me, since I began to seek his face.—Little as I know of God, and of Christ, and his ways, yet would I not exchange that little for the price of ten thousand worlds." A short time previous to his death, when asked if he ever during his long illness doubted in the great doctrines he had preached; with much earnestness he exclaimed, "No, never, I am ready and willing to-risk my everlasting all upon them."

In January, 1832, he became a member of Auburn Theological Seminary; and pursuing only a course of English studies, it was regularly terminated at the anniversary exercises, August 20th, 1834. He was licensed to preach the Gospel by the Cayuga Presbytery, in the preceding April, and in his Diary, April 22d, of the following year, he mentions that on every Sabbath, except one, besides on many week-days, he had preached God's message to dying men. "But alas, alas, I find myself altogether insufficient for this mighty work, as thou Lord knowest; yet thanks be to thy name, O my God, thou hast evidently girded me for this work far above my expectations," &c. He continued to attend at Auburn till April 25th, 1835, and in the various places where he ministered, appeared to have been received with much acceptance. His first discourse at Moscow

\*We sincerely concur in this opinion; and hope some hand worthy and capable of such a work—will be permitted to illustrate and adorn it, with a faithful and comprehensive account of the rise, progress, and fruits of those excesses, disorders, and heresies, in Western New York, which led to the Reform of 1837, and the Schism of 1838. When the Sermons of the late DR. FOOTE, were about to be put to press—we earnestly interceded with his widow, who consulted us about it—to have this important service to truth, as well as to the memory of that worthy man, performed in connection with a memoir of him, to accompany that volume. And we are sure a grosser injustice, of its kind, was never committed, than to allow a New School editor, to gloss over important acts of Dr. Foote's life and ministry, in order to serve a bad cause; and in our view, this was rather aggravated than mitigated, by the fact, that the editor was his brother. We trust in God, that a similar outrage, will not occur, in the case of Mr. Redington; but that on the contrary, the occasion thus presented, by God's providence, will be used to spread before the world, and to preserve for posterity the extent of the necessity which was laid on the Presbyterian church, to do all she has done from 1837 to the present time. It will be seen, in the course of this notice, that Mr. Redington's chief anxiety was, that enough had not been, and would not be done.—[ED.]

appears to have been delivered May 10th, 1835, from Isa. lv. 7; and the last day he officiated in public, he addressed his people from Isa. xxvi. 3: "Thou wilt keep in perfect peace," &c. He received ordination from the Presbytery of Ontario, at Dansville, in August, 1835, and with the exception of an interval of eight months, which he spent in Vermont, and certain sabbaths which were devoted to missionary labours, &c., he continued to serve the altar in that place where the Lord first stationed him. His services would have been gladly engaged in many other places; and offers were repeatedly made to him. But he was much attached to the little flock over which he laboured; and when his character and usefulness were most highly appreciated, it was the will of God to paralyze his strength, and lay him in the dust.

The part which Mr. Redington took in the memorable proceedings of 1837, led to an unhappy division in his congregation, to the loss of many of his best friends, and to a series of trials, such as few men have experienced. In the midst of his difficulties, the Lord sustained and directed him; for he "stayed himself on his God." His diary, written at this time, breathes a most pious, forgiving, and submissive spirit; at a period when he suffered much, and laboured zealously, in the cause of his Redeemer. The majority of his people adhered to him. The Presbytery of Caledonia was constituted, chiefly through his devotedness. Other ministers and congregations came nobly to his aid. In his missionary zeal he was the means of planting several promising congregations; and at the last meeting of Presbytery, which he attended, after an interesting statement of all that had been done, and was in prospect in this region of our country, he moved that steps be taken for the formation of a new Synod, in connexion with the General Assembly. In the opinion of the majority of his brethren, the time for this important measure had not yet come; but if we have not lost our zeal, and God's favour, when our lamented brother passed to glory, the time is fast approaching when such a consummation of our wishes may be prudently effected.

Mr. Redington was twice married. His first wife died in December, 1836, after a short and happy union of little more than three years. The fruits of this marriage, were an interesting boy and girl, who survive him, but too young to know their loss. In March, 1841, he again married, and his amiable and afflicted companion, who tenderly watched over him in his protracted sickness, would now be inconsolable, were it not for the help of God, ever present with his people in their day of need.—Among his papers, are five solemn covenants, made or renewed at different periods of his ministry, which manifest a spirit of holy resolution, with all his heart and strength to walk with God.

It appears that he scarcely suffered a single day to pass, without perusing a large portion of the Holy Scriptures. The whole of the New Testament, indeed, and much of the Old, he had committed to memory. Morning, noon, and night, he would hold communion with his God, and unburden every thought of his mind at a throne of grace. Several hours every day, were spent in his closet; and when others had retired to rest, or before day-light had appeared, his voice could be heard in fervent prayer, imploring mercy. Yet of all this he made no ostentation. He was a truly modest, humble, and holy man. "He was an Israelite indeed, in whom there was no guile." All his actions seemed to be dictated by the voice of conscience; and this at times made some who knew him not, imagine him to be unduly stiff, and unyielding in his character. But every step he took appears to have been preceded by prayer, and after God's direction had been earnestly implored. A mind thus prepared, is not prone to yield. But convince him that mistaken motives of duty had led him astray, and no man was more willing to retrace his footsteps. He only wished to know the will of God, that he might follow it. His means were limited, but his charities were very many, and beyond his ability to bear.

Where he had not the earthly abundance to relieve distress when it occurred, he would spare no labour of body or mind to assuage a mourner's grief. The bed of sickness—the young of his flock—the feeble minded—the broken hearted, called forth a large portion of his time, and his kindest regards. He was patient of injuries, and forgiving towards enemies; for some times the ardour of his zeal in some men's estimation, carried him so far as to give offence. But his love to souls, and his Master's honour, were dearer far to him than the ease, the applause, or the abundance of this earth. He first began to droop in the beginning of April, and continued daily becoming weaker, though still officiating in his own pulpit, till the 16th of May last. His illness was greatly aggravated by his anxiety to do his duty when his feeble state of body required rest. He had occasionally short seasons of relief, which inspired the hope of his recovery, and he felt anxious himself to live. At first his complaint seemed to have a trying effect on his temper; but soon his Christian spirit quenched it, and he became gentle as a lamb, and meekly submissive to the will of God. When the issue of his complaint became no longer doubtful, he longed earnestly to depart. On being asked a short time before his death, if his future prospects were bright, he replied, "I have peace, I trust in the Lord, I am holding on upon his covenant; I am waiting for my change. It comes rather slow; but the Lord will give me patience." Upon being asked if he had any thing to say to some of the friends, who would soon be as sheep without a shepherd, he replied, "stand fast in the faith; I have the most entire confidence in the doctrines I have taught.—They are the foundation of my hope. Stand fast in the faith." As he drew near his end, on the morning of the 15th of September, his strength was utterly exhausted, and he had no desire to converse much; but he continued to speak words of comfort to the mourners around his sick bed, and to assure them of his good hope, and abundant peace. He retained his faculties till near the last, and calmly yielded up his spirit into the hands of that Redeemer, in whom was all his confidence.

The following is the editorial notice (by REV. DR. ENOLES,) of the foregoing article, and of the subject of it; it is taken from the same number of the *Presbyterian*.

"REV. J. H. REDINGTON.—In another part of our paper may be found an interesting obituary of this devoted minister of Christ. We knew him well, and esteemed him highly.—Shortly after his entrance upon the ministry, and while in the state of Vermont, we received a letter from him, then an entire stranger to us, in which he expressed a deep sympathy for the truth for which the Orthodox were then contending, and to the knowledge of which he appears to have arrived, under the most unfavourable circumstances, by earnest prayer and study of the Scriptures. This led to a further correspondence, which was occasionally continued until near the time of his last sickness. Few perhaps have endured more for conscience sake than our dear departed brother. Settled within the excinded region, and surrounded by those who were utterly hostile to his views of divine truth, it required no ordinary courage to stand forth alone, and at the risk of being immediately displaced from his pastoral charge, to declare his attachment to the orthodox party. Yet he did it, in a noble and Christian spirit, which neither vaunted its sacrifices, nor sunk under them. Although his discouragements were many, he persevered, and had the pleasure of seeing the good work prospering around him, not only in his own church, but in the formation of several Presbyteries. Mr. Redington, was educated in the new divinity, and his abandonment of it was from conviction. We have seldom known any one whose mind was so thoroughly imbued with the truths of the Holy Scriptures, or who was so familiar with the duty of prayer. In the death of such a man, the church sustains a loss, but his

work was accomplished, and we cannot venture to say that he died too soon. While others are left to toil in the vineyard, he has entered upon his blessed reward, and could he address them audibly from heaven, his admonition would still be, "stand fast in the faith."

We adopt, without hesitation, every approving sentence in these statements. We knew Mr. Redington, well—admired him much—loved him tenderly. An acquaintance formed with him, in the midst of the agitations of the church, and becoming more and more intimate as we became mutually more thoroughly informed of each other's views and principles,—ripened into the firmest friendship. It is one of the sweet memorials of the way by which God has led us—that, if we have often had occasion to mourn over the weaknesses and sins of those from whom we had reason to look for better things; we have also often found their deserted posts and neglected duties more than supplied by better and nobler men—whom God has raised up, as the occasion demanded. Thus it was, precisely, with this true-hearted, single-minded, servant of Christ. At the very moment, and on the very theatre, when the interests of truth were most endangered; this man was called by the ever blessed God, to stand forth, the witness for his truth, in the midst of the open apostacy of some, the self-seeking cowardice of others, the weak vacillation of others—in Western New York. And truly and faithfully, did he execute his Master's bidding.—We unhesitatingly affirm, that in our opinion, no man, in the borders of our wide communion; no man, amid the hundreds who have passed through fiery furnaces amongst us within the last twelve years; no man, of all who have done and suffered many things for Christ's sake—in these latter trials by false brethren; of all these—not one has exhibited, in a more extraordinary manner, that noble devotedness to truth which constitutes so large a part of Christian excellence, and that rare and remarkable moral courage, which is amongst the highest endowments of our rational nature,—than this humble and obscure man. God grant, that this noble example—of one faithful amid many faithless—of one firm amid many faltering—of one true amid many false; God grant that this example—precious at all times—may not now be lost to a communion—which above all others, ought to know how to cherish and revere it.

In the month of May, 1837, a "Convention of Presbyterian Ministers and Ruling Elders"—appointed by various Presbyteries and orthodox minorities of Presbyteries, was organized in the city of Philadelphia, the week before the meeting of the General Assembly. The Committee appointed by the minority of the Assembly of 1836, had recommended the assembling of this Convention. In the autumn of 1831 a Convention of Delegates from the Presbyteries in the Mississippi Valley, had met at Cincinnati; and in the spring of 1835, a Convention delegated by Presbyteries which approved the *Act and Testimony*, met at Pittsburg; so that this Convention of 1837—was the third of those great movements—which in despite of the opposition and misrepresentation of some timid and over scrupulous but influential persons—bore so great part in the deliverance of the church. The body of which we now

speak, was composed of representatives from 64 Presbyteries and parts of Presbyteries. It is curious, in looking over the list of their names—to consider what the brief period of five years has produced; it is striking also, and very solemn. Of the four officers of the Convention, Dr. Baxter of Va., the president, Mr. Baird of Pa., and Mr. Pratt, of Georgia—the recording and reading clerks—are gone; Dr. Cuyler, of Phila., the vice-president, alone, remains. Some of the members, too, have fallen on sleep; more, perhaps, than we have had the means of knowing; but besides the name of Redington, we observe that of Crane. Some, too, have made shipwreck, of what is better than life—faith itself. Mr. C. W. Howard of Georgia, one of the most virulent haters and public revilers of our men and measures—was a member of that Convention. If we had ever felt any desire to visit his mis-deeds upon him for his public and personal attempts to injure us and our church; the reading of this list of names, and the remembrance of what he pretended to be, or if he was sincere—of what he has fallen from—would have cured it. On the 4th page of the printed Minutes of that Convention is this singular and characteristic entry. “*Mr. Redington, from the Presbytery of Ontario, appeared and was admitted as constituting the only minority of his Presbytery favourable to the Convention.*”

It was at this Convention, that we made the acquaintance of Mr. Redington. He has mentioned to us more than once, that such was his desire to attend this body, to meet, face to face, brethren whom he loved, having never seen—to become personally acquainted with men who held his own views of divine truth, and to confer with those whom he judged wiser than himself; that he had made up his mind—to walk, if necessary, from Moscow to Philadelphia. In the course of the proceedings of the body, he was called on in his order and place, to give some account of the state of things in his region and field of labour; a mode of obtaining minute and extensive information—at once simple and faithful.—Before this, he had taken no part—as far as we can remember—in our proceedings. The account he gave, and the manner in which he gave it—of himself, his work, his trials, his views of truth and duty, his desires and purposes—made so deep an impression on our mind and heart, that we sought, from that moment, his friendship and an interest in his prayers.

It is not so much our purpose, to speak of this excellent man, as to let him speak for himself. One of the profoundest observers of human nature, has put into the mouth of one of his most highly conceived characters, these striking words, uttered, too, when nothing but conviction escapes us—“*Speak, that I may know thee.*” If any man is ever known, it is, perhaps, in his familiar correspondence—with those he trusts, and upon subjects that deeply interest him. His letters begin soon after the Convention of 1837—and reach nearly to the end of their author's life. They speak with much freedom of men and things; but always with a kind spirit and a respectful temper. They occasionally present persons and subjects in a light, which we always thought too favourable; sometimes the reverse. There are certain passages which, some

may think an excusable weakness on our part would have led us to suppress; and others whose publication may appear hardly consistent with becoming modesty.

Two things have decided us, to publish these letters. *First*—they show in a remarkable manner, the light in which, the sincerely humble, earnest, prayerful, and God-fearing people in our communion—viewed its condition before, during and since its reform; and what estimate such people, of whom this man was a sample, put on the men and measures, that, by God's blessing, brought about that deliverance. *Secondly*—they contain the testimony of an enlightened, honest, fearless man—who loved God and his truth, and was willing to do and be all things for his name's sake; rendered, from personal and certain knowledge, through a course of years—as to the general state of doctrine, practice and order, of those "600 ministers, 60,000 Christians," &c. &c., of whose purity and orthodoxy, as well as their oppression and persecution so much has been written. For us personally, at least—these letters furnish a triumphant proof, that we have not acted, in our past troubles, without the testimony, the applause, the love, of the best men that best knew the facts. One who sat under the ministry of *Dr. Beaman*, studied the holy oracles at the feet of *Dr. Richards*, laboured and died, in the heart of the "burnt district"—in Western New York, and all this during the rise, progress, and maturity of those heresies and disorders, that had nearly ended in the ruin of our church; one thus trained, and yet by the wonder-working grace of God, kept fast to his heavenly truth—utters from his *apôtre*—a voice well deserving to be heard and pondered.—Alas! for us, that this voice, so true and so intrepid, so kind and so faithful—will be heard no more. Alas! for us, that one by one, the tender, and trusted, and tried ones—are snatched from our side; and the grave fed with the noblest in our ranks. Alas! for Zion—that her good and her great, fall thickly around her bulwarks, even while tempests blacken around her.

---

THE FUNERAL OF THE MASS.\*

CHAPTER I.—Concerning the exposition of these words, "This is my Body."

THE Romanists are wont to tell us, that these words of Jesus Christ, *This is my body*, are so clear to prove the real presence of Christ's body in the Host, and consequently to prove transubstantiation (or the substantial conversion of the bread into Christ's body) that they are amazed we cannot perceive so manifest a truth. Against which I form this argument: He that speaks contrary to the usage of all the world, and takes words otherwise than all other men do, must, without doubt, speak very obscurely: but if Jesus Christ, by these words, *This is my body*, had meant the real presence of

---

\*From the French of M. De Roden; first published at Nismes, in Languedoc, where he was Prof. Royal of Philosophy, about the middle of the seventeenth century.

his body in the Host, (as the Romish Doctors assert,) and consequently had meant the substantial conversion of the bread into his body, he had spoken contrary to the common usage of all the world, and hath taken the words otherwise than all other men do, which I thus prove. There was never any author, either sacred or profane, that made use of such words as these, *This is my body*, to signify the substantial conversion of one thing into another; or to signify the real presence of a thing immediately after the pronouncing of them, and not before. On the contrary, there was never any man that did not use them to signify, that the thing was already that which it was said to be. For example;—when God the Father, speaking of Jesus Christ, said, *This is my beloved Son*, it is certain that Jesus Christ was the Son of God before God said it: and in common usage it is never said this is that, except the thing be so before it is said to be so. For example; we do not say *this is a table*, before that, which we mean by the word *this*, be a table. Therefore it is contrary to the common style of all authors, as well sacred as profane, and contrary to the common usage of all men, to make these words of Jesus Christ, *this is my body*, to signify the substantial conversion of the bread into Christ's body, and the real presence of his body in the Host immediately after the pronouncing of them by the priest, and not before. Seeing then that Jesus Christ, when he said, *this is my body*, did not speak contrary to the common usage of all the world, and did not take the words otherwise than all other men do, it necessarily follows that these words of Jesus Christ, *this is my body*, do not signify the substantial conversion of the bread into Christ's body, nor the real presence of Christ's body in the Host immediately after the priest hath pronounced them, and not before. And this being so, the Romish doctors must seek some other passage of Scripture than this, *this is my body*, to prove such a conversion, and such a presence; and, seeing they can find none, I conclude that such a conversion and such a presence have no foundation in holy Scripture.

2. That which I have said concerning common usage is founded on this reason, viz., because things must be before there can be any image, picture, or representation of them, and consequently images are after the things, whereof they are images: but words are the images of conceptions, and conceptions the images of things; therefore things are such before we can really conceive them to be such, and we conceive them to be such, before we can say they are such. Therefore that which Jesus Christ held, and gave to his disciples, expressed by the word *this*, was his body, before he conceived that it was his body, and he conceived that it was his body, before he said, *this is my body*; and, consequently, it is not by virtue of these words, *this is my body*, that that which Jesus Christ gave to his disciples, expressed by the word *this*, was his body; but rather it is by blessing the bread, or thanksgiving, that the bread was made the body of Christ, because it was made the sacrament of it. Whence it follows that these words, *this is my body*, must be expounded thus, *this bread is my body*; and these words, *this bread is my body*, must be expounded thus, *this bread is the sacrament of my body*; which I prove thus:

3. A proposition must be expounded according to the nature of the thing in question; for example; if a man, pointing at the king's person, should say, *this is the king*, the proposition must be expounded thus, *this is the king's person*, because the king's person is meant: but if a man, coming into a painter's shop, and pointing at the king's picture, should say, *this is the king*, the proposition must be expounded thus, *this is the king's picture*; because here his picture is meant. Even so if Jesus Christ, laying his hand on his breast, had said, *this is my body*, we must without doubt have understood the proposition concerning his real body, and not concerning the sign or sacrament of it; because his very body had been then meant, and not the sign or sacrament of it: but Jesus Christ, being about to institute the Eucharist, and to that end, having taken bread, blessed it, and given it to his disciples with these words, *take eat, this is my body*, it is evident that they must be understood of the sacrament of his body, and the proposition must be expounded thus, *this is the sacrament of my body*, because here the sacrament of his body is meant. And seeing a sacrament is a visible sign of an invisible grace, as the Council of *Trent* saith, in its sixth session, it is evident that this proposition, *this is my body*, being expounded by this, *this is the sacrament of my body*, may be expounded thus, *this is the sign of my body*; which I confirm thus:

4. In these two propositions, *this is my body*, *this cup is the New Testament in my blood*, the word [*is*] must be taken in the same sense, because they are alike, having been pronounced upon the same matter, viz., the one upon one part of the Sacrament, and the other upon the other part of it; and because of like things we must give a like judgment. But in this proposition, *this cup is the New Testament*, the word [*is*] is not taken for a real and transubstantiated being; but for a sacramental and significative being; because neither the cup, nor that which is in the cup, is changed into a Testament; neither is it really and properly a Testament, but the Sacrament of the New Testament. Therefore in this proposition likewise, *this is my body*, the word [*is*] is not taken for a real and transubstantiated being; but for a sacramental and significative being: and consequently as this proposition, *this cup is the New Testament*, must be expounded thus; the wine that is in the cup is the sign and sacrament of the New Testament: so this proposition, *this is my body*, must be expounded thus, this bread is the sign and sacrament of my body. Whence it follows that in one single proposition of Jesus Christ in the institution of the sacrament of the Eucharist, viz., *this cup is the New Testament*, there are two figures, one in the word *cup*, being taken for that which is in the cup; this is a figure called a *metonymy*, whereby the thing containing is taken for the thing contained; the other figure is, that the cup is called the New Testament: this is also a figure called a *metonymy*, whereby the sign is called by the name of the thing signified. And therefore the *Romish* Doctors are mistaken when they tell us that all that Jesus Christ said when he instituted the Eucharist, must be taken literally, and without a figure. But withal we must not imagine that Jesus Christ spake obscurely, because he spake figuratively, these figures and manners of speech, being commonly and familiarly used by all the world.

5. But when we say that these words, *this is my body, this is my blood*, must be expounded thus; this bread is the sign and sacrament of my body, this wine is the sign and sacrament of my blood, we do not mean that the bread and wine are barely and simply signs of Christ's body and blood: but we believe that the bread and wine in the Eucharist are signs that do exhibit the body and blood of Christ to believers: for when they do, by the mouth of the body, receive the bread and wine of the Eucharist, they do at the same time, by the mouth of the soul, viz., by faith, receive the body of Christ broken, and his blood shed for the remission of their sins, as will be proved in the next chapter.

6. Add hereunto this one argument: when a man saith that a thing is such, if it be not such, during the whole time which he employs in saying it is such, he makes a false proposition. For example, when a man saith that a wall is white, if it be not white, during the whole time he employs in saying it is white, he makes a false proposition. But (according to the *Romish* Doctors,) when Jesus Christ said, *this is my body*, it was not his body during the whole time which he employed in saying *this is my body*; for, they say it was his body afterward only: therefore, according to the *Romish* doctors, Jesus Christ uttered a false proposition: which being blasphemous to affirm, we must lay down this for a foundation, that that which Jesus Christ gave his disciples when he said, *this is my body*, was his body, not only after he had said it, but also while he was saying it, and before he said it. And here we have this advantage of those of the *Romish* church, that we believe the truth of these words of Jesus Christ, *this is my body*, much better than they do; because they believe it at one time only, viz., after he had said it; but we believe it at three several times, viz., before he said it, when he was saying it, and after he had said it. But here some may object that we must not take the words of our Lord in too rigorous a sense, and that in these words, *this is my body*, we must take the present tense for the next future, and then the sense will be this, this will immediately be my body. To which I answer, that the *Romish* doctors will have us take these words, *this is my body*, in the rigour of the literal sense, and then the proposition is evidently false. I know that the present tense may be taken for the next future, as when Jesus Christ said, *I go to my Father, and to your Father; I go to my God, and to your God*: that is, I shall go speedily. But who can be so bold and ignorant as to affirm that this speech is without a figure, seeing all grammarians know that it is a figure called *enallage* of time? Therefore the *Romish* doctors must confess, that by their own doctrine this proposition of Jesus Christ, *this is my body*, is either false or figurative, and that seeing it is not false, it must be figurative, and that the figure must be a *metonymy*, whereby the sign takes the name of the thing signified, (as hath already been proved,) and not an *enallage* of time.

---

☞NOTICES, RECEIPTS, &c. &c., are excluded from the present number for want of space—and will be inserted hereafter.

## SPIRIT OF THE XIX. CENTURY.

---

VOL. I.

MARCH, 1842.

No. 3.

---

MERLE D'AUBIGNÉ'S HISTORY OF THE REFORMATION OF THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY.

*Histoire de la Réformation du Seizième Siècle, par J. H. Merle D'Aubigné. Tome Premier. Paris et Genève, MDCCCXXXV., pp. 537, 8vo.*

*History of the Great Reformation of the Sixteenth Century in Germany, Switzerland, &c. By J. H. Merle D'Aubigné, President of the Theological School of Geneva, and member of the "Société Evangelique." Vol. I. First American, from the Fifth London Edition. New York. Robert Carter,—pp. 390, 12mo.*

Our first remark on this book is, that the French is a far more beautiful edition than the American. It is got up with a degree of accuracy and taste—that, nearly at the same price, puts shame on the American book. This is a general and melancholy fact. American books are the worst printed, and the meanest looking books, that issue from the press in any civilized country. And when an attempt is made to do the thing in a tolerably handsome style, the cost is always higher than the foreign book, of a superior quality. We are offered in the book stores, the English edition of Charnock on the Divine Attributes, for less than the edition issued by the Presbyterian Board of Publication.

Our second remark is, that an unwarrantable liberty is taken with the title of the book; as any one will see by casting his eyes over the two prefixed to this notice. This proceeding, which is a literary impropriety against which every scholar ought to set his face; is, in the present case, not only in wretched taste, but detracts from the dignity of the subject, if it does not impeach historical verity. The Reformation of the sixteenth century—was emphatically "*The Reformation*;" and it was a Reformation, not "in Germany, Switzerland, &c.,"—but commensurate in its movement, with European civilization. It is childish to designate the author of this book, by describing him on his title page, as a "member of the Evangelical Society;" as much so, as it would be to describe the first scholars and divines of America, by calling them members of the Bible Society.

As for the book itself, we judge it to be one of the most striking performances of the present age. We have read the first and second volumes in the French language; parts of both of them several

times,—which is not usual with us. We have not seen the third volume; and the fourth—which will complete the work—is not published—perhaps not entirely composed. We are not able to speak of the merit of the translation—not having carefully compared the two volumes before us. Our impressions of it, however, are not favourable; and if we might judge, after having read many passages, and compared some—we should pronounce it not worthy of the original, either in spirit or fidelity. We will give a paragraph at hazard—as a sample, by which every scholar can judge for himself.

p. 265, LIVRE III. LES INDULGENCES ET LES THESES, 1517 Mai 1518. Il y avait alors une grande agitation parmi le peuple de l'Allmange. L'Eglise était descendue dans le mouvement des trafics. Elle avait ouvert un grand marché sur la terre. A la foule des chalands, aux cris et aux plaisanteries des vendeurs, on eût dit une foire, mais une foire tenue par des moines. La marchandise qu'ils faisaient valoir et qu'ils offraient à grand rabais, c'était, disaient-ils, le salut des âmes.

p. 209, BOOK III. THE INDULGENCES AND THE THESES, 1517—1518. A great agitation reigned, at that time, among the people of Germany. The church had opened a vast market on the earth. Judging from the crowd of buyers, and the noise and jests of the dealers, we might call it a fair; but a fair held by monks. The merchandise they extolled, offering it at a reduced price, was, said they, the salvation of souls.

Whatever may be thought of those portions of this work, for which the translator and the publisher are responsible; there can, it seems to us, be no difference of opinion amongst true followers of Jesus Christ, as to the grand events commemorated, and the extraordinary success with which the author has developed them.

M. D'Aubigné places the Reformation upon the same footing with that glorious revolution in society which Christianity itself originally produced. Certainly, it is second in importance, to no other. To a certain class of minds, the most forcible and persuasive argument for Christianity—is drawn from an exhibition of the blessings and benefits she has conferred on man; while to another class, the demonstration she made of herself, in her conflicts with Judaism, Heathenism, and other opposing elements—seems the most striking proof of what she is—and therefore her own highest commendation. It need only be remarked here, that any history of the rise and general establishment of Christianity, at all deserving to be called faithful—was always judged necessary to exhibit both these aspects; the religion of Jesus, in what it was and what it did. Precisely in the same manner, if the Reformation at all deserved to be ranked with this grand original revolution in society—its history should set before us, in these two aspects, its claims to the acceptance of enlightened, and especially of Christian minds. And yet it is precisely in these two respects, that the history of the Reformation has neither been ordinarily written or considered. The original establishment of Christianity—is never treated as a revolt against Judaism, nor yet as a civil conflict with heathenism; but the Reformation is very commonly treated as a revolt against Papism—and usually considered a revolution, fully as much mental and political—as spiritual. Its character, as a thing positive in itself, and that entirely independent of the special

obstacles that opposed it; its tendency as a thing specific and uniform, and that irrespective of circumstances that are altogether transient and exterior; its influence upon society and upon individual persons, as the necessary result of its nature and operation; these things, which constitute the essence and the value, of what we call the Reformation—are too often overlooked, or totally misconceived, even in elaborate histories and defences, of that grand event.

The case is altogether different with this work of M. D'Aubigné. He has undertaken to write the history of a positive, operative, and most peculiar *impulsion* (to use his own phrase,) of the human spirit; to expose to view the interior principles which accompanied and actuated this movement; to explain the personal and general influence, in the human soul and in society at large, of this grand development; to show to us, in short, the same Christianity which in the beginning supplanted Judaism, and after three centuries of conflict subverted Paganism—twelve centuries later, girding itself for a new and terrible warfare with the dark, ignorant, and ferocious spirit of the sixteenth century.

The book is strictly an original performance, digested from original materials, and written as one would write upon a subject absolutely fresh. It is a work of prodigious learning and research; of great candour and fairness; of absolute simplicity. It is written in a spirit of true piety, and of sound doctrine. It is conceived with consummate genius, and executed with surpassing beauty. We do not hesitate to say, that it is the very most engaging history we have ever read, and to express the belief that it is destined not only to become a standard work, in many languages, but to constitute an epoch in ecclesiastical literature. We but feebly express our sense of the merits of this performance, when we say—it is well worth the trouble and time of learning the French language, if there were no other book in it.

Such a work, produced in the present age, is not only a most remarkable sign, in the course of divine providence, but is a kind of testimony against the generation itself if it should prove recreant, in the new conflict which Christianity is now so signally called to wage, at the same moment, with all her enemies. A new movement in the army of the Lord has manifested itself, for about thirty years past; a movement, like that at the Reformation, like that at the beginning; and behold now in the field against her, not only Judaism, Heathenism, Islamism, and Infidelity—but at the head of all her enemies—the same Antichrist from whom God delivered her three hundred years ago. At a moment like this, we receive from many quarters, a new and clearer light shed upon the history of the past conflicts of Zion; and amongst the chief of all, this delightful and instructive work. It is most timely. God grant that its lessons pass not unheeded.

In regard to the influence of this history upon the character of the controversy between Christianity and Papism—one thought has weighed upon us with singular force. That there should ever be an end of this controversy, till Christ destroys Antichrist with the brightness of his coming; is what every well instructed child

of God knows, cannot be. But our reading, observation and reflection, have all conspired to convince us, that the controversy has been, and continues to be, waged with unequal success, and diversified results, chiefly, if not solely, on one single account. When we contend with Rome upon the outworks, and dispute with her about questions not touching the heart of the subject; we may or may not gain—according to the skill, temper and knowledge of the parties. But when we do battle upon the ground of the real, spiritual, and eternal interests which are directly staked on this controversy; then, we always have triumphed—and always will triumph. When we *wrestle* with Rome in the ring—our champion or her's, may win; and even if our's wins, it is odds, that in the embrace, he has contracted some pollution. But when we *do battle* with her, in the lists, armed in the panoply of Christ—we never fail of victory, and never contract infection.—This book, we incline to think, will have a decided tendency to bring back the controversy to the basis of the Reformation; and so make it decisive.

That we greatly need such an influence and such a change, is painfully manifest. For while many of our pulpits and periodicals and newspapers, are, by their silence or their slurs upon those who attempt to speak, act and write—really bearing their testimony for Rome; some of those who are trying to enlighten the public mind—so far from being obnoxious to the accusations of their ignorant or faithless brethren—are really to blame chiefly in this—that they have not adequately conceived the nature and extent of the deadly pollution of Rome—and therefore have not, with sufficient vigour directed their shafts at her heart. The grand charge against Rome, would remain untouched, if she could disprove ten thousand of the accusations made against her by faithful history; and clear her skirts of all the innocent blood she has shed. As long as she is the enemy of a holy heart and a holy life; as long as she denies the doctrines of grace; as long as she corrupts and conceals the word of God; as long as she propounds false methods of deliverance from sin; just so long, she is the enemy of Jesus Christ, and the murderer of the souls of men. Here is our battle ground. All short of this, is inconclusive. Whatever brings us back to this, brings us to the real cause of quarrel with Rome; the essential nature of the Reformation; the irreconcilable difference between Christianity and Papism.

We deem it not amiss to say a word here, by way of encouraging our countrymen, and especially our American youth, to give more of their attention to the French language and literature. As it regards the papal controversy in particular—there is great danger in allowing ourselves to be guided by the books of English origin usually to be met with; both because there are so many things in Anglicanism, which are, to say the least, not essential; and because so many of the English champions defend Anglicanism rather than Christianity. Moreover, we fear not to add, that the French Protestants, have as learnedly, and acutely, and more directly defended our religion. Certainly nothing of the sort, in our language, produced during the present age, excels the '*Essai sur L'Esprit et L'Influence de la Reformation de Luther*'—of VILLERS; and nothing

of the sort, in our time, in English, compares with this work of D'Aubigné. It is also to be constantly borne in mind, that the aspect of the French Papal Church, is very different, in many important particulars, from ultra-montagne popery; and that these discrepancies present a phase of papism, which all who would comprehend that mystery of iniquity, must study. The truth is, that France has been, since Charlemagne—that is, during a thousand years and more—for the greater part of the time, the predominating power in Europe, and the centre of her civilization. And it is scarcely too much to say, that they who are ignorant of what France has thought, and written, as well as done, during that long period of grandeur, cannot have mastered any question which lies within the compass of those centuries, fruitful with such immense and enduring influences. It is probable that there never was a period, when the relative importance of this literature was greater than at the present moment; and certainly, none has presented, at the same time, a cluster of men so distinguished in the very highest kind of composition—as this now offers to us. How many in any age have written history—better than Sismondi, Guizot, Thiers—or, to mention no more, D'Aubigné, himself? How many Englishmen—how many Germans, now alive, have done it? And yet it is the fashion of the day—and, by eminence, the ecclesiastical fashion—to extol the cotemporary literature of England and Germany, and depreciate that of France. Faithful to those principles, which lead us to exalt the freedom of the human spirit—we only exhort our countrymen to qualify themselves to decide this question for themselves; and then, decide it as they may, they will have gathered precious fruits, by the process.

---

[Continued from page 64.]

M O L I N I S M .

No. XIV.

**XXII.** *The Opinions of the Jesuits concerning the extent of the Power of the Pope, and his Infallibility.*

THE Jesuits maintain, that all the spiritual power established by our Lord Jesus Christ, for the government of the church, and all the aid which he has promised to the church, in order to ensure the conformity of its decisions to the truth, resides in the person of the Pope. They also maintain, that the power of the Pope extends to temporal things.

These principles are extremely fertile in consequences; for, in the first place, if all the authority which our Lord Jesus Christ has given to the church, is vested in the Pope, it follows, that even in the Roman Catholic communion, the subordinate clergy—the archbishops, bishops, priests, &c.—have no authority except that which they receive from the Pope. Of course no other communion—(whether the Greek, Armenian, or any of the various Protestant communions,) has any spiritual power whatever. In fact, other communions are no churches. In a recent discussion,

which, on the one part, was conducted by Bishop Hughes of New York, he declared that "Luther and Calvin, and their associates, had not a particle of authority from God or man. They were mere laymen in this respect, and their successors in the ministry are not and cannot be substantially any thing more." Such is the opinion of every Jesuit. But even in their own communion, no bishop, according to this opinion, derives his authority immediately from the Lord Jesus Christ, but from the Pope, who claims to be his vicar, and consequently every Roman Catholic bishop is the pope's delegate or vicar. It follows, too, that their own bishops, have neither power, jurisdiction, nor mission, except so far as the pope imparts it to them. And as the pope confers these things, he may deprive the bishops of them, by his own proper authority. The pope, according to this principle, may confer spiritual authority to exercise the functions of the ministry, *even within the dioceses of their own bishops*, upon societies of religious monks, friars, nuns; in fact, upon whom he pleases; and persons so commissioned, may put in exercise their powers without regard to the will or authority of the local bishop. This principle, too, exonerates the pope from the operation of their own canon law. He can abrogate it or change it at pleasure, without being accountable to any man or body of men. The councils even, do not bind him; their decrees, on the contrary, have no other or greater force or effect than the pope imparts to them. In one word, he is an absolute and a despotic monarch in the church, and there is no church but his church, and his word only is irrefragable law. These propositions are incontestable, if it be true, that the pope is the *sole* depository of *all* the authority which the Lord Jesus Christ exercises over his church.

In the second place, if the pope is infallible, and if the Lord Jesus Christ has imparted to him such an attribute or advantage, the decisions of the pope, upon points of doctrine, will be invariable rules of faith. It is enough, according to this notion, to bind every Christian to yield an implicit and blind obedience to the decisions of the pope, that he has pronounced them. It is not at all necessary that the church should adopt his decisions; on the contrary, the subordinate bishops have no right to examine them or consider of their propriety or truth.

The Jansenists, and the Society of Port Royal opposed these principles of the Jesuits, and undertook to prove that the ancient popes made no such pretensions, and that the ancient church would not have allowed any such. But it is no part of our purpose to undertake an examination of the question, what pretensions were made by the earlier popes. Briefly, however, we may say, that as the church began to be corrupted, and the bishops of Rome began to be ambitious, they put forth unbounded claims to power, and soon after the fabrication of the false decretals in the ninth century, the bishops became to a great extent dependent upon the see of Rome. The power of that see was at its greatest height during the pontificate of Innocent III. At the epoch of the Reformation, the power of the popes had somewhat declined, and one of the chief objects of the Society of the Jesuits was to restore it to its former greatness and splendour. Of course they

found materials in the history of the papacy for the support of many unfounded pretensions, and these materials suggested arguments which were more likely to embarrass the Jansenists, who adhered to that church, than the reformers, who attacked the whole system as an apostacy from the truth and liberty of the gospel, and as a fraud upon the civil and religious rights of man.

The second point mentioned in the creed of the Jesuits is, that the power of the pope extends to temporal things. If this be a correct principle—if indeed the pope has received from the Lord Jesus Christ, authority over temporal things, and the kings and other secular heads of the nations possess their powers only as vicars or lieutenants of the popes, and possess none whatever but such as he communicates or imparts to them; it follows, that he may deprive them of their powers, whenever he supposes they render themselves unworthy to be entrusted with them; and thereupon, it follows, also, that their subjects are no longer bound to obey them, any more than the subjects of a subordinate governor, are bound to obey him when the supreme authority in the state has divested him of his office. And if the pope commands them, the subjects will be bound to make war upon their secular sovereign, and even put him to death. It is obvious that this principle leads to the subversion of civil government.

This principle was first advanced in the eleventh century, by Gregory VII., which was before the origin of the Society of Jesuits, but this Society heartily embraced it, and whenever they could do so, have given it full effect.

This principle, as applied to popular governments, would lead to the result, that the right of suffrage is not absolute—but precarious, and dependent, not on the constitution and laws of the commonwealth, but on the will of the pope; for if the powers conferred by the suffrages of the people, may be divested by the pope as soon as conferred, or within the period for which they are given, the state must be reduced to the condition of anarchy, or the pope must have the power to supply a governor or supreme political head *ad interim*, and another election would be abortive, if the result of it should be displeasing to the pope. By what method this principle could be brought into practice, where the mass of the people are disposed to resist such a pretension, it is not easy to see. But let the mass become such Romanists as this principle (rather as the Jesuits) would make them, and the method of procedure would be to a certain extent, simple enough, *viz.*: that of papal nominations either directly or through his agents in the particular state or country. An inconvenience, however, might arise, in case of delinquency during the constitutional term of office, which it might not be possible to obviate, without impairing the effect of constitutional provisions. In fact, if this principle be sound, there can be no such thing as a constitutional government; and it is on this ground the comparatively recent change in the French monarchy has always been displeasing to the Court of Rome—(See vol. i, p. 205, of the Balt. Lit. and Rel. Magazine, for an extract from the Journal of Rome, bearing on this point). It is easy, also, to see the influence of this principle upon a mixed population of Protest-

ants and Romanists, like that of the United States at present. Those Romanists, who heartily adopt this principle, would in a mass, throw their votes according to the will of the pope; which gives him the power to stipulate, through his agents, with the candidates for office, for such terms as are favourable to his interest.

The confessional, and the fear of excommunication, and deprivation of the offices of the church, would be efficient means of enforcing the obedience of his subjects. But with devotees, such means would be unnecessary. In fact, the tendency of the system is to create an *esprit de corps* sufficient to overcome such motives, policy and preference as are founded exclusively on the real or supposed political interests of the state, and which usually divide the Protestant portion of the community into different parties.

This operation of the principle is already discernable in some parts of this country. It is sufficient to refer to the extraordinary claim set up by the Papists in the city of New York, for a separate portion of the public school fund of the state. During the discussions, one of the speakers (while he denied that it was a party question about which they were contending,) avowed the purpose, that he would vote for those who would support the claim.

If he were a Jesuit, his principles would not allow him to act otherwise. It deserves to be mentioned, also, as a circumstance indicating the tendency of questions affecting the political and social interests of our country to Rome, that an appeal was actually taken by the minority of the Romanists who acted in this matter, to the see of Rome, from the decision of a majority, accepting terms of compromise which had been proposed by the civil authority. The particulars of this matter, need not be stated. The affair *in itself*, is, perhaps, comparatively of little importance; but as an indication of the tendency of this principle of the Jesuits, it is of vast moment. It seems to show the entire incompatibility between the principles of a free and constitutional, Protestant government, with the (so called) religious principles of the Jesuits. The ground of fear for the country is, that this incompatibility will not be perceived by the Protestants, till their whole body politic, shall be so deeply affected by foreign ingredients, as to be incurable.—This danger is much more obvious to sagacious men living in Roman Catholic countries, than it appears to be to many patriotic and discerning citizens of the United States. The Abbé De Pradt, once a Roman Catholic Archbishop, and afterward, during the reign of Bonaparte, a distinguished diplomatist, has made some very just and impressive remarks upon this subject, in pp. 295, 297, 305, of his *History of Ancient and Modern Jesuitism*.—(See vol. I. of the *Balt. Lit. and Rel. Magazine*, p. 203, 204.)

But to resume, and conclude this topic: The Society of Port Royal, opposed these principles of the Jesuits, although not on such grounds in all respects as Protestants would take. In fact, some of the principles of this Society, would at first sight, appear to be more offensive to Protestants than those of the Jesuits. Their main drift was to establish the divine right of episcopacy. And while they maintained the supremacy of the pope, to certain intents, and the exclusive claim of the Roman communion, to be

the only true church, they maintained that every bishop received his power immediately from the Lord Jesus Christ. They maintained, too, as a consequence of these principles, that there is no salvation out of the Roman Catholic Church—at least that to be saved, a man must be in the bosom of that church, *in fact, or by desire.*

The Jesuits, on the contrary, held that a man may be saved even in heretical or schismatical communions, and even in other religions, provided he believes them in good faith to be true. This opinion, however is merely a consequence of their fundamental doctrine concerning the power of equilibrium and probability: for if a man keeps his conscience clear by following a probable opinion, why may not those who are out of their church, who believe upon probable, though false grounds, that their religion is good—why, said they, may not such be saved?

Such liberality is seeming, rather than real, because it is the product of a doctrine which is destructive of all religion. It is in fact, the liberality of infidelity, strangely enough joined with the intolerant notions of that corrupted church. The reader may have observed that many Roman Catholic ecclesiastics of the present day, affect to repudiate the opinion that there is no possibility of salvation out of their own church. We pretend not to say what are the grounds of that opinion in all instances. It will be found, however, it is presumed, that such an opinion is expressed only by Jesuits, and that the reasons of it are those indicated. It may be, however, that the reason of the opinion is not known in all cases by the person who expresses it, but in such cases it must be traced to the influence which the system of Molinism has had upon that church generally.

However this may be, it is one of those results of the system in question, which commends it to those who look only to the exterior or surface of things. It is a doctrine (*hisce temporibus accommodatior*) which seems to make Romanism fraternize with the Protestant communions, and in an age affecting liberal principles, so called, well adapted to promote the advancement of Romanism. But when it is known, that it is the offspring of such pernicious doctrines as those which have been discussed, it will scarcely receive more favour with serious and devout Protestants, than the mere exclusive doctrine of the Jansenists.

It is pertinent to remark, however, that the Jesuits do not allow their theory of the supremacy of the pope to interfere with the special interests of their Society. This may be made to appear very sufficiently by many passages in their history. The reader may take the following. The Jesuits were accused by the Jansenists of allowing their converts among the Chinese to practice idolatry, and to continue those superstitious honours which they had been accustomed to show to the departed souls of their ancestors; this was denied by the Jesuit father, Tellier, but Arnaud proved it upon him, and the development which was afterwards made of their transactions in China, conclusively proved the justice of the accusation. In 1700, the Jesuit, Le Comte, published a book in which he justified the religion of the Chinese. The book

was condemned in the Sorbonne. This led to a dispute in which the Jesuits were not only convicted of having authorized the idolatries of the Chinese, but also of having resisted openly and scandalously, Cardinal Tournon, whom Clement XI. had sent to China in the character of legate, to put an end to the affair. Tournon had always been a friend of the Jesuits, but when he arrived, in 1705, he was compelled by evidence, to disapprove of their conduct, and to make use of censures to reduce them to obedience, when he saw that mild methods would have no effect. The Jesuits disregarded his censures, (legate, as he was, of the pope,) and not only that, but under cover of the authority of the Emperor of China, with whom the Jesuits had great influence, they persecuted the Cardinal so cruelly, that on the 8th of June, 1710, he died at Macao, a prisoner in his own house, where he had been detained by order of the Emperor. Clement XI. pronounced a funeral eulogium on the Cardinal, October 14, 1711, in which he regards the Cardinal as a Martyr. And although this pope was himself also a friend of the Jesuits, he condemned them by a bull, on the 19th of May, 1715, beginning, *Ex illa die*. The resistance which the Jesuits made to this bull, was a decisive proof that the Society qualify their principle of devotion to the pope, and acknowledge practically his supremacy, only so far as the pope is willing to use his authority to promote their interests.

As connected with the transactions of the Jesuits in China, and not entirely impertinent to this point, it may be mentioned that in 1734 and 1735, there were published in France, six volumes of *Anecdotes of China*, and among them are the original pieces relative to the affair of Cardinal Tournon, as well as others, relative to the legation of Mezza Barba, patriarch of Alexandria, who went to China in 1721, by order of Clement XI. He also was persecuted by the Jesuits, notwithstanding the very great condescension of the papal briefs of which he was the bearer. In the 5th volume, there is a narrative of an enterprize of the Jesuits to dethrone the Emperor of China, then reigning, who was the son of their great protector, in order to put one of his brothers in his place. This enterprize cost the Jesuit father, Morao, (who was the soul of the conspiracy,) his life, and procured the banishment of the greater portion of their sect from China. No doubt this treasonable proceeding has been one of the causes which has contributed to exclude Protestant missionaries from that empire. The Chinese know not what the pure gospel is, nor have they had the opportunity, (at least not until lately,) of witnessing the different influence true Christianity has upon the lives of men, from that which the system of error and falsehood which the Jesuits passed off under the name of the gospel, produces.

It is superfluous, however, to multiply examples under this head. The reader, upon consulting the history of this society, will find many equally striking illustrations of the policy of the Jesuits. We shall, therefore, close this section, already too long, perhaps, without further remarks.

[Concluded from page 57.]

## READING NO PREACHING.

*The Fashionable mode of Delivering Sermons considered as opposite to Scripture, the Practice of the Primitive Church, Reason, and the Common Sense of Mankind, in a Letter to a Clergyman of the Church of England.*

Now granting that twenty instances of the clergy's general management were attended with partial good to the hearers, yet if one public piece of their conduct may be thought offensive to the Spirit of God, and injurious to their own, it may also be presumed to be attended with partial evil to the people. Though the dissenting clergy in imitation of their brethren of the established church, *read* their sermons, yet having not commenced the length of *reading* prayers, give some room to the Spirit of God and their own natural faculties in prayer, which manly as well as pious conduct is followed with this partial good, that of the few serious persons in the nation, they have at least six to one; but on the other hand, if they should continue the practice of *reading* their discourses, it is to me more than probable, that as by *it*, their twelve to one were reduced to six, so their six will be reduced to one for one; therefore, I think, it was a great pity that the Rev. Dr. Watts, in his "Causes of the Decay of the Dissenting Interest," did not fix on that practice as the principal cause; for if Conformists and Non-Conformists equally offend in the particular of doing their message in public, it is a rational conclusion, that the former will carry the day, having more temporal advantages on their side; the people who are apt to judge by outward appearances, not knowing the odds between *reading* prayers and *reading* sermons, will from a secret and natural appetite to interest, character and pomp, fall in with them, and in process of time, from a still more secret and natural spring, disregard both prayers and sermons. But this by the way.

That the *reading* conduct has been attended with partial evil to the people, appears highly probable, from the present religious face of the nation. The gift, the grace, the voice of prayer, are driven away under disgrace from almost all the families in England; a secret, surfeiting indifferency to the gift, the grace, the voice of preaching, has taken possession of the minds of the people; so on a view of the whole, we shall find the bulk of the nation reduced to a species of baptized heathens; and if we should inquire what are the visible springs of this visible evil, the Non-Conformists will readily answer, that a rubrical confinement to *reading* of prayers, has been the ruin of prayer in England; and say I, why may not a voluntary confinement to *reading* of sermons prove as fatal to preaching? for as by the former, one has been tempted to think that it was just as Christian to *read* a prayer at home, as to hear one *read* abroad; so by the latter, a second has been under the like temptation, to think that reading a sermon at home, answered all the purposes of *reading* one abroad; hence the one turned

careless, and the other from being careless, to be profane; and though neither of them did see their gradual removes from God, and the various occasions that afforded motion to their corruption, yet surely such there were, and as sure it is, God will require it at the hands of those who laid unrequired, unnecessary occasions of evil before them; and though their contempt of God and their own soul should have been begun, and carried on by a thousand different causes, if ministers should throw in but one of such causes, by any unnecessary conduct, they are so far chargeable with the evil; and if unprecedented, unrequired *reading*, should prove any cause of such contempt of gospel ordinances, then those who will not lay aside the practice, when they may, so far choose the continuance of such contempt.

Now that *reading* may not only be supposed to be, but really is, at least one cause or occasion of such contempt, is evident to me when I consider that, even supposing the Spirit of God, did sometimes own that method, for the conversion of a sinner here and there, experience convinces me, that this awakened sinner will soon leave the *moral reader*, for the *Christ-reader*, and next, the *Christ-reader* for the *Christ-preacher*, and when he cannot find the *Christ-preacher*, takes such measures to get one, as are frequently destructive of all order and decency; and when he procures one at this expense, is presently possessed of a disrelish to all regularly ordained ministers, because all such *read* their sermons. That this is the case with many thousands in England, we all know; and what little, low and despicable notions this conduct and case give to the unthinking multitude of gospel ministrations in general, we know also; and what fatal influence these notions have on the lives of thousands more, we may know too.

On the other hand, supposing the Spirit of God did not acknowledge and bless the *reading* practice, for reasons already mentioned; in that case, reading to the hearers, becomes the savor of death unto death; which savor of death would in general discover itself, by immorality in life, impiety in principle, and by a secret disgust to the public and stated means of grace; and that these harbingers of death are universally visible, under the *reading* method, is undeniable. Yea, farther, supposing the Spirit of God did neither bless nor curse it, it is plain that of itself, it is not the natural way of addressing the hearers of the gospel; and they are the less attentive, by how much *reading* is the less natural way of address than preaching; and their impressions of the things *read*, are less lively, by how much their attention is so; and their knowledge and practice of divine things are in proportion to their impressions of them; and by how much the less their knowledge and practice of Christianity are, their impiety and immorality are still the more. If, therefore, *reading* the gospel is not the natural way of publishing it, as really it is not, how can one help judging that it has, does, and will terminate in evil? Though in the mean time it may occur, that irreligion obtains in many nations, when the practice of *reading* sermons, is looked on as disgraceful; which, indeed is very true, even where the practice of *reading* prayers is disgraceful too. But then, when I consider that immorality, im-

piety and indifference in the matters of God and souls, reign not so universally, nor in such awful degrees, with such impurity and freedom, in any Protestant nation on the face of the earth, as in ours, and that there are other causes of that irreligion in those nations which are not to be found with us, I can not help inferring that there must needs be some peculiar causes of the supernumerary instances of irreligion in this nation, and therefore forced to inquire, whence do such causes or occasions of evil proceed? From the people, or from the clergy? Not from the people, because in *spirituals* they are not the fountains of good or evil to the clergy, but the clergy to them: and the people of *England* being as susceptible of good and evil as their neighbours, are morally good or evil, according to the good and evil examples set before them: and in regard there are ten visible evils among them, for one visible good, there must needs be ten occasions of evil given them, for one good example; and if such occasions of evil are afforded by their teacher's public ministrations, then the people will have that *conception* of soul and *conduct* in life, which immediately relate to the public means of grace, thereby infected and poisoned; and notwithstanding any exception of individuals, good or bad, this observation did, and will hold good in the general, that as the people are good or bad, in proportion as the generality of their clergy are so; so are they hot, cold, or indifferent, in any particular instance in which their clergy are so.

And if it should appear to the people, that the practice of *reading* notes carries an inactive, lazy, and indifferent air with it, whether they complain of it or not, it will follow, that by a secret analogy, the religious disposition of their spirits, and consequently their conduct in life, relating to public ordinances, will be lazy and inactive too; and that the practice of *reading* notes carries such an air with it, will appear, if a person but consults his own natural notions of that figure a minister of Christ should make in a pulpit, and that appearance which a *reader* really makes. For, to see a man who should stand in the room of Christ as a chosen ambassador, speaking out his message to the people, as a man speaketh to his friend, with all the freedom and boldness, with all the decent demonstrations of inward life and concern, that an embassy of the most awful consequence required; not thinking his own thoughts, not speaking his own words, not gratifying his own humour, not fearing the face of man; pleasing as well as personating the Redeemer of souls, by breathing out his own, taking heaven by violence, bidding defiance to hell, and farewell to earth, and preparing his people for the glorious appearing of the great God: I say, to see such a man pitifully bowed down, folded on a cushion, steady as a statue, eyeing his notes, wearing a pair of glasses on his face, his hands engaged in his papers, or pointing by turns at something he sees not what, speaking to a people he is afraid to look in the face, or speaking rather to his papers, as the less immediate way of addressing his hearers; seeming careful only how to pronounce his written periods, without offence to his own or their ears, with the same view that a school-boy reads his lesson; conveys to a thinking man, as lively ideas of sloth and awkwardness,

as he can well expect to have among the sons of men. Hence there steals in upon the minds of the hearers, whether they will or not, such a heavy, languid easiness of spirit, as bears an analogous proportion to the minister's conduct. And though to the praise of unmerited grace we must say that the *reader's* spirit is not at all times so inactive before God, as his posture before men would represent him; nor is every hearer so lifeless as the occasion tends to make him: yet *one swallow makes no summer*; that the practice in its own nature has a tendency to introduce a formal, lazy, lifeless, easy face, on the awful concerns of a future world, is plain in observation.

For my own part, I can say, in sad experience, that to me the very notion of the minister's lazy figure, renders the otherwise great and important subject he *reads*, altogether useless. And though I am apt, in this case, to blame my own corruption, yet all my reasoning faculty can not justify the occasion given it, which frequently lays me under the strongest temptation on the Lord's-day, to erect my closet into my only place of worship: and if this is not only my case, but of many thousands, who would not be thought void of an inward attachment to public ordinances, how irreligious must the state of those be, who have no higher inducement to attend them, than the public, scriptural conduct of their minister, I submit to your candid and impartial judgment. But though this lazy method should be no occasion of evil to the hearers, I think it exposes the minister himself to a state of less usefulness than otherwise he might have been. For,

By a slavish confinement to paper, and disuse of memory, he quite unqualifies himself to preach on any accidental occasion. He would do it, if he had his notes; but neither the time, the nature of the occasion, nor even decency, will permit him to have them, and therefore loses that opportunity of serving his Lord. Yea, what if any disorder should affect his eyes in youth or old age? Will he preach Christ without his eyes, or at least a pair of glasses? No; he will no longer draw a sickle in the harvest, though the Lord of the harvest should not deprive him of life, reason, tongue, or strength of body, but quit the field like a lazy coward, before he is called from it. Yea, farther, he is on his ordinary occasions, equally liable to being useless. What if by some unforeseen accident, he happened to drop his notes between his chamber and his church, or by forgetfulness, leave them behind him? The misfortune should not only render him no minister for that week, but the very notion of his disappointment, occasioned by a culpable practice, should provoke the grief of some, and the mirth of others.

There was a dissenting minister, not far from London, who, as he went to meeting, happened by neglect to leave his notes on his closet table; a servant who did not affect his master's *reading method*, fumbled them among some rubbish, and went his way. The minister missing his sermon, whispered to the pew-opener to fetch it, while he was praying; the man went, and searched for a full hour, but could not find it; the minister prayed the whole time, with the avocation of some longing glances at the door for the pew

opener; when he prayed himself out of breath, and the people out of patience, he sat down wearied. At length the man appeared, but no sermon; after some minutes of painful reflection, he rose up, and plainly told the congregation, that the sermon was lost, and therefore they were to have none that day; but withal promised if the sermon should be found, that he would cause it to be printed for their instruction, and never preach by notes again. I wish from my heart that every sermon-reader should meet with such a useful disappointment in order to make him more useful, and prevent disappointments of a more dangerous nature.

For any practice in religion, not warranted by Scripture, by primitive churches, and by religious nations, not founded in reason, not answering any valuable purpose, with regard to the being, or well being of the church of God, must inevitably be attended with consequences hurtful in some sense to ministers, hurtful to the people, and offensive to God. However, let my notion of *reading* notes be what it will, it is in use, and therefore will find advocates for it; and though I believe none of them will agree with a certain young divine, who lately told me that Christ read his sermons; yet they will say,

*Objection* 1st. That it is a matter of indifference, being not forbidden in Scripture.

*Answer.* If ordinary Scripture examples imply a prohibition of any practice contrary to such examples, then *reading* notes is forbidden, and that Scripture examples do so, is admitted by all Christian divines; and I hope it will be admitted, also, that all Scripture examples of preaching are of preaching without notes; consequently, preaching with notes must be forbidden, and therefore not indifferent; besides, if this argument were good, I might by a parity of reason, turn my back to the people, and my face to the opposite point, and preach in that posture, which certainly were a very unscriptural, unedifying, indecent way of it; and it should be a very provoking argument in defence of it, that it was not forbidden.

*Obj.* 2d. That there is no difference with respect to consequences, between *reading* a sermon, and preaching it word for word, after committing it to memory.

*Ans.* I do not think it very practicable for the strongest memory to preach from the pulpit every sentence, phrase, and particle that the minister has written in his closet, but will undoubtedly miss some stale thoughts and adopt fresh ones in their room. But though he were disposed to confine himself, and could really do it to a particle, even in that case he will act his part with greater grace, life, earnestness and natural freedom, than if he *read*; and whatever benefit his own soul may receive, surely his preaching is the more likely to be attended with a blessing to the hearers, who know not whether the minister confined himself, or not; for of the internal mode and spring of his thoughts, they are no judges but of what they hear and see; and it is certain also, that the minister lies the more in the way of divine influences, by how much the more his soul, in which by application he has treasured up his matter, is the more proper object of grace than paper. But still the best way of deciding in this case is, for any that doubt it, to try the experiment.

*Obj.* 3d. That in regard, the memory is treacherous, apt to mis-give, it is more safe to *read*, than to commit all to it.

*Ans.* It is not necessary, I think, to commit to memory every word which one would preach, but the general and particular heads with the Scripture quotations which serve to prove them; a person who with that store in memory, backed with meditation and prayer, cannot regularly, judiciously and piously, speak for half an hour, ought never in my opinion to preach; and a person whose memory is naturally not strong enough to retain the heads of a short discourse, I am apt to think, was not designed by nature or grace to be a minister. True it is, that a formal harangue consisting of senecal, pithy, moral sentences, periodical flights, numerous smooth cadences, pointed phrases, and picked words, calculated to please the ear and tickle the fancy, does no more command the memory, than it mends the heart; but if a person would renew the heart, and reform the life, he would do well to use, not what Seneca, Cicero and Plato have spoke from earth, but what the Son of God has spoken from heaven, which besides the advantage it carries to souls, being fitted in the methods of grace for their use, will be of double advantage to the preacher, as it is naturally calculated for his memory, and as the promise is past in faithfulness, to bring to his remembrance whatsoever necessary truth the Lord himself hath spoken.

*Obj.* 4th. That the age is critical, polite, and withal ill natured, ready to improve the least slip in matter, manner, or expression, to the disadvantage of a minister's character.

*Ans.* True enough; but it is not therefore true, that a minister of Christ should on that account abandon the good example of his Master to humour his enemies; for if they are really friends, they will not scruple to put up with the Scripture manner of preaching: besides, I cannot conceive why a judicious, experienced and otherwise eloquent minister, should have a distinct method, noble matter, polite manner, and proper expression with notes, and be always capable to blunder without them. Farther, I would beg leave to ask, how a preacher comes to know that preaching without notes will subject him to blunders? Has he ever preached without them to know this by experience? No; yea, where are they that do it excepting a few preaching mechanics, who, poor things, are apt to blunder, whether they read or preach, and yet seem better qualified by rough sense and plain grace to edify souls, than many polite *readers*. But let a minister lay aside his notes, and put his conjecture in theory to trial in fact, and then calmly judge; I would in such a case promise, he will have as tolerable an opinion of himself, and so will the age, as if he had read every word. I am sure he cannot judge himself below a lawyer at the bar, who can speak noble sense in a polite, agreeable manner, for a full hour, and not read a word; and I am equally persuaded, that the judges on the bench, who may be supposed the standards of the nation for taste, do not shift their ears upon Lord's days as they do their shirts. It is to me very surprising, that the critical vein of the nation should cow the clergy to their papers, and leave all other public-speakers at freedom. However, supposing two or three feminine fops, or masculine coquets, should make a man an offender

for a word, is he to cross the good example of thousands, and offend thousands more, to gratify the little-souled triflers?

*Obj.* 5th. That none but laymen preach without notes.

*Ans.* I should be heartily sorry if, of all denominations of clergymen in England, lay-preachers alone had scripture, reason, antiquity, and the universal practice of all Christian nations, on their side, in the particular of preaching. But supposing, not granting, that the case were so, will laymen's being void of the scripture mission, make their scripture method of preaching unscriptural? Or will those who have the scripture mission, conceal the natural way of publishing the gospel, merely because others happen to show it? There was a certain lady who made a practice of veiling her face, lest the chamber-maid should be thought more beautiful than her mistress; all persons admired the maid's face, which was always visible, and of her lady's face knew nothing but the unnatural covering; whereas, if her face had been exposed, beside her natural beauty which equalled that of her maid, she had many superior qualifications to recommend her. I am greatly of opinion that the existence of lay-preachers is greatly owing to the *reading* course of the regular clergy. What can poor creatures do, when by some blest providence, they become possessed of a concern for their souls, and the awful interests of a future world, and see those matters, which to them are dear as life, figured out weekly before their eyes, and *read* in a visibly unconcerned manner, as if there were nothing at all in preaching, but a weekly rational paper charm, to keep society in order? I say, what can they do, but look out for private Christians, who they think will speak the reality of the things of God, with the due concern of soul, even though they should happen, as they frequently do, to pitch upon persons of little knowledge and less grace, at the expense of peace and order? Craving stomachs must have food, though it should happen to be ill-dressed. But let the reputed sound clergyman embrace the layman's sound *manner*, and then I dare say, he shall have many who are now hearers of laymen, to be sharers of his more sound matter and manner; because no longer can it be said, that laymen are the only preachers in *England*.

*Obj.* 6th. That *reading* having received a sanction from time and custom, is now become as well agreeable to the people as to the clergy.

*Ans.* It is true, that time and custom make the bulk of the nation sit under it without grumbling; and it is true, also, that the same time and custom with some other culpable circumstances, make the one half of them sit at home on Lord's days, without preaching, praying or reading, or a thought about either; and it is likely to be true, also, if God prevents not, that as much again of the same time and custom, &c., will make the other half stay at home with their neighbours, and permit their ministers to *read* to dead walls, as in a manner they deadly read to dead souls before; and yet it cannot be true, that *reading* is more agreeable to a thinking people than *preaching*, because it is contrary to the nature of things, to common-sense, and to the universal experience of mankind, that they can retain as much of the one, as of the

other, having not such lively impressions of what is *read* as of that which is spoke with the earnestness of a man speaking to his friend; and being possessed of souls naturally desirous of knowledge, and whose knowledge is more or less according as the images of things in their souls are so, and the fruits of whose knowledge, with respect to God, to themselves, and to their fellow creatures, are lively or faint, in proportion as their knowledge (or notions of things) is so. That *reading* is agreeable to the clergy, no body doubts; but not, I suppose, on account of any superior excellency in it; however the question is whether on that same account it is pleasing to their Lord and Master? If it is, why did not he himself, when a minister here on earth, or any of his immediate successors, practice it? And why does he not *now* own and bless it? If it is not, its being pleasing to ministers, is so far from being an argument in favour of it, that it argues a difference in that particular between their Lord and them, which should be an argument with them for laying it aside. Yea, though it could be supposed a circumstance that neither pleased or displeased *Him*, which in my opinion is impossible; yet, I would judge it a piece of rational conduct to drop it, at least for some time, and try whether the plain Scripture way of it will be attended with more success: for a trial can do no harm.

*Obj.* 7th. That *reading* frees the minister from fear.

*Ans.* What fear? Is it the fear of men? His God expressly forbids him to be afraid of their faces, because the *fear of man bringeth a snare*. What is it in man that could make me fear him, while I stand in Christ's room, endeavouring in sincerity to think, to speak, to act, as he did? It is not worth while for either the frowns or smiles of my fellow-creatures, to alter one circumstance of my message from God, or one step of my journey to glory—God will restrain the remainder of their wrath, and shortly bury them and their anger in the grave—their money, favours, and tempting smiles shall perish with them. He that feeds the ravens, will feed me with food convenient for me—I shall want no money when I appear before the Lord Jesus.—But if it is a fear of stumbling, it is certainly commendable not only in the pulpit, but on all other occasions; lest by the criminal escapes of preachers, God should be dishonoured, his people offended, their own hands weakened, and their consciences wounded; and yet I cannot apprehend why such fear should prevail with *our* clergy, to *hide in a napkin* the Scripture talent of preaching, while all other Protestant nations *occupy it*, with a dependence upon the promised direction '*into all truth,*' till the Lord *cometh*.

*Obj.* 8th. That God will convince, convert and save his people, whether by reading or preaching.

*Ans.* It is true, God will find out his people, he knoweth who are his; but this speculative truth ought not to influence the conduct of ministers or others, to a diminution from, and addition to, or alteration of any circumstance of revealed duty, because God being "unsearchable in his judgments, and in his ways past finding out," his knowledge is not the rule of our conduct, but the knowledge we have, or ought to have of him.

*Obj.* 9th. That there are eminent and pious men, who love and use the reading method.

*Ans.* That there are great and good men who *read* their sermons, I acknowledge, and bless the Lord that there are such excellent ones in the earth; but sure I am, that the additional circumstance of *reading* their notes, gives no additional prosperity to the pleasure of the Lord in their hands.

*Obj.* 10th. It will be said, I not only lose my labour, but expose myself to the ill-will of many, by writing this tract.

*Ans.* As for my labour, though it should not have the desired effect, it cannot be lost, for I leave it with the Lord; let him accept or refuse it, I am persuaded he will remember it.—And as to exposing myself to the dislike of many, the many foolish, the many graceless, the many proud and unfaithful, I value not: the many faithful, and the many gracious, will judge it my duty to be faithful, as they judge it to be their own; and though they should love what I dislike, they must not hate me therefor, because they and I are to meet shortly beyond the stream of Jordan, where all our differences will be accommodated without corruption and strife, seeing more clearly under the beams of our Sun of Righteousness in his own land. And if they should smite me while we are yet on our way, I will *bless* them and say, and promise on my part—“Let the righteous smite me, it shall be a kindness; and let him reprove me, it shall be an excellent oil, which shall not break my head: for yet my prayer also shall be in their calamities”—Ps. cxli. 5.

Now, Reverend and dear Sir, I have said before you what occurred to me, in relation to the practice of *reading* notes; if you apprehend I have said any thing unbecoming the Spirit of Christ, pray for me and pardon me, because indeed I did not design it. If you think that what I have said does not conclude against *reading*, I beg you would show me what concludes for it, and oblige, Rev'd and Dear Sir,

Yours, &c.

---

#### THE FUNERAL OF THE MASS.

CHAPTER II.—Concerning the exposition of these words, “*He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life. My flesh is meat indeed,*” &c.

1. In this chapter I shall prove that Jesus Christ speaks of a spiritual eating and drinking by faith, and not of a corporeal eating and drinking by the mouth of the body. My first argument is this: when a man would satisfy his hunger, and quench his thirst, he eateth and drinketh that thing which he hungers and thirsts after, because eating satisfieth hunger, and drinking quenqueth thirst: but it is by faith, that is, by believing in Jesus Christ, that we satisfy the hunger, and quench the thirst which we have after Christ; for it is in the sixth of John, *He that cometh to me shall never hunger, and he that believeth in me shall never thirst.* Therefore it is by faith or by believing that we eat and drink Jesus Christ; and, consequently, the eating of Christ's flesh, and drinking his blood, is spiritual, and not corporeal.

2. My second argument is this: Jesus Christ saith, *He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life.* And, *Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man and drink his blood, ye have no life in you,* John vi. But it is the spiritual eating and drinking by faith that gives life eternal, and not the corporeal eating and drinking by the mouth of the body; because many reprobates (according to the very doctrine of Rome itself,) do corporeally eat the flesh, and drink the blood of Christ, and yet shall not inherit eternal life.

3. The third argument is taken from *St. Augustine* and *Cardinal Cajetan*, who expound the words of Jesus Christ as we do. *St. Augustine*, in Book iii. of *Christian Doctrine*, speaketh thus, *To eat the flesh of Christ is a figure, teaching us to partake of Christ's passion, and to imprint in our memories with delight and profit, that Christ was crucified for us.* *Cardinal Cajetan*, in his Commentary on John vi. saith, *To eat the flesh of Christ, and drink his blood, is faith in Christ's death, so that the sense is this, if you use not the death of the Son of Man as meat and drink, ye shall not have the life of the Spirit in you.* And having sufficiently proved his exposition, he adds: *To eat and drink the Sacrament is a thing common, as well to those that eat unworthily, as to those that eat worthily; but that which Jesus Christ here speaks of, is not common to both, for he saith, he that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life; he saith not, he that eateth worthily and drinketh worthily, but he that eateth and drinketh.* Whence it clearly appears, that according to the letter, he speaks not of eating and drinking the Sacrament of the Eucharist, but of eating and drinking the death of Jesus Christ.

4. Now that we may clearly understand this doctrine, we must consider wherein the life which Jesus Christ gives us doth consist; for seeing the flesh of Jesus Christ is meat to us, because it gives us life, it is evident that if we know what life that is which Jesus Christ gives us, we must know likewise how Jesus Christ is meat to us, and consequently how we eat him. But to know what that life is which Jesus Christ gives us, we must consider what that death is in which we were involved, which is expressed by Paul, *Ephes. ii.*, in these words: *When we are dead in sins and trespasses God hath quickened us together with Christ: by grace ye are saved;* and consequently the death in which we were involved consists in two things, first, in the curse of the law, which imports the privation of felicity, and the suffering of temporal and eternal punishment for our sins: Secondly, it consists in an habitual corruption, whereby sin reigns in us; and, therefore, it is said, *1 Tim. v.*, *The widow that lives in pleasure is dead while she liveth.* Also sins are called *dead works*, *Heb. vi.* So that the life which Jesus Christ hath purchased for us, consists in two things. First, in deliverance from the curse of the law by the pardon of our sins, as Paul tells us, *Colos. ii.* *God hath quickened you together with Christ, having forgiven you all trespasses, blotting out the obligation that was against us;* which obligation proceeded from the law, because it did oblige all the transgressors of it to a curse. Secondly, it consists in regeneration, or sanctification, whereof Jesus Christ, speaking in *John iii.*, saith, *Except a man be born again he cannot enter into the kingdom of God;* and Paul, *Heb. xii.*, *Without holiness no man*

*shall see the Lord.* Therefore, seeing that the life which Jesus Christ hath purchased for us, consists in the pardon of our sins, and in our regeneration and sanctification, which ends in glorification; and that Jesus Christ is called meat in reference to this life, we must consider the means whereby Jesus Christ hath purchased these things for us: and, seeing it is certain that his death is the means by which he hath purchased pardon of sins and regeneration, we must conclude that Jesus Christ is the food and nourishment of our souls in regard of the merit of his death. But that Jesus Christ by his death hath purchased life for us, (that is justification, which consists in the pardon of our sins, and regeneration, which consists in holiness of life,) appears by these passages of Scripture; viz.: *We are justified by the blood of Christ, and reconciled to God by his death,* Rom. v. *We have redemption by his blood, even the remission of sins,* Ephes. i. *He hath reconciled us in the body of his flesh by his death, that he may present us holy without spot, and blameless in his sight,* Col. i. *We are sanctified by the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all,* Heb. x. *Christ loved the church, and gave himself for it, that he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word, that he might present it unto himself a glorious church, &c.,* Eph. v. Therefore, seeing Jesus Christ hath purchased life for us by his death, and that his flesh and blood are our meat and drink (because they purchased life eternal for us on the cross, viz., the remission of our sins, and sanctification ending in glorification,) it follows that the action whereby Jesus Christ is applied to us for righteousness and sanctification, is the same by which we eat the flesh of Christ and drink his blood. But this action is nothing else but faith, as the Scripture tells us: *Being justified by faith we have peace with God,* Rom. v. *God purifies our hearts by faith,* Acts xv. *He that believeth hath eternal life,* John vi. From what hath been said I form this argument. That action whereby we obtain remission of sins, and sanctification, ending in glorification, is the same whereby we have that life which Jesus Christ hath purchased for us by his death, because that life principally consists in the remission of sins and sanctification, as we have proved. But the spiritual eating and drinking by faith, and not the corporeal by the mouth, is that action whereby we obtain remission of sins and sanctification, as we have also proved. Therefore the spiritual eating and drinking by faith is the action, whereby we have that life, which Jesus Christ hath purchased for us by his death, and not the corporeal eating and drinking by the mouth. And, consequently, seeing in John vi., a certain eating and drinking is spoken of, whereby we have that life which Jesus Christ hath purchased for us by his death, it is evident that a spiritual eating and drinking is there spoken of, and not a corporeal.

5. From what hath been said, it appears, that when Jesus Christ saith, *my flesh is meat indeed, &c.,* the figure falls upon the word *meat*, which is taken, not for corporeal, but spiritual meat. The reason whereof is, that corporeal food is that which is appointed for the nourishment of the body, as spiritual food is that which is appointed for the nourishment of the soul; so that, although corporeal food be taken by the mouth of the body, yet that only doth

not make it to be corporeal food, except it be taken for the nourishment of the body; otherwise poison, medicine, a bullet, &c., which a man should swallow, would be corporeal food; which is absurd to affirm; but the flesh of Christ, which is pretended to be eaten in the Eucharist by the mouth of the body, is not appointed for the nourishment of the body; because that food which is appointed for the nourishment of the body is changed into the substance of the body: but the body of Christ is not changed into the substance of our bodies; therefore the flesh of Christ is not a corporeal food, but his flesh broken, and his blood shed on the cross, is a spiritual food which nourisheth the souls of those, who, by a true and lively faith, do embrace this flesh broken, and this blood shed; that is, who do wholly rest and rely on the merit of his death and passion for obtaining mercy from God. And certainly, seeing that the life which Jesus Christ gives us by his death, is spiritual, that the nourishment is spiritual, that the eating his body, and drinking his blood, is spiritual (as hath been proved,) it follows that his flesh must be spiritual meat, and his blood spiritual drink. And this flesh of Christ is incomparably better, and more truly meat indeed in regard of its effects, than corporeal food can be; because it doth better, and more perfectly nourish the souls of believers, than corporeal food doth their bodies; this being corruptible food, which gives temporal life only; but that, spiritual and incorruptible food, which gives life eternal.

6. I conclude this chapter with this consideration. When a doctrine is proposed which is pretended to be divine, and that passages of holy Scripture are alleged for the proof of it, if it opposeth, or seems to oppose sense and reason, and to include contradictions; and that a more suitable and rational sense can be found out for those passages, so that all these inconveniences and contradictions may be avoided; there is nothing more just than that we should embrace that probable and rational sense, and reject that doctrine which opposeth sense and reason, and seems to imply contradictions. But the doctrine of the real presence of the manhood of Jesus Christ in the Host, and the transubstantiation of the bread into his body, is repugnant to sense and reason, and seems to include divers contradictions: (viz., that a human body is in a point without any local extension, that a body may be in divers places at one and the same time, that the bread and wine are changed into the body and blood of Christ, which were before; that accidents may be without a subject, &c.) and the passages that are impertinently alleged to prove such a presence, and such a change, have a sense very commodious and rational, for the avoiding all these contradictions, as appears in this and the former chapter, where I have very rationally expounded those two passages which the Romish doctors impertinently make use of for this subject. Therefore they ought to embrace that commodious and rational sense which we have given them; and to reject the doctrine of the real presence of the body of Jesus Christ in the host, and the doctrine of transubstantiation.

[Continued from Vol. VII., p. 413, of Balt. Lit. and Rel. Mag.]

THE UNITY OF THE CHURCH.

No. III.

THAT truth and the love of truth have a place and an influence in the church, is a position which admits not of doubt. This, notwithstanding, is to her a day of clouds. The mists of error, prejudice, passion, and a narrow-minded selfishness, are spread, in some places, densely over her territory, and greatly obstruct the vision of her children. To mere reason and experience, the conclusion is not very obvious, that her children shall ever, upon earth, so far recognize the extent of their common inheritance, see their true interests, and feel the claims of their relationship, as to harmonize their affections and bring them peaceably to inhabit the same dwelling. But whatever may be the language of unaided reason upon the subject, and however indistinct the voice of experience, there are agencies at work of a character more sacred, and influences, of a description more efficient than belong to fallen humanity are pledged for the accomplishment of this blessed object.

Let us listen with attention to the voice of prophecy, and upon the assurances conveyed by that voice, let the heart with satisfaction repose. Hear the promise addressed to Zion: *Thy watchmen shall lift up the voice, with the voice together shall they sing: for they shall see eye to eye, when the Lord shall bring again Zion. The Gentiles shall come to thy light, and kings to the brightness of thy rising. They shall not hurt nor destroy in all my holy mountain; for the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea. Then will I turn to the people a pure language, that they may call upon the name of the Lord, to serve him with one consent. In that day shall there be one Lord, and his name one.* Such is a specimen of the divine promise.

In his intercessory prayer, uttered upon the eve of the completion of his ransom for our salvation, the compassionate Redeemer, prospectively cast his omniscient eye over his church, in ages then distant. He saw the temptations by which his people should be assailed, their weaknesses, their yieldings to unblest influences; and, in the divisions and desolations of the household of faith, the mournful results of those unhappy and too powerful causes. The restoration of harmony and the re-establishment of a well directed activity among them, entered into the purposes and plans of mercy. All this was before Him, and hence the prayer addressed by him in their behalf, to his and our Father: *THAT THEY ALL MAY BE ONE; as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be ONE in us: that the world may believe that thou hast sent me.* Through the agency of her ministry and her ministrations, the church is destined to accomplish a mighty work—the conversion of the world to the faith of Immanuel;—*That the world may believe that thou hast sent me.* For the attainment of this, the united profession and action of the church are put in requisition: *That, for this, they all may be one.* Among the nations, and to their inhabitants, the children of Zion are witnesses for God and his Christ.

*Ye are my witnesses, saith the LORD.* Till the witnesses agree in their testimony, respecting Messiah and his cause, we, assuredly, have no reason to suppose that the nations at large, will believe in his name. Till then, the testimony, in its conclusive bearing, will not be extensively felt. For this argument, and for the attainment of its end, the Great Intercessor prayed. The acceptance of his prayer, and, in due time, its full answer, we are assured of by the dignity of his person, the value of his covenanted blood, and the infallible promise of the Father. The now divided and distracted church shall be united. In order to the effecting of this union, our prayers, consultations, actings, and privations, shall not be in vain. They are concurrent with the intercession of the Son of God; are sustained by the blood of the cross, and urged by the promise of our covenant God.—Whilst, then, Jehovah is saying to his spiritual Jerusalem, *Fear thou not*; he also says to the assembly of her saints, *Let not thy hands be slack*. Thus certified that well directed exertions shall be crowned with success, let us ascertain what is requisite to be done, how it is to be performed; and then do it with our might. Upon this subject, we must,

1, *Guard against erroneous positions.* One of these is, that, in a divided state of the church, the settlement of our terms of fellowship, as a practical affair, is no more difficult than before such division took place. Yet one great difficulty in the case is, to get back to the primitive ground, without injury to the cause of truth and godliness. It is easy to conceive that a specified form of a particular truth never ought to have been made a term of organical communion; but if ever made such, a receding from it may be in danger of being understood as an abandonment of the truth itself; and from the imputation of defection, injury may result to the cause of righteousness. To prevent this, no explanation may, in the mean time, be found available. In this connexion, it may be found that *All things are lawful, but all things are not expedient—edify not*. With obstacles unknown to the church, whilst united, though really containing the same substantial evils, as when divided, the friends of her unity have to contend, when truth becomes embodied in organized schisms. That which was easy to be done in the former state, may be found impossible in the latter. A mind free from the laws of consistency, and which has no regard to consequences, may be happily exempted from all feelings of this sort; but how much a mind so formed is likely to effect for, the real unity of the church, is not hard to perceive.

A second unsound position is that which affirms, that every point of moral doctrine and article of duty, susceptible of proof, as true and right, must be incorporated with the church's terms of communion; and that, in order, to the enjoyment of her communion, an intelligent reception and profession of those terms must be made. To this reference has been made in a previous number. How such a rule would operate to the exclusion, not only of multitudes of the babes and young men, but likewise of the old men of the family of God, need not be now repeated. If, indeed, such by the authority of the Redeemer, be the law of his house, it behooves us to bow in silence; but if not by his authority so settled,

we may not interpose ours, to impose burdens which he has not laid upon any. It should be remembered, that the rejection of a truth, or refusal to do a duty, is a very different thing from making it a term of ecclesiastical communion. These ought not to be confounded.

A third unsound position, and it not an uncommon one, is the assumption, that any number of professing Christians have a right, upon moral grounds, to fix, as may appear to them proper, by a lower or higher scale, their terms of communion; and, according to this standard, admit to, or reject from their fellowship. This scheme assumes to be liberal, and in defence of it we hear it urged—"We have adopted no article, as a term of communion, but what is, in itself, conformable to the word of God,—we encroach not upon the distinctive privileges of any other community,—and we attempt no compulsion toward any individual, to induce him to unite with us. We simply exercise that liberty wherewith Christ has made us free, and to all others we concede a similar right." This, indeed, is very plausible, and yet it is very unsound. Because man may not interfere, in such a case, to prevent this course, the moral right to pursue it is presumed. Were the church of the Redeemer a mere voluntary association, formed merely for individual convenience, whose advantages are altogether of a private nature, and over which the members have a legitimate control, the claim put forth for fixing the terms of membership, would be admissible. This, however, is not the case. The church is not a mere voluntary association. She is the kingdom of Jesus Christ. Into the fellowship of this society every individual of the family of man, who is made acquainted with its constitution, and is capable of apprehending its principles, institutions and ends, is morally obliged to seek admission. The privileges of this divine corporation, are the grants of the Saviour of men; the terms of admission to membership and the consequent enjoyment of privilege, are all settled by Him, and not left discretionary to the will or caprice of individuals, nor even of the whole assembly of professed believers. Every man, upon hearing the gospel of Christ, is bound to inquire, to believe, and to seek the blessings of redemption, in the fellowship of saints. To that fellowship the church is obliged to receive such applicant, upon his submission to the conditions fixed by the Lord Jesus himself.

Each one is thus laid under obligation to yield, in the communion of the church, his influence to advance the interests of the empire of his Lord, in being a helper of fellow Christians; and all, as associated, are bound to glorify God in doing good to each member, as well as to the whole conjointly. The right is possessed, neither by an individual nor by a multitude, to withhold from the community of the faithful, his or their aid in prosecuting the great ends of their heavenly calling; nor has the church, nor any number of her members, the moral power to reject the proffered aid of such, by the establishment of a higher grade of terms than has been done by the church's Head himself. Of such a measure, it is no justification to affirm that, in it, there is nothing that God has directly forbidden. The true question is—Has the Lord of Zion

required it, as a term of communion in his church? Has he required that avowal, or that form of observance, as indispensable to a participation in the privileges of his family? The house is the Lord's, the family is his, the table is his; none of them is exclusively ours; the terms of membership are settled by him, and by absenting ourselves, or by giving either a higher or lower character than he has done, to the terms of communion, we must not dare to dishonour him, or injure the interests of his household. *Thou shalt not add thereto, nor diminish from it.* The assumption now under consideration, however popular it may be, is most unscriptural. It supposes that the church is a mere voluntary society; that Jesus, her Lord, has settled for her no definite terms of communion; that every one is at liberty to nullify, at pleasure, the relation in which he stands to fellow Christians; and, if acted upon, it would go to authorize, without end, the formation of parties.

Under this head, extremes must be avoided. The rigorous enforcement of truths, the discovery of which depends upon long processes of ratiocination, the evidence of which is not likely to be seen by any, except those possessed of distinguished powers of abstraction, is one of these extremes. The other is, that easy system of accommodation that, to answer a purpose of convenience, is ready to dispense with any truth, and to set lightly by the institutions of the sanctuary. No article, stamped by the authoritative seal of inspiration may be abandoned, excluded from the ministrations of the church, or concealed. Paul would say, and every minister ought to be able to say—*I have not shunned to declare unto you the whole counsel of God.* The articles of the creed should be plainly scriptural, distinctly stated, cordially received, and faithfully declared.

2. *Having dismissed false positions, care must be taken to ascertain, with all possible precision, in what that visible union consists, which the church of God is authorized to expect, and what are its bonds; to fix upon the mind and heart a deep sense of the importance of them, and to carry out that sense of their importance, in religious life.* Permit no occurrence, under any pretext whatever, to innovate upon or break their legitimate power. Truth must be kept pure, every ordinance entire, and, in its proper season the observance of every duty must be regarded. Where innovations or breaches have been made, ascertain what remains untouched of the sacred principles of truth and order; lay hold upon these, preserve them, and use them as means of restoring what has been lost. Thus *strengthen the things which remain that are ready to die.* An unremitting regard to the bonds of brotherhood, is indispensable to the maintenance of harmony where it exists, and to the regaining of it where breaches have been made upon it. But the instituted unity itself must be known, and its proper bonds be felt. Defect in the settlement of these, as a preliminary step, will always be followed with confused and unsatisfactory results.

3. *Ascertain the causes, nature and extent of existing ecclesiastical divisions.* In order to this, bring distinctly into view the extent of ground occupied in common, by the denominations usually reckoned orthodox and evangelical. Attention to this is specially due

by the several branches of the Presbyterian family, and those who in their forms of order and doctrine approximate toward them. Upon this common ground there can be no reason for conflict; here, to all its extent, the parties are *one*. Along with doctrines of settled authority, which constitute a common possession, find out, too, the practical observances regulated either by statute or common law, in which they are agreed. In good faith, candour, and with a spirit of generosity, to act upon this common ground in a concurrent course of administration, while it would go to mitigate the evils of party, would likewise prepare the way for the prosecution of the proposed inquiry to a favourable issue.

In connexion with the ascertainment of the common ground, upon which all stand, seek the true subjects of difference. Let them be understood in their general and commonly received shapes. Discover, as far as possible, in what, upon those subjects, the difference consists; how much of it is referable to a misapprehension of the import of terms; how much of it pertains to mere names, or mere denominational distinctions; how much to habits, prejudices, or passions; and how much to substantial discrepancy in principle: this last alone should be allowed to have any weight, in retarding a happy union of the now severed church. And it is possible the result of the inquiry now recommended would be to some, matter of surprize, in finding the alleged causes of separation reduced to dimensions so very small.

In order to the distinct discovery of those points of agreement and disagreement, let the several parties open with each other a correspondence. The form of delegated conventions, select committees, or epistolary communications, may be adopted. To one, or as occasion may require, to all of these, recourse may be had. The common ground already occupied, should not be disturbed. In the investigation of other points, now suggested, candour should prevail, and discussion be full and free. Upon the footing of that faith which they hold in common, there will, by this intercourse, be a mutual recognition of one or other as departments—though in some things mistaken departments—of the family of God. Pursuing this course, in the becoming spirit of the sons of God, and while, in these discussions and mutual prayers, they really enjoy to a great extent, the communion of saints; is it unreasonable to suppose that they may experience some surprize, in being able to trace in each other so many distinctly marked features of family likeness, as to leave no doubt of their relation to their Father in heaven, and to Jesus, the Elder Brother, the blessed Mediator? And while obtaining assurance that He is not ashamed to call them brethren, is it improbable that they will feel a generous shame, when they remember how long, and in how many instances, they have mutually acted the part of aliens—treating each other as though estranged from God, unworthy of a place in his domestic circle—at that sacred table,—where the Father's love to the heirs of promise, is distinctly expressed?

4. *The causes of division having been discovered, weighed in the balances of the sanctuary, and their value found; the way is opened for enlightened and candid consultation.* At once free the creed,

or constitution, of the church, in all her departments, from those causes of separation which consist of the wood, the hay, and the stubble. The amalgamation of contradictions into one harmonious system, must never be attempted. It is an impossibility. The transient expedients of short-sighted policy must not be permitted to deform, or enfeeble the platform of Zion's faith, worship, and order. No material upon which has been heard the sound of the hammer, wielded by the human hand—we mean the doctrines and commandments of men, in the things of God,—must be allowed a place in the sacred superstructure. Look back to the principles, the spirit, and the provisions of the apostolic church; then cast the inquiring look down to the millennial age; and in the light of inspired prophecy and promise, learn what the church, in her form and administration, is likely to be in that day of light. Approximate toward that standard now. Whilst thus engaged, let us endeavour to estimate what may be reasonably expected of man, under the influence of divine grace, while an inhabitant of earth; taking into the account, as far as may be done, the great diversity of circumstances that mark his condition, in various localities. From the whole of this view, in the light of reason, instructed and guided by the word of God, let us try to ascertain what, upon this subject, are the purposes and requisitions of God.

The result will be the exclusion from the church's constitution and stated creed, of all that is capricious, partial, and of mere temporary and local character. Her terms of fellowship will then be full, distinct, and simple; without imposition upon conscience, and providing for an ample development of truth and evangelical order. In this arrangement, that which belongs to the foundation will not be confounded with the materials of the superstructure. The foundation and superstructure are both essential to the perfection of the edifice, each in its appropriate place; but that which pertains to the wall, if introduced among the fundamentals, or if what belongs to the foundation be transferred to the wall, the beauty of the building may be marred, or its stability be endangered.

Of the very different state of the church under the apostolic economy, from what it was under the Levitical, we are not unappreciated; nor are we to be inattentive to the difference between the circumstances of the apostolic and the present age. Yet, in this connexion, to a reflexion or two, on the administrations of prophets and apostles, it may not be out of place to call the reader's attention. Too much, we know may be attempted to be made, by the latitudinarian, of the facts to which reference is made. From them, nevertheless, an admonition is given to rashness and untempered zeal. We refer to the practical illustration of tenderness to the unity of the church by prophets, apostles, and martyrs, and by the Great Head of the church himself, while in our nature, he sojourned upon earth. The state of religion, in various periods of the old dispensation, was deplorable. In the apostolic times, bad principles, bad men, and evil deeds, were not few. Isaiah, Jeremiah, their associates and successors, down to Malachi, reproved, plead, and suffered; but attempted not the rearing of a separate temple of purer worship. The apostolic churches were rebuked for neglect

of discipline, and permitted errors, but not for continuing in the fellowship of the church, where even great irregularities might be found. Steadfastness in the cause of the Redeemer, forbearance with mistaken brethren, and the exercise of discipline in its legitimate forms, were pressed upon all by the authority of apostles; but in no instance do we find them authorize the formation of a separate communion. Upon the foundation that God had laid, the churches of Rome, Corinth, Galatia and Asia, were commanded to continue their building, and there to abide; but no erection of a separate building was allowed. With these facts before us, it would seem not to be an unsuitable inquiry, to ascertain how far and how long, while full liberty is possessed and ample opportunity is given, to maintain truth and expose every form of error, we may remain or form fellowship with those, whose personal belief is not in every point accordant with our own. Upon this, every community is, to some extent, obliged to act. And often by those most strict, a very liberal construction is given both as to faith and practice. Those too who in an evil hour, an hour of unrul'd passion, have excluded such as displeas'd them, from the table of the Lord in their apartment, would be the first to raise the reproachful cry, did those excluded brethren refrain from solemnizing the seals of the covenant, in their own assemblies. Blame them for not applying the seal themselves, yet keep them from doing it in company with you! The consistency of this appears worthy of a passing thought, when settling the provisions of the constitution of the church.

5. *In this work, a spirit of deep piety toward God, good will toward men, and impressive views of the importance of the organized unity of the church, are indispensable to success.* The absence of these, to an extent calling for humiliation, has opened the way for much mischief in the house of God. This spirit, the absence of which is deplored, will embrace the knowledge and love of the truth as it is in Jesus, and to whatever, in the application of the principles of true evangelical order and worship belongs to the communion of saints, it will lead. A harmony in moral action, in the several departments of life will be the result. This spirit will carry along with it an enlightened and practical persuasion, that it is God alone that is adequate to give success to the attempts made to harmonize into one happy assembly the severed portions of the true Zion. His it is to *bind up the breach of his people, and to heal the stroke of their wound*, and upon him reliance must be placed, while means are used for the attainment of the much desired end.

Feeling the importance of this original unity, in order to the existence of proper dispositions among the parties composing the household of faith, and for the efficient action of the whole, in pursuit of the end of their high calling; each denomination, by itself, must, in the progress of the good work, be actively employed. Derive all possible aid from others, the individual party may and ought; yet when, in this way, all is effected that can be done, the work must, by each, be carried on and prepared by the domestic hand. This will be in accordance with the obligations of all, to co-operate upon their common ground for the attainment of the

common end. Mean while, no guarantee may be given, by inconsistent acting, to the perpetuation of schism. While each portion of the divided church, desirous of finding a meeting place with others, is thus projecting and endeavouring self reform, there will be a falling back upon first and fundamental principles, a more thorough examination of their bearings, and an inquiry into the place which remote deductions should occupy in the authorized faith and bonds of the fellowship of Zion. Her distinctive sectional positions will, in this process, be brought into contact with those principles, their consistency be brought to trial, and their value be more perfectly ascertained.

[To be Continued.]

---

ROBERT WICKLIFFE AND HIS CALUMNIES.—HIS SUCCESS IN EATING  
A FILE.

THE abortive attempts of bad men to destroy, by calumny, the good name of those they hate and dread—have long ago, been likened to the mad attempts of a serpent to bite a file. That "old man venomous"—Robert Wickliffe, of Kentucky—by his flagitious, malignant, and fruitless attacks upon us, has afforded another illustration of the truth and aptness of the similitude. We thank God for this new deliverance; and beseech him to visit every enemy of his name and his people—with an overthrow as signal as he has been pleased to award to this incorrigible old man. What a world it would be, if a merciful God did not interpose his special providence, for the rebuke of the wicked and the protection of those against whom cruel wrong is perpetrated? For our part, we are constrained to say, that no part of the dealings of God has been more signal or more surprising towards us, than his constant, faithful, and effectual care of our life, our reputation, and our soul, from the snares of abandoned men.

We have had occasion to note the influence of party hatred in regard to this and other attacks upon us, and have been not a little edified, and sometimes not a little surprised—at its developments. The better sort of those occupying ranks which we have been called in God's providence to encounter, for his truth's sake; have either stood silent, scorning to acknowledge for an auxiliary, one so depraved and so exposed; or else have, with becoming candor and honor—openly confessed that this bad old man, was justly and utterly degraded. The baser sort, have hailed him with delight—eagerly enrolled him with themselves—diligently circulated his detected calumnies; thus, by a new and signal proof establishing the universality of that instinct—*like to like*—which pervades all nature. Tell us what a wise man says—what a virtuous man does—what an honest man determines; and we will answer, for ninety nine out of every hundred of the like kinds, under the like circumstances—the world over. Tell us the prattle of a fool, the deceit of a knave, the malignant cowardice of an assassin; and we will go bail that others like them, will follow their example, time and chance concurring.

The horrible outrage which Mr Wickliffe has committed—and the dreadful dealing with him, which he rendered indispensable; put this whole case in such a light, that it was impossible for any decent man who knew the facts and valued public opinion—to stand forth openly as his defender. As far as we have seen the expressions of the public press—no-body has justified him—no-body has even excused him. Even his cries to the most embittered of our opponents—and his open and scandalous offers to make common cause with every one, that had any grief, real or imaginary, against us; have failed, as far as we know—to produce any public manifestation in his favour; although his second pamphlet has been more than a year—and his first one a year and a half, before the public.

On the other hand, we might fill pages of this work with unqualified and unsolicited testimonies, of the public press, secular and religious, of our own and other denominations, in many portions of the country; expressing the fullest conviction, that we had *disproved* all the accusations of the most scandalous and unscrupulous falsifier, that ever put pen to paper. When the circumstances are considered; we could ask nothing more. It is not that this venomous libeller *has failed to prove* any thing on us. It is, that we have done what in all fair controversy is conceded to be ordinarily impossible; we have established negative after negative, by proof so clear that doubt is impossible, and demonstration so comprehensive that conviction is irresistible. We have done this, of a body of transactions covering a period of half a century; and in regard to most of which, the evidences were in their nature, evanescent.

Let any man run his mind over the current of his own life, and over the charges made against us, and over the sort of proof necessary to establish a negative; and then he can comprehend, the danger from which God has delivered us—the extent of our obligations to him for his special providence, and the broad and undeniable grounds on which we have a right to demand of every virtuous and honest man—an unqualified condemnation of our malignant persecutor.

The private testimonies, voluntarily tendered to us from all parts of the country, and from persons of all conditions in life, are most decisive; and have deeply affected us. We never had a doubt—a particle of doubt—as to our perfect ability to do what has been done, and what more may be needful; but we did fear, that on account of the purely personal and private nature of the case, as well as the great extent of it—the public would not take the least interest in it, and indeed could not be expected to do so. In this alone, we have been disappointed; most gratefully disappointed. For as far as we can ascertain—both of our defences have been eagerly read; and the second one, of which we speak more especially at present, and of which not less, perhaps, than 20,000 copies have been scattered in various forms, over the whole nation, has put the whole matter at rest, wherever it has been read.

The testimonies which follow, are but samples. They were not, of course, written for publication, and we therefore take some responsibility—which the circumstances will justify, to every honorable mind—in printing them.

A layman connected with an important secular journal in the south, writes thus :

"I am much gratified at your triumphant vindication of yourself and family from the aspersions of Wickliffe. You have perfectly annihilated him."

An old and distinguished clergyman, with whom we have a slight personal acquaintance—writes thus :

"I return you my hearty thanks for your second reply to Robert Wickliffe. I think you have flayed him alive, and broken every bone in his body. And he richly deserved all that he received. In punishing him according to his deserts, you are perfectly justifiable, not more as a vindication of your personal, than of your ministerial character. And a regard to the latter might lead you not to pass lightly by that, which you might be inclined not to notice as affecting the other. But it is quite needless even to state this to you, except only as pointing to the light in which it is received by me, and I suppose by others."

The following is from one of the first lawyers and scholars of Virginia.

"I thank you for your "Second Defence"—which I received yesterday and read last evening with great pleasure. I really thought that you had pulverized your antagonist before; but "bray a fool in a mortar, &c ;" but you have certainly done for him this time. Beyond all doubt he can never be able to speak or write against you again. I am sorry, indeed, that you should be obliged to waste so much of your valuable time, upon such a worthless object; yet upon reflection, I do not know but it is all well, for the notices which he has forced you to give us of yourself, must serve to raise you still higher in the regard of all your friends. I think, however, you may let him rest now, and even say, "like a good catholic—*requiescat in pace.*"

One of the most distinguished gentlemen of New Jersey—writes thus, to us :

"I received from Ky.—I suppose from you or by your direction, your answer to Robert Wickliffe. I thank you for it. The testimony which it conclusively affords, not only of his entire want of principle, but of his miserable, profligate brutality—is really amazing ! The answer is, no doubt, perfectly complete and overwhelming. The only doubt, I think, that can exist on any mind is, whether such a wretch was worth answering."

A gentleman of high reputation both as a lawyer and a scholar—and now a judge, in one of the middle states—expresses himself to us, thus :

"I think your defence conclusive. Your opponent is shut up to the denial of your facts, which he cannot do, in the face of the records to which you appeal, and the other vouchers which you deposited with Mr. Todd. It must have been very painful to you, to be engaged in a controversy with such a man on any subject, especially on one of a private and personal character. Yet I doubt not, it was quite unavoidable, and your friends and the disinterested portion of the public, I am persuaded, will quite approve the way in which you managed it. I should presume this Second Defence will suffice for the future, as well as for the past, as I cannot conceive that a man of whom such things can be written, should be worthy of further attention."

A gentleman of the city of New York, widely known to the public as one of the first merchants and most decided Christians of that city, writes to a friend in Baltimore as follows :

"I have received thro' the post office, Mr. Breckinridge's Defence against the Seditious slanders of Robert Wickliffe. I have read it with interest and deep emotion; and tho' in one sense, I regret that a man of God was thus forced to appear before the public, yet in another, I am glad he had the moral courage to

“ nail this villain to the wall, where he will ever appear as a beacon and warning to our poor fallen and depraved nature. Please present my Christian regards to Mr. B., and tell him, I knew and loved dearly his brother John—whose memory is very dear to me, and that I should be happy and esteem it a privilege if he would make my house his home when he visits New York; for I think I love a brave and honest man, especially one of God’s dear children and servants in the ministry.”

An old college friend, now a prominent and influential gentleman in one of our southern states, writes to us as follows:

“ I have just finished reading your “Second Defence” against Wickliffe.—Whilst I greatly lament the necessity you are under, of turning aside from your calling as a Christian minister, to scuffle before the public with such a foul mouthed brawler; yet judging from the extracts which you have given from his speech, I am ready to admit that the cause, and your provocation, were very great; and I do not see how you could have acted otherwise. You have, however, skinned him; and I sincerely rejoice in the triumphant vindication of yourself which you have given to the world.”

We should never have troubled our readers, or the public with this degraded old man, if it had not been that both his circumstances and our own were peculiar, and the interests at stake, both public and private, too great to be jeopardized, on punctilios. Nor should we now recur to him were it not that we constantly get letters from the west, saying that he is stirring every element anew against us; and that, as we judge it may be necessary to deal with him again—we do not wish him, in the mean time, to suppose he is forgotten. As far back as December 14, 1841, a friend in the neighbourhood of Lexington, wrote to us thus: “You may prepare yourself to see the most vulgar, low, and scurrilous abuse, that human depravity and malice ever conceived, or the envenomed tongue of slander ever uttered.” Much more to the same purport, then and often since by other friends—has been written to us, of a series of attacks upon us, published after we left Ky., from September to December, 1841; but a copy of which was never sent us either by the author or publisher. We have received, at last, complete samples, as we suppose, of this new distillation of venom and filth; but as it is in newspaper form, and that form is bad for reference; and as we have been very busy for some months, and not very well; as we can bide our time—and are in no haste, after submitting for ten years, to the injuries of this wicked man; we have not yet taken any of this last decoction, except a drop or two, here and there. Mean time, after writing repeatedly, for copies of the pamphlet edition of the matter, we are lately answered by a friend in Lexington, that it is doubtful when the pamphlet will be out, if at all. The reason given for this dead stop, is the fact that Mr. Wickliffe had said in one of his pieces that Chief Justice Robertson, had authorized him to declare that we had mis-stated his opinions in our defence; and to make very grave statements against us; and that the Chief Justice, having been obliged, by his sense of justice, truth and honour, to publish a card contradicting Mr. Wickliffe; this incident, arrested for the time, the forthcoming pamphlet. Our friend did not know, apparently, that long before this printed card of the Chief Justice,

he had written a private letter to Mr. Wickliffe—far more full and decided than the printed card; a copy of which he sent to us, and which, if Mr. Wickliffe does not publish, we shall; which certainly confirms all our statements, and explicitly contradicts Mr. Wickliffe's—so far as Judge Robertson's statements go. This much, by the way.

Whether we shall deem a formal reply necessary to Mr. Wickliffe's third attack, will depend on what we shall judge necessary, after reading it. At present he seems ashamed of it, himself; and disposed to suppress it.

We beg that it may be borne in mind, *that as yet*, we have acted wholly on the defensive. We have not travelled out of the case, as made by Mr. Wickliffe, to attack him, nor have we even incidentally pursued our investigations into his life, conduct, and principles—beyond what we judge to be the line of strict defence.—We will not pledge ourself to act any further, under such self-imposed restrictions. And we fairly say to him and to all immediately concerned—that we judge ourself to be no longer bound by any considerations to spare any of them—any farther than our own sense of pity or propriety may dictate.—And whenever we shall give to this controversy an aggressive aspect, if it shall ever become our duty to do so, the public will see, how much Mr. Wickliffe and others very near to him, have been indebted to our forbearance. It will then also appear, that constitutional faithlessness is a very small part of his vices; and that we were neither the first, nor the last victim, by many—whose sacrifice was required by his various and enormous villanies.

---

SOME ACCOUNT OF THE LATE REV. JOHN H. REDINGTON, WITH PARTS OF HIS CORRESPONDENCE AND ILLUSTRATIVE NOTES THEREON.

*Article Second.—Letters written in 1837.*

MOSCOW, LIVINGSTON Co., N. Y., Aug. 31st, 1837.

*My Dear Brother:*—I have often thought of writing to you since our brief acquaintance in Phila. in May last, but something or other has hindered hitherto. I find my time very much occupied, and though I seem to bring little to pass, yet I scarcely know what may be called *leisure* moments. O that my time might be wholly devoted, and to good purpose, in the service of our Lord Jesus Christ! But alas, how little love do I exercise towards him, or his cause in these dark days of wrath and rebuke! I trust in God, that you are in health, my brother, and that your soul prospers daily.—No doubt you find both your head and hands sufficiently engaged at the present time in the Lord's work. His work is great and important. May the arms of your hands be made strong by the hands of the mighty God of Jacob! May you be anointed with the unction of the Holy One, and be strong in the Lord and the power of his might.

Since my return from Convention, we have had much trouble in Moscow—a good deal of opposition has been manifested against me, both in our own church and elsewhere. But I thank God through Jesus Christ, that the truth has continued to prosper among us. The church of Moscow, is small, only about 100 members, but the post is important. A large popu-

lation of unconverted men, are among and round about us.—The Lord may build up a large church here, on a sure foundation, but in order to this there is much work to be done on the part of his people in faith and love. I am very much alone, as to my brethren in the ministry in this region, in the stand which I have taken.—The few orthodox brethren which we have, and who countenance me, do it not in that open, decided manner, which the cause of truth demands.\*—Our Presbytery had a meeting a few days ago, and some of the New School members were for putting irons upon me at once. But God restrained them by raising up some of the better sort, to make a stand against them. I did think of asking a letter of dismission to the Presbytery of Erie, but when I saw the course things were taking, I changed my plan a little and declared off at once, acknowledging no farther obligation to the Presbytery of Ontario, and casting myself upon the Assembly. The church of Moscow, also declared off (having first asked a letter of dismission, without obtaining it) at the same time. A committee was appointed by the Presbytery to visit and confer with this church. Meantime, the session of the church held a meeting and resolved they would have nothing to do with this committee, *as such*, or as acknowledging that the Presbytery of Ontario had any rightful authority over us.—This committee visited us yesterday—and we conversed with them, not officially—but as individuals. They advised us to suspend all further proceedings in the cause, and *to lay all our papers on the table*, till the meeting of another Assembly. To this I was ready to answer, *no*, at once, as I suppose were that part of the session, who hold with me, (constituting a majority) but we were not unwilling to *think* a while, upon their proposal, especially, as some who are friendly to us, strongly recommended the measure. Some days are allowed us to consult with our friends from abroad, at the expiration of which the committee will visit us again, to know our final determination. My own mind, I thank God, is already made up. What my views in relation to this matter are, you will find in the Presbyterian of 26th inst., in an article signed “R.” I can see little or nothing to gain, and much that may be lost by delay. Still I am desirous to be advised, and therefore, dear brother, I now write to you. Doubtless

\*Probably no fact was more characteristic of those sad times, than the one here spoken of, viz. the want of “open and decided” conduct on the part of many of those who professed to love the truth and to believe it to be in danger. The orthodox had for years together connived at the entrance and spread of error in our church; and when in 1831 and ’2, some stirred themselves and began to give the alarm, they were said to be men of “a bad spirit;” after 1834, those who moved boldly forward, were publicly attacked in the church courts and in the religious periodicals, by many now ready to boast of their orthodoxy; and even in 1837 and ’8—whole Presbyteries, and these led by men now claiming to lead the church—held themselves aloof—from a struggle—the end of which they could not, as they feared, clearly see. This spirit in the church, is the more worthy to be signalized, since, even to this hour, it has pursued with a severity it never manifested against error, many of those whom God really used to rescue his church, in her day of trial; and has succeeded in taking possession of many of the high places of our Zion. If another conflict, like that from 1831 to 1839, only on some other question, were to come now upon us; who is certified of the course things would take? Or rather who does not know, that this same spirit of fierce-moderation, and self-denying—time-service—would still be found—in much of its former vigour? Oh! that God would purify his sanctuary!—[Ed.]

†This has been characteristic of the New School from the origin of that faction. Ever ready to cry out persecution, when any thing was done to maintain the truth or order of the church,—they have omitted no opportunity to treat with harshness and visit with cruel wrong, orthodox men and churches subjected to their power. Minorities in their Presbyteries and churches have, however, no instance that has come within our knowledge, been treated with justice or with courtesy; but in many, with extreme rigour.—[Ed.]

you know what is going forward among the Old School, and what ground they will be likely to take at the next Assembly, and what course it may be best for the church of Moscow to pursue. We have a decided majority in the church, and think without doubt we can hold the premises,—also, with God's blessing, the gospel can be supported here without any aid from those who oppose us. The question, then, is, shall we at once go and unite with another Presbytery—say that of Erie, Penna., or shall we wait till another Assembly meets? In which way shall we most help the cause of truth and glorify God? Which course will be best for us? If we defer the step till another year, I suppose we can get along, during this, in some sort of peace (if peace it can be called) with our New School members, but it must be war in the end, and I know not why we may not as well or better meet it now. If you can spare a few moments from your great and various duties, will you, dear brother, devote them to writing me a few lines on receipt of this, giving your advice. And tell me also, how things are in Baltimore, and your region, whether the brethren are full of faith and hope and courage, in the Lord, or whether their hands hang down and they are discouraged. The state of our whole church, is in some respects truly deplorable, and it is difficult to tell what the issue of our great controversy may be. But the Lord reigns, and let us put our trust in him and rejoice. I do hope, whatever may happen—whether the orthodox are in the majority or minority, in the next Assembly, that such measures may be pursued, as under God, will result in the establishment of a true Presbyterian church, on the immoveable foundation of the Bible and of our standards. O what a heterogeneous mass is our Presbyterian church at the present day! How is it possible any thing but discord, contention, and confusion, can result from such a composition. †

\*The reader will remember that the Assembly of 1837 had abrogated the Plan of Union, declared the four Synods of Western New York and the Reserve not in our connexion, discountenanced the action of the Home Missionary and American Education Societies in our churches, and in general, adopted the famous and illustrious measures, for the reform of the church. One, the 4th clause of the act in regard to the Synods of Western New York, expressly covered the case propounded in this part of Mr. Redington's letter; and directed the course to be taken which his own mind evidently inclined to, and which he finally adopted. But it was not at all certain, at this period, what the general sentiment of the church might be, in regard to the acts of the assembly of 1837; nor what the Assembly of 1838 might do in regard to them. In this condition, nothing could be more simple, faithful, and courageous, than the conduct of this good man; how different from that of many, who stood neutral, as long as there was a neutral spot large enough to hold them.—[Ed.]

† Nothing is more remarkable than the opposite opinions of good men in the church, as to its real state, immediately before its reform. Many wise and excellent persons in various parts of the country, considered the condition of things, not seriously alarming even up to 1836. And the strong probability is, that if the New School had deported themselves with ordinary prudence in the Assembly of that year—in which they had a majority, the controversy might have been indefinitely protracted, and they might even have carried the mass of the church with them. But their conduct and avowals on that memorable occasion terrified even the most moderate of the orthodox, who saw, in the refusal to condemn the errors of *Mr. Albert Barnes's Notes on Romans*, and the abrogation of the steps taken the year before, to conduct foreign missions, by the Assembly—a settled purpose to corrupt the doctrine and subvert the character of the church.—It is to be remembered, however, that as far back as 1831, and still more decisively in 1834, those called "*ultra*," had not only become fully convinced that the church was on the brink of ruin—but had proceeded to take public and formal action as the result of this conviction. The testimony in this letter is solemn and affecting—and proves that Mr. Redington, like all the more decided Presbyterians of that day, considered the controversy, as being one about the most vital interests

Pray for me, my brother, and for Moscow. Trust in the Lord Jesus Christ, and be as mount Zion that cannot be removed. Prove all things, hold fast that which is good.

Affectionately yours, in Christ Jesus.

JOHN H. REDINGTON.

Rev'd R. J. Breckinridge—Baltimore.

WILKSBARRE, PA., Saturday night, }  
Oct. 21, 1837. }

*My Dear Brother:*—Your favour of 6th Sept. last, was duly received by me at Moscow. I thank the Lord and you also, my brother, for that letter—for it strengthened our hands in God's work. It came in good time, and gave us assurance that there were some names in the Presbyterian church, whose minds were fully made up to stand or fall with the truth. "A double minded man," says an apostle, "is unstable in all his ways"—hence the instability of many in these days. May the Lord confirm and establish us more and more in his word, and make us always to abound in his work. I thank you for the Magazines which you sent me. I read them with interest,\* and will become a subscriber. I yesterday enclosed some money to W. S. Martien, Phila., and told him to pay over to your agent \$2,50 for a year's subscription to your Magazine, beginning with the Oct. No. of the present vol. But as you have sent the Nos. of Sept. and July, and as I would like to get that of June also, please to send it, and date the subscription back at that time.

It is a good, great, and responsible work, my brother, to edit and conduct a religious periodical in these days, and a man to do it will need much of the grace of God, in addition to necessary intellectual qualifications. May the Lord bless and sustain you in this work. Were not my acquaintance with you so slight, I might make a suggestion or two, concerning some of the productions of your pen—not, however, learnedly critical, because for such suggestions I am not qualified, but simple and fraternal. If I can circulate a few copies of your Magazine, in my neighbourhood, I will.

I very much approve of the resolutions of your Presbytery, and think it is high time all true Presbyterians took similar ground. But alas, this is not the case! Many still vacillate and hang back, of which I have recently had too clear evidence.

I left home, in company with others, on 16th inst., to connect thro' some Presbytery, with the Synod of New Jersey, hoping to obtain a new Presbytery, in the region of Moscow immediately. We succeeded in forming the connexion; and when there was a plain and proper motion made in the synod, by Dr. Miller—to set off a number of us into a new

of true religion, and as involving in its issue, the fundamental reform or utter ruin of our branch of the church of Christ. It is a falacy, wholly disingenuous and disreputable, to pretend, that our difficulties were about unimportant differences; and now we presume none believe, that our danger was imaginary.—[Ed.

\*The *Balt. Lit. and Rel. Magazine*, during the latter half of 1837 and the former half of 1838, contained a series of articles written to explain and defend the acts of the Assembly of '37—to some of the earlier numbers of which, allusion is here probably made. Those articles place the defence of those acts in preparing and carrying which, the writer of these lines, is known to have had some share; upon the grounds, which decided his own mind in advising, preparing, or supporting them. And as we always considered much of the reasoning by which others defended the Assembly neither clear nor sound; we now take leave to refer to the articles in question, as containing the views which, as we well know, governed the conduct of at least a very large section of the majority of the Assembly of 1837.—[Ed.

body to be called the Presbytery of Caledonia, the "New School," together with a number of "Moderates," in the house, defeated this most desirable and important measure—by postponing the subject till the next annual meeting of the Synod. Indeed every thing was *postponed*, in whatever shape brought up, when definite and present action on it would have obliged the Synod expressly, either to approve or disapprove of the action of the last Assembly.—Complaints, will go up to the next Assembly, in relation to some of the doings of this Synod, at their recent meeting at Easton.—If the full orthodox strength had been in the house, they could have done what they pleased—but many staid at home, while the "New School," came on the ground almost to a man. Such indifference on the part of the orthodox, in respect to attendance in our judicatories, will never do. We must take heed that we be not ruined next spring, on this account. Every man should be at his post and do his whole duty.

A great work of reformation, thro' the good hand of God, has been begun in the Presbyterian church, but much, very much remains to be done. Our church in a sense, has become like the fabled stubble of old, which Hercules was obliged to clean, and which he effected by turning the stream of a whole river into it, despairing of less effectual means to this end. Our hope must be steadfast in God, but the great danger is, in our discussions and conflicts, we shall neglect prayer and other holy and self-denying duties. There are some who are full of zeal for orthodoxy, even to fierceness, who take no better heed to "walk in the law of the Lord," than Jehu did. Such are a scandal and hindrance to our cause. Let us, my brother, warned by their example, watch and pray, against temptation.\*

I am now on my way home from the Synod of N. J.—May the Lord prosper me in my way—that I may soon be with my dear family and the people of my charge. The Lord has not yet suffered the adversary to prevail at Moscow, tho' he has given us much trouble. We think the truth gains ground among us, tho' against much opposition. We beg an interest in your prayers. Your Synod, I hear, is to meet soon. May God be in the midst of you, and may your doings give an additional impulse to the work of reformation in our church.

In relation to what you mentioned about my writing some numbers, on a certain subject,† for the Magazine—I would gladly do this, but cannot,

\* We have before remarked on the lamentable want of decision complained of by Mr. R.; and now we hear him complaining with equal pointedness, along with it, of a want of personal piety in an opposite class of persons. We are bound to testify, that here also, he had truth with him. Nothing in all our controversies has been more obvious, than that many persons, of every shade of opinion have been actuated by unholy motives and that much unholy conduct has marked the progress of our troubles. We firmly believe the ministry of our church to be, to an unusual extent a converted ministry; but truth obliges us to say, with the author of these letters—that our cause was both hindered and scandalized by some, who were fierce for orthodoxy. Indeed, if we should characterize the religion of our age—we fear we should be obliged to say, one of its worst and most striking marks is, the want of a spirit of humble, fervent, self-denying, God-fearing piety. And we are ready to add, that Mr. R., was one of those whose whole intercourse was most calculated to keep alive this precious spirit, in the heart. For our own part, we are free to confess, that his whole influence, personally and by letter, has been to us, a means of grace, exceeded by very few individuals with whom we have ever had intercourse. He was a truly holy and faithful man.—[E.D.]

† See note on p. 88. We were exceedingly desirous that some competent and faithful hand should write a full and clear account of the rise, progress, and fruits of Semi-Pelagianism, in Western New York; and urged Mr. R. to do this great service to truth, as well as to his own and the next generation. We greatly regret that scruples without due foundation prevented him from performing a work, so

for two reasons:—1, I lack the necessary information. 2. Had I the requisite information, I fear my ability would be insufficient. My opportunities have been small—but my attainments are smaller.—Yet let me be in God's hands as clay, in the hands of the potter.—May the Lord bless you and yours.—Grace be with you.

Affectionately your brother in Christ,

JOHN H. REDINGTON.

Rev'd R. J. Breckinridge—Baltimore..

REMONSTRANCE, TO THE HON<sup>BLE</sup>, THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF MARYLAND, NOW IN SESSION,  
AGAINST THE PETITION OF THE LATE "SLAVE-HOLDERS"  
CONVENTION."

GENTLEMEN,—There is now upon your tables a petition of about eighty gentlemen, calling themselves a "*Convention of Slave-Holders*," pressing upon you, the adoption of twenty-two propositions, which if they shall be sanctioned by you, will become laws of this commonwealth. The obvious, if not the avowed objects of the petitioners are two fold: 1, To drive from the state the total mass of its free coloured population: 2, To render slavery perpetual in Maryland.

The *first* object they propose to reach by such enactments as the following, amongst others is, viz.: that free negroes shall not be allowed to come into the state, nor if they go out of it, to return again, nor while they are in it, to use the ordinary public conveyances—except in extraordinary cases, stated in the propositions 3, 4 and 5, and that the law of 1831, allowing them to remain in the state, be repealed; that free negroes, allowed to remain in the state under any circumstances, be required to register their names, once every year, and no certificate of freedom to be considered good, if of an older date—(that is, if we comprehend the matter, every free negro ceases, *ipso facto*, to be free, if he fails to register once a year;)—that no free negro shall be capable of receiving, either by sale or gift, title to any slave, (not even his wife, parent, or child;)—that every free negro shall give responsible security, annually, for his good behaviour, or failing to do so, be subjected to arrest, and to temporary or perpetual servitude;—that it shall be penal on the part of the officers of justice if they do not enforce all laws respecting free negroes;—that no free negro shall hold real estate, or even lease-hold, longer than from year to year;—that all the children of all free negroes, shall be taken from them, at the age of eight years, and be bound out, to serve till they reach 21 years, if males, or 18, if females;—that no meeting of free negroes, for any purpose, shall be permitted after sun-set—and exhorters or preachers amongst them, no matter by what Christian denomination authorised, herein offending, to be liable to fine and imprisonment for the first offence, and to be sold out of the state, for the second.

The *second* object, is to be attained by enactments, such as the following

important; and not the less, that no one else has been found willing to undertake it—so far as we know. It is, in our judgment, unspeakably important, that the thing be done—while the facts are in reach, and the witnesses alive; and surely the orthodox owe to themselves, and posterity will have a right to demand at their hands, a full account of those things, upon which so large a part of their fears and their proceedings were based. The same things may be said, in regard to the northern part of Ohio, portions of Tennessee, Illinois, New Jersey, the cities of New York and Philadelphia, and other portions of the country.—[Ed.

amongst others, viz.: That no one shall be allowed to manumit a slave by last will and testament—nor by deed, to take effect, *in futuro*; that no manumission, even by deed, *in presenti*, shall be valid except on condition of instant transportation to some place out of the U. S., and that at the expense of the manumitor; that the owners of runaway slaves, shall be obliged by law to pay a reward for their apprehension, to be graduated by the distance of the capture from home; that the state shall, in certain cases, bear the expenses of suits, in other states, involving title in runaway slaves; that sales and gifts of slaves to slaves, shall be void—(this means, we suppose, that a slave shall be incapable of procuring his own freedom—for by the law as it now stands, property conveyed to a slave vests not in himself, but in his master;) and that, as in the case of free negroes, so also of slaves, it shall be a penal offence on the part of the public officers omitting to enforce all laws respecting them.

Gentlemen, these are monstrous propositions. So much so, in my opinion, that even a citizen like myself, so obscure, so retired, and so entirely removed from all political agitations that in ten years I have cast but a single vote, and that but for a single person; is not to be considered presumptuous, in humbly suggesting considerations, why they ought not to be hastily adopted by your honorable body, and thus clothed with the venerable mantle of the law, before the sense of the great body of the people in regard to them, shall have been taken in some effectual manner.

Who are those represented in this convention of slave-holders? How have the members of that convention been chosen? What evidence is there that the body speaks the sentiments of any considerable portion of the slave-holders themselves? Beware, Gentlemen, that you do not allow yourselves to be seduced, fatally alike to your own reputation and for the peace and advantage of the State, into the adoption of measures which, our life on it, the people of Maryland will never sanction; and whose premature adoption can have no other effect than to convulse the Commonwealth with discussions and agitations which every prudent man must deprecate.

Let it be admitted for a moment, that these gentlemen calling themselves the Convention of Slave-holders, do, in fact, speak the sentiments of that whole class in the State. Is there no other class in Maryland? Let facts speak: There are in Maryland 62,580 voters, (so many actually voted at the last Presidential election;) there are, by the census of 1840, just 89,495 slaves in the State. How many of these voters own a slave? One in five? one in eight? one in twelve? Gentlemen, be not deceived; the overwhelming mass of your constituents own no slaves. The slave-holding interest in this State must keep the good sense and discreet judgment of the mass of the people with it, or the moment it separates from that mass, and dictates to it, the most revolting propositions in the most dictatorial spirit, you may rest assured, the first developments thereafter will show that, as a political interest, it is comparatively very small. We are doubtful whether one single society of Christians amongst us cannot cast more votes than there are slave-holders in Maryland; and yet that society has 10,000 free persons of color, in this State, under its care and watch, whose condition, if you adopt the suggestions of this convention, must become that of an organized banditti, robbed of every element of civilization.

But it is inconceivable that these gentlemen have spoken the feelings or wishes of the great body of Maryland slave-holders. Look back for fifty years. The slave-holders of Maryland, within that period, have voluntarily manumitted slaves worth twelve millions of dollars, at the very least. And it is within the bounds of belief, that this same class of persons is now anxious to adopt a system and to enact laws which will have just the effect to degrade, by statute, those they have manumitted, and to re-supply their place by other slaves, to be hereafter obtained? The idea is absurd. And

it will be found whenever such propositions as these are obliged to be passed on by the slave-holders of Maryland, that they will be repudiated even by them.

No separate interest in any community can be allowed to dictate the public policy, much less the fundamental laws; even if that interest were the largest and the most meritorious of all. The Commonwealth of Maryland, and every individual person in it, has a direct and permanent interest in the whole question of negro slavery; so that the idea of regulating all other interests by this, is not only ridiculous—but the idea of regulating this, solely by the notions of those holding the slaves, could originate only in the narrowest views of public rights and duties. The public character is at stake, in every such question; the public peace is involved in it; the public prosperity is implicated by it; and is not the Commonwealth itself, and every interest and every person in it, in every sense a party to all these, and all that affects them? The utmost length then that this Convention should have gone, was candid deliberation and respectful petition to your honorable body. But one, reading its acts, is almost ready to conclude that they are already esteemed to have the force and effect of laws of the land; and by way of initiative, a stenographer who came to note their doings, is committed to prison. Resistance to their behests, will brand you as Abolitionists; and words spoken against them, subject you to the charge of seditious, perhaps felonious designs. Gentlemen, you represent a free, and a manly constituency. Resist such principles and such designs; and turn over to the people this whole subject, and with it, those who have taken so extraordinary a course in regard to it. If there must be a radical revolution in the whole policy of the State, and the whole civil code in regard to slavery; let us hear the necessity and end of this change fairly discussed, before it is finally fastened upon us.

Maryland is a border state, as to the slave interest. She will probably continue so for years to come, whether she retains her present policy or changes it. The first dictate, then of common sense,—indeed the first necessity of such a condition, is the establishing of a code and a spirit answerable to her position. Extreme opinions are utterly out of place here—they are the reverse of the whole sentiment and practice of the Commonwealth on this precise subject, for half a century. But the sum and substance of the recommendations of this Convention, is the very essence and marrow of the extreme pro-slavery code; and if it can carry its plans into effect, slavery in its harshest form is fastened irrevocably on Maryland, and she must inevitably become again an importer of slaves. Gentlemen, have we come to this? Are we ready for it? Will you endorse it?

There are many and difficult questions connected with this of slavery and the black race. The whole subject is one of the largest ever submitted to the mind of man, and one of the most complex. Even as it regards the comparatively limited sphere of our own State, many and very serious questions of a collateral kind are to be solved before wise men can stand by and permit the sweeping propositions of this convention to be rivited upon us in the form of statutes.

The direct question in the mind of the Convention, no doubt was between the free blacks and the slaves. Well, look for one moment at this. We have by the census of 1840, 89,495 slaves and 62,020 free blacks.—This latter interest has been steadily approximating the former for many years. In 1790, the numbers were relatively 103,036 and 8,043; in 1800 they were 105,635 and 19,587; in 1810 they were 111,532 and 33,587; in 1820 they were 106,993 and 44,730; in 1830 they were 102,994 and 52,938; and in 1840 as stated above.

It is perfectly manifest from these figures, that a spirit of voluntary emancipation is of ancient date in this commonwealth; that it has steadily increased in its force for the last fifty years; and that it has been more operative than usual in the ten years preceding 1840. Now, can any thing

be more preposterous than the imagination that a spirit thus ancient, fixed, operative, hereditary; a spirit which has survived every national and every individual vicissitude, every shock of time and change; is to be turned back, and rooted out, and beaten down by the declamation of a few gentlemen met in Annapolis to dictate a fundamental revolution to your honorable body?

But suppose no such feeling existed. Here is a question for the political economist, of the gravest character. We have 62,020 free blacks, and 89,495 slaves: only 17,375 more slaves than free: that is, in every five blacks, two are free. Now, the proposition held out to us in the simplest form, by this Convention is this, viz., to expel, chase off, degrade, brutalize—two out of every five—in order to render it more certain that the remaining three, may be held to a more fixed and immutable slavery. Let us suppose slavery to be that great personal and national blessing, the Convention seems to take it for granted it is; is there no way to make it permanent and complete over these 89,495 except by the utter ruin of these 62,020—so far as the whole power of our state can compass their ruin? Are the increased advantages to be reaped by the state, from the ruin of these 62,020 persons, sufficiently assured, economically considered, in the mere circumstance that by this means, the slavery of the 89,495 will thereby be somewhat better guaranteed?—Why, gentlemen, this is a horrible proposition, whether you look at it in a personal, or a national light. And before it is consummated, you will surely expect some proof, that any Commonwealth ever before ruined at a blow, the seventh part of its total population, under the pretence of humanity and patriotism.

But there is another aspect of this matter. The great bulk of these free blacks are labourers, or domestics at service. Many of our small landed proprietors do not own slaves, but cultivate their farms by the hired service of free blacks. Are all these small proprietors to be broken up? Or is it one object of the convention to triple and quadruple the price of labor, and thus triple or quadruple the value of their slaves? Many persons, too, have conscientious scruples, not only about owning, but about hiring, slaves. What are such persons to do? Violate their consciences, in order to give triple or quadruple value to the slave property of the state? Surely your honorable body will pause before it lends itself to such proceedings.

Can it be conceived that such horrible measures as are here proposed, are necessary for the security of the slave-holder? The laws protect him in the enjoyment of his property; they punish with great rigor all attempts to deprive him of it, or to diminish its value. What more should he expect? The laws cannot change the spirit of the age. Even a convention of slave-holders cannot alter our physical position. Maryland, after all these monstrous things are sanctified by legislative enactments, will still be a border state; and means of escape for her slaves, which no enactments can reach, will remain as before. With a frontier open every where—and capable of being effectually guarded no where—it is an absolute illusion to suppose, that our slaves can be kept more securely under such a system as this convention recommends. Probably the reverse would be true; for if the agitation of the subject did not result in the abrogation of slavery—which is not impossible—the success of the plans of the Convention would convert our whole free black population—which is now quiet and contented—into a formidable body of auxiliaries to slaves disposed to seek freedom in flight.

But suppose I err again, still I put it to you, gentlemen—if the agitation of this question in any form, is not untimely; and if it does not become you to pause upon it? For many years our state has remained quiet on this most exciting topic. Before the rise of modern abolitionism, the state shaped its policy—upon full deliberation, and with general concurrence.—Something perhaps was conceded on all hands; but a result was reached; laws were framed; plans adopted; and the wisdom of the line of conduct,

fixed on by the Legislature ten years ago, is manifest in the quiet of the state, amid surrounding agitations, during that whole period. Is it wise, at this time, to disturb the regular course of events, and enter anew upon the question—even in its limited aspect as a question involving chiefly the slaves and free blacks? Let those who bring on these agitations be responsible for the results; for gentlemen, rest assured, it is easier to open than to close these questions.

You are aware, gentlemen, that, by a most remarkable provision of our state constitution, slavery can never be abolished in Maryland, by any public act, while that provision remains, without the unanimous consent of both branches of the Legislature, expressed at two different, but successive, sessions.—That is to say, it never can be done at all, by any public act, until this feature of the constitution, introduced into it a few years ago, shall be rescinded, in the usual mode of amending our state constitution.

Now, it is proposed by the Convention of Slave-holders to prohibit the voluntary emancipation of slaves, by their owners, within this Commonwealth, except upon conditions which are equal to a denial of the right to do so. So that emancipation being now impossible, under the constitution, by any public act, and hereafter prohibited in individual cases; the necessary result is, that slavery becomes eternal in Maryland; and this is, no doubt, precisely what the convention wished.

Gentlemen, it has already been shown that this result is directly contrary to the whole spirit of our people, and the whole current of our laws, for half a century. It is more. It is a direct attack upon the settled and highest policy of the state, and the clear and common rights, civil and religious, of the people.

The wise and patriotic men who have shaped our public policy and created our public sentiment, for half a century, have sedulously fostered the idea that a *unity of race* was the evident and decided policy of Maryland. Hence in part, the laws favoring emancipation, discouraging slavery and fostering colonization. But now, it is deliberately proposed to render any unity of race eternally unattainable in Maryland, and that, too, precisely at the moment when every circumstance is conspiring towards an accomplishment of the long sought object. For, within ten years last past, the white emigration into Maryland, and the black emigration out of it, as well as the voluntary emancipations, have been greater than ever before.—These are the three elements of that result: emancipation, colored removals, and white accessions. But here is a proposal to arrest emancipation and white accessions, and to supply, with a new slave population, the deficit created by expelling the free blacks, and keeping off the laboring whites; for free white labor and slave colored labor can no more co-exist than a shinplaster and a gold currency. So that we are driving, not only at a revolution in law, policy and public sentiment, but in the social condition of our people; pell-mell, and with a most edifying contempt of all consequences.

But, this proposed revolution attacks also the common rights of the citizen; yea, of the slave-holder himself; his rights both civil and religious. A. and B. each own slaves; A. chooses to keep his in bondage—and the community, though nine-tenths of them never owned a slave, and though slavery has not been cherished by the public sentiment of this Commonwealth for fifty years—permits him to do so, and secures him, in the exercise of that right. B. chooses to emancipate his slaves, that is to remit his right to and over this sort of property; and the state has heretofore considered his right to do this as sacred as his neighbor's right to pursue an opposite course; and has as strictly watched the door that would let in more slavery, as that which introduces more free negroes. At length, however, it is ascertained that A's right to keep his slaves in bondage, is a more clear and perfect right than B's right to set his free: that the good of

our state requires the former to be protected, and the latter to be suppressed—and that to achieve this end, the rights of conscience, the obligations of kindness, the rewards of fidelity, and all the ancient privileges of all our citizens, shall yield to the fancies of about one fifteenth part or less of the voters of the state! This is span new doctrine—both in morals and politics.

Let it be remembered as we go along, that there is no pretext for this alteration, founded upon any public danger. No-body pretends to fear any thing from the blacks in this state; and if any body did, they would be laughed at. The only fear or danger to their master is, least they run away.

Remember, also, that it is not conceded, but it is expressly denied, that any peculiar danger threatens the tenure of that sort of property in this state, to justify such a movement and such demands as these; and that no one asserts that the laws are not clear, precise and full; or that any body has moved for their repeal.

Remember, further, that the assumption tacitly made all through the action of this Convention, that slavery is beneficial to Maryland—or that it is, on any account, worthy of special encouragement, or to be upheld by violent and inhuman proceedings against the free blacks, and the denial of common and sacred rights even to masters; all this is not only not conceded, but is directly in the teeth of the laws, policy and sentiment of this ancient Commonwealth, as read on her statute book, and illustrated in the whole conduct of her people.

Gentlemen, note well this concatenation of facts and reasonings. Dam up suddenly and violently this humble, obscure, but most effective drain upon slavery, seated in the conscience, and manifest in the private and voluntary action of the good people of this state; and what do you suppose will be the result? Do you think you can easily force the consciences of men in cases like this? Would you do it if you could? Is the object held out to you worthy of such an attempt?

No, gentlemen, if you regard the prosperity, the quiet, or the honor of Maryland, let this thing alone. For rest assured, the revolution dictated to you by the Convention of Slave-holders, cannot happen. It is contrary to the policy and interest of the state, to the settled sentiment of the people, to the spirit of the age, to our physical position, and to every consideration of prudence and humanity. For the fear of God, and for the good of the state, let the thing alone.

The very capitol in which you deliberate pleads against such acts as are urged upon you. For how many illustrious men have occupied your seats, whose memories you would reproach by undoing their wise and humane labors? And how many precious monuments of our history and legislation which would be rudely torn down, consecrate those venerable halls? That greatest name in the history of man, the best, the wisest, the firmest; even the name of WASHINGTON, pleads against a profanation so deplorable. For in your very halls of legislation, where you are invited to perpetrate these acts—he performed one of the most illustrious of his own; and at last closed his unparalleled career—by the solemn, formal, and deliberate performance of that, which you are required to brand as infamous if not felonious! I feel it, gentlemen, to be a token of good, that sheltering myself under the name of the father of my country, I am permitted to date this humble Remonstrance, on the anniversary of his birth.

ROBERT J. BRECKINRIDGE,

*A servant of Jesus Christ, and a free citizen  
of the Commonwealth of Maryland.*

BALT. FEB'Y 22, 1842.

LORD CHANCELLOR KING'S INQUIRY INTO THE CONSTITUTION, &c.,  
OF THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH.

*An Inquiry into the Constitution, Discipline, Unity, and Worship of the Primitive Church, that flourished within the First Three Hundred Years after Christ. Faithfully Collected out of the Fathers and extant Writings of those ages. By Peter King, Lord High Chancellor of England. New York. Methodist Episcopal Conference Office.—1841. 12mo., pp. 300.*

WE rejoice to see this learned, candid, and truly conclusive book—which has been long out of print, re-published. This edition is said by its editor, to follow the original strictly, “except in the orthography of some words;” a fidelity which ought to give increased circulation to the work.

PETER KING, afterwards Lord King, Baron Ockham, &c., was a nephew to John Lock, and a man of great reputation as a scholar, lawyer, statesman and writer, during the fore-part of the last century, and the latter part of that preceding. The present work was published first, in 1691.

The object of the book is to gather out of the monuments left to us, of the first three centuries of Christianity—the real nature of the church itself, as to its outward form and action. That this has been done with diligence, candour, learning, and skill, has been conceded by all impartial persons; so that the work itself must be of peculiar value to persons who have neither time, opportunity nor means, to ransack antiquity for themselves.

In two respects, this information is of peculiar value at the present time; for, now more than ever before, the church of God is called by a certain party, to recur to antiquity as its guide; and now, also, that antiquity is declared, with peculiar boastfulness, to testify against the common principles of the Reformed Churches.

If this book tells truth, two things are certain; 1, That the present Constitution of the Reformed Churches is nearly identical with that of the primitive ages, and the lofty pretensions of Popery and Prelacy are destitute of a shadow of foundation—for three centuries after Christ. 2. That in many particulars, the simplicity of the gospel, was very early corrupted; and that therefore the Bible and the Apostolic Church, and not the Fathers and the Primitive Church, should be our guide and model, even when the latter are right. That is, the Reformed Churches are right in fact and right in principle; and Popery and Prelacy are wrong in both.

Could not the Board of Publication of the Presbyterian church, aid in the circulation of this important work, by purchasing the sheets from the Methodist Book Concern—omitting only the first 8 pages—and printing a new title page? It could thus be placed amongst its own publications, without interfering with the operations of a sister church. These remarks are made, supposing the work to be stereotyped.

## ACCOUNTS OF THE BALTIMORE LITERARY AND RELIGIOUS MAGAZINE.

Capt. E. M. Donaldson and Mr. D. Kirkwood, of York, Pa., \$2,50 each for 1841.—Received from Mr. B. Milton of Versailles, Ky., \$20, of which \$2,50 to the credit of Mr. J. Aberdeen, \$2,50 to that of Mr. Wm. Allen, both of same place, and both for 1841, \$2,50 for Thos. H. Wallace, Lawtonville, S. C., also for 1841—which leaves (with, 50 cents heretofore paid for us, and explained in Mr. M.'s letter of Dec. 28,) \$13, to the credit of Mr. Milton; but we are unable to say, from our books, for what years to credit it, and beg for information from him.—We will try to obtain the odd Nos. written for by Rev. Mr. P., and have changed his direction as requested.—P. M., Hillsboro', N. C., \$10, for Dr. Streadwick, Dr. Long, Rev'd Mr. Burwell; and W. J. Bingham,—the first three for 1841, the last—see notices for present work; and the name of Dr. J. Webb, substituted for that of Dr. Long, on the subscription list of our work.—Rev. Samuel Wilson, \$5 in full to the end of 1841, and stopped.—Col. McEwen of Nashville, paid D. Owen \$5, for 1841—and for 1842, for the new work.—Gen. John H. Cocke, Fluvanna Co., Va., \$11,25, in full for the Magazine, and also for 1842, for the *Spirit of the XIX. Century*.—P. M., Columbia, S. C., \$5, for Rev. Dr. Howe, for 1840 and 1841.—Mr. James Martin, Columbia, S. C., \$10, of which \$3 in full for J. A. Sloan of Mount Hill, \$2,50 for himself for 1841; and the remaining \$4,50 to his credit on this work; thanks for his kind letter.—Mr. G. T. Snowden, Columbia, S. C., \$5, for 1841, and 1842.—Rev. J. S. Shields, Mexico, Juniata Co., Pa., \$5, for 1841 and '2.—P. M., for James Hawthorn, Wilsonsville, Ky., \$3, in full, and stopped.—Capt. McCorkle, Lynchburg, Va., \$5, for 1841 and 1842.—Benj. Douglass, Esq., New Orleans, \$5, for 1841 and 1842.—J. B. Breckinridge, Esq., Staunton, Va., \$10, of which \$7,50 for himself for three years, ending with the expiration of the Magazine; and \$2,50 for Rev. J. Hendren, for 1841—who, like too many other worthy friends—don't continue subscription to our new publication.—Wm. L. Martien, Phila., we are obliged by his favour, and refer it to D. Owen and Son, who will communicate with him.

## ACCOUNTS OF THIS PERIODICAL.

Rev. S. W. Blain, Yancey's Mills, Albemarle Co., Va., \$2,50.—Rev. W. S. White, Charlottesville, Va., \$2,50.—Mr. J. N. Bell, of Winchester, Va., remits us \$10, for himself, Rev. Mr. Atkinson, and Mr. Nathaniel Bent, of that place, and Rev. R. S. Bell, of Rappahannoc Co.; which pays for all for 1842; the Nos. requested sent.—John Kalso, Balt. Co. \$2,50.—Rev. Dr. Miller, Princeton, N. J. \$5, of which \$2,50 for the Mag. for 1841.—Names of Rev. Neill McRay, Cumberland Co., N. C., and Rev. R. A. Porter, Greene Co., Alabama, added, by order of the latter.—We are obliged to Mr. W. J. Bingham, of Hillsboro, N. C. for his letter of Jan. 8, and correct our entries by it, so as to make his account stand paid in *advance* for 1842, '3, and '4.—W. W. Handy, Esq., and Hon'ble J. D. Jones, Princess Ann Co., Md., paid D. Owen \$2,50 each, for 1842.—Rev. J. C. Coit of Cheraw, S. C., \$10 for self and for Dr. McLean, Laurence Price, Esq., and John Wright, Esq., for 1842, the three last, new subscribers; back Nos. written for sent.—P. M., Princess Ann Co., Md., \$2,50, for Levin Handy, Esq., for 1842, name added.—Letter from John R. Gray, Easton, Pa., enclosing \$2, (Rail Road,) from which 37½ cents postage deducted; leaving \$1,624 to the credit of Jeremiah Gray, to whom this work is sent; we know nothing to the contrary of what he supposes about the payment by Mr. Wm. Gray; and take his statement as correct.—Mr. Daniel Kendig, Middletown, Dauphin Co., Pa., name added from Jan'y.—Rev. J. D. Matthews, Lexington, Ky., \$5, for 1842 and '3.—Rev. J. B. Spottswood, Ellicott's Mills, Md., \$2,50 for 1842.—Miss Coulson, York Pa., name added from Jan'y, \$2,50, for 1842, paid.—Thomas D. King, Oakland College, Miss., \$8, for Rev. S. M. Marshall, which pays for a few Nos. at the close of 1841 and for 1842.—Rev. Archibald Baker, Cowper Hill, Robison Co., N. C., name added from Jan'y 1842.—Dr. Wm. Dunbar, of Natchez, sends us a check on New York, for \$27,50—which pays for Mrs. Dunlap, Mr. A. C. Henderson, Mr. John

Hutchins, and Dr. J. C. Jenkins, (new subscriber) five dollars each, for 1842 and '43; also for Rev. James Purviance, \$7,50, for 1841, '42, and '3; and Dr. D. will remember, that his own subscription is already paid in advance, up to the end of 1843—if God allows our work to live so long.—H. McElderry, Esq., Balt., paid \$2,50, for 1842.—Name of George Douglass, Esq., city of New York, added from last Jan'y, and \$2,50 for this year paid.—Mr. J. F. Matheson, Cheraw S. C., by the hands of the Rev. J. C. C., \$5,50, of which \$3, in full on the former work, and \$2,50 for 1842—this work; [ ] the commission will be carefully attended to. [ ]

As the foregoing accounts are very difficult to be kept separate, persons who have remitted money, not finding it acknowledged in the one they expect, will perhaps see it in the other.

As a general rule, we prefer that advance payments should not be for more than the current year, since, in the event of the discontinuance of the work, at any future time—the replacement of such advances might be a matter of no small embarrassment and trouble. On the other hand, the allowing of accounts to run long in arrears, is a great evil, to all concerned.

An explanation is due to the excellent author of the series on the *Unity of the Church*, of which the III. No. is published this month, and the last one will be published soon. This part of his manuscript, in reaching the press, crossed the Alleghanies three times; once in a road wagon—which is not the swiftest sort of modern conveyance.

D. Owen & Son, agents for settling the accounts of the *Balt. Lit. and Rel. Magazine*,—will make out and we will publish, if it shall seem best, a list of payments, explanations, and refusals made to them, by way of response to their circular—covering the accounts of the patrons of that work. In looking over their correspondence, we have been often greatly amused and often greatly astonished. No doubt mistakes have crept into the accounts, in some cases; sometimes by negligence on the part of others, sometimes through error on ours. During the existence of the Magazine, several thousand persons had accounts with it. As we have before said, our ultimate reliance, is on the justice and good faith of the subscribers themselves. And having published so much—we supposed we had given ample ground, for all who had paid, who ought not to pay, or who did not choose to pay, to build a sufficient answer upon. We find ourselves greatly mistaken; and as we never destroy papers, (manuscript that has been printed from always excepted,) we may, some day, select from this correspondence, a very curious port folio for some collection of autograph letters. There are many very odd people in this world of ours. For example, there is now, in the Maryland Penitentiary, a man by the name of *Miller*, who has been twice put there for two years each time, for stealing, identically the same one gallon tin kettle, (full of whiskey,) twice from the same owner.

Quite a series of Nos. is being published, in the 'Charleston Observer,' in reply to the short article on—"The Use of the title—Bishop"—printed in our January No. Their author, who signs himself "A Bishop," appears to have one qualification for conducting controversy with ability, which is a very enviable one; we mean good books. Some of our brethren may not be aware that this whole matter was before the last General Assembly. A very worthy and influential member, (*Rev'd Mr. Smyth, of S. C.*)—introduced a resolution to the effect, if we remember rightly, that our ministers ought to be commonly called *Bishops*; and his resolution was referred to a committee of five able bishops—(*See p. 420, printed Minutes, 1841*;)—who reported, that the resolution ought not to pass, as we remember, (*see p. 428*); and it was so decided by the Assembly, (*see p. 447.*) In all this, as in the matter of reading sermons, we cordially approve the action of the Assembly; and sincerely believe the proposed change to be useless and ridiculous—if not worse.—We would respectfully request the editor of the *Observer*, after "A Bishop" has, to his own entire satisfaction, hammered our little article, to print it in his paper. It is very short; and perfectly civil.

We have lately read, with great interest and profit, a series of Nos. in the *Protestant and Herald*, (Ky.)—establishing the right of Ruling Elders to take part in all Presbyterian ordinations, and to lay on hands, with other Presbyters. For clearness and beauty of style, for calm and concentrated logic, for scholar-like and Christian-like management of a discussion—such models seldom fall under our eye: We have been surprised, that these Nos. were not extensively republished; and are satisfied, they will put the question at rest, wherever they are read. We do not know who the author of them is; but such gems, never came from any but the richest mine.

We have on hand a full and rich supply of matter from stated and occasional correspondents.—A fine article on *Iowa*, and a powerful reply by the author of the *Calm Discussion*, in regard to ecclesiastical corporations were intended for this No.—and will appear—with others, in our next. The reply will be published entire—though rather long for a single article. As a *general rule*, short articles can be sooner inserted, and are more certain to be read.—To the friend who enquires in regard to an article about agencies, and a series on another subject—we reply, we shall be glad to hear from him.—We had as well mention in this place, that we have no active agents to solicit subscribers for this work; nor do we expect to employ any; it must support itself or die; and we are sorry to add that for two months past, the discontinuances are much more numerous than the new subscribers; and what is not very pleasant to add, in not a few cases, persons have discontinued largely in arrears, and made us pay postage to learn this news. In one case, we paid 57½ cents for this information. In another an eminent Presbyterian dignitary, who had received our poor services for nothing, for four or five years, without the slightest claim upon us, either personal or public, was so provoked at D. Owen & Son for sending a bill—that he sent the bill back in his letter of refusal, apparently for no other reason than to make us pay double postage. On the other hand, the great mass of our patrons, continue to do, as they have always done—all that is kind and generous, towards us; for which they have our grateful thanks.

---

#### BETHEL ACADEMY.

THE undersigned intends opening on the 1st Wednesday of May, at Bethel Church, Harford County, Md.—a Classical and Mathematical Academy.

The location of this institution, is in one of the most healthy districts of the state, 23 miles from Baltimore, and six miles east from the Baltimore and Susquehanna Rail Road.

All the branches of an English education—the Latin and Greek languages, with the Mathematics as far as they are usually studied preparatory to admission into the higher classes of our colleges, will be thoroughly taught.

Particular attention shall be paid to the moral and religious instruction of all under his charge. The discipline of the institution shall be kind, but decided and firm.

There will be two sessions in the year. The summer commencing on the 1st Wednesday of May and closing the last Wednesday of September. The winter commencing on the 1st Wednesday of November, and closing the 1st Wednesday of April.

*Terms*, including tuition, boarding, bedding, washing, mending, light and fuel—each session, \$75, in advance.

Persons wishing any further information, may inquire of the Editor of this journal, or of the subscriber.

ANDREW B. CROSS, *Principal*.

Baltimore, Feb., 1842.

# SPIRIT OF THE XIX. CENTURY.

Vol. I.

APRIL, 1842.

No. 4.

[For the Spirit of the XIX. Century.]

REPLY TO A "SERIOUS REVIEW OF A 'CALM DISCUSSION OF THE LAWFULNESS, SCRIPTURALNESS AND EXPEDIENCY OF ECCLESIASTICAL BOARDS,' BEING A DEFENCE OF THE ECCLESIASTICAL BOARDS OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH;"—  
BY THE AUTHOR OF THE CALM DISCUSSION.

I am glad that this Review has given me the opportunity of appearing again in defence of the venerable Standards of the Presbyterian church. Fully persuaded as I am, that those Standards contain the "mind of the spirit" upon the nature, extent and proper distribution of ecclesiastical power, and just as strongly assured that the system of action to which our church, in an evil hour, has lent the sanction of her name and authority, is subversive of her peculiar and characteristic principles of government and order; I must feel anxious to bring her back, so far as my efforts can be of any service, to her ancient platform, and to arrest the progress of those abuses, which, in a general decline of all true religion, had silently and imperceptibly crept in among us. The cause of missions will suffer nothing from a discussion conducted in the fear of God, and prompted by a single desire to glorify his name. Light is the friend of righteousness; and we never can expect the people of God to engage in any spiritual enterprize with interest and prayer unless its principles are addressed to their *faith*. It is by *faith* that kingdoms are to be subdued and righteousness wrought, the mouths of lions stopped, the violence of fire quenched, and the edge of the sword escaped. By *faith* alone can the weak be made strong, and the timid wax valiant in fight, and if ever the empire of darkness is to be overthrown and the armies of the aliens put to flight in this rebellious province of God's dominions, the sacramental host of the elect must go forth strong in *faith*, wielding no other weapons than those which their leader has commanded or approved. The great defect, as it strikes me, of all the missionary schemes of the day, is that the principles upon which they rely for success, their leading measures, the general plan upon which they are conducted, are addressed to the natural sympathies of men and not to the faith of the saints of the Most High. They are constructed in such a way as to conciliate public opinion in their favour and the great instrument of their success is the popularity of

their measures, leading to liberal and handsome contributions. Take away from them the approbation and the money of the world, and they wither and die instantaneously. They have no principle of life in themselves. Unlike the ordinances of God which thrive by opposition and flourish amid reproach, these sickly creatures of human benevolence and folly can accomplish nothing without the treasures of Egypt at their feet; and will attempt nothing until the great men and mighty men of the earth are duly consulted, flattered and cajoled. I will not say that like the Jesuits of Rome, they become all things to all men for a valuable consideration—but I will say that if they were more spiritual, they would have fewer friends among the enemies of God—if they were more scriptural, they would be less vain-glorious, and if they were less crafty, they would probably be much more successful. Addressed to perishing and fleeting passions, they rise and fall, ebb and flow with the tide of popular favour and mercantile success. When their treasuries are empty the merchants of the earth have made bad speculations, the commercial embarrassments are distressing, and the pecuniary affairs of the country are involved in dreadful perplexity. There was a time when Herod and Pontius Pilate, the rulers and people of the earth, could league in malice against the Lord and his Anointed, and yet his throne be set upon the holy hill of Zion in defiance of all their opposition. There was a time when the rise and fall, the prosperity and decay of the kingdoms of this world were alike conducive to the advancement and success of that kingdom which the God of heaven had established in the midst of the earth: there was a time when the church of God could grow and flourish and spread her conquests far and wide in the midst of scorn, persecution and reproach, and when she expected nothing from the world but its malice, and asked for nothing but to be patiently heard. These golden days have either passed away, or those institutions, which live only in the breath of the public approbation, are radically wrong. Those were days of *faith*. Men did *what* they were commanded and *as* they were commanded, and then rested upon the sure word of promise which was better than the favour of kings, the applause of subjects, or thousands of gold and silver. If we would be alike prosperous and alike independent of the fluctuations and vicissitudes of this world's interests, we must return to the *simplicity of faith*; and as no institutions can address themselves to the faith of God's people, but those which are founded upon God's word, (for the word is the measure and the standard of faith,) we must abandon all the expedients of human wisdom, which, in spiritual matters, ever has been and ever will be *folly*—we must despise the elements of carnal policy which, however conducive to success in the affairs of this world, brings nothing but disgrace and defeat in the affairs of the church—and we must confine ourselves simply to what God has sanctioned—and rely for success upon his promises, and just as far as his favour transcends in importance the applause of men, and his Spirit excels in efficacy the co-operation of mortals, so far may we hope, that the success of scriptural measures will exceed the success of our present contrivances.

Whatever is addressed to faith can be made the matter of wrestling prayer, and brought home upon the conscience with the sanctions of duty. While discussion will inevitably prove fatal to every plant which our heavenly Father hath not planted, and shiver into atoms many a fair fabric of unhallowed zeal and will-worship, the simple appointments of God will commend themselves with additional force to the hearts of his people, and accomplish all their ancient achievements in the hand of his Spirit. Who shall say that discussion is not the very means by which God, in our day, is shaking the heavens and the earth in order that the things which are made, the devices and expedients of man may be shaken and removed, and that those things which cannot be shaken—which rest upon the firm and solid foundation of his own word—may remain? I feel well assured that nothing is more dangerous than a blind zeal, and that consequently, discussion must be valuable, in disseminating light and knowledge upon the ends and principles of our benevolent operations. If they are found to be wrong, we know that the cause of God will suffer nothing, but gain much from the total destruction of every Board connected with the church—if they are found to be right, we can support them with a conscience void of offence towards God and towards men.

Believing that a full, thorough and candid discussion of this whole subject will be eminently subservient to the prosperity of missions, both at home and abroad, by purifying the zeal of the church, and enlisting more generally the affections, prayers and co-operation of all her true-members, I embark in it with cheerfulness, trusting that the Lord may over-rule my poor lucubrations to his own glory and his people's good. It is the welfare of Zion that I seek; but I cannot consistently pray, "peace be within thy walls and prosperity within thy palaces," without exerting every nerve and making every lawful effort to dispossess the strangers that are defiling the sanctuary and defacing the carved work of the city of our God. The Review before me, gives me an opportunity of presenting the principles for which I contend in immediate contrast with those upon which the Boards are founded. Let me invite my brethren to compare them carefully and make up their minds in the fear of God. If they have hitherto sustained the Boards as a matter of course, and taken it for granted that they were right without subjecting them to a severe investigation, let me beg them to remember that as he only is a sound philosopher who begins his inquiries in doubt, in order to end them in conviction, so he only is a consistent Christian who forbears to believe until he is convinced that the Lord hath spoken. He who believes when he ought to doubt, is liable to doubt when he ought to believe. He who begins in blind credulity may possibly end in absolute skepticism. When he finds principles which he had regarded as certain, merely because he had never examined them, gradually giving way beneath him, he is in danger of drawing the hasty conclusion that nothing is fixed, and that all truth is mere delusion. There is great danger, therefore, in taking things for granted, and hence I would urge my brethren to read this discussion with that cautious suspense of judgment which is indispensably required in the search after truth,

and which is equally removed from partiality to any set of opinions on the one hand, and to indolence of understanding on the other. Let them be indifferent as to *what* may prove to be true, but earnest and fixed when the truth has been discovered. If this discussion should be conducted and received in this spirit, those who commenced it will never be reproached as troublers of Israel.

In replying to the reviewer, I shall notice his defence of the Boards, and take up his objections to the *Calm Discussion* in such order as the train of my own thoughts may suggest.

The reviewer begins his article with a proposition, which, however just in theory, can never be of any practical importance in the search after truth; because it can never be applied till the truth is known. Like Aristotle's definition of virtue, it supposes you already in possession of what you profess to be seeking. No doubt the "middle path between latitudinarianism on the one hand, and ultraism on the other," is always the safe one, but the difficulty lies in determining these extremes. The reviewer, I apprehend, is a master of rhetoric, and employs his whole introduction in illustrating this truism, with the obvious design of fastening upon those who are opposed to his views the unmeaning charge of ultraism—a charge which must always be unmeaning until the extremes are accurately defined, and the middle path clearly pointed out. Still words are the coin of fools, and he who appeals to a silly prejudice founded upon a name, may succeed with multitudes in throwing odium upon principles which he finds himself unable to refute. The reviewer is fond of drawing illustrations from the church of Scotland. Does he know what class of her sons is called *moderate*, and with what propriety the epithet is applied? And is it beyond the compass of possibility that those among us, who, like the reviewer, are glorying in their moderation, may be doing no more for the glory of God and the purity of his institutions, than their namesakes across the waters? If in fact, there *appears* to be as striking a coincidence in principle as there is in name between them—each labouring to put the inventions of man above the appointments of God, and virtually denying the undivided authority of Christ as King and Head of the church, I hope it is only an appearance. But after all, what is my ultraism? If I understand the reviewer, latitudinarianism, so far as the present subject is concerned, consists in upholding voluntary associations—ultraism in maintaining that the church of Jesus Christ is the true instrument of converting the world, while the middle path of safety and of truth is to be found in supporting ecclesiastical corporations. Now, for aught that I can see to the contrary, it is just as safe to make voluntary associations the extreme of latitudinarianism, ecclesiastical corporations the extreme of ultraism, and the church of God, as organized by her glorious Head, the true middle between them. I have noticed this sly and artful introduction, because with many minds it may have the force of a negative argument. The question of voluntary associations is settled among us—to assert, therefore, that the opponents of Boards are just on the opposite extreme, will produce in some, the calm and settled conviction that the friends of Boards are just what they ought to be. Their neighbours are

all wrong, and as they are not like them, therefore, they must be right. Many a conclusion has been obstinately supported by no better reasoning than this.

What the reviewer formally proposes as arguments, are of two kinds, positive and negative—and these again are direct and indirect. I shall answer them in the order in which they have been proposed.

1. First, then, he asserts that there is a presumption in favour of the Boards, from the fact that they are established institutions, and that my principles are new and singular. This may be so, but let it be remembered that a presumption of the same kind existed against Christianity, when its doctrines were first promulgated, and against the reformation of Luther, when he first commenced to testify against the iniquities of Rome. The only effect of such a presumption is to throw the burden of proof upon those who assail existing institutions. Whatever positive force it possesses depends upon the probability that whatever is settled must be right, or that institutions sanctioned by prescription must necessarily be founded in reason. It is an argument which may be pleaded just as strongly in defence of abuses as in behalf of righteousness, and, therefore, as an argument, it is absolutely worthless. Granting, then, that the presumption exists—it *proves* nothing, but only throws upon me the necessity of proving my point—but, in fact, no such presumption exists—the onus probandi rests upon the reviewer himself, and those who espouse his principles. The *Calm Discussion* insisted upon abiding by the Standards of the church, and those who believe that the plans which every Presbyterian minister has solemnly sanctioned are ineffectual and weak, are bound to show the defects of our system. The presumption is, that our standards are right until they are shown to be wrong. The true innovators are those who have grafted another system upon our ancient and venerable platform. The reviewer, throughout, labours under the singular mistake, that in the *Calm Discussion* a scheme was proposed separate and distinct from the provisions of our book. A leading object of that article was to deny the right of devising schemes at all, and to confine the church within the limits of Divine prescription. It takes for granted that the plan developed in our standards is agreeable to the word of God, and labours to bring back the churches to a cordial adoption of its principles. If, then, the real question at issue is, shall we adopt the method of our book, or shall we devise another of our own? the presumption unquestionably lies against those who depart from the book. They must prove that Boards are scriptural, or acknowledge that they do not commend themselves to the faith and prayers of God's people. When they bring their strange inventions into the church of God, and require their brethren to sustain their contrivances, we have a right to ask them by what authority they do these things: and if they can produce no sanction of their measures from the word of God or the standards of the church—the bond of our ecclesiastical connection—we have a right to complain of them as innovators and troublers. They bound themselves by covenant, to one plan, and behold they have introduced another. Hence I can triumph

antly retort the presumption upon the reviewer himself. It is with pain, however, that I add—for I was astounded at his declaration upon the subject—that neither the Scriptures nor our Standards are decisive authority with him. The presumption in favour of Boards is so very strong in his view, that neither the doctrine of the Bible nor the principles of Presbyterianism, however plainly opposed to them, should detract from their authority. Listen to his own words: (the Italics are my own,) "They," that is, the opponents of Boards, "must establish against this system," the system of Boards, "a charge of unscripturality and dangerous opposition to our standards and to our creed. *Nor is this all.* These objectors admit with us the absolute necessity of accomplishing that work which these Boards and Agencies are designed to perform. They acknowledge as fully as we do, the necessity of the end. Our only difference is as to the means by which that end may be best secured. The means we propose, are those already in operation. These means have been sanctioned by adoption—by long trial, and as is believed, by eminent success. Now it is incumbent on these brethren to show not merely that this means is liable to objection and abuse; or that it has been actually abused in time past. They must make it evident that it necessarily leads to such evils, and that these evils are inseparable from it. They must further provide a system of means by which the end, which, as they allow, must be attained, can be accomplished. This system of theirs, they must show is free from all similar difficulties and objections—is not liable to similar abuses, and is, in itself, scriptural, Presbyterian and expedient. All this our objectors are under obligations to do before they can fairly call upon us to abandon the existing system and to endanger an end of such necessary and transcendent importance."—*Balt. Lit. and Rel. Mag.*, for 1841, p. 459-60. It seems, then, that even if the Boards should be proved to be unscriptural, and in dangerous opposition to the standards of the church, their friends cannot be called on to abandon them until a better system is actually provided. No matter if God forbids them, we are bound to uphold them until it can be shown that the scriptural plan is really the best. And what are those mighty arguments in favour of the Boards, which can silence the voice of God and annul our covenanted engagements as members of the Presbyterian church? Why, they have "been sanctioned by adoption, by long trial, and, as is believed, by eminent success." These weighty considerations, which can be pleaded in defence of every abuse under heaven, which apply just as strongly to the propaganda at Rome—the inquisition in Spain, and the infernal butcheries of Mahomet, as they do to the boards of the Presbyterian church, are gravely brought forward to drown the voice of inspiration, and to silence the clamours of those who are zealous for the Lord God of Hosts. Oh tell it not in Gath. Publish it not in the streets of Ashkelon! I trust, however, that there are still those who *will* abandon the Boards if they are proved to be unscriptural and in dangerous opposition to our standards and our creed; and who *will* require no stronger argument in favour of a "more excellent way" than that it is both scriptural and Presbyterian—being fully assured that whatever plan

God has prescribed he will certainly bless. For such I write—for such even the reviewer has written, as he has entered into an elaborate argument to show that the Boards are scriptural, although, according to his own principles, it was a matter of no sort of consequence, whether God approved them or not, seeing that they have been sanctioned by “adoption, by long trial and by eminent success.”

2. Passing by the negative argument of the reviewer, which will be sufficiently considered in another part of this discussion, I proceed to notice the principle upon which he lays out his strength, and which he felt to be of vital importance to the system which he has undertaken to defend. If I can show that this principle is false, unsupported by scripture and condemned by our creed, my task will be done, and every additional argument that I may choose to advance will be *ex abundantia*—over and above what can strictly be required of me. This principle is, that the church, to a certain extent, is the confidential agent of her Divine Head—invested with discretionary powers, and left to the resources of her own wisdom. Two parts of the review are devoted to the discussion of this gratuitous dogma—one attempting to show that it is recognized in our standards, and the other that it is sanctioned by the word of God. The method of proof in each case, is substantially the same. The reviewer lays it down as an axiom—that where duties are required, the necessary powers to discharge them are conveyed—if not directly, at least by implication. Now it is admitted on all hands, that the gospel must be preached to every creature. It is assumed by the reviewer, that God has made no provisions in his word for sending out the heralds of salvation to the waste places of the earth; but as he requires that this should be done and done by the church, he has tacitly committed to her the full power of making such arrangements as to her, in her wisdom, may seem most meet. She is His agent—His minister of state—His prime adviser, authorized to act in his name and to do any thing and every thing not positively prohibited, that may promise to subserve the end to be accomplished. Speaking of the church, the reviewer says: “She is now under a dispensation of principles and not of rules. The church has passed from a state of pupilage to the age of maturity. God now speaks to her as to a full grown, reasonable person. He has given to her general laws and great fundamental principles. He has enjoined upon her certain great and glorious duties. By those laws she is to be restrained and guided in the exercise of her own wisdom, in devising the ways and means for the accomplishment of the greatest good in the best possible manner.”—*Spirit of the XIX. Century*, p. 28. Again: “That which the church is required to do, she is empowered to do by all means not expressly forbidden or implicitly countermanded.”—*Ibid.* p. 27. The principle maintained in the calm discussion, that the word of God was a perfect rule of practice as well as of faith, and that the church has no right to add to it or to take from it, is pronounced to be Judaical and inconsistent with the glorious liberty secured by the Son of God.—*Ibid.* p. 28. We must make a passing remark on the expressions employed, because they are *ad captandum*. We

are, then, distinctly to understand that subjection to the will of God is bondage, and that Jesus Christ has purchased for his people the glorious privilege of walking in the light of their own eyes? It is certainly a new idea that the servitude of the Jews consisted in the fact that they were guided by the Lord in all their ways—and that they were at liberty to do nothing of a religious nature without Divine direction. I had supposed that their bondage consisted in the *burdensome* nature of their ritual, and that true Christian liberty, so far as the Levitical economy is concerned, implies an exemption, not from Divine direction, but from these particular services. The Christian is free, not because his dispensation leaves him to himself, but because God has not enjoined upon him the same laborious duties which he exacted from his ancient people. Still, what is his duty, is just as much enjoined, just as strictly commanded as the cumbrous sacrifices and painful ceremonies of the Jews. If it is Jewish bondage, to be guided in all things by the wisdom of God, and Christian liberty to be left to the suggestions of our own wisdom, under certain general limitations and restraints, I should say, by all means, give me the bondage of the Jew, rather than the freedom of the Christian. But the church, it seems, is "now under a dispensation of principles, and not of rules." Had it not been for the subsequent illustration, I should have found it impossible to catch the idea which the author here intends to convey, and even with the aid of his simile I am not sure that I apprehend his meaning. What is the distinction between *rules* of action and *principles* of action? Does a moral principle differ from a moral rule in any thing else but the form? A rule is a law prescribed by adequate authority. A principle is any thing proved, acknowledged or assumed to be true. The truth of the principle is the foundation of the law. The principle, therefore, necessarily contains the rule, and the rule just as necessarily supposes the principle. If you make the principle more and the rule less general,—the general must include the particulars; so that I do not see how it is possible to be under a government of principles without being under a government of rules. The principle states the general truth, out of which the rules of conduct or particular duties arise, and therefore obviously includes them. They are so intimately connected, that in moral subjects—matters of practical obedience, the terms may safely be used as synonymous. You may say it is a principle that truth ought to be spoken—it is a rule, also, or law. That foolish talking and jesting are not convenient you may regard as a principle—the proposition obviously contains a rule. There is a distinction between principles and rules, acknowledged by philosophers—but it is a distinction which has no conceivable connection with this subject. When we inquire *why* truth, justice and benevolence are obligatory, or attempt to investigate the foundations of moral obligation, we are said to investigate the principles of morals; but when we lay down *what things* are right and binding, we may be said to prescribe the rules of morals. Now the reviewer cannot mean that God has told us in his word *why* righteousness and truth are to be sought and cultivated, and left it to ourselves to determine *what things* are just, lovely or of good report. The Bible confess-

edly contains a perfect code of moral rules; the law of the Lord is perfect. What then is the distinction between a government of principles and rules? I presume that the author means by principles, the ends to be attained, and by rules, the means of attaining them, and then the proposition will amount to this, that God has told us what to do, but not how it is to be done. In other words, he means that the church is invested with discretionary powers, restrained only by the positive prohibitions of the Divine word—that is, what, from the form of its enunciation, was evidently intended to be passed off as an argument, turns out to be a repetition, in almost an unintelligible shape, of the very thing to be proved—a mere *petitio principii*. This principle, thus variously stated, is the hinge of the reviewer's whole argument. A principle so important, one would think, would have been fully and indisputably proved, and yet it is a singular fact, that not a solitary direct argument is adduced in its support. There is an appeal to the authority of Calvin, but the passages quoted have no bearing upon the subject at all—they might as well have been adduced to prove that there are inhabitants in the moon. A passage from Owen is quoted in a foot note, but it is directly against the reviewer. The Confession of Faith is also quoted, but the passages unfortunately refer to a very different point. His indirect argument, which is every thing in the shape of reasoning, that I can find in his two last articles, amount to this—God has required of the church certain duties, without furnishing her with the means of performing them; upon the principle that where duties are commanded, the necessary power is conveyed—she is at liberty to devise the means for herself. The whole force of this reasoning depends upon the proposition that God has not furnished the church with the proper apparatus of means for doing all that he has required. In other words, the real point at issue between the reviewer and myself is—whether the church as organized by Jesus Christ and his apostles is *competent* to do all that her Head has enjoined upon her, or does she require additional agents to assist her? This is the real question, did Christ give the church all the furniture she needed, or did he partially supply her, with a general direction to make up the deficiency? Upon this question, I fearlessly join issue. So strong are my convictions of the adequacy of the church as organized in the scriptures, to meet all exigencies, that if it can be clearly shown that she is incompetent to discharge any office assumed to be imperative upon her, I should think it much more probable that the duty was not enjoined, than that the church was thus relatively imperfect. What she clearly cannot do is not commanded. The reviewer has evidently confounded—and it is the source of all his error on this subject—the acknowledged Protestant principle, that “there are some circumstances concerning the worship of God and government of the church, common to human actions and societies, which are to be ordered by the light of nature and Christian prudence, according to the general rules of the word, which are always to be observed,” (*Confession of Faith, ch. I., sec. 6;*) with the general doctrine, universally condemned among all true Protestants, of discretionary power. Had he attended to the proper

distinction upon this subject which is so clearly drawn by Calvin, and so unanswerably established by Owen, he might have spared himself the trouble of appealing to these illustrious men in behalf of his extravagant views of ecclesiastical power. They do sanction the doctrine of our Confession—a doctrine which was fully admitted in the *Calm Discussion*, but a doctrine which, by no means, covers the principle on which ecclesiastical corporations are founded. I shall let Calvin speak for himself:—"We have," says he, "an excellent and most certain mark, therefore, which distinguishes those impious constitutions by which it has been stated that true religion is obscured and men's consciences subverted, and the legitimate regulations of the church, which are always directed to one of these two ends, or to both together; that in the holy assembly of the faithful, all things may be conducted with suitable decorum and dignity, or that the community may be kept in order, by the firm bonds of courtesy and moderation."—*Institutes, Book IV, ch. 10, Sec. 28*. Subsequently, he remarks: "We do not place order in those nugatory pomps which have nothing but a vain appearance of splendour, but in that well regulated polity which excludes all confusion, incivility, obstinacy, clamours and dissensions. Of the first kind, examples are furnished by Paul; as that profane banquets should not be connected with the sacred supper of the Lord; that women should not appear in public without being veiled, and many others in common use among us; such as that we pray with bended knees and with our heads uncovered; that we administer the sacraments of the Lord, not in a slovenly manner, but with due decorum; that we observe some decent order in the burial of the dead and other things of a similar nature. Of the second sort, are the hours appointed for public prayers, sermons and sacraments; quietness and silence under sermons; the singing of hymns; the places appointed for these services, and the days fixed for the celebration of the Lord's supper; the prohibition of Paul, that women should not teach in the church, and the like; but especially the regulations for the preservation of discipline, as catechising, ecclesiastical censures, excommunications, fasting and every thing else that can be referred to the same class. Thus all the constitutions of the church which we receive as holy and useful, may be classed under two heads; some refer to rites and ceremonies, others to discipline and peace."—*Ibid., sec. 29*. A little further on, he adds, "I approve of no human constitutions except such as are founded on the authority of God and deduced from the scripture, so that they may be considered as altogether Divine."—*Ibid., sec. 30*. The reader is here requested to mark the difference between Calvin and the reviewer; Calvin approves of *no* human constitution which is not founded on the *authority of God, and deduced from Scripture*—the reviewer approves of *any* human constitution founded in *expediency and not condemned* by the word of God. The passages already extracted, to which many others of similar import might easily be added, show conclusively that the only discretion which Calvin allows to the church, is precisely that accorded by our Confession of Faith, and respects "some circumstances concerning the worship of God and government of the

church common to human actions and societies." The question concerning Boards is not a question of order and decorum. It is a question concerning a positive institution, which is itself to exercise this very discretion in regard to decency—a question concerning a grave and important addition to the government of the church, and not about some circumstances common to human actions and societies. Those "specific regulations," (*Spirit of the XIX. Century*, p. 28,) of our book, which the reviewer endeavours to trace to the same principle on which he defends the Boards, are mere matters of arrangement, coming obviously under the doctrine of Calvin, and of a much greater than Calvin, who has solemnly enjoined by the Spirit of inspiration, that "all things be done decently and in order." The essential difference between those "circumstances common to human actions and societies," which may be regulated by the "light of nature and Christian prudence, according to the general rules of the word," and those additions to the worship of God and government of the church, which all true Protestants have united in condemning, is thus clearly stated by Owen in his "Discourse concerning Liturgies"—*Works*, vol. 19, p. 437, a discourse, which, mutatis mutandis, may just as conclusively be applied to Boards. "Circumstances," says he, "are either such as follow actions as actions, or such as are arbitrarily superadded and adjoined by command unto actions, which do not of their own accord, nor naturally, nor necessarily attend them. Now religious actions in the worship of God, are actions still. Their religious relation doth not destroy their natural being. Those circumstances, then, which do attend such actions as actions, not determined by Divine institution, may be ordered, disposed of and regulated by the prudence of men. For instance, prayer is a part of God's worship; public prayer is so as appointed by him. This, as it is an action to be performed by man, cannot be done without the assignment of time and place, and sundry other things, if order and conveniency be attended. These are circumstances that attend all actions of that nature to be performed by a community, whether they relate to the worship of God or no. These, men may, according as they are good, regulate and change, as there is occasion. . . . There are also some things which some men call circumstances also, that no way belong of themselves to the actions whereof they are said to be the circumstances, nor do attend them, but are imposed on them or annexed unto them, by the arbitrary authority of those who take upon them to give order and rules in such cases. These are not circumstances attending the nature of the thing itself, but are arbitrarily superadded to the things that they are appointed to accompany. Whatever men may call such additions, they are no less parts of the whole, wherein they serve, than the things themselves whereunto they are adjoined." Circumstances of this sort, to which Owen indeed denies the name, are according to him, unequivocally condemned in the word of God. He maintains the principle—and what Presbyterian or Protestant can feel himself at liberty to deny it—"that whatever is added, is contrary to what is commanded, though not in this or that particular commanded, yet to that com-

mand that nothing be added." *Works*, vol. 19, p. 444. To bring Boards or ecclesiastical corporations within the principle admitted by Owen, the reviewer must show that they are circumstances necessarily attending the actions of ordaining ministers and sending them out to preach the gospel to every creature, considered merely as *actions*, and unless he can establish this point, the noble discourse of Owen bears just as hardly upon his favourite Boards as it does upon human liturgies. It fully coincides with the opinion expressed in the *Calm Discussion*, that the *silence* of the word of God concerning these inventions, seals their condemnation. When the reviewer shall have proved that ecclesiastical corporations are mere "*circumstances*, concerning the worship of God and government of the church, *common to human actions and societies*," he may conscientiously sustain and support them without deserting Presbyterian principles for the extravagant pretensions of churchmen, prelatists and Papists. Let the reviewer consider carefully Owen's definition of *circumstances*, and his account of the real extent of discretionary power in ecclesiastical matters, and he will surely be constrained to acknowledge that he understood neither what he said nor whereof he affirmed when he ranted, at random, about a "dispensation of principles and not of rules." My faith in the Divine authority of our Presbyterian forms, is quite too strong to allow me, for a moment, to suppose that a rejection of the reviewer's preposterous dogma "would lay the axe to many a fair branch of our ecclesiastical polity, and leave a bare and barren trunk behind it—that it would tie up the hands and feet of our sacred polity, and deprive it of all power of motion, or that it would emasculate it of all its strength and vigour, and reduce it to a helpless and exanimate system."—*Spirit of the XIX. Century*, p. 27. On the contrary, I sincerely believe that the following remarks, by an able reviewer of the *Tracts for the Times*, and other kindred publications, with the exception of the historical allusions, apply just as forcibly to the Presbyterian church in these United States, as to the Church of Scotland: "It is not our smallest cause of gratitude to God as a church, that he has left us nothing to wish for or condemn in the constitution of our church, as laid at the reformation. All that is necessary is, that we fill up the outline which was then drawn, that we build upon the foundation which was then laid, that we carry out the principles which were then brought fresh and immediately from the word of God. She need invent nothing, displace nothing, alter nothing. Our reformed church was perfect in the economy of her creed, constitution, discipline and ritual. All we require is, not to select among the institutions of modern innovators, or the antiquated relics of the middle ages. We have but to return to the condition in which our own church existed at the period of the first and second reformations, to find realized as pure, and as perfect a transcript of the apostolic church as can exist among uninspired men. This is an advantage which no other church can lay claim to. And, accordingly, whenever a revival happens to other communions, they are led in consequence to depart from the principles and arrangements of their constitutions, while the more profound and powerful the

revival we experience, it brings us back but with the greater force to a more perfect conformity to our own glorious constitution. We fear we are not sensible of this our exclusive privilege, nor sufficiently thankful for it."—*Presbyterian Review*, (*Edin.*) No. 55, p. 619, *foot note*.

Having now, as I conceive, clearly detected and exposed the singular confusion of ideas which led the reviewer, with great parade of argument and corresponding hope of success, to quote both Calvin and the Confession of Faith, in support of a principle which they both equally condemn, I proceed to the real question at issue: Is the church adequately organized to discharge all the duties which Christ, her glorious Head and King, demands at her hands; or is she at liberty to supply the defects of her constitution from the resources of her own wisdom? In other words—Is the church simply a servant of Christ, bound to do what she is commanded, and as she is commanded, acting in all respects according to orders; or is she a confidential agent, instructed only as to the ends to be accomplished, and left to invent the means for herself? The reviewer and myself differ, and differ fundamentally as to the true relation in which the church stands to Christ. According to my views, the church is commissioned to teach men to observe all things whatsoever that Christ has commanded. According to the reviewer, she must add to the commandments of God, those wise expedients of her own, without which the commandments of God would be of none effect. It is true that according to his own confession, these inventions of the church do not exactly bind the conscience, (*Spirit of the XIX. Century*, p. 31.) but then the commandments of God do, and these commandments cannot be kept without these inventions—so that a man, after all, is left to the alternative of sinning against God, or of observing the ordinances which the church has instituted. This may not be binding the conscience, but it would seem to require a sagacity equal to his "who could divide a hair 'twixt north and north-west side" to discriminate between being actually bound to do a thing, or being under the inevitable necessity of sinning—that is, of violating obligation, by not doing it. The reviewer is very acute—he can distinguish between a government of principles and a government of rules, and no doubt can resolve the difficulty in the case before us.

I might expose the fallacy of his principle by appealing to the great Protestant doctrine, that the scriptures are a sufficient and complete rule of faith, and that through their instructions the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto every good work.—(2 Tim. iii. 16, 17.) I might appeal to the equally acknowledged truth, that all the power of the church is ministerial and declarative, and that she has no right to make laws, establish constitutions, or institute ordinances without the authority and sanction of the written word.—(*Form of Gov.*, ch. 1., sec. 7.) I might show that the discretionary power demanded by the reviewer, and actually exercised in the organization of ecclesiastical boards interferes with the royal prerogatives of Christ, and the executive functions of the Holy Spirit. On all these grounds he might be met and tri-

umphantly refuted. It might be shown that he is at war with the whole spirit of Protestantism, and is undesignedly making common cause with the friends of priestly intolerance and the foes of religious liberty throughout the world. But my present purpose will be best subserved by omitting all considerations of this sort, and showing at once, that the church is adequate to do, through her Divine organization, all that, in the Scriptures, is enjoined on her. In this way, the only earthly pretext for ecclesiastical corporations will be removed, and the last lingering tie that binds the hearts of our people to these idols of men will be severed—I hope—forever. As the work of foreign missions is confessedly the most difficult enterprize with which the church is entrusted, if it can be shown that she is perfectly competent to conduct this department of labour without foreign assistance, extraneous agencies will hardly be demanded for any other part of her duty. Now what is required that our church courts are not qualified to do, in order that the gospel may be sent to "every creature under heaven?" There is a preliminary office which the Holy Spirit must discharge before the gospel can be preached either at home or abroad. Men must be called into the ministry and qualified by a special unction from on high as well as by the subordinate teaching of man for its solemn and responsible duties. When men give satisfactory evidence to the church that they are called of God and duly prepared to preach the glorious gospel, this fact is declared by the imposition of hands, which the Presbytery alone can do. We have now the preachers—the next business is to send them, that is, to support them by supplying their daily wants in their respective fields of labour. The money must be raised in the separate congregations, and the scriptures have appointed a set of officers who are ordained for the very purpose of attending to the secular affairs of the church. When you have raised the money, the next step is to send it to the preachers, which with the commercial facilities afforded by the present condition of the civilized world, can surely be no hard matter. The Holy Spirit, then, supplies us with preachers, the Presbytery ordains them, and the deacons of the church support them. What more is required? In what respects is this arrangement defective or inadequate? The character, qualifications and control of the minister belong, of right, to the Presbytery, and when they send him out, they are furnished in every congregation with the necessary organization for supplying his wants. This is a plain and simple matter, and evidently requires none of the cumbrous and circuitous arrangements which characterize the Boards. The Presbyteries are courts acknowledged by our constitution—Deacons are officers recognized in every particular congregation, and capable of being employed in the service of the Presbyteries and the higher tribunals of the church. If one Presbytery should be too feeble to support its missionaries, provision is made in our book for obtaining assistance from its neighboring Presbyteries. This is certainly the plan, and the only plan, contemplated by the framers of our Form of Government. Yet our reviewer, though he has solemnly received it as agreeable to the word of God, has pronounced it to be preposterous and utterly in-

adequate to meet the wants of a dying world. The pith of his whole argument—if argument that may be called which arrives at a conclusion without any premises at all—is contained in the following extract: “The world is given to our church in common with others, as a field to be cultivated for the Lord of the harvest. The heathen world is, according to our ability, to be provided with the preaching of the gospel and all other things necessary to its full success. The present wants of our own country, also, are to be met, by a continually increasing supply of good and faithful ministers. These claims require for their fulfilment the education of candidates for the sacred office—and the sending forth and sustaining them when ready to enter upon their various fields of labor. For the accomplishment of this work, which is of such evident greatness, the co-operation and assistance of every church is required to supply the men and the means—and in addition to this, some agency by which these men and this means may be disposed of to the best advantage, and by which all the operations involved in carrying out such a plan may be conducted under the most watchful responsibility and with the greatest possible economy. Let any one consider, for a moment, the details implied in the prosecution of this entire work—the extent of the field to be overlooked and accurately surveyed—the number of the ministers to be sent forth—the number of candidates to be brought forward—the incalculable difficulties connected with their preparation—the sending forth, the locating and the supervision of these laborers in the vineyard—the indisposition of our churches to exercise liberality, and yet the absolute necessity of an unfailing supply of means—the wisdom, prudence and toil involved in the management and outlay of the funds, and the daily and hourly demands which are made upon the church by these immediate calls from all quarters for immediate direction, assistance and co-operation. Let any one fairly consider these things in connection with the department of education, or of domestic missions, or of foreign missions, or of publication, or of our seminaries of instruction, and he will at once perceive how vast is the end to be attained and how wisely adapted must be the means for its attainment. Let it also be remembered that all these claims come upon the church in every period of the year—at all times, and in urgent demand for their immediate consideration and provision. Let it also be borne in mind, that the change of circumstances continually requires a change in the arrangements of the benevolent operations of the church. It will be thus most certain and evident that for the wise management of these operations, a permanent body of some kind, entrusted with discretionary powers, is absolutely necessary.”—(*Balt. Lit. and Rel. Mag., for May, 1841, pp. 460-1.*)

Now this whole paragraph, which was intended to show the insufficiency of the plan proposed in our book, contains nothing but a statement of the various details of the work to be done. The question still returns, why cannot the Presbyteries accomplish this work just as efficiently as the Boards? The first thing wanted is good and faithful preachers—a “continually increasing supply of good and faithful ministers.” Now can Boards make them? Is it

not the sole prerogative of God, the Holy Spirit, to call and qualify and send forth labourers into the harvest of the world? Does Christ require of the church any thing more than fervent and constant prayer to the Lord of the harvest, and can Boards infuse the spirit of love to a dying world, and the spirit of prayer to our ascended Lord? Boards can no more make a preacher than they can make the hairs of our heads white or black. These ministers are to be educated; granted. They are to be sent to the schools and colleges of the country, and if they are unable to pay their expenses, they are to be supported by the bounty of the church. Is there any thing in this too hard or too mysterious for a Presbytery to perform? The money must be collected from particular congregations, and I do not see why the demands of a Presbytery should be less respected than the authority of a Board? I see no magic in an ecclesiastical corporation that shall infallibly open the purses of the people. These ministers—having been ordained, must next be sent to their various fields of labour—that is to say—they must be supported and sustained. But what is to hinder the Presbyteries from supplying them with the means of going wherever God in his Providence, may call them? Give them the money and they can easily procure their own conveyances, and the comforts which their situations require. But the reviewer begs us to consider the extent of the field. What of that? It is confessedly extensive, being no less than the world; but cannot fifty or a hundred Presbyteries survey it just as well as a single Board? And again—is it not the duty of each missionary to select his own field? He cannot expect that others should determine for him where God has called him. This is a matter which he must settle for himself, and having settled it, the church is to help him on his journey after a Godly sort. We are next to consider the number of ministers to be sent forth. Why cannot the Presbyteries count them just as well as a Board? And why cannot the Presbyteries support them just as comfortably? The money, after all, must be collected from the various churches under the care of the different Presbyteries, and for aught that I can see, this matter can be attended to just as well by those who have the immediate care of those churches as by a body five hundred miles off. Not to pursue the reviewer's details any farther, I assert generally, that he has not mentioned a single matter which the church is not fully competent to manage through her regular and constitutional tribunals. And I here challenge him to construct a single syllogism, which will not palpably beg the question, out of any of the materials contained in the passage which has been fully quoted. "I doubt, in fact, whether he can read his pompous enumeration of particulars from which he has pretended to draw his "most certain and evident" conclusion without laughing at his own extravagance. It is really amusing to see a man start out with boasting promises of what he intends to prove, and then find that all his reasoning is nothing but a statement, in another form, of the very thing to be proved." The reviewer's proposition was, that Presbyteries are inadequate to send the gospel to the heathen—the proof is, that sending the gospel to the heathen includes a great many particulars; and not a solitary

reason is given, why these particulars, so elaborately detailed, are beyond the capacity of the Presbyteries to manage or conduct. If we should grant that his premises prove the necessity of a “permanent body of some kind,” we might still ask whether a Presbytery is not as permanent as a Board? It can meet as often upon its own adjournments, and frequency of meeting is all the permanence which any body of the sort can have. “Would any merchant in this mercantile country,” asks the reviewer with an air of triumph, “entrust to such an agency the accomplishment of such ends, involving such interests, and requiring for their management such continual oversight, such deliberative wisdom? Would any sensible and prudent minded Christian man commit the affairs of our missionary Boards with their hundreds of employed missionaries, their numerous churches, and their continually increasing openings for enlarged usefulness—or our Board of Education with hundreds of young men in its watch and care—or our Board of Publication, with all the responsibilities it involves—during the twelve months that intervene between one meeting of the Assembly and another—to a “bench of deacons commissioned only to disburse funds,” which funds are to be raised only by deacons within the bounds of each several congregation?”—(*Balt. Lit. and Rel. Mag.* 1841, p. 463.) But here I am constrained to ask who ever proposed such a scheme? It is assuredly not to be found in the *Calm Discussion*. The plan there insisted on is, that the courts of the church, the *Presbyteries*, are to do the business now done by the Boards, and to employ these deacons, according to God’s appointment, as their financial agents. And why are not the Presbyteries just as trust-worthy, just as faithful, just as able, and just as efficient as the Boards that have been named? We ask the reviewer to give a sufficient and satisfactory reason, and until he does this, all his declamation, however pompous, how full soever of “sound and fury” must still be taken as “signifying nothing.” He must show us why it is that the “supervision, direction and controul” which he pronounces to be the very life of our benevolent operations, “more important even, than money or the physical resources,” cannot just as safely be committed to the Presbyteries of the church, as to ecclesiastical corporations. I ask triumphantly, why? and echo answers—why?

The reviewer having shown, as he supposed, the inadequacy of the scheme drawn from our standards, and maintained in the *Calm Discussion*, next proceeds, with equal success, to prove that it is unscriptural and unconstitutional. “It is unscriptural,” he assents. “It cannot be traced to the scriptures directly—it cannot be deduced from them by necessary inference. It is, therefore, to be denounced as a human invention?” Are we then to understand him as asserting that Presbyteries are unscriptural, and that deacons are not recognized in the word of God? Does he believe that our whole Presbyterian Form of Government is a mere human invention—not contained in scripture nor deduced from it by necessary inference? But how does the reviewer establish his point, that the plan set forth in the *Calm Discussion*, is contrary to scripture? By asserting, first, that deacons are confined to particular churches,

and empowered only to take care of the poor.—(*Balt. Lit. and Rel. Mag.*, 1841, p. 465.) That deacons are officers, elected and ordained in particular churches, is true. So are elders—but as there is nothing in this fact inconsistent with an elder's acting for the church at large in our ecclesiastical courts, so there is nothing to prevent the deacon from exercising his peculiar functions in a wider sphere. A pastor is installed over a particular church, but is he at liberty to preach no where else? An elder belongs to a specific congregation. Is our constitution, therefore, wrong in permitting him to sit as a member of Presbytery? If the mere fact of being an officer in a particular church, necessarily confines one to that congregation alone, the reviewer will find it a hard task to show how elders and pastors are ever formed into Presbyteries. He must either admit that the Presbyterian Form of Government is unscriptural—or that deacons may act for Presbyteries as they act for their particular congregations. His only alternatives are congregationalism, or the abandoning of his reasoning upon the subject of deacons. His syllogism is, that whoever is installed as an officer in a particular church, can never be an officer of the church catholic. Deacons are so installed—therefore deacons can never be officers of the church catholic. I might change the minor proposition and say, elders are so installed, and how can he avoid the conclusion? He must evidently abandon his major proposition or abandon Presbyterianism. Which horn of the dilemma will he take? By the same process of reasoning, his objections drawn from the constitution may be conclusively answered. But it seems that deacons are to be entrusted with nothing but the care of the poor. Is the reviewer yet to learn that the common method of instruction pursued in the scriptures, is to inculcate general truths by insisting on their particular applications, rather than dealing in abstract statements? Our Saviour teaches the doctrine of a special providence, by pointing to the fowls of the air—the lilies of the field, and the hairs of our heads. Just as in the contemplation of the works of nature, we rise to the abstract from the concrete—the general from the particular, so in the book of revelation, we are often to pursue the same process of cautions and accurate induction. When our Saviour is asked who is our neighbour, he gives no formal and elaborate definition—he simply states a case, and from that case the principle may be gathered. The decalogue itself can be proved to be a perfect law, only by admitting the principle that "under one sin or duty, all of the same kind are forbidden or commanded"—many of the precepts containing only examples of a large class. As, then, it is frequently the method of scripture to teach by example, where is the impropriety in supposing that the attention to the poor enjoined upon the deacons, was intended to include the whole department of secular business with which the church was to be concerned? It is certain that the reason assigned by the apostles for ordering their election, applies just as strongly to the collection and disbursement of funds for one purpose as for another. Their object was not to get rid of attending to the poor, but to get rid of secular distractions: "It is not reason," said they, "that we should leave the word of God and

serve tables. But we will give ourselves continually to prayer and the ministry of the word."—(Acts vi. 2, 4.) What would they have gained by divesting themselves of the care of the poor, and continuing to be perplexed with the collection of funds for all other purposes? It must be perfectly obvious to every candid mind that the entire secular business of the church, was entrusted to the deacons—that one specific duty is mentioned, in accordance with the general method of Scripture, as a specimen of a class, and that the reason of the appointment determines the extent of the duties imposed. Here, then, is necessary inference deduced from scripture, clearly confirming the general position of the *Calm Discussion*. It is plain, also, that the deacons acted for the whole college of apostles—not by travelling about with them in their various missionary tours, but by being under their inspection and controul while they continued in Jerusalem. They stood in the same relation to them that I would have them occupy in regard to our Presbyteries. The office of deacon, then, as set forth in the *Calm Discussion*, is both scriptural and constitutional, and all the reviewer's preposterous efforts to make me the originator of new officers and a new set of courts, are utterly abortive and ridiculous. The idea that a deacon cannot attend to the secular business of the Presbytery or Assembly without being removed from his particular congregation, is perfectly ludicrous and absurd. In reading this part of the reviewer's article, it is hard to believe that he is really serious. His whole train of reasoning has so much the appearance of a hoax, that one is tempted to fear at every step, that he has, after all, been egregiously quizzed.

Still, although he cannot refute it either from the scriptures or from the constitution of the church, the reviewer obstinately maintains that the scheme defended in the *Calm Discussion*, is "perfectly chimerical. It bases a system of practical operation upon a mere theoretical hypothesis." What! are our Presbyteries merely visionary bodies, incapable of being put into practical operation? Was it a visionary scheme which the apostles adopted when they desired to be emancipated from secular distraction? Is our whole *Form of Government* a mere hypothesis which can never be carried into practical effect? If so, it is time to review our standards and to abandon Presbyterianism as a mere chimera, which, however attractive in theory, can never produce any valuable results. "It assumes," continues the reviewer, "a self-controlling, self-perpetuating principle to exist some-where or some-how within these operations." This sentence I do not understand. I cannot see why it assumes such a principle in the case of missions more than in the case of any other Presbyterianial business. Nor do I see how, if the Presbyteries are liable to such a charge, the Boards are free from it. The whole sentence is nonsense. "It attributes," he proceeds, "to our several judicatories a foresight and wisdom which can provide for the thousand contingencies which may arise during the course of every year, and that they could make all those provisional arrangements in the course of a brief session, which now occupy busily during the entire year, our several officers and committees." I would simply ask how often

the Boards meet\*—how long they continue in session, and why the Presbyteries may not possess as large a share of foresight and wisdom as these contrivances possess? The objection lies just as powerfully against the one as it does against the other. If the Boards have committees to carry out the details of their plans during the interim of their sessions, what is to prevent the Presbyteries from adopting the same arrangement, and what is to hinder the Presbyteries from meeting just as often as emergencies may require? In chapter 18 of our Form of Government, such a committee in each Presbytery, seems to be contemplated; and this, by the way, is an additional proof that our fathers intended to entrust the whole work of missions to the care of the Presbyteries. "It assumes," adds the reviewer, "that the funds will be voluntarily forthcoming from all our churches in every portion of the church." And do the Boards assume that these funds shall be *forcibly* forthcoming? The Lord loveth a cheerful giver, and we have no reason to expect that any but free-will offerings will be accepted of God. I do not see how Boards can raise money at pleasure, whether the people choose to give it or no. If there is not a spirit of love to dying souls and of zeal for the Lord's kingdom diffused among our churches, no organization on earth, can make them do the work of the Lord. If the heart be not right, the acts will never be good—if the tree be not sound, the fruit can never be wholesome. The reviewer evidently thinks that there is some magic in a Board

---

\*This is an extremely important question, and whatever may be thought of the argument, the churches should know the manner in which these Boards manage the business committed to them. The four Boards of the church consisted, in 1840, of the following number of members, viz.: Board of Domestic Missions, 64 members; (p. 61, of its Report;) the Board of Foreign Missions, 120 members; (p. 31 and 32 of its Report;) the Board of Publication, 104 members; (p. 18, 19 of its Report;) the Board of Education, 68 members; (p. 17 of its Report.) The writer of this note was never a member of the Board of Domestic Missions (as he remembers)—and therefore knows little about its internal economy or proceedings. He has been a member of all the remaining three, and has occasionally attended the meetings of each of them. The Board of Publication meets monthly, but if our personal notice is a just rule of judgment, we should say that exclusive of its Executive Committee, so many as one in ten of its members, rarely attend its regular meetings. We have attended every meeting of the Board of Foreign Missions, we believe, from its organization; its meetings were at first semi-annual; they are now annual only. The Minutes of 1840, (the latest in our reach,) show that the Board held its annual meeting in Philadelphia, that its sessions continued *three* days, and that 40 (out of its 120) members were present, during *some part* of those sessions. Our recollection is, that in 1841, the case was still worse; indeed that not more than a dozen persons regularly attended the short annual sessions of this important body. Now can any thing be more ridiculous, than to say that a few persons, met for a few days once a year, can fulfil the duties or discharge the obligations of the church in regard to this vast subject? Or can any thing be more insulting to the church courts, than to allege their incompetency, *to do this work this well?* It would be a most edifying commentary on the urgent pleas for the incapacity of our church courts and the ardent commendations of the labours of our ecclesiastical corporations, if some one would publish a table of their times of meeting, and the attendance on their meetings, for a series of years. We unhesitatingly assert our conviction to be, that the result would be a new proof of what we long ago asserted to be the fact, viz., that the whole power of those Boards is ultimately vested in a few persons, who are virtually self-appointed.—[Ed.]

which shall charm avarice into liberality—inspire a love of God where the Saviour's love has never been shed abroad—kindle a flame of zeal in the hearts of the formal and hypocritical, and discharge all the offices which the scriptures attribute to the Holy Ghost. But I would beg him to remember that there was a point at which the magicians of Egypt were compelled to pause. There were some wonders which their enchantments could not compass, and which only the finger of God could achieve. "It seems to imply," he further asserts, "that such benches of deacons and such general treasurers can be found to devote themselves to such agencies and duties, and to do so gratuitously." And why is it any harder to find deacons for our churches than elders? And why should they not be paid for their services if it should be found necessary? Is there none who love God in any of our churches, who would be as willing to serve the Lord in attending to the stuff, as those who were ordained to a much more troublesome business at Jerusalem? The reviewer seems to think that there is no such thing as vital Godliness in any of our congregations—that the Boards are a standing substitute for the graces of the Spirit, and that, consequently, if they should be removed, the wants of a dying world would never excite the first tear of sympathy, the first sigh of compassion, the first prayer for relief, or the first effort for its salvation. If this, indeed, be the condition of our multiplied churches—Ichabod, may be written upon our walls. The glory has departed, and no inventions of man can ever save us from the withering curse of an insulted God. If this, indeed, be so, the heathen world may say to our people, as the Saviour said to the daughters of Jerusalem, "weep not for me, but weep for yourselves." Our first work is evidently at home, in our own hearts, and we should give no sleep to our eyes, nor slumber to our eyelids, till the insulted Spirit of God has returned to our desolate Zion and built up the walls of our ruined city. If we are dead ourselves, we cannot expect to give life to others—our most laborious efforts will be only the dead burying their dead. If, on the other hand, we are alive to God, and he has enlarged our hearts, we will run in the way of all his commandments—our meat and our drink will be to do the will of our heavenly Father, and men, in abundance, will be found to fill all the offices which Christ has appointed in his church. His people shall be willing in the day of his power.

I beg the reader now to review calmly and dispassionately the assumptions which the reviewer declares to be "most utopian and gratuitous," charged upon the *Calm Discussion*, in the passage which has been considered, sentence by sentence, and seriously ask himself whether they amount to any thing more than this; that Christian men love the Lord Jesus Christ, and his cause, and are willing, in their several stations and departments of labour, to spend and be spent in his service? Is not this the whole of that violent hypothesis, on account of which the scheme which I defend is pronounced to be preposterous in the extreme? And has it come to this, that all faith, all love, all zeal, have departed from our borders, and that a man who shall venture to assume that such things as grace and piety are to be found in the length and breadth

of the whole Presbyterian church in these United States of America, must be held up as utterly wild, utopian, and visionary—bereft of his senses and in love with chimeras? Merciful God! to what a pass are we come! And dost thou, my brother, read me a lecture for speaking disrespectfully of the Boards? Shall the man who does not tremble, notwithstanding solemn vows, to denounce the institutions of God, and to uncover the nakedness of the mother that has nursed him, who does not hesitate to revile the Lord's people as a nation of hypocrites and a race of evil doers—who is shocked at the assumption that any man can be found so utterly utopian as to love the Lord Jesus Christ and his cause, and to count it a privilege to labour in his Master's vineyard—be yet astonished and amazed when the suspicion is expressed that Boards are not the best guarantees of the faith once delivered to the saints! Whence all this zeal for the soundness of the Boards—and all this contempt for the piety of the church! How comes it to pass that the Boards should be such guardians of orthodoxy—so zealous for the Lord, when all the church is *dead, dead*, utterly dead? and which is the greater sin, to question the excellence of ecclesiastical Boards, or to question the grace of all our churches? He cannot deny that his whole argument against the efficiency of Presbyteries proceeds on the assumption that neither they nor the churches take any interest in the matter; and this is tantamount to saying that there is no real love to God or his kingdom, among all professing people. He is fairly shut up to the conclusion that the scriptural organization is sufficient, or that the spirit of piety is extinct in our churches.

I think now, that it may be safely concluded that the reviewer has totally failed to substantiate his position, that the scheme which he opposes, is "preposterous in the extreme, altogether visionary, and, in no degree, adapted to the necessities of the case." In other words, the ends to be accomplished by the Boards, can be accomplished as easily, safely and efficiently without them, through the regular action of our ecclesiastical system. His defence of Boards, consequently, falls to the ground. His argument was, that the church has a right to appoint them because she *cannot* do without them. For aught that appears, she *can* do without them—therefore, upon his own principle, she has no right to appoint them. The necessity upon which the right was suspended, does not exist, and consequently the right itself disappears in "levi aere." The church can ordain ministers just as well without them as with them. She can send them abroad just as well without them as with them. She can raise funds just as well without them as with them. She can attend to all proper, secular and spiritual concerns just as well without them as with them. Therefore they may be safely given to the winds. And this is the conclusion of the whole matter.

There is an *a priori* argument against the principle of the reviewer, that God has prescribed only the ends to be accomplished, and left the invention and adjustment of the means to the wisdom and discretion of the church herself, which, it would seem, ought to give satisfaction to every Christian man. This argument was fully stated in the *Calm Discussion*, and noticed in the review, only to be

perverted. Was there ever a more remarkable instance of evasion than the following sentence affords? “It is maintained by the objector, that our Saviour constituted his church with a special reference to missionary operations; therefore the church is under obligation to carry on such operations by the best and most effective agency.”—(*Balt. Lit. and Rel Mag.*, 1811, p. 463.) The principle of the *Calm Discussion* is, that the visible organization of the church—its courts and officers, were so constituted and arranged as that missionary operations, through and by them, might be readily and efficiently conducted. Therefore, says the reviewer, she is “under obligation to carry on such operations by the best and most effective agency.” That is, because God has made and ordained her as his instrumental agent in this business, she is at liberty to appoint and ordain another for herself. The Head of the church is virtually charged with folly in all his arrangements—his plans are found to be utterly defective and inadequate, and unless the church interposes with her wisdom, the world must die without the light of the knowledge of God. Christ has constructed a machine for a particular purpose—the machine, however, is so clumsily put together, that it will not and cannot work until man has given it the finishing stroke. What an impeachment of Divine wisdom, and what an extraordinary specimen of reasoning? He who should seriously maintain that because God has given us eyes for the purposes of vision, therefore we are under obligation to use spectacles, or because he has given us legs for the purpose of walking, therefore we are bound to resort to crutches, would reason precisely as the reviewer reasons in the case before us—God has appointed the church for the purpose of holding forth the word of life to a perishing world, therefore we are under obligation to fabricate Boards. But passing by this miserable sophistry, is it so that Jesus Christ has constituted the church with a special reference to missionary operations? Is it her business to hold the truth as a precious deposit—to bear testimony to it among the dying sons of men, and to proclaim it fully to earth’s remotest bounds? What say our Standards, and what say the scriptures? “Unto this catholic, visible church, Christ hath given the ministry, oracles and ordinances of God, for the *gathering* (mark the expression) and perfecting of the saints in this life, to the end of the world; and doth by his own presence and Spirit, according to his promise, make them *effectual* thereunto.” (*Confession of Faith*, ch. 25, sec. 3.) The reader will note that *God* makes his ministers, word and ordinances, effectual by *his presence and Spirit*. So says the Confession. The reviewer says that the *church* makes them *effectual* by *her own Boards*. But possibly our Standards may be wrong. What say the Scriptures? “And he gave some, apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers, for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ.”—(*Eph.* iv. 11–12.) It is plain, that Christ, in giving gifts to his church, supposed that he had sufficiently furnished her for the work which he had set her. The church herself, at that time, thought nothing more was needed—for we find her going forward on her grand missionary enterprise

with no other agencies in operation, but just those which Christ had appointed, and experience would seem to indicate that she was abundantly provided for her office, as no missionary annals that the world has ever seen, contain more signal and striking proofs of success, than the Acts of the Apostles. But, however this may be, we are shut up to the conclusion, that Christ's expectations were disappointed, and his plan a failure, or that the church, as constituted in the New Testament, is adequately furnished for discharging effectually all her obligations: and as the wisdom of the Son of God cannot be questioned, we are bound to believe that the "word, the ministry, and the ordinances of God" will always be made effectual, by his presence and Spirit, in gathering his sheep from the four quarters of the globe. There is but one way of evading this argument, and that is, by denying that there is any model of church organization Divinely prescribed, or that it had reference to the duties and functions to be discharged by the church. Neither of which can consistently be done by any true Presbyterian. The scriptural view of the church, as a visible institution, is that she is a mere instrumentality employed by Christ, for the purpose of accomplishing his own ends. She is the body, and he the Head, and as the members can only move and act by the volitions of the head, so the church is subject to the will of Christ in all things. She has no will, wisdom nor power of herself: She is the instrument, and he the agent. She is not his confidential adviser, to whom he reveals his purposes, and whom he consults concerning his plans. She is not his confidential agent to whom he communicates his will, and leaves it to be executed as she may see best. She is a *positive institution*, and therefore, must show a definite warrant for every thing that she does. It is not enough that her measures are not *condemned*. They must be *sanctioned, positively sanctioned*, by the power which ordains her, or they are null and void. Like the Congress of the United States, she acts under a written constitution, and must produce her *written authority* for all that she undertakes. Hence, so far is the church from having the power to ordain means, that she is herself the *very means* by which her glorious Head accomplishes his purposes in the world; and, therefore, as being ordained by him, must be completely adequate to meet the ends in view: and this conclusion being once admitted, the argument of the reviewer necessarily falls to the ground. If he should contend that where duties are enjoined, the power to perform them is conveyed—behold all the power in the Divine constitution of the church; if he should still persist that where ends are proposed to be accomplished, adequate means must be adopted—behold God has given us the means in the same Divine institution, and promised to render them effectual by his presence and Spirit. In this way, I have sufficiently answered the reviewer, by showing that his minor proposition is false, without entering into a full refutation, as I might do, and as I may yet have to do, of his major. At present, I have preferred the course which would give me the opportunity of showing that we might leave the subject of missions just where it is left in our Standards. I have thought it sufficient to state that his fundamental principle is a fallacy into which he has

been led, by confounding two things entirely separate, and leave it to his own candour to abandon it. I have felt no serious inclination to expose it, as I do not suppose that there are half a dozen ministers in the Presbyterian church who could seriously embrace it, when fairly set before them in its naked deformity. He chose to rest the defence of Boards upon their *necessity*. On that ground I have fully met him. The argument between us might here rest. But I think it well, before closing this article, to notice briefly some of the objections to the Calm Discussion, which have not yet passed under our notice.

One of its charges against the Boards was, that they give us a set of ecclesiastical officers and courts separate from those acknowledged in our Standards. This the reviewer denies, and insists upon it, that those engaged in the service of the Board are ministers and elders of the church, and do not cease to be such in consequence of their relations to the Boards. The service of the Board, let it be remembered, becomes their calling—their distinct vocation. Is it the service to which they were ordained? Is it not a very different employment from the usual duties of ruling elder, bishop or evangelist? I shall not quarrel about a name. If the duties of these men are different from those to which they were ordained, the purpose of my argument is answered. It signifies little what they were when they went there. The question is, what do they become after they go there? As to the Boards being ecclesiastical courts, the reviewer admits again and again that they have spiritual jurisdiction—that they are entrusted with the oversight of the spiritual affairs of the missions—that they exercise spiritual functions in God's house. What more can be said of a Presbytery or a Synod? If you should maintain that it is necessary to a court that its powers should be inherent and original, you may change the word which the Calm Discussion applies to the Boards, but the thing itself remains: the unlawful power is still possessed and exercised, and they only do what, if they were courts, they would do. The point of the argument is in the possession and exercise of the power, and not in the application of the name. The reviewer denies that Boards interfere with the parity of the clergy—and yet admits that undue influence may be exerted by them. I can only testify as to what I have seen and heard. I saw and heard a ruling elder give a solemn charge to two ministers of the gospel, just as they were preparing to leave their native land to labour among distant and perishing heathen. What more would a Right Reverend Prelate have done under the same circumstances? The reviewer also maintains, that what is done by the Boards, is done by the church in her ecclesiastical capacity. He would be nearer the truth in saying that she *appoints* in her ecclesiastical capacity. The work is certainly done not by herself, but her agents.

Finally, the reviewer cuts his own throat by admitting that no one is under any moral obligation to support the Boards. They do not, according to his own statement, which I leave him to reconcile with other statements which he has made upon the same general subject, they do not bind the conscience. Then we are at lib-

erty to destroy them. They cannot surely be so vastly important as he makes them, and yet have their existence suspended on so slender a thread. Every dollar might be withheld from them, and yet no guilt incurred. They might all be destroyed and yet no sin committed. As, then, according to his own confession, there is no sin in refusing to sustain them, and as many of his brethren believe that there is much danger in upholding them, the safest course is to let them alone or consign them to the "tomb of all the Capulets."

Before closing this article, I wish to present a few additional considerations showing that the Presbyteries ought to take the whole business of missions into their own hands.

1. The first is, that the constitution of the church absolutely requires it. Those who have attentively studied our Form of Government will perceive that two leading ends were contemplated by its framers. The first has reference to the peace, union and harmony of the whole body, and the second relates to its extension and enlargement. The church is regarded as one whole, and its visible organization is adapted to its unity. The General Assembly is the "bond of union, peace, correspondence, and mutual confidence among all our churches." (*Form Gov.*, ch. xii., sec. 4.) Our system of courts of appellate jurisdiction and the distribution and arrangement of their powers, are admirably suited to bind all the parts of the church together, and to preserve the unity and integrity of the body. But the church must be *enlarged* as well as *united*. Now it is evident that there can be no extension without the formation of individual churches. This is the first step—the church spreads by increasing the number of its particular congregations. Whatever provision, therefore, our Constitution has made for the formation of new churches, is just its provision for missionary operations. Wherever it has lodged the power to do the one, it has lodged the power to do the other. Now this power is expressly given to the Presbyteries, (*Ib.*, ch. x. sec. 8.) and to the Presbyteries exclusively; and hence, by necessary inference, the Presbyteries are the missionary agents contemplated by our system. The Synods and General Assembly cannot directly interfere until the Presbyteries have done their work and supplied the materials, in the formation of new churches, out of which other Presbyteries and other Synods may be formed. The Synods and Assembly are courts of *union*, having reference only to churches already existing. The Presbyteries are also *formative* bodies, giving existence to the parts to be united. The only way in which the Assembly or Synod can plant a mission is by "directing the Presbyteries to ordain evangelists or ministers without relation to particular churches." (*Ib.* ch. xviii.) How undeniably plain, then, that our Constitution never contemplated any other agencies for missions but Presbyteries, with whom it has lodged the power to ordain ministers and form new churches—which includes the chief business of missions.

2. Another reason—which I repeat here because the reviewer seems not to have understood it as stated in the *Calm Discussion*

—is that, in this way, the churches will know what they are actually sending to the heathen,—whether the gospel of Christ or the traditions of men. The Boards require that all their ministers should be endorsed by Presbyteries. Very true—but what signifies an endorsement to me, by a man or body of men of whom I am profoundly ignorant? *Personal knowledge*, either of the party sent or of the party recommending, is indispensably necessary in order that our churches may support a man with a good conscience. They should either know him themselves or know those who testify to his character. Under the system of Boards, the churches in South Carolina may be supporting a man sent out by a Presbytery denouncing them as unchristian and hypocritical—a Presbytery that would silence all their ministers, and excommunicate all their members. They do not know to whom their money goes. How then can their prayers and their alms go together? But let the Presbyteries take the matter in hand, and their churches will know who are supported, and as all the Presbyteries in the same Synod are personally known to each other, they can assist in sustaining each others' missionaries; and know what they are doing. There is here a security against abuse—against an ignorant upholding of false men and false doctrines.

3. Another reason is, that by such an arrangement, the undivided energies of our churches might be called into action. The whole body would be reached. Let it be made a part of the ordinary business of our Presbyteries to pray and provide for the wants of a perishing world, and a new and glorious order of things would speedily arise. But as this point has been urged in the *Calm Discussion*, I proceed to a reason drawn from the peculiar condition of the church.

4. There are elements of division among us. Points on which Presbyteries and Synods are known to be divided. A central plan of action, therefore, cannot be adopted with any hope that it shall be permanent. I need not specify. My meaning will be obvious to those who have watched the progress of discussion and the march of opinion on the subjects of slavery, temperance, and kindred topics. Prudence would seem to dictate that our combinations, if we would preserve peace, must be as few as possible. In this way Christian charity and the unity of the church may be alike preserved.

I have now, as I think, sufficiently noticed the objections of the reviewer to the *Calm Discussion*, and completely refuted him upon his own ground. His ideas of church government and ecclesiastical power strike me as being exceedingly loose and exceedingly dangerous. His notions are even more extravagant than those of high-churchmen and prelatists—for they do make the church a *Divine* institution; but he makes it, to a mournful degree, a mere human association, and then clothes it with the same extraordinary powers which the strenuous advocates of the apostolical succession ascribe to it. If he believed that Presbyterianism rested on *Divine* authority, he would undoubtedly have more faith in its efficiency, and be less prone to try the expedients of man in its stead. My

faith in the adaptation of our system is founded on my faith in its Divine origin. Believing that our Zion is the city of our God, and that he has promised to establish her forever, I am fully persuaded that if we would carry our principles into thorough, practical operation, his presence and Spirit would attend us and make our walls, salvation, and our gates, praise. Let us only have faith in the success and efficacy of Divine institutions, and we shall find experience more than justifying our highest expectations. The sickly sentimentalism, which for years has passed current for the spirit of missions—which has been fostered and diffused by the American Board and kindred institutions, and which appeals to the carnal sympathies of man rather than to the faith of God's elect, has had its day and done its work. The real spirit of missions, a spirit of jealousy for the Lord God of Hosts, of love to a glorious Saviour, and of ardent attachment to the pure spiritual principles of his kingdom, combined with a godly desire to save the souls of men from death, is beginning to revive. The church is waking up to the magnitude and importance of the contest with the powers of darkness—and knowing her enemies and the enemies of man to be strong, vigilant and active—she is enquiring for tried armour—for weapons which shall stand in the day of battle, and drive her enemies discomfited before her. She is returning to the simplicity of faith, and enquiring for the old paths of safety and success. It is a good omen. I trust that a glorious destiny yet awaits our church, that God has delivered her from a long, dark, mournful bondage to Pelagian principles and Pelagian measures, and is now about to deliver her from an equally galling bondage to human traditions, for the purpose of making her a joy and a praise in the whole earth. As the Israelites were brought up harnessed out of Egypt to drive out the Canaanite, the Amorite and Hittite from the promised land, so we are brought up from as mournful a captivity, and girded with the whole armour of God to take possession, in the name of our Master, of the revolted tribes of earth. God is preparing us for a noble enterprise. Let all our Presbyteries, marshalled under their glorious leader, go out, like the tribes of Israel under the conduct of Joshua—let them all come up in unbroken phalanx to the help of the Lord, the help of the Lord against the mighty, and they will soon have as mighty wonders to celebrate as the ancient people of God. What we want, is *faith*—faith in the Divine promises—faith in the Divine appointments, and when this faith is imparted, earthen pitchers and lamps will be strong and resistless in our hands. To this faith our church is returning. God grant that she soon may be fully established upon the foundation of the prophets and apostles—Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone!

[For the Spirit of the XIX. Century.]

## SKETCHES AND RECOLLECTIONS FROM MY NOTE BOOK.

No. XII.

*Doctors Differ.*

YES, even honest, intelligent and experienced doctors differ. My recollections furnish me with a striking illustration of this adage. I give it just for what it is worth. Many years ago, while I was yet but a probationer for the gospel ministry, I was privileged with the advice and direction of two doctors in divinity, who enjoyed in their day, a large share of public applause as well as great success in their ministry. They were both eminently, in public estimation, orators—great divines—commanded large and intellectual audiences, and occupied two of our first city churches. One of them, wherever he moved for a length of time, filled the place where he spoke, so that even the aisles had to be furnished with benches. The other, I was informed, had sometimes to be assisted in through a window, every other entrance being blocked up long before the hour of service. At the period to which I allude, there were not, perhaps, two men in all the land whose advice would be regarded as more important to a clerical novice. They were considered as eminent for piety, learning and eloquence. They occupied distinguished places in the church, and their fame filled the land. It is not strange, then, that I considered myself greatly privileged to have the counsel of such men in my novitiate. Among the subjects on which they kindly instructed me, the only one which I purpose at present to mention, was the *manner*, &c. of preaching; and on this they differed "toto cœlo." In their success, these men were so identical, that I should have thought them made on the same model, and as far as men could be such, perfectly twin brothers in manner, if not in matter. In this, however, I would have been greatly mistaken, for perhaps no two men of the age really differed more than they did in these particulars.

The one who was the less popular of the two, advised and even adjured me never to take any paper or notes with me into the pulpit. He was full and eloquent upon the subject of extemporaneous preaching, and said doubtless, for I only give the recollected substance of the remarks, all that could be said by a man of talents upon the subject; and that, Mr. Editor, you will allow, was not little. The power of the eye—the influence of an untrammelled gesticulation—the opportunity of a heated and aroused imagination to seize upon new thoughts or new combinations of thought, and present them to the audience—the flash and fire arising from the unexpected collisions of the moment, with their power to fuse as well as enlighten the hearts of the audience, with many other advantages, all of which are lost to the person confined to his notes—all these, I say, were forcibly and eloquently presented as arguments against reading sermons, and they were not without their effects.

The other Doctor, who was perhaps in every respect, the first of this distinguished pair, as he undoubtedly was in power over the

hearts of an audience, enjoined it upon me, as a general thing, not to go into the pulpit without a fair and full written sermon. He advised me to write it out largely and legibly, with a good space betwixt the lines, leaving a margin for noting down any additional thoughts which might occur to me previous to preaching. He was eloquent and urgent upon the propriety of preaching from a full, written sermon, and greatly deprecated the opposite practice as inducing a slothful, slip shod, as well as an undigested and consequently uninstructional style of preaching. The man who did not use his notes in the pulpit, as a general thing, would not likely write his sermons; and he who did not write, was not likely to study; and he who did not study, was in danger of ranting instead of reasoning—of declaiming instead of analysing, and of presenting a rambling, discursive harangue instead of a logical, consecutive discussion, calculated at once to instruct the heart and convince the conscience. As to writing and committing to memory, he had no opinion of it—partly because it was not likely that any man, and if any, very few, would persevere in such a drudgery, and consequently the next step was to fall down into the habit of extemporaneous declamation—partly because it was not only an unjustifiable waste of time, but of all ways of addressing a popular audience, the most servile—partly because there was a large portion of time thereby consumed, in cultivating simply the memory without any possible advantage to the heart or judgment; to the consciences of the hearers or the soul of the preacher; and partly because there was about it an air and semblance even of *deception!*

It will not be supposed that in what is said above, I pretend to give the words or even the exact argument in every instance. These are mere *recollections and sketches*. The facts, however, are substantially as stated—and we think, prove our proposition, that “doctors differ.”

In relation to the subject, I have other recollections and very considerable experience, which I may in part present, provided I am not regarded in the light of a disputant upon the subject. If I were to dispute upon this or any other subject, the editor of this work is the last of all men with whom I should desire or venture to do so; first, because of a reason containing too much *heart* even to be presented to such a cold and heartless world as the present; and second, because I am sure I would come off but second best in such a contest.

I know the gentlemen of the bar and the forum are quoted as instances of extemporaneous speakers, &c. &c. But I never could see any force in the illustration. 1st, They speak but seldom, and if they even spoke less frequent still, it would be better. 2d, The general character of their speaking is no model either of logic, diction or sense. 3d, Their subject is such and their ranting method of discussing it is such, and their personalities are such, and the excitation is such that their eloquence, as a general thing is *sui generis*. True, there are many and noble exceptions. We have Calhouns and Clays, Websters, Buchannans, and Prestons; so in the pulpit, we have men who may speak just as they list—men who stand out as grand intellectual exceptions among their kind—

men of great mental powers; men of great luxuriandy of fancy; men of great command of language; men of great powers of ratiocination; but these are the exceptions with whom we common minds have nothing to do as examples. It would be as unjust for us to oblige them to be tied down to our rule, as for them to make themselves a rule for us. But while we have exceptions, in which there is a high order of argument and instruction, in extemporaneous pulpit addresses; and while we have exceptions in which there is fire and sprightliness of manner in those who are *memoriter readers*, yet as a general thing, the one is verbose, vapid and uninteresting, while the other is tame, stiff and school-boyish. A man with the rare oratorical talents of the late Dr. John Breckinridge, who had such unbounded influence over mind, might do as he pleased; and yet we never heard, even him, to such advantage to himself or his hearers as on occasions when he was particularly prepared, and that preparation before him in the pulpit. Then it was that he was *great*. On other occasions he was *pleasing*. The great object of public speaking is persuasion, and the man who is in earnest, will endeavour to do it in such a manner as may best accomplish his purpose, and as a general thing, the man of good sense, superadded to earnestness, will soon discover what that manner is, as it regards himself; but we utterly and entirely dissent from the proposition that *this*, or *that*, or any man, shall make his manner the standard for us. It is my solemn duty to use the way and manner in which I conscientiously believe I can do most good; and conscience, my conscience, in this matter, and not my neighbour's, is the rule of duty to me. I may be left-handed and my neighbour right-handed. I may be an object of pity and compassion, because I cannot think and act like him. Well, I must bear the cross which God has laid upon me; yes, and I must bear the superadded cross which my *friend* lays on me, because I either cannot or will not make him my example; but were I to act against conscience, and in fear or complaisance to copy my neighbour to the hurt of the cause in which I am engaged, then I would be an object, not of pity, but of derision—then I would have the heaviest of all crosses to bear, even the cross of conscious and palpable delinquency of duty. If I cannot do good in my neighbour's mode of doing it, I must do it in my own; and if I cannot do it to the amount that he does, I must do it to the greatest amount in my power. If the tortoise cannot run like the hare, it must even be permitted to crawl, and by being diligent at it, and crawling on while the hare sleeps, and going straight forward while he gambols and performs his many circles and curvatures, &c., he may make, if not a real, yet a greater comparative progress than at first sight might appear possible to the mere theorist, and all men, when they are writing upon a favourite subject, become, to some extent, theorists, if not *mono-mania-tists*!

As far as we are able to judge, the *common preaching* of the extemporaneous speaker, is *but common*; and yet it has no doubt its peculiar advantages as it regards *manner*, which may in some wise make up for *matter*, so that it does not become me to throw a stone at it. As far as it regards the soul and intellect of the hearer,

it makes no difference whether the man who offers him instruction reads it off his memory, and thus indirectly off his paper, or does it directly off his paper; except that in the one case the speaker is trammelled, and in the other case he is untrammelled. On this subject I speak from knowledge. Never did any man, I presume, make a greater effort than I did, to do without notes in the pulpit. To accomplish this I wrote in full, and committed faithfully, and then read it off with the greatest servility—but it was *servility*. I turned every leaf, in my recollection, and could at any moment have told the page and paragraph, if not where the very line was that I was speaking—nay, so entirely was I absorbed in *reading*, while I appeared to *speak*, that I scarcely saw the audience, while all animation was suppressed under the great effort of memoriter reading. As the subject then, was betwixt my own conscience and my Master; and as I was bound to attend to the manner in which *I*, not my neighbour, might do most good, I considered myself shut up by providential necessity to ascertain that manner, and then pursue it. This, my friend may say, was the result of weakness; well, be it so! Who is sufficient for these things? Are you? Alas! what blunders we all make upon subjects of this kind, and how *little*, the biggest of us are, if we but knew it. The rock is big, when there is no object in view but a pebble, but how amazingly big the pebble feels when there is nothing larger present than a grain of sand! and yet, what are these, or any of them, to a mountain! a continent! a world! a universe! Such is feeble man! Such is his happiest manner! Such are his best and greatest efforts! “Man at his best state is altogether vanity”—“vanity of vanities, all is vanity”—nay, so vain and vapid, that he “is crushed before the moth!” I, therefore, who am one of the very least of the little, should be the most silent. I feel so, and hope that no brother will consider that I wish him to make my manner his criterion, provided he presents the truth as it is in Christ Jesus, and does it in the best, most faithful, most winning and persuasive manner that he can.

“Who does the best his circumstance allows,  
Does well, acts nobly, angels can no more.”

THE LOW STATE OF TRUE RELIGION.—LETTER FROM REV'D JAMES C. BARNES.

MY DEAR BROTHER:—I have just been reading with great delight, an article in *The Princeton Review*, on the Theological Opinions of the venerated President Davies. It appears from the Review, that a stereotype edition, of the Sermons of this eminent servant of Jesus Christ, has lately been published. In this I greatly rejoice. For the memory of no minister of our church, who has lived, and laboured in America, have I a more profound veneration. In reading the extracts given in the Review, my mind was deeply impressed with the following train of thoughts. If the views of this pious and devoted servant of God, in reference to the *nature* of real religion, are *true* and *scriptural*, (and that they are, no real Christian, I am persuaded, will deny,) then there is in the *present*

age, very little vital godliness! Who can read the following extract which fell from the lips of that burning and shining light in his day, and not apply it *with a deep fetched sigh*, to the present state of the visible church. "Since it has been the mode to compliment mankind as able to do something very considerable in religion, religion has died away. Since it has been *the fashion* to press a reformation of men's lives, without inculcating the absolute necessity of Divine grace to renew their nature, there is hardly such a thing as thorough reformation to be seen; but mankind are evidently growing worse and worse. Since men think they can do something, and scorn to be wholly dependent on divine grace, the Lord, as it were, looks on and suffers them to make the experiment, and alas! it is likely to be a costly experiment to multitudes. God withholds his influence in just displeasure, and lets them try what mighty things the boasted powers of degenerate nature can do without it; and hence, alas! they all lie secure and sleep in sin together."

If this was a true picture of the state of Christ's visible kingdom near a century ago, it is more distressingly true of the state of that kingdom at the present period. I am aware that such a sentiment is in direct opposition to the *popular fancies* of the day; and even in opposition to the opinion of many, probably the majority, that are united to the visible church. It is a popular notion in this *doing age*, that under the influence of the *mighty operations* of benevolence and piety that have been set on foot within the last half century, the world will be speedily converted to God! And we are even called upon by some of the orators of the day, to fix our eye upon the sun of the latter day glory, now already above the horizon! But let any lover of the Lord Jesus, and his spiritual kingdom, first enquire of such master workmen as President Davis, and then of the inspired apostles, and above all of the Great Teacher in Israel, into the nature of *real*, vital, heaven-born religion, receiving their plain and heavenly instructions in the spirit of *a little child*, and keeping them before the mind's eye, and then look from east to west, from north to south, over this or any other Protestant Christian land on earth, and he will be utterly unable to discover even the break of day preceding the Sun of the latter day glory. Take a view of our own once *united and happy*, but now *divided and distracted* country; and how much is to be found among any denomination of Christians of that *sincere, humble, self-denied, child-like, cross-bearing, and Christ-loving spirit*, held up so prominently by Jesus and his holy apostles, and reiterated by such men as President Davies? Look over the visible kingdom by geographical sections, not to mention particular denominations. Let the real lover of Jesus, cast the eye of his mind over the north eastern section of our country, and *according to living testimony*, with the Saviour's rule before him—"by their fruits ye shall know them"—and then, in *thought*, remove from the ranks of the visible kingdom, those who give no evidence of a saving union to Jesus—alas, how few will be left. All, for instance, who deny the fundamental truths of our holy religion, such as the depravity of man—the divinity and atonement of Christ—and the *personality* and

work of the Holy Spirit—all who are resting secure with nothing more than a *natural* or (as President Davies calls it,) a *self-sprung* religion—all who are in the ranks of our King from the mere force of education, or because it is fashionable to be a professor of religion, and we shall find the numbers on the Lord's side by profession greatly thinned. But go a step further, and remove in thought, all who have been enlisted among different denominations, under the *high pressure system*, without any experimental knowledge of their utter helplessness as sinners, and without of course any *right up-taking* of the mercy of God in Christ—and who are either kept in the ranks from pride of character, the force of example, or upon the old principle *do and live*. How few, very few, are left after even such a sifting as this, and this is but a faint emblem of that work the Lord shall do when he comes with his fan in his hand, thoroughly to purge his floor, and gather the wheat into the garner. Let us now turn our thoughts west and south, (not to the far west or extreme south,) and do we discover a clearer moral sky? or a brighter day shining on the Zion of our God? Go through the same process as that mentioned above, and alas! among all denominations of Protestants we shall find, as it is verily believed, as small if not a much smaller number of real spiritual cross-bearing followers of the Lamb. Among some, in this region under review, the *high pressure scheme* is pushed to such an extent that out of *hundreds* that are *forced* into the ranks at a given period, scarcely *tens* are left at the close of the year that even profess to be on the Lord's side. We know, also, to what an alarming extent the *cold water* (not *temperance*) system is practiced. This is declared boldly and publicly, and believed by multitudes to supercede the necessity of *divine influence* to convert the soul, and considered far more efficacious to wash away sin than the *blood of atonement*. Travel to the far west, and the far south, and what do we discover? A vast moral wilderness, with here and there an humble laborer in this boundless field—here and there a feeble church composed of a few pious souls craving the bread of life; and at vast distances separated, a few pious disciples sighing and crying for all the abominations of the land.\* But let the intelligent lover of the Saviour, assisted by credible testimony fix his thoughts on any Christian Protestant land on the globe, and let him visit every missionary station between the poles, with the evidences of *vital* religion in view, received from the *fountain head*; and then let him candidly say if the truth uttered by our Lord does not accompany him in all his researches, “many are called but few are chosen—narrow is the way that leads to life, and few there be that find it.”

In pondering on this subject, one thing greatly surprises me, and that is, notwithstanding all that is said by our Lord and his holy apostles, by parable and in plain language, respecting the dark and degenerate state of the world, lying in the *wicked one*, and in the arms of antichristian powers up to the *moment* that Messiah shall appear the second time in the clouds of heaven; that there should still be found some, yea many among the pious, the learned, and even *aged servants* of Christ who are yet dreaming of a *golden age* connected with the *present dispensation*, and even suppose they

discover the dawn of such a bright period. To such, with great respect and deference, I would propose this plain question—*Are we taught by Christ and his apostles that the triumphs of the gospel shall be universal under the present dispensation, or before the second advent of our Lord?* But here I am entering a wide spread territory, and will stop for the present at the border.

In the bonds of Christian love, your brother,

JAMES C. BARNES.

Rev'd Dr. Breckinridge.

Dayton, Ohio, Jan'y 29, 1842.

### THE FUNERAL OF THE MASS.

#### CHAPTER III.—*Against Transubstantiation.*

I. TRANSUBSTANTIATION is the substantial conversion of the bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ, which I destroy by divers arguments; the first whereof is this:

In every substantial conversion, that thing into which another thing is converted, is always newly produced. For example, when seed is converted into an animal, that animal is newly produced; when Jesus Christ turned the water into wine, the wine was newly produced, &c. But the body and blood of Christ cannot be newly produced in the Sacrament of the Eucharist; therefore the bread and wine are not substantially converted into the body and blood of Christ in the Sacrament of the Eucharist. The second proposition, viz., that the body and blood of Christ cannot be newly produced, I prove thus; that which is newly produced receives a new being; because, to produce a thing, and to give it a being, is one and the same; but the body and blood of Christ cannot receive a new being, which I prove thus: a man cannot receive that which he hath, while he hath it, and therefore he cannot receive a being while he hath a being; for, as it is impossible to take away a being from that which hath no being, so it is impossible to give a being to that which hath a being already; and, as you cannot kill a dead man, so you can not give life to one that is living. But the body and blood of Christ have, and always will have a being; therefore they cannot receive one, and consequently cannot be reproduced in the Eucharist.

2. My second argument is this. In every substantial conversion, that thing which is converted into another is destroyed. For example, when the water was turned into wine, the water was destroyed; but in the Sacrament of the Eucharist, the bread and wine are not destroyed by the consecration; which I prove thus; in the celebration of the Eucharist, there is breaking, giving, eating, and drinking, after the consecration, as appears by the very practice of our adversaries, who after consecration, break the Host, and divide it into three parts, give nothing to the communicants but consecrated Hosts, and eat and drink nothing but what was consecrated: but the Scripture saith, that in the celebration of the Eucharist, bread is broken, that bread and wine are given, and that

bread is eaten and wine drank, as appears by these following passages. St. Paul, 1 Cor. x. saith, *The bread which we break is it not the communion of the body of Christ?* and 1 Cor. xi., St. Matth. xxvi., St. Mark xiv., and St. Luke xxii., it is said that *Jesus Christ took bread, brake it and gave it*; and St. Mark xiv. and St. Matth. xxvi., Jesus Christ, after he had participated of the Sacrament of the Eucharist, saith, *I will drink no more of this fruit of the vine*: and 1 Cor. xi., *As often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup. Let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of that bread and drink of that cup.*

3. Secondly, when Jesus Christ said to his disciples, *drink ye all of this*, St. Matth. xxvi.; that is, drink ye all of this cup, either he commanded to drink of a cup of wine or of a cup of blood: if he commanded them to drink of a cup of wine, then it follows that they drank nothing but wine, because it is certain that they obeyed Jesus Christ; for it is said, St. Mark xiv., that *they all drank of it*. Or if he commanded them to drink of a cup of blood, then it follows that the wine was already changed into his blood, because it is not probable that Jesus Christ said to them, drink ye all of this cup of blood, and yet that it was not a cup of blood, but a cup of wine. But when Jesus Christ said, *drink ye all of this*, he did not speak to them of a cup of blood, for the wine was not then converted into Christ's blood, because (according to our adversaries,) it was not changed until Jesus Christ had made an end of uttering these following words, *for this is my blood*. But he uttered these words, *drink ye all of this*, before he uttered these, *for this is my blood*; because a man must utter a proposition before he can give the reason of it.

4. Thirdly, when a thing is converted into another, we cannot see the effects and properties of the thing converted, but only of that into which it is converted. For example, when the seed is changed into an animal, we can see no more the effects and properties of the seed, but of the animal only; and when Jesus Christ turned the water into wine, the effects, properties, and accidents of the water were no more seen, but of the wine only, &c. But in the Eucharist we cannot, after the consecration, perceive the effects, properties, accidents, or parts of the body and blood of Christ; but we see there all the effects, properties, and accidents of bread and wine: therefore in the Eucharist, the bread and wine are not converted into the body and blood of Christ. And the truth is, if that which appears to be bread, and hath all the effects, accidents, and properties of bread, be not bread, but Christ's body clothed with the accidents of bread; then it may likewise be said that they that appear to be men, and have all the effects, properties, and accidents of men are not men, but horses clothed with the accidents of men.

5. The fourth argument is this. In every substantial conversion there must be a subject to pass from one substance to another; for then it would be a creation, which is the sole action that doth not pre-suppose a subject. But in the Sacrament of the Eucharist, after the consecration, there is no subject; because, according to our adversaries, there remains no subject; for, as they assert, the

accidents of bread and wine remain without any subject at all: therefore in the Sacrament of the Eucharist there is no substantial conversion.

6. The fifth argument is drawn from hence, that transubstantiation destroys the nature of accidents, thus. That doctrine which asserts that accidents are not accidents but substances, destroys the nature and essence of accidents, because it is impossible that an accident can be a substance. But the doctrine of transubstantiation asserts that accidents are not accidents, but that they are substances, which I prove thus. That doctrine which asserts that accidents are not inherent, but that they subsist of themselves, doth assert that accidents are not accidents, but that they are substances, because inherent is the essential difference of an accident and subsistence. But the doctrine of transubstantiation asserts that accidents are not inherent, but that they subsist, which I prove thus. That doctrine which asserts that accidents may be without a subject, doth assert that accidents are not inherent in a subject, but that they subsist by themselves: but the doctrine of transubstantiation asserts that accidents may be without a subject, viz., the accidents of bread and wine without any substance, and without any subject to sustain them; for by transubstantiation the substance of the bread and wine is gone, and their accidents remain: therefore the doctrine of transubstantiation asserts that accidents are not inherent, but do subsist by themselves, and consequently asserts that accidents are not accidents, but substances, and so destroys the nature and essence of accidents. But here it may be said, that actual inherence doth not constitute an accident, but aptitudinal only. Against which I form this argument. Whatsoever doth exist actually, either it exists in something else actually so, that it cannot be without it, which philosophers call actual inherence, as walking: or else it exists in and by itself actually, so that it may be alone by itself, which philosophers term actual existence; the former of these constitutes an accident, and the latter constitutes a substance. But the accidents of the bread and wine, after consecration, do exist actually: therefore they must exist either in something else actually, or in themselves actually. But they do not exist in and by themselves actually, for then they would subsist by themselves and be real substances, which is impossible: therefore they exist in something else actually, viz., in the substance of the bread and wine, and consequently the substance of the bread and wine remains after the consecration, and so there can be no transubstantiation.

7. The sixth argument is drawn from this, that transubstantiation destroys the nature of sacraments, because every sacrament is a visible sign of an invisible grace, as the Council of Trent saith in *Session 6*, and every sign relates to the thing signified, so that we must speak of signs and sacraments, as of things relating to something else. But all relative things have, as it were, a double being, viz. an absolute being, which is the natural being of the thing, and a relative being whereby it relates to something else. For example, in a man that hath begotten a child, we consider his absolute and natural being, as he is a man as others are, and his relative being, whereby he is a father, and is distinguished from other men that have no children,

and so are not fathers. So in the sacrament of baptism, the sign, viz. the water, hath an absolute and natural being, viz., its cold and moist substance, whereby it is water as other waters are; and a relative, sacramental, and significative being, whereby it is the sign and sacrament of Christ's blood, and differs from other waters that are not employed for this sacred use. Even so in the Sacrament of the Eucharist, the bread and wine, which are the signs, have their natural and absolute being, viz., their substance whereby they are bread and wine, as other bread and wine, which we commonly use; and their relative, sacramental, and significative being, whereby they are the Sacrament and signs of the body and blood of Christ, and differ from all other bread and wine that is not thus employed. To this I add, that it is impossible a relative being should be without an absolute, because a relative cannot be without its foundation. For example, it is impossible to be a father without being a man; to be equal without quantity, &c. And this being granted, I form my argument thus, that which takes away the natural being from signs and sacraments, destroys their nature and essence; because the relative and sacramental being cannot be without the absolute and natural, as hath been proved. But the doctrine of transubstantiation destroys the natural being of the bread and wine, which are signs and sacraments of Christ's body and blood; for by transubstantiation, the whole substance of the bread and wine is destroyed: therefore the doctrine of transubstantiation destroys the nature and essence of sacraments.

8. To this argument our adversaries answer, that in the Eucharist the bread and wine are not signs, because by the consecration they are destroyed as to their substance. But some of them say that the signs are the accidents of the bread and wine; others say that the body and blood of Christ contained under the accidents of the bread and wine, are the signs of the body and blood of Jesus Christ crucified; lastly, others say, that neither the accidents of the bread and wine only, nor the body and blood of Christ only, but the body and blood of Christ, together with the accidents of the bread and wine, are the signs of the body and blood of Jesus Christ crucified: therefore seeing the doctrine of transubstantiation doth not destroy the natural being of Christ's body and blood, nor the natural being of the accidents of the bread and wine, they maintain that the doctrine of transubstantiation doth not destroy the nature and essence of sacraments.

9. To this I reply, that neither the accidents of the bread and wine only, nor the body and blood of Christ only, nor the body and blood of Christ together with the accidents of the bread and wine, are the true signs of Jesus Christ crucified; but the bread and wine only, which I prove thus:

First, In sacraments there ought to be an analogy and similitude between the sign and the thing signified, as our adversaries confess, and particularly Card. Bellarmin, Book I. of the Sacrament; chap. 9, in these words: *The fourth thing required in a sacrament, is that the sign should have some similitude and analogy with the thing signified.* And he quotes St. Augustine in Epist. XXIII. to Boniface, speaking thus: *If sacraments had not some similitude of the things wherof they are sacraments they could be no sacraments:* But in the

Sacrament of the Eucharist, neither the accidents of the bread and wine, nor the body and blood of Christ, whether jointly or severally, have that similitude and analogy to the thing signified which is required, but only the bread and wine in substance; because that which is principally signified, and represented by the signs in the Sacrament of the Eucharist, is the nourishment of our souls in the hope of eternal life: for as baptism is the sacrament of our regeneration and spiritual birth, so the Eucharist is the sacrament of our spiritual nourishment, as Card. Bellarmin confesseth in Book III. of the Eucharist, chap. 9, and in Book IV. chap. 19, he saith, *that the Sacrament of the Eucharist was ordained to preserve spiritual life*, which cannot be represented and signified but by signs, which can nourish our bodies; for the analogy and similitude consists in this, that as the signs have virtue to nourish our bodies for the preservation of temporal life, so the things signified, have a virtue to nourish our souls in the hope of eternal life. But neither the accidents of the bread and wine, nor the body and blood of Christ, whether severally or jointly with the accidents, can nourish our bodies (nourishment being essentially the conversion of aliment into the substance of a living body), and it is certain that neither the accidents of bread and wine, nor the body and blood of Christ, whether separately or jointly with them, can be converted into our substance, but only the substance of bread and wine, and other aliments which we take: therefore neither the accidents of the bread and wine, nor the body and blood of Christ, whether separately or jointly, with them, are the true signs; but the bread and wine only, which being the ordinary nourishment of our bodies, do represent to us the spiritual nourishment of our souls by the body and blood of Christ, received by faith.

10. Secondly, The Council of Trent, in Session 13, commands that the Sacrament of the Eucharist shall be adored with *Latrie*, which, according to our adversaries, is the sovereign worship due to God only. But the accidents of the bread and wine ought not to be adored, because they are creatures, and that God only must be adored. Therefore the accidents of the bread and wine are not the Sacrament of the Eucharist.

Thirdly, A sacrament is a visible sign of an invisible grace, as the Council of Trent defines it in Sessions 6 and 13. But in the Eucharist the body and blood of Christ are not visible. Therefore, in the Eucharist, the body and blood of Christ are not the signs.

Lastly, I say, that in every sacrament the sign relates to the thing signified; and relation is always between two different things, because nothing relates to itself, and consequently nothing can be both the sign and thing signified. But the body and blood of Christ are the things signified. Therefore the body and blood of Christ are not the signs. And it is to no purpose to say that Jesus Christ in the Mass is the sign and figure of himself on the cross; for Jesus Christ, wheresoever he is, is one and the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever. And therefore Jesus Christ not being different from himself, cannot be relative to himself, nor the sign of himself.

Other reasons which are usually alleged against transubstantiation will be more properly mentioned in the next chapter.

[For the Spirit of the XIX. Century.]

## IOWA TERRITORY—ITS CONDITION, RESOURCES, POPULATION AND WANTS.

THE attention of mankind is, for the most part, directed to centres of influence. Whatever is remote from those centres is too much neglected, as possessing no importance. This is especially the case with prominent and capable men, who exert a commanding influence over the movements of society. It is commonly supposed that large cities and densely populated communities afford the greatest scope for the exertion of intellect, and the best fields for the promotion of benevolent enterprises. This opinion is correct; the weight of intellect and power—moral and mental, should follow population, and bear a just proportion to it, for where it is densest, the greater necessity exists for strenuous labour and a beneficent influence to correct the corrupt impulses of man, and devise wise plans for the amelioration of his condition. But the tendency of general movements is to extremes, and men are prone to fall into the current of common opinion and custom. The undue tendency of this centripetal force is manifest to any one who possesses the smallest knowledge of the far west. Throughout all the north-western states and territories the number of good and wise men bears no proportion to the extent of the country—the fertility of the soil—or the number and enterprise of the inhabitants. In the territory of Iowa, this fact is painfully evident. The hardy farmer, seeking to mend his broken fortune—the enterprising merchant—the reckless speculator—whom the hope of gain has allured, or hard necessity has driven from the home of their childhood, seek this fertile and lovely country, as the land of promise and of hope; but the eye looks in vain for the statesmen who are to form the political character of the young community, and to frame a wise and well balanced constitution for its government, or for the religious influences that are to shape aright the crude elements of society. This whole subject is of the highest importance, in whatever aspect it is viewed; and I will occupy a few pages of your magazine in speaking of the condition, resources and population of this country—and then of its wants.

The present territory of Iowa embraces all that part of the possessions of the United States which lies west of the Mississippi river, north of the state of Missouri, and east of yellow river. That portion of the territory to which the Indian title has been extinguished, extends from the southern boundary—north, to the British possessions—and west from the Mississippi river to the average distance of sixty-five miles. Formerly, Iowa and Wisconsin were included in the territory of Michigan. In 1836, Michigan was admitted into the Union, and the territory of Wisconsin formed, which included Iowa. On the 12th of June, 1838, Congress passed an act "To Establish the Territorial Government of Iowa," and under that act this territory went into operation on the 4th of July, of the same year. The present extent of the country is sufficient for all purposes of a state government, yet efforts have lately been made to enlarge it. In October last, commissioners on the part of the general government, held a negotiation with the Sac and Fox tribes of Indians who dwell upon our western border, for the purpose of purchasing all their extensive and fertile tract of country; but the meeting broke up without any treaty being concluded. The unhappy Indians have a consuming thirst for ardent spirits, and it is supposed that next spring or summer they will part with their lands to obtain the means to destroy their bodies.

The face of the country is extremely beautiful, and from its character, its appearance will be still more lovely when it is brought under general cultivation. The prairie and timberland are better intermixed than in any

other prairie country in the west; and that they should bear a proper proportion to each other, is of more importance than a stranger would suppose. In a large prairie of ten or twenty miles square, the settler is put to great inconvenience to obtain fuel, and even water—for the prairie is without a shrub, and water is almost entirely confined to the timber. Amongst other useful purposes to which timber is applied, not the least is its use in fencing farms; but where it is scarce, the ingenious farmer devises a substitute, which is said to be eminently successful. The mode is to mark out the space to be enclosed, and then to dig up the sod in a line around it, in pieces of from twelve to fifteen inches square—making the line of circumvallation from two to three feet in width, and building a wall with the sod taken up; by this means a substantial and durable wall is erected, surrounded on the outer edge by a ditch, equal in depth to the height of the fence. This mode of enclosing land is very common in Illinois, where the prairies are large and timber scarce; but it is practised to a very limited extent here, for the proportion of the two qualities of land just mentioned, is generally so equal as to render it unnecessary.

The soil of Iowa is as fertile as any in the west. The upper layer is from 18 to 25 inches in depth on the rolling prairies—and on the bottom lands, from 30 to 48 inches. This layer is black and rich, and bottomed upon a sort of clay, said to be hardly less fertile. The country, though rolling, is in no part mountainous; in the northern portion of the territory, known as the mineral region, there are some ranges of hills and mounds which are unproductive; if we except these, and the high cliffs that overhang the Mississippi river, every part of the territory admits of the highest cultivation.

All the productions of the temperate zone grow luxuriantly in Iowa. The principal products are, corn, wheat, rye, oats, buckwheat, and every species of garden vegetables—and the yield of each of these products, equals that of the same kind in any of the states east of the Mississippi. The general impression amongst those who are ignorant of the territory, is that the climate is too cold for comfort, and the season too short for good crops. This is an entire mistake. That portion of the territory to which the Indian title has become extinct, lies between 40° 20' and 43° N. latitude; thus it appears that the centre of Iowa lies almost in the latitude of Baltimore, and considerably below that of middle New York. It is remarked by those who have had an opportunity of judging, that a given degree of latitude in the west is not subject to as great an extreme, either of heat or cold as the same degree of latitude in the east; so that in fact it is never so cold or so warm in the greater part of Iowa, as it is in Maryland, Pennsylvania, or the southern part of New York. This may be considered eminently a temperate climate—the order of the seasons admits of the cultivation of every product of a temperate climate—and no portion of the Union is better adapted to the wants of the husbandman.

But the great object of interest, is the population that is filling up this lovely country. Its increase is wholly unexampled in the history of emigration. In 1832, a portion of the present territory of Iowa was purchased from the Indians, and went by the name of the "Black Hawk purchase." Previous to 1833, not a white man occupied the western shore of the Mississippi, above the state of Missouri; in the month of June, of that year, the Indians, true to the terms of the treaty, retired from the "purchase," and from that time may be dated the commencement of emigration to Iowa. In 1835, the young community was attached to the territory of Michigan for judicial purposes, and it was not, as before remarked, until July, 1838, that Iowa was organized into a separate territory. The territory contains now, more than sixty thousand inhabitants, and the press of emigration to its shores exceeds all precedent. The country presents, probably as mixed a population as ever was collected in social and political union. The observer may perceive the frank, manly Kentuckian; the

honorable Virginian; the hot blooded Southerner; the emigrant from the middle states, whose character has received so many elements from different portions of the Union, that one scarcely knows how or where to class him; the "cute" yankee, industrious, thrifty and prospering; the stunted Canadian; the thick-set, unintelligible Dutchman; the nimble Frenchman, altogether too polite for any state of society, and especially for a new country; and even the phlegmatic German—all pushing along together in ludicrous comminglement; with diverse habits, modes of thought and living—and each man striving to secure the fortune he was allured hither in the hope of obtaining; or perchance, some struggling to retrieve the losses which forced them from their native land. The mass of the population of the southern part of the territory, came from Kentucky, Virginia, Indiana, and Illinois. Emigrants from New England, for the most part, people the northern portion. Probably when Iowa comes to assume a fixed character, from the centre, south, the character of the people as a body will partake most largely of western traits; and from that point, north, of the qualities that distinguish the inhabitants of New England and the eastern states.

In reviewing the prosperity and rapid progress of all this north-west, the mind insensibly wanders back to its former possessors; and the retrospect is painful in the extreme. But a remnant remains, and soon the aboriginals of North America will be known only in history. I pause for a moment, to dwell upon the contrast presented by the former and present condition of this wretched race. All have read from their earliest childhood, of the unhappy fate of the American Indians; some of the most eloquent and touching pieces in the language, have been produced by the contemplation of their gradual decay before the steady progress of the white man. They have been driven from the ocean to the Alleghanies, and from the Alleghanies to the Mississippi; the same gathering power that has forced them before its wide front more than two thousand miles, is pushing them on by its resistless force to the very foot of the Rocky Mountains; and at every successive impulse, they wither in numbers and degenerate in character. To know in their fullest extent, the fatal consequences to the Indian tribes, of the *protection* extended to them by the United States, it is necessary to remember their former condition, and then to witness their present state, abject, wretched, and they almost extinct. Less than ten years ago, thousands of miles now held by the government, and occupied by its citizens, were in the possession of numerous tribes, who occupied from the British possessions on the north, to the mouth of the river Des Moines on the south, and indefinitely westward, from the present state of Illinois; now, a miserable remnant skirts the western border of Iowa; hardly enough, all collected, to form a respectable village; and daily withering beneath the thousand causes produced by the neighborhood of their hereditary foes.

In the year 1836, the Chipeways counted 2500 mounted warriors; now, all told, men, women and children, they number but 300 souls; and so it is with all. It is impossible for the Indians to retard the progress of the Anglo Saxon race, or to live in its presence; they share the fate of every other people who have attempted to combat its power, or to stay its advance—and perish away before its mighty influences. I speak not of the causes in detail, but of the remarkable fact; the consequence of its contact with any hostile interest is the destruction of the latter. This wonderful race has ever struggled, by reason and by the sword, against the pressure of tyranny upon itself; and as constantly has it meted out a different measure to others. It has established freedom for itself—but it has wrested from others, this, their dearest birth-right; it has founded and maintained the purest principles of civil and religious liberty; it has placed them side by side, and pronounced them equally valuable—and then has said, worship God as your conscience dictates, but yield up your civil lib-

erty, your prosperity, all your rights, if need be—to our power. It fastens the fetters of oppression, even as the noblest maxims of truth and right are uttered from its lips—as a people, maintaining for themselves principles worthy to govern the world, but heedless of those principles, when they thwart the hope of dominion. This race has inflicted upon man, much wrong, but it has also given to him inestimable benefits. It seems to be the order of Providence that freedom, truth and great principles shall be made sure and established through trial and through blood; the suffering of many, has ever been the condition of general good. May the Anglo-Saxon race disseminate throughout the earth the seeds of freedom and of knowledge which it holds—and thus cover with the glory of the good it achieves, the memory of the wrong and suffering it has inflicted.

But the Indian is banished; the white man dwells upon his lands; the wilderness of nature is giving way before the labours of civilization; and the resources of Iowa give assurance that its vast and fertile plains will soon be covered with a dense population. Other considerations than the remembrance of its former occupants, their sufferings and fate, demand the attention of the patriot and the Christian. Here we have a country, blessed by a beneficent Providence with every natural advantage; a fertile soil; a salubrious climate, and inexhaustible resources of mineral wealth; the noblest streams intersect the country at suitable distances, from east to west; her internal commercial advantages are unsurpassed, and the great "father of waters," flowing along the whole length of her eastern border, lies a noble and convenient high-way, on which the surplus products of her agriculture may be turned to the markets of the south and east.

All these things make it certain that in a very few years this country will be one of the most populous and important states in the west. In view of these facts, it is of incalculable importance that a just and proper moral impulse should be given to this infant power. A crude and recent political system is easily changed, but religious tendencies, of whatever kind they may be, are hard to subvert. The importance of the whole question has called forth some efforts from several denominations,—and amongst others, from one whose ecclesiastical or political supremacy would be the ruin of the commonwealth. The territory possesses no religious character; the Methodists, probably form the largest portion of the religious community, as they do in all the new states and territories. May their noble spirit and devout zeal extend throughout all the earth; they have ever been the pioneers of religion, and often of civilization; no lover of his race wishes their downfall; nor need the patriot fear the doctrines they inculcate. The Baptists and Episcopalians, each have a small organization, and are using all laudable means for the promotion of good. The Unitarians have one or two small churches and meagre congregations; this is a very small body which must perish for lack of wholesome blood to circulate through its veins, and nourish its existence. The church of Rome, zealous every where to propagate its creed, is active here also. It has a chapel at Burlington, a large cathedral at Dubuque, with several congregations in different parts of the territory, and is making arrangements to erect churches at Iowa city, St. Peters, and near the falls of Makoqueta, all under the auspices of "the right reverend bishop of the Catholic See in Iowa." The Presbyterian church, also, has a few ministers and churches, with a small number of devout members, but its influence is feeble and limited, as is that of every denomination in the territory. There is one Presbytery, composed of seven ministers, which is attached to the Synod of Illinois. The church serves but few places of public worship, and these are for the most part in the country. There is no Presbyterian meeting house in Burlington, but the congregation rents a private room in which to hold divine services; if their hopes are fulfilled, one will be erected next summer. The New School party can hardly be said to form a denomination at all; a very few may be found at Burlington, still fewer at Fort Madison, (twenty miles

below, on the river,) and none that I know of in any other part of the country; they have no house of worship, and but one preacher in the territory.

I have thus given a brief, but a correct sketch of the character, resources and religious condition of this country; it holds within itself the elements of future greatness, but the direction of their development is as yet uncertain. Its political character is indirectly shaped by the checks of the organic law of the territory, and the Constitution of the United States; these, with the republican education and spirit of the greater part of its citizens, guarantee that its political system, though crude, will be free. But it is not of this that I speak; the moral development of the people is a matter of manifest importance to the cause of truth and freedom. Pure morality, and a religious tendency, are the conditions of enlightened freedom—and in this view of the case, their prevalence should be the desire of the patriot; but the efforts of the Christian should be called forth by motives of mere enlarged philanthropy. The prospects and present condition of Iowa, implore the aid of efficient ministers of the gospel. Wicked influences are sowing the seeds of evil; error is more zealous than truth; its ministers labour with untiring activity to poison the public heart; yet no adequate influence resists their efforts. Iowa may feel deeply in after times the present neglect of young and remote interests. Many preachers of noble intellect, great energy, and devoted piety, now lavish their sacred gifts on meagre congregations, and in spheres where their influence is scarcely felt—whose labours would be inestimable here. I hesitate not to say, that even three or four efficient, able, energetic ministers might produce a result for good in this territory, that would continue to be manifest for years to come. The people generally entertain a respect for religion, as they understand it, and under the term, they include all kinds, good and bad; they attend houses of worship with more punctuality than many who live in more favoured regions, and manifest more reverence for the outward forms of Christianity.

Again, I say, Iowa possesses no fixed religious character; it is as crude and unsettled as its social or political structure. This whole field is open to good or evil influences. The fluctuating character of Iowa awaits the touch of some commanding power to shape it aright or wrong; the commonwealth will be possessed by the most active. I know that one man, or two, or three cannot mould the destiny of a country; a distinguished man is rather the index than the author of the condition of his times—mankind move forward, rather by a common impulse, than by the impelling power of one intellect; and great movements and happy results are produced by a combination of many minds, rather than by the superior efforts of one. These facts apply with greater force to dense communities, than to thinly settled border countries, and rather to an established order of things, than to an uncertain and vacillating condition of society. A limited power can produce a greater result in a small sphere than in a large one, and it is easier to give a direction to public character, than to change it when established. From the causes I have mentioned, a small influence exerted here, would produce the greatest results. This country needs a few pious men, with apostolic spirit, to resist the encroachments of a wicked ecclesiastical organization, and to cast in virtue's mould the unformed character of the people. It presents no attraction to those who prefer the life of indolent ease, to a life of virtuous toil; but let him come, whose hopes and efforts are for the good of his generation; the result of his labours will approve his course—and the smiles of an honest conscience more than compensate him for all temporal privations.

EVANGELICAL CHURCH AT LYONS IN FRANCE—LETTER FROM  
THE REV'D MR. CORDES.

GENEVA, 4 Decemb., 1841.

*My Dear Brother:*

It is from *this* place that I must date my present letter, and not from Lyons, which city I have left several months since, on account of a serious indisposition in the throat, with an irritation which had produced a slight expectoration of blood, and has reduced me to an utter incapacity for preaching or even raising my voice to speak. For nearly four months, I have not pronounced one word aloud to any living soul, confining myself to a few *hushed* communications.—I am profoundly grieved to be obliged to begin my letter in a manner apparently so egotistical, but you will not, I am well persuaded, accuse me of this ugly sentiment; you will rather join me in praying for the relief and recovery of your feeble and unworthy fellow servant of the best of masters! I ask this favor on better grounds than mere personal desires, for altho' these are not excluded, yet the urgent wants of the church at the present period, certainly suggest more elevated motives. From the earlier part of the month of June last, the beloved congregation over which it has been my privilege to preside now for more than five years, has been deprived of a regular ministry until within the last fortnight, when in answer to many fervent supplications, and as the result of assiduous and almost incessant researches, it pleased God to send to Lyons, the Rev. Mr. Larigt, evangelist from the south of France, to supply, as resident minister, my place for the winter, but that season will soon be spent, and the evangelist required elsewhere, besides which, the Lyons church, with its increasing labors and prosperity cannot possibly be presided with effect by one single pastor; two are needed most urgently, and even these will not find time hang heavy on their hands. Judge, therefore, dear sir, you who know the great scarcity of evangelical ministers and students in France, whether the recovery of even the feeblest laborer be not a desideratum. But I hasten to turn to an event in which I am persuaded you feel deep interest,—the opening of the Evangelical Chapel at Lyons. It is now more than three years since a conviction of the pressing need of an orthodox fixed place of worship led to the resolution to bring the subject before the Christian public, and from that day to this, strenuous, and incessant efforts have been made in order to accomplish this great and difficult enterprise. The obstacles, delays and hindrances by which our faith and perseverance have been tried in its pursuit, were innumerable, and you will believe me, when I say that we rejoice with thanksgiving, at being at length enabled to report their almost entire annihilation. On Sunday last, 28 Nov'r, the church and congregation have been enabled through much mercy, to engage in the solemnity of opening this house of prayer. Due and timely notice having been given to the public authorities, the doors of the chapel were thrown open at 9 in the morning, and by half past 10, when divine service began, the house, which can hold from 7 to 800 persons, was full. After a short introductory prayer and the reading of 1 Kings viii., a hymn was sung, followed by an appropriate prayer, after which the Rev. Mr. Blanc, pastor of Mens, and President of the *consistoire* of that town, occupying the pulpit, delivered an impressive discourse, from Gen. xxviii. 17, "This is the house of God." The minister thought we were bound, both to magistrates and people, to declare frankly what we are, and what we believe; and therefore entered into some details, explanatory of our designation of Evangelical Christians and of our faith, resting on *Bible authority, as alone supreme*. An evangelical Christian, he said, seeks to regulate his character, sentiments, desires,

hopes and morals conformably to gospel principles, promises and precepts, and his faith to gospel declarations and doctrines, it is by these as infallibly true, that he judges any doctrine good or otherwise; that if any minister or even an angel of heaven were to come and preach another gospel, he knows that St. Paul has pronounced against such an one, Anathema, and as to any particular *confession* of our faith, we cite that of the gaoler at Philippi, that of the eunuch of Ethiopia, that of Cornelius and of Peter, and say, Believing with all his heart that Jesus is the Christ, the sinner has the forgiveness of his transgressions. This was the faith of the bishops and martyrs, Polycarp of Smyrna, and Irenæus of Lyons, as well as of the Christians of the XI. century, who were hunted down and persecuted under the name of the *Poor of Lyons*, and of the believers of the XVI. century, since recognised by the law of the 18 Germinal year X., and later still, by the Charter of 1830. Man is a sinner, and every man is a sinner, *all*, therefore, need a Saviour, than which there is no other but Jesus Christ, the Son of God, Himself God, else he could not have shut the gates of hell nor opened the doors of heaven to poor believing sinners. We trust not to good works for salvation, as merited through him, but regard them as the *fruits* of faith, and of a Christian love to Christ and hatred of sin. And this doctrine we believe must be received by the sinner through the operation of the Holy Spirit, otherwise it remains hidden like the contents of a sealed letter. And woe to any minister that should here preach error and heresy, for "this is the house of God." After the sermon, the congregation rose whilst the minister offered up the solemn prayer of dedication, calling down from above, blessings upon this house of prayer, and its absent and suffering pastor, upon the numerous benefactors who had so largely contributed towards its construction, and upon all the members, and the future proceedings of the church. A hymn was again sung, and a prayer of thanksgiving presented, after which the numerous and attentive audience was dismissed with the benediction. At 2 o'clock, 40 members of the church (as drawn by lot,) united with about 20 Christian friends from a distance at a fraternal repast provided by the deacons, with the aid of a pious lady, and at which the pastors present presided, and the deacons served. The conversation was both general and edifying. In the evening the chapel was opened again for divine worship, and the hearers were nearly as numerous as in the morning. The Rev. Mr. Bonifas of Grenoble, opened the service by prayer, after which a hymn was sung, and 1 Tim. iii. read, from which the minister took his text; "The house of God, is the church of the living God, the pillar and ground of the truth," v. 15. He expressed in a feeling manner, his regret at not seeing there the pastor of this church who (I copy the words as they stand reported,) had done so much, both by word and deed, for the erection of this chapel, and he intreated the Lord to grant him that he might well supply his place. He then called attention to two principal points; gratitude towards God, and the expression of this sentiment. Gratitude is due, 1st, for the very existence of this building, as given by the Lord, to be a house of prayer, named by his name, as the dwellings of families are some times designated by their names. 2d. For that religious liberty which we owe, under God, to our present government. 3d. For the generous co-operation of so many Christians in so many places, countries, and conditions. And this gratitude should be rendered manifest by the spiritual consecration, each Christian of himself, as a living temple to God. The church has received the signal honor of being the "pillar and ground of the truth," but this truth which we are favored to know, is dishonored by a world living and delighting in error and deceit. "The world in its wisdom knows not God," but the church knows him and all his perfections. The world in its blindness knows not the real nature and condition of man. The man of the world thinks himself good, he loves praise, and praises himself; but the church,

enlightened by the truth, is acquainted with the heart of man, and is aware of its corruption and depravity. The world knows not the mystery of the love of God in Christ, revealed effectually to the church. The unenlightened sinner pretends to expiate his transgressions by certain moral deeds, however imperfectly performed, whilst the church builds her hopes of salvation exclusively upon the sacrifice of Christ, the chief corner stone, the sure foundation of its faith. The world keeps not the commandments of God, but invents commandments of its own, whilst the church through love submits to the laws of its God. The world is ignorant of the real character of God's laws, which it perverts, changing vice into virtue, regarding egotism as self preservation, deceit as prudence, impurity as allowed pleasure. But the church, the depository of the truth, appreciates and seeks the fruit of the spirit, and therefore is called the house of God. The Lord dwelleth in the hearts of his people, who are "the temples of the Holy Ghost." Ye who believe, therefore, are the real church in this city, where other churches abound, hung with ornaments and glittering with gold; but do ye remember that you must shine by your good works; "growing in grace," and "holding the unity of the Spirit in the bonds of peace." What purpose would this house serve, if our hearts were to remain dead and cold? Ye, therefore, who tread on ground sprinkled with the blood of so many martyrs, from Pothinus and Irenæus, in the 2d century, to the 5 students in the 10th, and who are bearing reproach for the same cause as Peter Waldo, the pious merchant of your city in the 12th century, preserve as living witnesses, the faith transmitted to you by your venerable forefathers, and thus show your gratitude. The assembly then sang a hymn, and some having withdrawn, the Lord's supper was administered by the Rev. Mr. Larigt, who exhorted the brethren to walk as Christians both in our domestic and social life. The church now separated, deeply impressed with the solemnities of the day, and animated by feelings of joy and gratitude, which, it is hoped, will never be lost.

If it be asked, is the collection complete? we reply with heart-felt gratitude towards the Lord and his people, that the great and lasting efforts and numerous sacrifices made by so many Christians, have enabled us (independently of a mortgage debt of 51000 fr., against the liquidation of which, when due, we possess a dwelling house, pertaining to the premises as originally purchased, but remaining unaffected by the chapel and detached from it, worth 35 to 40,000 fr.) to meet every expense of the building, except about 3000 fr. which yet remain due and to be provided for.

Divine service is performed in the chapel to French and German congregations, and arrangements are making for an English service also. Rooms are provided on the upper floor for our boys' school, girls' school and infant asylum. Two adult schools, one for men and one for women, as well as a children's school, are likewise held on the premises every sabbath. I trust we shall continue to be prayerfully remembered by you and your people, and recommend myself most especially to your prayers.

I remain, most respectfully and affectionately,

Your grateful servant

And brother in Christ.

C. A. CORDES.

*The Rev. B. J. Breckinridge, Pastor  
of the 2d Presb. Church, Baltimore, U. S.* }

## NOTICES, ACCOUNTS, ANSWERS TO LETTERS, &amp;c.

Received from Rev. S. H. McDonald, of Cumberland, Md., \$7, of which \$2.50 for Major Mitchell, \$2.50 for Rev. M. Raymond, and \$2, for himself for 1842; in regard to the other matters, the account of Mr. Raymond stands as stated by Mr. McDonald, and his own thus—subscription for 4 years, viz., 1838—1841; payments in all, \$9, including the \$2 lately sent to Owen & Son, if our books are correct—Eben Milton, Esq., Lex., Ky., \$13, in full to the end of '41, and does not continue the present work; this sum over-pays by 50 cts., which C. M. Keiser will please hand to Mr. M.—Mrs. General Hampton, Columbia, S. C., \$10, in full to the end of 1843, if our new work lives so long.—Rev. J. M. C. Bartley, New Hampshire, \$2.50, for '42, by the hands of Mr. Mudge, of Balt.—To Wm. Kerr, Jun., West Hill, Pa., we say, that we abide by his statement, and enter his subscription paid in full to the end of this year; the odd Nos. as far as we have them will be sent to him by mail if desired; the person by whom he wrote, did not see us.—Rev. B. M. Smith and John Wayt, Esq., Waynesboro', Va., each \$2.50 for '42; the odd Nos. written for, sent.—P. M., Danville, Va., \$2, for Rev. S. J. P. Andersop, his account stands thus—4 years subscription, viz., '38—'42, \$10; cash, to his credit—\$5.50 heretofore received—\$2.50 lost in the mail—\$2 now received, total, \$10; at the same time the remittance for Mr. A. was lost, a like sum, viz., \$2.50, was lost, which is credited to Dr. Wm. S. Graham, of Campbell Co., Va., for '40.—Dr. G. O. Trenchard, Church Hill, Md., name added from Jan'y, '42, back Nos. sent him, and \$2.50 received.—Mrs. A. Roney and Mr. Samuel Nye of Baltimore, names added, and both paid D. Owen for '42.—Warick Tunstall, name added, and paid D. Owen for '42, also paid him for J. B. Cambden, for this year; both of St. Louis, Mo.—Rev. W. C. Emmerson, Montpelier, Ala., name added from Jan'y, and back Nos. sent, by order of Mr. R. O. who received for us Mr. E.'s subscription, and also that of Mr. Charles Worrall, for '42.—Rev. T. R. Owen, and Mr. J. Potts of Washington, N. C., send us, by the P. M., \$6, for 1841, and both discontinue; the letter is dated, February 26, so that they had allowed three Nos. of the present year to be sent to them both, and two Vols. thereby to be rendered useless—before responding to our very reasonable request, published in the middle of last November. Such cases, we are sorry to say, are far from unusual; and seem to us, hard to be reconciled with the royal law of *deus vos would be done unto*.—P. N. Wood, New Orleans, three Nos. sent, and then refused; another Vol. rendered useless.—P. M. at Branch Port, Stuben Co., N. Y., under date, Feb'y 26, '42, refuses, for Mr. Elon Stebbins, who says "he subscribed and paid for the work for one year, ending first of Jan'y last, and declines taking it any longer;" see Magazine for 1840, p. 492, near the top—where the evidence is conclusive, that Mr. Elon Stebbins, is entirely mistaken; and from which it is manifest, that he has done to us, what he would be very angry, if we should call by its common name.—The Magazine sent to the late Samuel Richards, Esq., of Phila., discontinued, and the bill sent, by request of James McClure, agent, &c., No. 111, N. Water street, Phila.—Judge Willard Hall of Delaware, by the hands of the P. M. of Wilmington, \$5, for '42 and '3, if we are not starved out before the end of that time.—We have received a letter from S. Weir, Esq., of Columbia, S. C., dated Feb'y 22, inclosing \$5, for Thos. E. Peck and John S. Scott, Esq., for 1842, and directing the subscription of Rev. Dr. Hazelins, who is going abroad, to be discontinued: we had previously received a letter from Mr. Weir, dated Dec. 11, '41, about which he enquires in this letter, and in which he remitted \$10 to be credited to Mr. John Kyle, (since discontinued,) to Dr. Hazelins, and to Thos. E. Peck; these facts are published on p. 47 of this work, near the bottom of the page, but by some mistake the credit to Mr. Peck, is said to be Mr. Weir himself; so that being rectified, Mr. Peck is now credited for '41 and '2. We think it not improbable there may be some mistake in the accounts of the Messrs. Scott; we have two J. S. Scott's, subscribers living in Columbia; Mr. John S. Scott is charged with our whole work from the beginning, and is credited with \$17.50 on the old books, and \$2.50 now remitted by Mr. Weir, total, \$20; Mr. James S. Scott is charged with 3 years, of the old work, viz. '39-'41, and with '42, total \$10, and has no credit: is this all correct?

# SPIRIT OF THE XIX. CENTURY.

---

VOL. I.

MAY, 1842.

No. 5.

---

[Continued from page 106.]

M O L I N I S M .

No. XV.

XXIII. *The Occasion of the Bull Unigenitus—Some Observations upon that Bull—It condemns all the Doctrines maintained by the Port Royalists, and sanctions the Errors of the Jesuits.*

THE BULL UNIGENITUS is a decree of Pope Clement XI., which condemns one hundred and one propositions derived from a book of Quesnel, containing brief reflections upon each verse of the New Testament. The work appeared in 1671, when its author was but thirty-seven years of age. This was two or three years after the peace of Clement. At first the work was confined to the Evangelists, but afterwards the author added reflections on the Acts and the Epistles. As successive editions were called for, the work was somewhat enlarged. It had an astonishing success. It was strongly recommended by Mr. de Noailles, afterwards Cardinal and Archbishop of Paris—by M. Nicole—Gaston de Noailles, and others. "Many bishops," says Voltaire, (in his History of the Age of Louis XIV. chap. 37.) "gave it the highest applause, at its first appearance, and confirmed it, when the book had received from the author its ultimate perfection. I myself knew that the Abbé Renaudot, one of the most learned men of France, being at Rome, the first year of the pontificate of Clement XI., going one day to the house of the Pope, found him reading the book of father Quesnel: There, said the Pope to him, is an excellent work. We have not a person at Rome capable of writing so. I wish I could bring the author near me."

This work, however, was not agreeable to the taste of the Jesuits, as it contained the system of doctrine taught at Port Royal. Yet the popularity of the work kept them in check for a while, and it was not until 1698, which was twenty-seven years after the book was first published, that they ventured publicly to attack it; which they contrived to do by means of an ecclesiastical problem, addressed to the Abbé Boileau, one object of which was to injure M. de Noailles, the Archbishop of Paris, whom the Jesuits regarded as their enemy. Their problem which was regarded as a libel, and excited public indignation, was burned by a decree of the Parlia-

ment of the 10th of January, 1699, and was condemned at Rome by a decree of the holy office, as it was called, July 2d, 1700.

But the Jesuits were not discouraged by the ill success of this first effort. The problem just mentioned, was published and condemned during the pontificate of Innocent XII. The character of Clement XI., who succeeded Innocent XII., and certain secret motives which influenced this Pope, opened the way for a successful renewal of their measures, which they did not fail to improve. Clement XI. (who was Cardinal Albano,) had been, while Cardinal, strongly attached to the person and to the opinions of Cardinal Sfondrate. Sfondrate, was a determined Molinist, and had pushed the consequences of that doctrine very far. He published a book called *Nodus Predestinationis Reseratus*, in which he maintained, (1.) "That on the part of God, all men are beloved, and that all are destined to eternal life, or to some thing better. (2.) That infants which die without baptism, are indeed deprived of the celestial kingdom, but that they enjoy a natural felicity and are preserved from sin, which is a good that is preferable to the celestial kingdom itself. (3.) That, if it be admitted, (i. e. if it can be assumed as a fact,) that a barbarous people are in a state of invincible ignorance of God, that is a great grace of itself, and a great benefit; because sin being essentially an offence and an injury done to God, it follows necessarily, that if the knowledge of God be removed, there is neither injury nor sin nor eternal punishment." Cardinal Albano, (afterwards Clement XI.,) undertook the publication of this work, after the death of Sfondrate, and the reader may easily suppose, (notwithstanding his declaration to the Abbé Renaudot,) that the doctrines of Quesnel's book could not be agreeable to him. Besides this reason, Clement XI. had another. He disliked the Cardinal de Noailles, and was willing enough to find an occasion to mortify him. Noailles had shewn great zeal against this book of Sfondrate—in fact he had in conjunction with the famous Bossuet, Bishop of Meaux, and two other bishops, denounced the book to Pope Innocent XII. Besides; Noailles defended with zeal the liberties of the Gallican church, in the Assembly of 1705, which greatly offended the Pope. It was reported that Cardinal Fabroni, (a devotee of the Jesuits,) who had great influence at Rome, had said that "matter could easily be found in the book of Father Quesnel to make the Cardinal de Noailles repent of the course he had taken in that Assembly." And such being the dispositions of Clement XI., and of the Court of Rome, no wonder the Jesuits succeeded against the book of Quesnel. It was ordered to be examined by certain Cardinals and others who were known to be disaffected towards the Cardinal de Noailles and this book of Quesnel; and on the 13th of July, 1708, a decree appeared against the New Testament of Quesnel, condemning it in the strongest terms, and in order to let Cardinal de Noailles understand that he was to be punished for the part he had taken against Sfondrate, the Pope affected to make use of the same odious qualifications in condemning the book of Quesnel, which Noailles and the other bishops who united with him, had used in reference to the book of Sfondrate in their letter to Pope

Innocent XII. But this brief of the Pope was not received in France, and the book of Father Quesnel continued to be read and esteemed notwithstanding the efforts of the Jesuits to deny it.

The Jesuit Tellier, succeeded la Chaise in his office of Confessor to Louis XIV. Tellier had a personal pique against Arnauld who had refuted a book of Tellier, and had so clearly convicted him of fraud and calumny, that Tellier had suffered even at Rome. Tellier, therefore, made use of those bishops who were devoted to the Jesuits, to attack Cardinal de Noailles, and the book of Reflections, and on the 15th of July, 1710, obtained the signature of two bishops to a piece drawn up by Jesuit theologians, in which they inform the public that this book of Quesnel (which had been already forty years before the public,) was full of impious doctrines and of a poison which carried death to the heart.—Cardinal de Noailles published an ordinance on the 28th of April, 1711, in opposition to this writing, and in opposition, also, to another of similar import, which had been published by another bishop. Then Tellier, in order to injure the Cardinal, engaged these bishops to write to the king to make Cardinal de Noailles odious to him, and letters were prepared for all the bishops who favoured the Jesuits to sign. Already thirty had given their signatures when the plot was divulged, by means of the Abbè de Saron, an ex Jesuit, who wrote a letter to the bishop of Clermont, soliciting him to enter into the conspiracy, which letter fell into the hands of Cardinal de Noailles. The letter became public, and this design of the Jesuits fell through. The Cardinal de Noailles then revoked the powers of some of the Jesuits to preach and hear confessions. This embittered them against him still more. The quarrel also between the Cardinal de Noailles and the bishops who had attacked him, made a great deal of noise, and gave occasion to many writings. Bossuet, Bishop of Meaux, published in 1710, (which was about the time we are speaking of,) a justification of the book of Moral Reflexions, though he had composed it (as it is said,) in 1699.—Finally the Court of France interfered. The Dauphin who was the father of Louis XV. took cognizance of the matter. Noailles was obliged to abandon the book of Moral Reflexions as a condition to his receiving a sort of reparation for the insult which had been shewn him. Finally, in 1711, (which was forty years after its first publication,) the king by instigation of the Jesuits, revoked the privilege which had been given to print this book, and asked of the pope a bull condemning many of the sentiments or propositions contained in it. These propositions were sent to Rome at different times, and were as many as one hundred and fifty-five. The pope appointed a congregation to examine this matter, composed of Cardinals Fabroni and Ferrari, of nine counsellors or consulters—of Father Damascene a Franciscan monk and confessor of the Pope, and the first approver of the book of Cardinal Sfondrate, and who (by order of Clement XI., not then made a cardinal,) had written the preface and a eulogium on the book. The other counsellors were greatly prejudiced against Quesnel's book, and were not very well informed persons, with the exception of Le Droce, who, however, was sent away from Rome under some honourable pretext, though

in truth because he was too favorable to the doctrines which the Jesuits opposed. Such, then, was the body which drew up the famous Bull, UNIGENITUS.

Quesnel wrote to the Pope (July 22, 1712,) a very respectful letter, in which he asked that he should not be condemned unheard and without having the liberty and the means of defence. He wished also, to be informed what parts of his book were found fault with. But Quesnel was in bad odour at Rome on account of the part he had taken in defence of the Archbishop of Sebaste. Besides, the Jesuits and the Court of France required the condemnation of Quesnel, and the pope was willing to grant it. Of course Quesnel's request was not granted. But there was another peculiarity in this business. After the bull was drawn up, the pope did not, according to custom, communicate it to the cardinals, except Ferrari and Fabroni, to whom he added Ottoboni and Albani (who were ignorant of theology,) and Cardinal Tolomei, who was a Jesuit. The pope signed the bull on Friday the 8th of September, 1713, the day of the nativity of the holy virgin, according to the Roman calendar, and he published it on Monday following, without having first sent a copy (or *projet*) of it into France, as had been agreed upon from the beginning. He had sent only the preamble and the conclusion but without the propositions condemned. The Jesuits, who had prevailed with the Court of France, to ask for this bull of the Court of Rome, having obtained one as favourable as they desired, were eager to get the pope to commit himself by publishing it. So that they could count upon his assistance against the difficulties which certain things contained in the bull, would cause in France. At this very time, it should be observed, there were several persons under persecution on account of Jansenism: for example, Willart and S. Claude, were in the Bastille—the nuns of Port Royal were dispersed—Quesnel and Petitpied were fugitives in Holland, and Du Sausai theolgal\* of Orleans had been interdicted the exercise of all his functions.

The bull commences with an invective against wolves in sheeps' clothing, who make a show of piety in order to insinuate imperceptibly, their dangerous dogmas—who maliciously interpret and corrupt even the Scriptures themselves, to their own ruin and the ruin of souls. The pope then proceeds to apply these odious characters to the Book of Reflexions—he alludes to the condemnation he had made of it in 1708, and declares that after having examined it and caused it to be carefully examined, he has discovered the poison concealed in it, under the appearance of piety, &c. After the preamble, follow one hundred and one propositions, which the pope condemns respectively, as *false and captious*,† to which

\*A Theolgal, is an assessor of a bishop attached to the principal chapter of the Diocese by a prebend, and instituted to exercise in aid and for the relief of the bishop, the functions of preaching every sunday in the year, or of giving lessons in theology or the scriptures to clerks and particularly to the canons.

†Tanquam falsas, captiosas, malè sonantes, piarum aurium offensivas, scandalosas, perniciosas, temerarias, ecclesie et ejus praxi injurias, neque in ecclesiam solum, sed etiam in potestates sæculi contumeliosas, seditiosas, impias, blasphemias suspectas de hæresi, ac hæresin ipsam sapientes, necnon hæreticis et hæresibus ac

he adds twenty or more other epithets of the most offensive character. The pope forbids by the bull all the faithful of both sexes, *to think, to teach, and to speak* of these propositions otherwise than is contained in this bull. So that whoever should teach or maintain, or publish, these propositions or any of them, either conjunctively or separately, or who should treat of them by way of dispute publicly or privately, unless for the purpose of combatting them, *ipso facto*, incurs ecclesiastical censures, as well as those who should compose, read, or keep writings made to defend the book of Reflections or the propositions condemned.

The French civilian, Toullier, calls this the *famous bull Unigenitus*, and he adds that there were issued in France during the ministry of Cardinal Fleury, fifty-four thousand *Letters de Cachet*, in order to carry into effect its provisions. "Armed with this order (i. e. a *Lettre de Cachet*, says this author, *Droit Civil liv. 1, Tit. 1, No. 213*,) the agents of the government carried off a citizen from his house, often at midnight, to conduct him to a castle or prison, sometimes at the other extremity of the kingdom. There it was not permitted ordinarily, either to see him or to write to him, and it was not a rare thing, that it was not even known what had become of him until it should please the despotic minister who caused his arrest, to restore him to liberty."—if such were the fruits of this bull, it is easy to decide whether Jesuitism and the papacy were a blessing to France during the period in question. It is not a mitigating circumstance that the Court of France solicited the bull of the Court of Rome. The Court of France was under the controlling influence of the Jesuits. They taught the civil power to interfere with the rights of conscience and to force this unrighteous bull upon the consciences of the better portion of that church by the terrible means which have been just mentioned. The French government had long been used to such interferences, and it is to the revolution in 1789, that Frenchmen owe the liberty of conscience, and liberty of worship which they now enjoy. Just previously to the time in question, viz., on the 22d of October, 1685, Louis XIV. revoked the edict of Nantes, adopted in 1598 by Henry IV., in favour of the Protestants and concerning the liberty of conscience. This revocation was followed by the most tyrannical laws, which were executed against the Protestants with rigour, augmented by military executions. It is not to our purpose to enter into this subject, and we have alluded to it only to show that the tyrannical government of that country was prepared by such proceedings to execute with severity the bull in question against the Jansenists and other opposers of Molinism. We return now to the bull.

The greater proportion of these one hundred and one propositions were faithfully extracted from Quesnel's book of Moral Reflections, but several of them were taken from editions published

---

etiam schismati faventes, erroneas, hæresi proximas, pluries damnatos ac demum etiam hæreticas, variasque hæreses, et potissimum illas, quæ in famosis Jansenii propositionibus et quidem in eo sensu, in quo hæc damnatæ fuerunt, acceptis continentur, manifestè innovantes, respectivè, hæc nostrâ perpetuo valiturâ constitutione declaramus, damnamus et reprobamus.

previously to 1693. In that year Cardinal de Noailles had caused a revision of the book to be made, in which some of these propositions were suppressed or corrected: besides this, the propositions were translated from the French into Latin, and they give, in some instances, a sense not contained in the original French. Also some of the propositions were unfaithfully wrested from the context, and made to give a sense which would not occur to any one who should read them in their proper connexion. But notwithstanding all this, the Jansenists or Port Royalists were willing to maintain these propositions as contained in the bull, and they alleged that they were in conformity with the scriptures and the fathers. It was said that these propositions contained exactly the doctrines maintained by the Society of Port Royal against the Society of the Jesuits. They have been reduced to the following classes.\*

(1.) The doctrines of grace and predestination and the difference between the two covenants.

(2.) Christian morals.

(3.) Rules concerning the administration of the sacrament of penance.

(4.) The principles of the hierarchy, or the lawful limits of the power of the popes and the abuses introduced into that church.

(5.) The reading of the Holy Scriptures and other means for enlightening the piety of the faithful.

The third and fourth of these heads concern matters upon which Protestants are equally at variance with Jansenists as with Jesuits. We deny that there is any scriptural warrant for the sacrament of penance as it is called, and the thing itself being of papal invention, the rules which regulate its administration are equally so. Protestants also deny that the pope has any other rightful power than as bishop of Rome, and such Protestants as deny that there is any scriptural warrant for diocesan episcopacy, deny that the pope can have any rightful authority except by virtue of his connexion with a particular church as the pastor and bishop thereof. But upon the first of these classes, viz., the subject of the human will, the power of grace and predestination, the Society of Port Royal, according to one of their own authors or adherents, maintained, "that by ourselves we are only misery and sin—that without efficacious grace we never do any thing which is good, and that we do it when such grace is given to us, because this grace is a holy pleasure which God sheds abroad in our hearts, which produces therein infallibly the good to which God has directed it—that God being the sovereign disposer of this grace and distributing it with full independence, he decides thereby, the eternal condition of men, by a predestination, which is as gratuitous in its principle as it is infallible in its effects." The propositions condemned by the bull, which support this doctrine, are the 48th, the 2d, the 16th, the 13th and the 12th. There are others, which are alleged (by the author just referred to,) to maintain the same doctrine, but the

\*The reader may find these Propositions in the second volume of Bishop Kenrick's *Theologia Dogmatica*, p. 399, Appendix.

before mentioned propositions are the chief. As expressed in the bull, they are as follow.

*Prop. 48th.* 'Quid aliud esse possumus nisi tenebræ, nisi aberratio et nisi peccatum sine fidei lumine sine Christo et sinè charitate?' (This observation of Quesnel is founded on Eph. v. 8.) *What else can we be, but darkness, but wandering, but sin, without the light of faith, without Jesus Christ and without love?\**

*Prop. 2d.* "Jesu Christi gratia, principium efficax boni cujus cunque generis, necessaria est ad omne opus bonum: absque illa non solum nihil fit sed nec fieri potest." This observation is founded on John xv. 5. *The grace of Jesus Christ, the efficacious principle of all good, is necessary for every good action. Without it, not only does a man do nothing, but he can do nothing.*

*Prop. 16th.* Nullæ sunt illecebræ quæ non cedant illecebris gratiæ, quia nihil resistit omnipotenti. This observation is founded on Acts viii. 12. *There are no charms which do not yield to the charms of grace; because nothing resists the Almighty.*

*Prop. 13th.* Quando Deus vult animam salvam facere, et eam tangit interiore gratiæ suæ manu, nulla voluntas humana ei resistit.

\*Franciscus Patricius Kenrick (Episcopus Arathensis in partibus infidelium et coadj. Ep. Phil.) has recently published a treatise upon Dogmatic Theology in four volumes, and written in the Latin language. This work is deserving of a careful examination. The brief examination which has been made in these essays of the important disputes which have been carried on in the Roman Catholic church since the reformation, may aid the reader in comprehending some of the doctrinal statements of the bishop, and also his reasons for omitting some matters which we should naturally expect to find treated in a work of that nature. In Tract VIII., the author treats *de gratia Christi*, adding in an appendix the (79) propositions condemned by the bull against Baius—the (13) propositions condemned by Alexander VIII., and the (101) propositions condemned by the bull Unigenitus.—It is not easy to say what precisely are the opinions of the author concerning the matters which were in dispute between the Molinists and the Thomists, as he abstains from entering into the discussion on the ground of the rescript or decree of Innocent XII. in 1694, *ad Lovanienses*. He says, sapientissimo huic decreto in hærentes a scholasticâ concertatione adstinendum duximus, Tract VIII. No. 100, vol. 2, p. 288. He does not, however, believe in the doctrine of total depravity, "*totalis pravitatis placitum adeo apud sectarios celebre Janseniorum suffragiis munitum, longe distat ab ecclesiæ doctrinâ.*" Tract VIII., No. 49, vol. 2, p. 274. The doctrines of Arminius, he thinks, come much nearer to the Catholic faith than those of Calvin,—"*Dariora Calvinii placita . . . Arminio . . . haud arriiserunt, qui, magistro sectæ derelicto, nova excogitavit dogmatibus Catholicis affinia, quamvis deinceps Semipelagianâ vel Pelagianâ etiam labe infecta sint, agente præsertim Simone Episcopo.*" Tract VIII., No. 58, vol. 2, p. 278. He does not enter much into the subject of predestination. He admits that what Augustine has advanced on the subject, cannot easily be reduced to the sense of the Molinists, although (*Collatis inter se testimoniis, et præ oculis habitis quos impugnavit erroribus verosimilis interpretatio Molinæ placitis consona data sit,*) 'if testimonies are compared together, and if we keep in view the errors which he (*viz. Augustine*) impugned, a probable interpretation may be given consonant with the doctrines of Molina.' Tract VIII., No. 444. The author's inclination to Molinism is apparent in many places: indeed he would hardly be a good Catholic if he were not a Molinist, since the publication of the bulls before mentioned—By the bye, it is curious to observe how often he quotes, with approbation, the Oxford Tracts. In the judgment of Bishop Doane and some others, he must have misconceived entirely the tendency of those tracts—See Vol. iii., pp. 50, 208, 232, 238, 250, 252, 255, 257, 258, 259, 260, 261, 262, 264, 269, 270, 271, 274, 277, 278, 279, &c. &c.

*Obs. on Luke v. 13. When God wills to save a soul and touches it with the inner hand of his grace, no human will resists him.*

*Prop. 12th. Quando Deus vult salvare animam quocunque tempore, quocunque loco, effectus indubitabilis sequitur voluntatem Dei. Obs. on Mark ii. 11. When God wills to save the soul at any time, in any place, the indubitable effect follows the will of a God; l'indubitable effet suit le vouloir d'un Dieu.*

The last two of these propositions are said to have been taken by Quesnel, the one from Augustine (lib. de correptione et gratia, chap. 14.) and the other from Prosper—(Carm. de ingr. L. xiii.)

The reader may now remark how much ground the Jesuits had gained since the congregations *de auxiliis*. The Jesuits offered at that time to embrace the doctrine of gratuitous predestination, provided they were allowed to maintain, at the same time, that grace is not efficacious by itself. By this bull, the reader perceives they obtained not only the condemnation of the doctrine that grace is efficacious by itself, (which they consented during these congregations, the Dominicans might continue to teach,) but also they obtained the condemnation of gratuitous predestination which they then agreed to embrace themselves, (however contrary it was to their inclination,) in order to have the liberty of denying or refusing to admit the doctrine that grace is efficacious by itself. The reader may remember that Paul V. dismissed the examiners employed in these congregations and the generals of the two orders, on the last day of August, 1607, saying that he would publish his decision when he thought fit. The bull in question was published on the 11th of September, 1713, a little more than a century afterwards. The victory which the Jesuits had gained in this interval, was the fruit of intrigues, but it was the victory of error—it was a shame to those who had gained it—it was a judgment of God against that church which permitted the result.

We have in this event an example of the influence of a corporate body upon the propagation of a certain set of opinions. The papacy itself is another example of the same sort of influence.\*

\* It is a tradition, that Paul refers by the words "Ye know what withholdeth," &c., in 2 Thess. ii. 6, to the Roman Government, and his meaning was that popery, or the man of sin could not manifest itself till the downfall of the Roman power. At length that event occurred and popery or the man of sin appeared. But there is a further withholding by the present secular powers, and these powers must be taken out of the way, before the full grown antichrist or lawless one will be revealed. By the overthrow of the present governments of Europe—an event which is foretold in scripture, especially by the prophet Daniel—the restraints on the man of sin will be removed as preparatory to his ultimate manifestation, and destruction by the coming of the Lord. Hence it is expected, that popery in some of its organized forms will survive the present political governments of Europe, and will become the perpetrator of enormous evils in the earth. When we consider the predicted end of the kingdoms of the fourth monarchy and the predicted end of the little horn of the beast, although in a general sense their destruction will be cotemporaneous, it being symbolized by the destruction of the beast itself—yet there is nothing incredible in the supposition that the little horn should be the part last consumed or destroyed, or in plain language, that the ecclesiastical organization of popery or Jesuitism, which is one horn of the beast, should survive by a short space the political organizations of the kingdoms in which it exists, and shew, in the absence of all restraining influences, in a more dreadful way, the attributes of the man of sin and son of perdition just previously to its final overthrow.

The interval through which we have cursorily passed, was occupied by several generations. From the 27th of September, 1540, the date of the bull of Paul III., establishing the order of Jesuits until the date of the bull *Unigenitus*, 11th of September, 1713, is about one hundred and seventy-three years. During the greater part of this period the leaders of that Society directed their efforts to the establishment of a certain system of doctrines, which they continued without remission or deviation of aim notwithstanding the frequent transmission of the powers and faculties of the society from hand to hand. Each successive general and his coadjutors labored for the advancement of the views of the society, with the same energy and untiring zeal, as though they were the monarchs or administrators of a kingdom. The eventful history of that society furnishes motives to those who at present exercise the control of it and direct its operations. They doubtless look forward to equal successes which time and opportunity may afford to them, and which societies less compact, could not turn to their own account. Vicissitudes arising from internal causes which may affect their existence or their power to act, are less likely to occur in that Society than in civil states and kingdoms. Hence the hope, that as their existence will run parallel with that of the political states of the earth, the society will be able to profit by the errors and misfortunes of the latter, and even to establish itself with political power upon their ruins. The constitution of the Society of Jesuits has been tested by an experience nearly five times as long as the existence of the United States as an independent nation. Hence some may infer that the probability of its surviving another century is five times as great as the probability that the present constitution of our political government will survive that period. And if we look at the elements which compose the society, and the leading principles of its organization, and the manner in which its members are perpetuated, and compare them with the corresponding particulars of any civil state or kingdom, the probability of its cotemporaneous existence with the states and kingdoms of the earth during all future time, is greatly strengthened. A society composed of ungodly men which is thus capable of becoming a rival and an enemy of a state, by that fact alone becomes both. It has this advantage, too—it is not a body politic existing within defined geographical limits which can be approached by fleets and armies. It is an enemy which forms a part of the state itself. It is fixed to no place,—its organization is secret,—its members not known—they voluntarily submit to arbitrary and absolute power. The acts of the society are secret, while their effects only are visible—its course is occult and tortuous, its principles intolerant, and while political societies are made up of discordant elements and divided into factions, all of which are at times ready to gain strength by the sacrifice of principles and important interests in order to succeed in some ephemeral object, the Society of Jesuits, on the other hand, is at peace within itself, and being ready to avail itself of every emergency in favour of its own interest—pursues its selfish and unsocial ends with an unflinching step. But we digress from the subject.

These disputes concerning the doctrines of grace led to the discussion of the two covenants. The Society of Port Royal taught that the old covenant, which consisted only in the knowledge of the law, could not make a man just and holy—that God ordained the law only to make men feel the greatness of their spiritual diseases, and their need of healing by the grace of Jesus Christ, who forms the new covenant by writing the law in their hearts, that is by making them love it. In conformity with this view of the subject, are the 6th and 8th of the propositions condemned by this bull.

*Prop. 6th.* "Discremen inter fœdus Judaicum et Christianum est quod in illo Deus exigit fugam peccati et implementum legis à peccatore, relinquendo illum in sua impotentia; in isto verò Deus peccatori dat quod jubet, illum sua gratiâ purificandò." *Obs. on Rom. xi. 27,* or as it is more literally translated from the French,

"What a difference, oh my God, between the Jewish covenant and the Christian covenant! The one and the other has for its condition the renunciation of sin and the fulfilling of the law: but THERE thou requirest it of the sinner, while leaving him in his weakness—HERE thou givest him that which thou commandest in purifying him by thy grace."

*Prop. 8th.* "Nos non pertinemus ad novum fœdus, nisi in quantum participes sumus novæ gratiæ, quæ operatur in nobis id quod Deus nobis præcipit." *Obs. on Heb. viii. 10.*

"We belong to the new covenant just so far only as we participate in this new grace which works in us, what God requires of us."

It is scarcely necessary to call the reader's attention to the repugnancy there is between these propositions, and the doctrines of the Molinists. They taught that man's salvation depends on himself,—they taught also that all men, Jews as well as Christians, have equally the power to save themselves, and this power is the fruit of a versatile grace which is as common as nature itself.

[To be Continued.]

[For the Spirit of the XIX. Century.]

#### SYSTEMATIC BENEVOLENCE, VS. THE AGENCY SYSTEM.

THE "Hints on the Agency System," which appeared in the March and September numbers of the Magazine for 1840, presented every thing then deemed by the writer proper for him to offer on the subject. It was thought that nothing in the tone of those articles, indicated a less modest temper than their title, and that so far from giving occasion of offence, they did not even render a disclaimer of such an intention necessary. The matter indeed was pursued more in the mode of an enquirer, and the expediency of the agency system was rather questioned than denied. That it should be engrafted on our ecclesiastical system as the settled policy of the church, was deprecated, and while readily conceding that no one claimed for it such permanent adoption, the questionable character of its expediency was predicated on that fact. For

if it will not suit the Presbyterian church forty years hence, if we are determined to have something else, the sooner the substitution takes place the better. The great object on all hands is to bring into full action the resources of the church. The General Assembly has never adopted the agency system, as such, but merely commended it as a necessary expedient in the present state of the church. Readily admitting its necessity in some cases, are there none in which a substitute can be found? If no substitute is practicable, then let the system be fully and permanently adopted.

In the effort to show that the system should be abolished with all possible expedition, it was obviously proper to portray its defects, its inconsistency with our Form of Church Government, and its (frequently) unhappy results. But every effort was made to avoid giving offence, and in this, so far as can be discovered, the effort was successful. And while, by some, the hints were misconstrued as being obstacles to the efforts of brethren employed in the service of the church, in promoting the laudable objects of her boards; their true object and bearing was well understood by others, and among these, several occupying the first places on the list of secretaries and agents, connected with our benevolent institutions.

Let there be no misconception. The church as a body, represented in the General Assembly, is competent to devise all the necessary plans of benevolent action; to church Sessions under Presbyterial, and Presbyteries under Synodical supervision, belongs the duty of providing men and means. The Assembly may have its executive organs, by whatever name you please to call them.\* Strict controul exercised "in more majorum," by Synods and Presbyteries would speedily bring church sessions to a proper degree of regularity and if the sum of receipts for a few years should prove less than it now does, yet the annual income would be more certain and with the increase of light and the application of a renewedly stricter enquiry at Presbyterial meetings, there would be a gradually increasing receipt into the church treasury.

This great object it is believed, is that of all concerned in this discussion. The question at issue, may be narrowed down to that indicated by the above caption. "Shall we adopt some plan of systematic benevolence or adhere to the agency system." Awaiting for eighteen months the development of opinion on this subject, it may now be stated that if recent action in Presbyteries in various portions of the church can be considered a fair index of that opinion, there is little doubt to which answer it points. Without entering into statistical expositions it may be safely said that

\*Without entering into a controversy now in progress respecting the Scripturalness, &c. of Boards, the enquiry is merely ventured—is not the old way of managing this matter, by a committee of the Assembly, the best after all? Do we not derive the name and thing of "Boards" from the voluntary system of congregationalism: and is not the greatest objection to them derived from their inutility? In this as in many other matters "in mediis tutissimus," and while not advocating the views of the reviewer nor those of the author of a *Calm Discussion*, probably we might find that committees responsible directly to the Assembly would serve all purposes of the present organization, and be liable to no valid objections urged against Boards.—*Village Pastor.*

in a large majority of cases, in which the subject has received Presbyterian attention, some plan of systematic benevolence has been adopted and efficient measures determined on to render such plan productive of good results.

Good or bad habits once formed are not easily broken. Customs sanctioned by long usage and beneficial tendency, retain a place in the affections, and exercise a controul over conduct which cannot be effected by expedients, however well devised, attractive for their novelty or successful for a time. Suppose (and is it unreasonable to anticipate such results?) that the custom of semi-monthly, or monthly, or quarterly contributions, by all, or the most of our churches, to objects of benevolence, were once fairly established; that the people looked forward to such seasons with fixed purposes to give according to ability; that pastors made it a part of their business, as it doubtless is their duty, to inculcate on such occasions the duty of liberality and excite to its performance by appropriate instruction and appeals from the pulpit; is it not evident, that with every increase in numerical power, the church would advance in like ratio in moral influence, and that every successive year would witness new efforts, stronger zeal and greater results in the work, of evangelizing the world? What if a few churches do not, in a given term of years, contribute as many *dollars* as they may under the present scheme, (and the question is, by no means, definitely settled,) is there no importance to be attached to the cultivation of benevolent habits, of a growing interest in the work of the gospel, and a prayerful believing spirit? The agent under the most favourable circumstances, cannot visit all the churches, unless you exact a larger amount of labour than one man can perform, or multiply nearly four-fold the number now employed. Hence many churches are left unsolicited. The people, pastors and elders, alike await on the agent. The pastor has not been led to give special attention to the special object, or, since the people might lose some respect for him, in such an unusual capacity, he dislikes to undertake the business; and thus, a year of strenuous, successful effort under the agent's operations, may be followed by another of comparative indifference and barrenness. The receipts of our Boards may be some times swelled, by the flordings of temporary blood-letting from the veins of avarice and cupidity, and then brought low by the withdrawal of the agency lancet. Is not a *system* proposing a steady, uniform and healthy benevolent action, preferable to one which is to-day abundant, but tomorrow uncertain, and perhaps the next, paralysed?

But, it may be said, this is mere supposition; "better to bear the ills of the agency system than rush on plans of which we know nothing." No man is so absurd as to suppose the great work proposed, can be accomplished at once, by resolutions and reports and other modern modes of warfare on evils, or instruments for the architecture of benefits. We must be content to move slowly, to gather strength by degrees, "*crescere eundo.*" How long has it required the churches to reach even our present limited approximation to the practical acknowledgment, that "the silver and gold are the Lord's," that we are his stewards, and to

feel, by a rich experience, that "it is more blessed to give than to receive?" And who will say that with peace in our borders, with unity of counsel in our judicatures, with "eye to eye" among our ministry, with the influence of our own literature to mould our people, to say nothing of the interesting success of our missionary schemes, our seminaries and our educational provisions for indigent and pious youth, we may not more rapidly advance in future. In many parts of our church, thirty years has witnessed a vast improvement in the matter of ministers' salaries, and wherever Presbyterian supervision has been actively felt, punctuality and increased faithfulness on the part of ministers and people in the fulfilment of reciprocal duties have resulted. Indeed what is the business of our Presbyteries and Synods? When the proceedings of lower judicatures have been reviewed, licentiates examined for ordination or candidates for licensure, reports and statistics presented, and the minutiae connected with every ecclesiastical assembly attended to, what standing business remains materially to occupy attention? Might not part of a day, at least, be profitably employed in discussing plans for benevolent action, receiving reports, encouraging the downcast, and stimulating the sluggish? Let the effort be fairly made, persevered in to success or failure, and if it be the latter, then, confessing that our church is not fully organised as a missionary body, according to the requisition, "Go ye into all the world," &c.; let us examine her constitution, rectify it, and provide that hereafter "the ordinary and perpetual officers in the church, are bishops or pastors, *agents*, elders and deacons."

And here it may be well to observe, that unsatisfied with the usual defence of the agency system, derived from considerations of expediency, utility and necessity, a certain, pure, divine authority for its existence has been plead. "Discussion, sirs, on this matter of agencies is improper. The General Assembly has settled the subject. Let the church enjoy the repose, fondly believed to be her portion. Experience of Congregational churches, (*vide*, *Missionary Herald!*) has clearly proven, that it is a superior plan to any other. Nay more, the New Testament has furnished apostolic example and practice to justify it." These are not quoted as any man's "ipsissima verba," but as expressive of an argument on this subject of no ancient date. The apostolic succession has found a new channel. If our Episcopal brethren will not admit parochial episcopacy a genuine relationship, how can they dare refuse the "truly primitive, apostolic" character of our beloved brethren, "whose praise is in all the churches" as the true successors of Paul as to his conveying funds to the poor saints of Jerusalem, collected from the storings of the Corinthians, agreeably to the admonition, 1 Cor. xvi. 2, "On the first day of the week, let each one of you lay by in store, according as God hath prospered him, that there be no gatherings when I come?"

But what saith the Scripture? Of course we urge no argument drawn from the absence of all allusion to agents, boards, secretaries, &c. Is there then in apostolic example and practice, even the principle of the agency system? Let us see. Paul, travelling

from one point to another, hearing of the sufferings of the poor saints, and charged (Gal. ii. 10,) to remember them, received what "it pleased them of Achaia and Macedonia to contribute," (Rom. xv. 26,) and took it to Jerusalem. (Acts xi. 30; xxiv. 17.) But was this Paul's *prime business*, in all that celebrated tour, after his consultation with James and others, (Gal. ii. 9,) through Asia, Macedonia, and Achaia and back to Jerusalem? Will it be said, Paul, as our brethren — and —, travelled to collect money and performed a great deal of useful ministerial labour in Phillippi and Corinth and Athens? Much ink has been spilled and much paper wasted in the discussion of Titus's episcopal character. Now, henceforth, be it known to whom it may concern, that it is no matter whether Titus ever wore band or gown or a white muslin jacket, or was my Lord Bishop Titus, or not. We find for him, in 2 Cor. viii. 23, a new and more substantial claim to extraordinary gifts. He was a *sub-agent*. Paul was the general agent, and Titus an aid. See how express is scripture, "Whether any do enquire of Titus, he is my partner and fellow helper concerning you." How obtuse have been our fore-fathers, never to have discovered this new claim of Paul and Titus. But the context is more to the point. In verse 4th he testifies to the Corinthians, the great liberality and readiness of the Macedonian churches, (as to this above mentioned collection for poor saints) who had been willing even beyond their power, "praying us with much entreaty, that we would receive the gift, and take upon us the fellowship of ministering to the saints." Indeed! it seems Paul did not even "present the cause" in Macedonia. The good people there, were ready without the agent. This does not argue much for the primitive and apostolic origin of the agency system. But farther, he very well bases on this laudatory reference to Macedonian liberality, an exhortation to the Corinthians (v. 7;) that they should abound in this grace also, and then goes on to say, that "the same earnest care was put into Titus's heart, of God,"—v. 16, who of "*his own accord had gone to them.*" But, if it thus appears, that Titus had undertaken this agency, as it is properly believed Paul did, not as a chief business but merely an incidental matter, it must certainly be admitted that the brother, whether Gaius or Aristarchus does not appear, (compare 2 Cor. viii. 19, and Acts xix. 29,) "whose praise was in all the churches," *was sent* on this special business "chosen by the churches." See v. 18, 19. Turning back to 1 Cor xvi. 3, 5, it will be seen that Paul, alluding to the collection above mentioned, had said he would send it, *the gift*, (or *liberality*, Eng. version) "by whomsoever they would approve." It is very probable, therefore, that although Paul ultimately conveyed it himself, he alluded to some individual designated to be the bearer of this alms—and so in the case under consideration. Banks and bills of exchange were then unknown, and it was highly prudent and proper to seek some trusty person to convey any considerable amount of specie such a distance.

And this is the Scriptural basis of the agency system! Doubtless it is here clearly taught that ministers or others may properly be the media of transmitting benevolent contributions. What is the

bearing, however, of all that Paul says, especially 2 Cor. viii. and ix.? Undoubtedly, that it is a part of ministerial duty to urge liberality. Thus, in Rom. xii. 8, among the gifts imparted according to the measure of faith, this gift or grace of giving (and in 2 Cor. viii. and xi., the liberal spirit is thus called a grace, is enumerated among the gifts imparted by Christ. Paul exhorts to its proper use. Here is the authority and injunction (for apostolic example in *inimitable things*, is precept) which pastors and evangelists are bound to notice; authority for urging their people to deeds of benevolence and injunction to do it. Is brotherly kindness a grace or gift from Christ? Then is it ministerial duty to urge to its possession. So of other things, and this grace of giving, among others. Must the pastor call for an agent to preach on liberality? Then why not call for another to preach on faith, another on prayer, another on love, another on the 6th commandment, and so on through the whole routine of subjects of scripture doctrine and practice?

Verily, whether this "matter about agencies," be invested with so much consequence as to demand the notice of some or not, whether it rise high enough to attract the eye of some whose ecclesiastical proportions are a little in excess or not, this much is true, that till the church recognise her duty and engage fully in its performance, as such, she will not arise and shine. If agents be occasionally necessary to collect funds for a special emergency, let them be employed, but so long as we design to secure a regular, permanent, healthful ecclesiastical action, we must inscribe on our banner, *THE church, and the church only, by her duly constituted authorities, as propagator of the truth, is God's appointed instrument or agent to provide all necessary means.* If she decides on experiment, that for cultivating this grace, a new order must be established, be it so. None will bow more readily to her authority than those who contend earnestly for her purity. But be it remembered, so long as the agency system prevails, it is reproductive of the necessity for whose emergencies it is the provision. Let every pastor, elder, deacon, Presbytery and Synod see to it, not that the agency system be battered down, but by strenuously advocating and establishing productive plans of systematic benevolence, its farther continuance be rendered unnecessary. To this every agent and secretary will say, amen—2 Cor. viii. and ix. will furnish texts for sermons, clearly establishing the duty of ministers and people, and be no longer tortured to prop a system, whose manifest decay in public esteem, is the best harbinger, that it "waxeth old and is ready to vanish."

A VILLAGE PASTOR.

[Continued from page 126.]

## THE UNITY OF THE CHURCH.

No. IV.

6. *For the purpose of establishing mutual confidence, impressing more deeply the public mind with a feeling of the great importance of the work; as well as to put the sincerity of the parties out of doubt, let them give to each other a pledge by the solemn subscription of a federal bond, engaging themselves to candour and fidelity in the pursuit of the subject before them.* In this deed, let the great object sought be stated, a reference to existing obstacles be made, a comprehensive glance at the general means of surmounting those obstacles be taken; and finally a solemn engagement of the parties, according to the best light that may be had, to seek the attainment of the desired end.

This would not be a novel measure, nor one without precedent in the movements of the people of God. In Judah, the work of reform was repeatedly accompanied and advanced by covenant transactions. In the days of Nehemiah, upon the return from the Chaldean captivity, recourse was had to the measure. To such a transaction, it would seem, the apostolic age was not a stranger. The Macedonian churches—the best of that day—appear to have exemplified the work; in giving themselves first to the Lord, and then to the apostles by the will of God. Protestantism, on the continent of Europe and elsewhere, has practiced it. We do not, in this, refer to partial actings of a partizan spirit which are alien to the true and generous spirit of enlightened covenanting, and which, in some localities, talked of for *little purposes*, may have brought it into disrepute. We have reference to such instances as that of Smalcald, in the 16th century; and in the 17th, to a transaction with which American Presbyterianism is more nearly related, and to which it is deeply indebted. To February 28th, 1638, we look back with intense interest. That was a proud day for Presbyterianism, when the united bonds of prelatical and political domination over the spiritual interests of the church, in Scotland, were broken by the friends of religion and liberty. On that day the oppressed and divided friends of Presbyterianism, in the purest form of that order that had appeared since the apostles had fallen asleep,—were united, and they sealed their union by a public covenant. The friends of truth and liberty, of every name, in England, saw that the cause of religion and liberty was connected with that measure. They, too, were in motion, but knew not how to advance. At the feet of Henderson, the projector and draftsman of the Scottish covenant—with his associates, Bailly and Blair, they were taught to go forward, and in 1643, in opposition to prelatical usurpation, we find the pure High Church Presbyterian, the Low Church Episcopalian, though not then designated by that name,—the Erastian Presbyterian, and the Independent,—all who were the opposers of despotism and friends of liberty, were the friends of the League, and throughout Scotland, England and Ireland, they associated under its bond. The first of its fruits were the

Westminster Documents—the Confession of Faith, Catechisms and Presbyterian Form of Government—Documents, the equal of which, on this side the days of inspiration, no age had produced. Under the solemn bonds of their covenants, in which, without partiality, they had pledged themselves to seek the truth, walk in it, and aim at the union of the church, in the truth and order of the gospel, in all lands, they consulted, they acted, and left a blessing behind them, as an inheritance for succeeding times. American patriots and Presbyterian professors are too little in the habit of tracing back, to the deed of their fathers, on February 28, 1638, their high possessions at this day, in this free and happy land.

The seed that Calvin, by Knox, had planted, and which Melvil and his companions had watered, now shot up a verdant and vigorous stem. Some of its branches transplanted in the western world, have grown and spread. Under the goodly shadow we rest in safety and eat the pleasant fruit. In its natal soil, the parent stock was subjected to blighting winds and unpropitious storms, which spoiled its beauty and marred its fertility. Without figure, the unblessed connexion of the ecclesiastical system with an unhallowed political power, stopped the progress of that reformation which had gone far in purifying the sanctuary, in the British empire. Of this we, in the United States, are in no great danger. In all her departments, the church with us, is untrammelled by profane alliance with the state. In republican America seems to be the proper place where the church of God may, with every prospect of success, begin the work of union, upon her own proper, spiritual, foundation. Why then shall not the whole reformed church in all her branches, under the solemn pledge of a covenant promise, engage in the work of being visibly one, in the Lord? Why will not Presbyterians—*Presbyterians indeed*—all true hearted parties and individuals, in the great Presbyterian family, lead the way, in this blessed work? Why not in solemn, federal bonds “with God and one another,” thus make the honest, united, and efficient effort to be one, that with associated force they may bring the spiritual influence of the gospel of God, to bear upon the kingdom of darkness, as it is now under the immediate auspices of the “man of sin” and pagan idolatry?—to bear also upon the doubts of infidelity, the gloomy offspring of pagan and popish idolatry?

We enlarge not upon the danger of hasty and partial unions, formed under the influence of feeling or mere convenience. If not upon grounds comprehensive and commanding, they will be of doubtful tendency. Instead of diminishing, they are likely to increase the number of parties, and if not this, they are in danger of giving strength, intensity, and permanence to faction.

7. *To the authorized symbols of the reformed churches, let due deference be paid, as professed by the respective denominations that have received them.* This harmony of the confessions of the several departments of the Reformed church, in doctrine, principles of worship, and order, has been the subject of universal remark. In this connexion, let us attend to the suggestions under particular 3 of this paper; and then ascertain, mere forms of expressing the

same thing being set aside, whether the confession—the creed of the whole, be not really one and the same.

In reference to these symbols there may be by one, in a particular point, a not coming up to the designated mark; by another, a pressing of some article beyond its legitimate bonds; and, in a third, may be found an ambiguous phraseology. Things of this sort are found among individuals of the same organized body, and when discretion, good temper, and godliness prevail, without affecting injuriously a happy communion. Without injury to truth, or pressing upon any principle of order or piety, such causes of difference, it would seem, might be easily accommodated; and when the thing is understood and embraced, why contend about the verbiage of the symbol by which it is exhibited? By a well constructed act of adoption, may not the whole of those solemnly authorized symbols be recognized as expressing the faith of the Church? It really is so. Why not, then, leave it optional, to take the whole or any one of the particular symbols, as may, by those immediately concerned, be deemed most eligible? Those who take one, have their creed in narrower bounds and without repetition, those who embrace the whole have no more than the others; but they have the advantage of viewing it in different forms. To reach this point, indeed, would require thought, discussion, explanation, and concession—concession, not of principle, but of mere forms and habits of thought, incidental from circumstances of a transient character. The subject thus understood, and with the understanding of it, a right temper of mind existing and prevailing, the formation and adoption of a compendious, distinct, and simple creed, will be a task of no very difficult accomplishment. But for it the public Christian mind must be prepared. Time, and patience, and mental labour must be put in requisition. The danger is from precipitancy in rushing to the result; or from impatience of the requisite mental toil which the subject demands.

We are not unapprised that this union of the church, to be useful, permanent, and happy, must be purely ecclesiastical, unembarrassed by mere property incorporations, and free from the entanglements of false principles. Its basis must be broad and firm enough for the whole redeemed family of God to build upon. Reject from the foundation, not only the hay and the stubble, but likewise the wood. Let provision be made for its superintendence by ONE SUPREME ECCLESIASTICAL TRIBUNAL. Thus, expression will be distinctly given to the unity of the church, in one organized body. Presbyterianism in the United States, in America—may thus, in a glorious manner give a practical exhibition of *her own* conservative principle of representation—a principle better understood and more extensively applied in the United States, than by any people that ever lived; a principle through whose medium the saving influence of evangelical doctrine is destined to extend, to attain permanence, and to bless the world. Let, then, sound Presbyterianism, in America, show what it is capable of effecting, under the divine blessing, for the empire of Jesus, in all the earth.

CONCLUSION.—It will be remembered that all we proposed at this time, upon the subject before us, was in some remarks, to sug-

gest the importance of those who have talent and leisure, taking it up, and giving to it the place it deserves. We have been obliged to be brief, and from that as well as other causes, may be obscure. Our concluding remarks must, however, likewise be few and short.

1. From schemes and measures that have little in view, except the accomplishment of mere party aims, the church of God, as his kingdom, has little to expect of permanent good. The failure of those devices, in which so small a portion of God's means of restoring Zion can have a place, and in which so large a share of man's bewildered wisdom and dark passions must have prominence, ought not to discourage the enlightened lover of Zion's peace, in his attempts to harmonize her members and their sacred interests. It has been long known as a truth, that *the world by wisdom knew not God*—and that *the foolishness of God is wiser than men, and the weakness of God is stronger than men*. Means, if they bear the signature of God, though deemed foolish and weak, by presumptuous man, will for the accomplishment of their destined ends, prove wisdom and strength.

2. The revolutionary spirit and movements of our age, present no insurmountable barrier in the way of uniting the divided church. Because of the shakings of the ecclesiastical earth, the bursting of party bonds, the tearing up of old foundations, and the removal of ancient land-marks, no heart among the sons of Zion should fail. Inconveniencies may and must, to some extent, attend such revolutions. In instances not a few, evils of very serious character may follow; evils in themselves, and felt to be such—especially because they have not been before experienced or suspected. Against these it becomes us to guard with care. Due attention to the moral barometer will advise of the coming tempest, before its growlings can be heard in the distance. Be prepared for it when it comes.

These convulsions and changes are preparatory to a better state of things. The fearful forebodings of inexpedience and unbelief ought not to be permitted, by the production of despondency in the public mind, to bring faintness to the heart, or paralysis to the arm. How, may we not suppose—would the untutored admirer of nature in her native grandeur, but unskilled in architecture—lament the inroads of civilization upon the forest, and deplore the defacing of her beauties, in the oak and the pine, by the application of the axe, the saw and the chisel? And who, never having heard of the process of building, while he contemplates the collections of timbers, with their mortices and tenents; the masses of sand, of lime, and of rock, with the other materials of the future edifice, could imagine the formation, from such apparent ruins, of the well-proportioned and stately mansion? The skillful architect, however, had formed his plan. In his mind existed a clear conception of every part, and of the whole in combination. The mind that conceived the plan can carry it into execution. Thus, over all the confusions of Zion, wisdom, goodness, and almighty power supreme preside. Jehovah the Redeemer builds Jerusalem; he has laid the foundation, his hand rears the wall, and *He will bring on the top stone with shoutings of grace, grace unto it.*

To the attainment of the happy result, of which we are assured these shakings and revolutions are indispensably requisite, every man of reflection who had turned his mind to what God had promised, and to the condition of the church, must have foreseen their approach, if not in their actual forms, at least in their essential character. The state of things fifty years since, had it been perpetuated, would have forever stood as an insurmountable barrier against the introduction of the millennial age. That state of things was unnatural, immoral, and anti-evangelical. Even the assumed denominational names of the several departments of God's church, indicate their factious position. Not one of them bears a name that reaches the vitalities of the religion of Christ. Each and all of them are denominated from some circumstance pertaining to an external form—to something which is a mere out work. In this is there a particular providence? The way is open for the church to assume, or re-assume, a name that will indicate her formal and vital character. This to her will indeed be a *new name*.

To change her present condition, God has come out of his place, to shake the earth. He has been and is now shaking the heavens, the earth, the sea, and the dry land, preparatory to his giving peace. In and about the actual church there has been gathered and piled up, much that is of human making. All this must be taken away, and in order to its removal, is this shaking; *that those things which cannot be shaken may remain*. This earthquake is in progress. Its termination is not yet. Another quarter of a century will give wonderful developments. Who, amidst these agitations will be found active, and yet in his proper place? For the issue there is no doubt. With our covenant God is the residue of the Spirit. His distracted church shall be united upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, *Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone*. In this he will employ the principles, dispositions and agency of his people. *He will return to them a pure language, and put in them a right spirit*; and strengthen them with might for the great and hallowed work to which he calls them. The issue of all this will be happy. *The wolf shall dwell with the lamb, and the leopard shall lie down with the kid; the calf and the lion, and the fatted together; and a little child shall lead them. They shall not hurt nor destroy in all my holy mountain. I will give them one heart and one way, that they may fear me forever, for the good of them and of their children after them. And there shall be upon every high mountain, and upon every high hill, rivers and streams of waters, in the day of the great slaughter, when the towers fall. Moreover the light of the moon shall be as the light of the sun, and the light of the sun shall be seven fold, as the light of seven days, in the day that the Lord bindeth up the breach of his people, and healeth the stroke of their wound*. The light of the gospel shall increase, celestial influences shall flow as streams, the towers of anti-Christianism shall fall, the breaches of Zion shall be bound up, and the wounds of her children shall be healed.

For this blessed result, let us not cease to plead with our Father in heaven, by prayer. Let not the lover of God and his cause be dismayed. Amidst the agitations of the day, let his mind be fixed

upon the Rock of Ages, and his eye, by that light which proceeds from the throne of God, be directed to the scenes that pass before him. In that light he may trace the operations, of the divine hand, and have confidence that that hand will do all things well. *Walk about Zion: tell the towers thereof. Mark ye well her bulwarks, consider her palaces, that ye may tell it to the generations following. For this God is our God for ever and ever.* Zion's towers still stand, her bulwarks remain, her palaces continue; there God dwells, and will help her right early.

The summary of our remarks is:—The church of the Redeemer, by divine institution, is ONE; she ought actually to be one; and the obligation to seek this unity, as a matter of great practical importance, should be felt upon the conscience and heart of her sons. Her present divisions are referrible to folly, at one time, at another to crime, and again, to her children's misapprehension of duty, in the cloudy and dark day; not recognizing their relation to one another. In a review of the whole subject, it will be found impossible for any of the parties into which the church is separated, upon the ground now occupied, on the head of ecclesiastical communion, to act consistently with itself. To some of the steps which are calculated, as is thought, to relieve the difficulty which presses upon all, by healing the breaches among those who, except in name, are really one, we have adverted. For the present, under the disposals of Immanuel, the subject is left to the reflections and counsels of those who are the friends of the true, pure, and extended union of Zion. G.

---

[For the Spirit of the XIX. Century.]

A SECOND LETTER TO THE PRESBYTERIES, PARTICULARLY OF THE WEST—BY AN OLD SERVANT OF JESUS CHRIST.

*Rev'd and Dear Brethren:*—In my last number, I took the liberty of calling your attention to a few facts illustrative of the present state of the world. I endeavoured to show that there was at this time a loud call upon all Christians, but especially upon the Presbyterians of these United States, to put forth an effort in the cause of Christ, such as they had never yet done. I promised in subsequent numbers, to labour to answer two questions. 1. By what means shall we be able, as Presbyterians, to preach the gospel more extensively in our own country? To the answer of this question we now address ourselves. That we have been deficient, and that the command of Christ must, as far as possible, be complied with, there is but one opinion among us. The command is imperative, and that every Christian person, but especially every Christian minister, in his individual and especially his associated capacity, is bound in the most extensive possible degree, to preach the gospel to every creature, none will deny.

What have been the means hitherto employed by Presbyterians to effect this object? Chiefly two. By the pastoral relation, and by missionaries. To me, it has always been a matter of surprise,

that the churches of Christ, through the whole world, have not embraced the simple, and it would seem the essential element of a church, the *pastoral relation*. "He (Christ) gave some pastors." And yet there are many churches without them, or have mere substitutes. In one church we have archbishops and bishops and curates, neither doing the work of a pastor. In another church we have bishops, and presiding elders, and circuit riders, and class leaders, but still no one in the form or office of a pastor. In a third church they seem to be governed, and fed, so far as there is any feeding, by quarterly meeting and women. The Presbyterian, is the only church that has fully embraced the apostolic idea of a *pastor*, and the Saviour's injunction to Peter, "feed my sheep." We hope that nothing we may say, will be construed as militating against the office of pastor. We consider it one of the glories of Presbyterianism, and in the present state of the church in our country the only effective means of disseminating the gospel. Like all plans, whether formed directly upon the Bible, or deduced from it, the office of pastor is liable to misuse in the hands of imperfect men. From the various duties the pastor has to perform, among the old and the young, the rich and the poor, the learned and the ignorant, the docile and the froward, the pious and the impious, it is a matter of surprise that pastors so often sustain themselves. Besides, the pastor is liable to many temptations to indolence, and the neglect of duty, and I am afraid there are not a few who fall before the temptation. The recurrence of the same round of duty weekly. The presence of the same audience. The quiet possession of the pulpit without fear of contradiction. The certainty of approbation, if not of applause from prepossessed hearers; these, and many other circumstances of a similar character conspire to produce an inactive state of interest and of piety. Still, the church cannot do without this important ministerial relation. Is there no way of avoiding many of these evils, and greatly augmenting the usefulness of our pastors? I most firmly believe there is, for I cannot think that any of God's appointments necessarily produce any thing but good. There is nothing of which I am more fully convinced than that the exercise of the pastoral office in the Presbyterian church of these United States, is in need of great amendment, and is capable of being made the richest blessing to the church and to the country. In order to this, two things are necessary, as it respects both the people and their pastors. The cultivation of a generous, liberal spirit, involving a willingness to make sacrifices. And also a willingness to lay aside old and long established habits. Let us look at this matter in another aspect. The spirit of Christ and his religion is *generous* and *expansive*. There was nothing selfish about Christ. There should be nothing selfish or contracted about his ministers, his elders, or his church. Let any man think of human nature. Of its plastic and yielding character, especially where ease and self are concerned. How easy and how common it is in such cases to make the worse appear the better cause. To magnify the mole-hill-good that we have done, into a mountain. As also the little difficulties in the path way of duty, into insurmountable barriers. Is there no method of

imparting new energy, and more active every-day effort into the affair, and of preserving entire the pastoral relation, so essential to the well-being of the church? I would simply suggest the propriety of *enlarging and diversifying the field of labour of all our pastors*. I say of all our pastors. For there can be no material change unless it be general, embracing both town and country, and unless recommended by our Presbyteries and sanctioned by the Assembly. I hear it immediately objected by many of our pastors, our fields of labour are already too large, nor do we wish them at all diversified. Dear brethren, let us calmly look at this matter. I know that many of the difficulties of life are greatly magnified by being looked at in the mass. I suppose the pastor to be a man of ordinary health and talents. I also suppose that the people of his pastorate enable him to devote himself wholly to the work of the ministry. Still farther, I suppose his congregation to be in the country, and himself to live in the country. These I believe to be the general characteristics of the pastors of our land, except as to adequate support. And I have always observed that a diligent pastor-working minister makes a paying and kind people. Upon an average, our pastors have under their care not more than one hundred and sixty families. Now suppose the pastor thinks it to be his duty to visit every family in his congregation once every three months. In three months there are about eighty days, not including the sabbaths. Supposing the pastor visits four families in each day, he will get round in forty days—leaving the one-half of his time, with the addition of the Sabbath, at his own disposal. If the minister should think it needful to visit every family in his charge only once in six months—and perhaps every valuable purpose may be answered by doing so, then the pastor will have three-fourths of his time at his own disposal, for study and other social purposes. How are those more than two hundred days to be employed, rather, how are they employed? Are they all in some way for God and his church? Let conscience answer. Something must be done; a different course must be pursued by our pastors, or the office itself must become a blot, an utter failure, and the Presbyterian church must dwindle in our hands.

A pastoral visit. What ought it to be? In a right conception of this, consists the value of such a visit. The term itself explains the object. The sole design ought to be to feed the sheep, especially the lambs of the flock. Consequently, it must be a visit of a very distinctive character, or it had as well not be made. In the ordinary visits of our neighbours and friends, we may, and I would say we ought to converse about politics, about agriculture, about science, and about all the ordinary concerns of life. Not so upon this pastoral visit. It ought not to be about the external concerns of the church. This short intercourse between the minister and his people, ought to be pastoral altogether. A season of comforting, of building up, of feeding the flock, and especially the lambs. I can conceive of a visit of this character being perfectly useless, and worse. And I can conceive of a minister going into the house of one of his parishioners, with a kind and cheerful countenance, exhibiting all the courtesy of a friend and affection of a father, and

going directly to the proper object of his visit—bringing to the attention of the parents, of all the children, and servants, Christ and him crucified. Bringing to view the necessity of personal and family religion, closing the visit with a short prayer, all not to consume more than forty-five minutes, or at most an hour. I see him retiring with the benediction of every member of the delighted family. They will be well prepared to meet their minister on the next sabbath. It will be like the meeting of a father and his children. Is this a fancy picture? I hope not. It is in real life, and must be often exhibited again. If not, I repeat it, our pastoral relation must prove a sad failure; that it may not do so, the pastor's heart must be in the matter, and he must prepare himself for this part of his ministerial duty, by prayer and meditation.

We have been endeavouring to point out some of the difficulties and liabilities of abuse of the pastorship, with its duties. We come now to speak of the effects produced upon the people by the present mode of conducting the pastoral work. The persons who are the object of our remark, are these one hundred and sixty families, committed by an act of Presbytery to the pastoral care of one man. This act alone, separates, to a great extent, this man and these one hundred and sixty families from the rest of the church, and gives them an interest somewhat isolated. We have no objection to the thing thus far, it seems to be necessary, and we willingly make the sacrifice for the attainment of so great a good, as the pastoral relation. Two things ought to command the attention of all persons concerned. First, that the duties of the pastoral office be so performed as to make it really profitable to the church, and return an equivalent for the isolating nature of the office. And secondly, whether it cannot be so modified as to connect the pastor and his people, more closely with the perishing thousands all around them, and make the Presbyterian church a great and active missionary society.

If I am not mistaken, many of the families under the care of our pastors, rarely, perhaps never have seen their minister at their social fire-side, or joining them in family prayer. The more wealthy and pleasant families may not be so much of strangers to him. But the poorer part of his charge only know him in the pulpit; and are scarcely known to him by sight. The young people of the pastorate are not much more regarded, either by the pastor or the eldership, than are the children in a sister church, by those who are profanely called "god-fathers and god-mothers," at the time of their baptism. A large portion of the pastoral duties is tacitly, though not formally transferred over to the sabbath school. Even there the pastor is rarely seen, and many of the elders never. The church, except on the sabbath day, is as though it had no pastor. The pulpit is often more a place of parade and show, than of causing the sheep to lie down in green pastures, and leading them beside the still waters. The people go to church every sabbath, because it is their habit, and there they see their neighbours, and perhaps love to hear their pastor, because he has been their pastor a long time. They pay their yearly stipend, because, upon the whole, they believe their minister to be a good man and needy.

But as to feeling a lively interest in the salvation of their children and neighbours, or for the conversion of the world, these things give them little or no trouble. Instead of laying up from week to week as God may have prospered their honest industry, or may have caused the clouds of heaven to drop down fatness upon their farms, and passing their offering quietly into the hands of their pastor, to be by him appropriated as directed; if money be needed for the advancement of any of the benevolent objects of the church, it cannot be obtained but by the assistance of an agent, who must be paid for his services out of the mites of the poor. The church has all the appearance of decay about it, though it may have a pastor, there are no green pastures, nor bleating sheep. And now nothing will do but a resort to some new measures, perperhaps unauthorised by the Bible or the usages of the church. The result is, many hasty additions, and then all matters fall again almost as quiet as the grave. Is this a caricature, or is it a true picture? Let candour and observation decide. Is there no method of connecting these one hundred and sixty families more with their dying and darkened neighbours, and with a ruined world—of making them more liberal and uniform, both to their pastor and the charities of the age, and consequently more happy, and pious, and usefully devoted to doing good. Are there no means of enlarging this pastor's field of labour—of elevating him and his people to the missionary standard, without oppressing him or affecting his pastoral relations, or their obligations to him? It may be said it is easy to ask these questions. To me it seems not to be difficult to answer them, provided that there is all round a disposition to come up to the spirit of the nineteenth century. Sacrifices must be made. We must do as we would be done by. We must, every one of us, pastors and people, bear our proper part in preaching the gospel to every creature. The above remarks were predicated upon a church in this country consisting of one hundred and sixty families. They are equally applicable to all our churches in our towns and cities. In these, a pastor can visit eight or ten families in a day, and never be out of sight of his own door.

To the pastors either in the country or cities, we have assigned them pastoral visits, so as to leave them one-half or three-fourths of their time at their own disposal, not interfering at all with their sabbaths. Now the question ought to be made in some form, by all our Presbyteries and Synods, but especially by the Assembly, how ought this time to be employed? Are we to go on in this half sinecure way that we have been pursuing for more than a century? or can no better plan be thought of? Resolutions, such as were passed at the last Assembly, will do no good. They have done no good. Let the Assembly authorize, by recommendation, a specific application by the Presbyteries, to all our churches, for the free relinquishment of the one-fifth of their pastor's time, to be by them, under the direction of their several Presbyteries, in preaching the gospel and other ministerial services in the destitutions around them. This being done by the Assembly, and acted upon by the Presbyteries, I will venture to predict that not one church in a hundred will decline the relinquishment. The responsibility

will then be cast upon the ministers. And who among us will decline to help to bear part of that burden we have for years been laying upon the shoulders of our consecrated missionaries? It is granted that it would be much more pleasant to be at home and in the bosom of our families. But it ought to be remembered that Christ had no home or family. Though I cannot see that having both would have made him a sinner, or have unfitted him for his work. Shall the pastors of our churches live in their sealed houses and sleep in their curtained beds, while the leaders of the Lord's hosts are in the woods, in Asia, in Africa, and in the wilds of America.

It is said, let missionaries be employed, and let pastors mind their flocks. I say that a great work is to be done in the thickly inhabited parts of the United States, which if not done by pastors will never be done. This proposition is capable of the clearest proof. Supposing as above that the majority of our Presbyterian congregations consist of about one hundred and sixty families. Within the bounds of each, there are at least one hundred and sixty other families that belong to no church, and who hear little or no preaching. This is not missionary ground, no missionary is ever sent to them. They may be and doubtless are visited by our Methodist brethren, but not by Presbyterians, upon our present plan, nor ever can be. As far as Presbyterians are concerned, this people living among us, within call of our churches, are as certainly lost as are the Hindoos. We believe that we have got the truth, not exclusively, but that we are eminently the light of the world. Are we not so managing this pastoral relation of ours, as to make out of it a putting our light under a bushel? We have, then, the thing as the apostles received it from the hand of Christ. By a little self-denial—a little more commiseration for our perishing neighbours—a little more of a true missionary spirit, of the high-toned feeling of the nineteenth century, and the work is done. And our pastors and elders and churches are all the better for the effort.

Another method to spread the Gospel has been resorted to besides pastorates and missionaries, by that of appointing at each of the stated meetings of the Presbyteries, each of the members to preach a sabbath or two in those churches that are destitute of a pastor. I have no doubt it has always been well intended. I have seen little good attending the plan during fifty years that I have seen it practised. No great evil could result, were it wholly laid aside.

Dear brethren of the Presbyteries—as I have presumed to address you, I hope you will hear me through. You may pity my weakness. I hope you will not censure my temerity. Let it not be censured as a western scheme, and be thrown under the table. I am not alone, as you will presently learn, in considering the plan proposed as of vital importance to the progress of the Presbyterian church in these United States. Perhaps I am asked what is the use of finding fault with former and long practised means, without proposing something better. We have found fault, we trust, in the spirit of kindness, and we propose a remedy, and propose it to the whole Presbyterian church, and ask for it the serious consider-

ration of all the Presbyteries, Synods and the Assembly. The plan is subjoined. Extracts from the records of the Synod of Indiana. At a meeting of the Synod of Indiana on the last Wednesday of September, 1841, the Synod appointed a committee to devise some method for the better supplying our destitutions with the regular administration of the word and ordinances of God's house. Dr. Blythe was chairman of this committee. He reported the following resolution, with an address to the General Assembly on the subject.

1. That the Synod of Indiana request the eldership in each of our churches to enquire at the churches and congregations, whether they are willing to relinquish a part, say the one-fifth week of their pastors' time, to be by them devoted to preaching the gospel and other ministerial labours in destitute parts, as they may be directed by their Presbyteries, and this without affecting the pecuniary responsibilities of the churches to their pastors, and that a full report be made by all the churches on this subject, at the next stated meeting of the Presbytery.

2. Should this relinquishment be made, (of which the Synod have little doubt,) then it shall be the duty of each Presbytery, at its first stated meeting to divide the whole territory within their bounds, into as many districts or circuits as may be equal to the number of their ministers, and direct each to his field of labour, having suitable respect to those pastors who may have more than one church under their care; and of the faithful discharge of the duties committed to him, each minister shall render a full account to his Presbytery at its next stated meeting, together with a statement of the success of his labours.

3. In addition to his proper ministerial labours, it shall be considered the duty of each minister when performing his circuit, to seek for, and endeavour to put forward pious and promising young men, who may be desiring an education with a view to the gospel ministry.

4. Should this plan succeed, the pastors shall request their sessions either as a body, or in rotation, to meet on the Sabbath days when their pastors shall be absent, to hear the children and young people of the church and congregation, repeat the Shorter Catechism, and attend to such other religious exercises as are commonly performed by the eldership.

5. Resolved that a suitable address be prepared to the Assembly on the above resolutions.

6. That a Commission of Synod be appointed to meet the Synods of Kentucky, Cincinnati, and others with a view of inviting their co-operation with this Synod in this important enterprize. James Blythe, D. D. and E. D. MacMaster, D. D. were appointed to attend the Synod of Kentucky.

The following is the address spoken of in the fifth resolution. It was not adopted by the Synod, not because it was deemed irrelevant, but because it was deemed too long. The Synod prepared an address of their own, and in their own way, which doubtless will be before the Assembly. As we are Addressing the Presbyteries, and wish to make a full exposition of our views, I will lay before the Presbyteries the address to the Assembly as prepared by

the Committee. If the thoughts have any weight, we hope that some person will give them a more impressive form, and present them to the Assembly, if the business should be before that body.

*Rev'd Fathers and Brethren.*—God sustains and governs this world with reference to his church. It must be evident that the condition of the church has been greatly changed, within the last half century, God has multiplied her duties and responsibilities. Her sphere of power and usefulness has been greatly enlarged. The church, not to say the world, has awoke as from the slumbers of ages. Both are hereafter to be governed by reason and the application of means divinely appointed. The result of this renewed energy have been prodigious. In no department of human life, has this influence been so distinctly felt as in the church. And in no branch of the church ought it to be so distinctly felt, as in the American Presbyterian church. It is true, much has been done. Devices for good-doing have been multiplied, and some of our plans have been pushed on with a vigorous hand, and to happy results. Truth has been sustained. The cries of suffering humanity have fallen upon our ears, especially from abroad. They have been more than heard; they have, to some extent, been answered. Life has been jeopardized by many of our sons and daughters. Home and country have been forsaken—all that the command of the Saviour might be complied with.

The Synod of Indiana would say to the Presbyteries, and through them to the Assembly, not in the spirit of dictation, but that of filial affection, "Watchman, what of the night? What of the night? The watchman said, the morning cometh." Is it not abundantly evident that the world is about to be converted? We do not say in a day or in a year; nor yet in a century. But is not the work evidently commenced, and under the most favourable auspices? The present is more favourable than the sixteenth century, when the glorious reformation commenced. It was but the emancipation of Christendom from the dominion of the man of sin. *This*, the deliverance of the world from the dominion of the prince of darkness. Do not the floods clap their hands? Has not the time come when there shall be "no more sea?" (Obstruction to human intercourse.) When princes shall come out of Egypt, and Ethiopia shall stretch out her hands to God? Has not the time dawned upon our world, when he shall judge many nations and rebuke many people? And they shall beat their swords into plough shares, and their spears into pruning hooks, when nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more? Does it not appear from the dispensations of providence, that God is about to commit the evangelizing of the whole world, in a large proportion to Great Britain and America? Who send out ambassadors to the sea as these nations? In the midst of all the follies and ambition of both Great Britain and America, where has the truth so many firm and enlightened friends, as in these two nations? Still, things are not among us as they should be, especially in the Presbyterian church, under the care of the Assembly. What are our churches, what are our pastors doing? Surely we are called upon to look up and behold the hand of God, it is at this time

solemnly depositing a large portion of this work, if not of converting the world, of waking up our own churches and pastors to renewed effort. Are there no means within the power of the Assembly to bring up the church, the whole church, the poor as well as the rich, to come forward, at the dawning of this glorious day? Are not the Assembly bound immediately to enquire whether the pastoral relation, so well calculated to beget a family feeling, has not been made to administer to the growth of a *selfish spirit*, which of all others, is most hostile to the spirit of the gospel and of Christ? A noble generosity, is as much an element of the gospel as is holiness. Repentance and remission of sins must be preached to all nations—but we must begin at Jerusalem—at home.

Dear brethren of the Presbyteries—I would humbly, but affectionately, ask you, and pray you to ask the Assembly, if there be no better means of promoting the gospel among ourselves, than those now employed, but as each Presbytery appointing each of their members at their stated meetings to preach a sermon or two each in their vacancies. Shall the Assembly fold its hands, and not speak to our numerous pastors, and enquire whether there are no means of giving the whole Presbyterian church more of the spirit and form of a great missionary society. The above plan was as you see, unanimously approved by the Synod of Indiana. Suffer me to subjoin the proceedings of the Synod of Kentucky in the premises.

Extracts from the proceedings of the Synod of Kentucky, October 17, 1841.

Drs. Blythe and MacMaster were then heard on the subject of missions, after which the committee to whom the subject had been referred presented their report, which was accepted and adopted, and is as follows: Resolved,

1. That the following minute be sent down to our church sessions, viz. The Synod of Kentucky request the eldership in each of our churches to enquire at the churches and congregations, whether they are willing to relinquish a part (say one-fifth) of their pastors' time, to be by them devoted to preaching the gospel and other ministerial labours in destitute parts, as they may be directed by their Presbyteries, and this without affecting the pecuniary responsibilities of the churches to their pastors, and that a full report be made by all the churches on this subject at the next meeting of their Presbyteries.

The Rev'd Mr. Scoval laid the subject before the Synod of Cincinnati, and by letter from him, I learn it met with a most favourable reception. Thus, dear brethren, I have laid the whole matter before you. I commit it to God, and to your prayerful consideration.

Dear brethren of the Presbyteries—there is another subject on which I feel bound to address you. It is the means of raising larger sums of money, to promote the grand efforts of the day. We need two things. A larger amount of money, and that amount rendered less fluctuating. I am far from thinking that any of the efforts of the church have been a failure, but certainly they have all of them been less successful than was desirable, and these failures have often been for the want of money. After so many years of

experience, cannot we improve upon our plans? I firmly believe we can and will. We must have money, and it must be greatly augmented as the business is daily increasing upon our hands. The sources from which the money is derived, must be more certain and permanent, and not liable to so many casualties. This matter must be immediately set about in good earnest, or be a reproach to our enemies. 1. Expenses may, in my estimation, be greatly lessened. The principle involved in Boards, must be retained. It cannot be dispensed with, nor is it contrary either to the Bible or to common sense. But why half a score of Boards I never could see. Could not all the business of several of our societies be done by one officer with the assistance of a clerk or two, and the Assembly be spared the infliction and time of hearing three or four different reports? Could not such a man as Walter Lowry do a large portion of the executive business of our whole church, with the aid of a young clerk or two, all in the same building, thus diminishing the expenses of this part of the business one-half, perhaps three-fourths—and the business be greatly simplified. 2. The plan of agencies, besides being the very most expensive, has many weighty objections connected with it. Of these, we cannot now speak. Bad as it is, I have no idea that it ought to be prematurely laid aside. I have heard it announced, not long since, in a Synod, and by a father of some standing, that "agencies were indispensable and could not be done without." I asked myself at the time, are they of Bible authority? I say they are not of Bible authority, and may and ought in due time be laid aside, and will. The collection of funds for these great purposes is a *pastoral* and *parental* duty, and can and must be effected by them, if ever fully done. That the authority of Presbyteries over their pastors, and of pastors over the members of their churches, in this matter of collections for church purposes, is a matter fairly deducible from the Bible, I think can be proven. It will not be denied by Presbyterians, that the authority of the apostles has passed into the hands of Presbyteries. Now the apostle in writing to the Corinthians says, (xvi. 1.) "Now concerning the collection for the saints, as I have given order in the churches of Galatia, even so do ye. Upon the first day of the week let every one of you lay by him in store, as God hath prospered him, that there be no gatherings when I come." From this passage, it seems to me to be fairly inferable that it is the duty of Presbyteries to take order with their members on this subject, just as the apostles "gave order," to the Galatians and Corinthians. Shall it be deemed proper for Presbyteries to see to it that their members preach the gospel? That they are instant in season and out of season? That they are exemplary in all their personal intercourse with their fellow-men both in and out of the church; and never take any "order" with them about those charities upon which the conversion of the world depends? Shall pastors feed their flocks, and from Sabbath to Sabbath inculcate personal and social duties upon them, and make no enquiry of them whether they are, "on the first day of the week laying up in store as God has prospered them," in relief of the perishing millions of our world?

Let this grand project of providing funds for the conversion of the world be at once entered upon, first, by every Presbytery seeing that each minister does his duty in this matter; then by every pastor exciting his people by example and by precept;—and lastly, let parents on the day of the baptism of each of their children solemnly enter the name of their child, the father the name of his child as a member of society, the mother the same name as a member of a different society, with a sum attached to each to be paid quarterly, half-yearly or yearly, by the parents during the infancy of the child, and by the parents enjoined upon the child so soon as capable of discretion. The sum to be increased or diminished as the Lord prospers them or not. In this way the whole Presbyterian church would be an organized body from infancy. I bear my testimony to a plan similar to this being a means of grace in my own family.

Suffer me to subscribe myself

Your fellow-labourer in the Lord,

South Hanover, Indiana.

JAMES BLYTHE.

[For the Spirit of the XIX. Century.]

CRITICAL REMARKS ON MATTHEW XII. 20.

“A bruised reed shall he not break, and smoking flax shall he not quench, *till he send forth judgment unto victory.*”

This passage is variously rendered, as the reader may perceive by referring to the note at the bottom of the page. The words *us viros* have a peculiar signification in the LXX. They may be rendered, *forever, at last, to the end, utterly, ever*, as the connexion

\* *Εως αν ικβαλη us viros τῆς νικισι*—Til he cast out dome to victory, *Wiclif*.—Tyll he send forth judgment unto victory, *Tyndale*, also *Cranmer*.—Till he bring forth, &c., *Geneva*.—Till he cast forth judgment unto victory, *Anglo-Rhemish*.—Whilst he is bringing righteousness unto victory, *Gilbert Wakefield*.—Until he render his judgment victorious, *Thompson*.—Till he render his laws victorious, *Dickinson*.—Jusqu' à ce qu' il rende victorieuse la justice de sa cause, *Version published at Mons*.—Jusqu' à ce qu' il fasse triompher la justice de sa cause, *De Sacy*.—Jusqu' à ce qu' il ait rendu la justice victorieuse, *De Beausobre et Lenfant*.—Fin c'habbia messo fuori il giudicio in vittoria, *Diodati* and *d'Erberg*.—Infin' a tanto, che pronunzj l'ultima sentenza, *Della Lega* and *Ravizza*.—Jusqu' à ce qu' il ait fait triompher la justice, *Pasteurs et les Professeurs*, &c. *de Geneve*.—Bis dass er ausfuehre das gericht zum siege, *Luther*.—Donec ejiciat ad victoriam judicium, *Erasmus*.—Usquedum protulerit ad victoriam judicium, *Beza*.—Donec proferat judicium ad victoriam, *Tremellius*.—Donec ejiciat ad victoriam judicium, *Vulgate*.—Usquedum proferat judicium ad victoriam, *Fabricius*.—Donec ejiciat in victoriam judicium, *Montanus*.—Bis dass er das gericht zum sig ausfuehre, *Erhard*.—Jusqu' à ce qu' il ait fait veniz en avant le jugement en victoire, *David Martin*.

requires. They occur in 1 Cor. xv. 54. Death is swallowed up in *victory*, καταποθη ὁ θάνατος εἰς νίκος. The Apostle here cites and translates Isaiah xxv. 8. He will swallow up death in *victory*, that is, "so that it shall lie forever conquered and prostrate, nor ever again reign over the saints who are Christ's guests at that feast." (See note of Junius and Tremellius, on Is. xxv. 8.) Glassius (Philol. Sacra, 1935,) remarks, νίκος victoria pro perpetuum, 1 Cor. xv. 54, absorpta est mors εἰς νίκος hoc est εἰς αἰῶνα in perpetuum. He says the Hebrew word here translated νίκος victory, signifies also perpetuity, especially when it has *lamed* prefixed as in Isaiah, xxv. 8, where the Hebrew word which signifies *perpetuo*, the LXX. translate εἰς νίκος.\*

Let us then, in this place, translate the words εἰς νίκος, *completely*, or *utterly*, or *forever*, instead of *unto victory*. Making this substitution and retaining the rest of the common version of the clause, it reads thus: "till he send forth judgment *utterly*," (or *completely*, or *forever*). The reader may perhaps suppose that this emendation does not make the sense more clear, but he is requested to suspend his judgment till we proceed a little farther.

The word ἐβαλεν, which is here rendered *send forth*, commonly means *to cast out*. See Matt. vii. 4, 5, 22—viii. 12, 16, 31—ix. 25, 33, 34, 38—x. 1, 8—xii. 20, 26, 27, 28, 35—xv. 17—xvii. 19—xxi. 12, 39—xxii. 13—xxv. 34. These, it is believed, are all the places in which the word occurs in this evangelist.

In twenty of these places it is rendered *cast out*,—once it is rendered *put forth*, (ix. 25,)—twice it is rendered *send forth*—(ix. 38—xii. 20,) once *bringeth forth*—(xii. 35.) In Mark i. 12, the word is rendered *driveth*—"And immediately the spirit *driveth him* (ἐκβαλλει) into the wilderness." In the parallel place in Matthew

\* Other examples of the use of this expression are the following, which the reader may consult. The common version is first given—then the great text of the LXX., and then Thompson's version of the Greek.—2 Sam. ii. 26. Shall the sword devour *forever* μὴ εἰς νίκος καταφαγεται ἡ ρομφαία? Must the sword devour *to a complete victory*? Job xxxvi. 7. He withdraweth not his eyes from the righteous, but with kings are they on the throne; yea he doth establish them *forever* and they are exalted. Οὐκ ἀφελει ἀπο δικαίου ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτοῦ καὶ μετὰ βασιλείων εἰς θρόνον, καὶ καθιεῖ αὐτοὺς εἰς νίκος καὶ ὑψωθήσονται. He will not withdraw his eyes from the righteous, but will seat them *at last* with kings on a throne, and they shall be exalted. Jer. iii. 5. Will he reserve (his anger) forever? will he keep it *to the end*? Μὴ διαμνη εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνα ἡ φυλαχθήσεται εἰς νίκος. Will his anger continue forever? Shall he keep it *to the last*? Lamentations v. 20. Wherefore dost thou forget us *forever*, and forsake us for so long a time? Ἰνατι εἰς νίκος ἐπιλήθη ἡμῶν καταλιχθῆς ἡμᾶς εἰς μακροτητα ἡμερῶν. Wilt thou *utterly* forget us? Wilt thou leave us for length of days? Amos viii. 7. The Lord hath sworn by the excellency of Jacob—Surely I will *never* forget any of their works. Οραμνη κυριος κατα τις ὑπερφανιας Ιαχοβ εἰ ἐπιλησθησεται εἰς νίκος παντα εργα ὑμων. The Lord swearth in opposition to this arrogance of Jacob, that none of these works of yours shall *ever* be forgotten.

(iv. 1.) the word *απηχθη* is used instead of *εκβαλλει*. Luke (iv. 1.) uses the word *ηγετο*, was led.\*

The translators of the common version departed, in the place under consideration, from the usual sense of the word, probably because it was not easy to conceive what could be meant by *casting out* (*την κρισην*) *the judgment*—and yet it is not much, if any, more easy to conceive what is meant by *sending forth judgment unto victory*. Mr. Barnes in his notes on the Gospels says “judgment (*κρισην*) here means *truth*—the truth of God, the *Gospel*. It shall be victorious. It shall not be vanquished. Though not such a conquerer as the Jews expected, yet he *shall conquer*,” &c. The word *κρισις*, then, it seems may mean *truth, the gospel!!* If we join this sense to the literal and primary sense of *εκβαλη*, we have the reading “till he shall cast out or expel the truth or the gospel *unto victory*” (that is, utterly, or *entirely*, or *forever*, for such we have proved is the meaning of *εις νικος*). Such cannot be the sense of this passage.

But if we can determine the true meaning of these words, (*την κρισην*) *the judgment*, it will not be difficult to choose between the various meanings (if it has more than one) of *εκβαλη*. The word *κρισις* occurs in John xii. 31, and Michælis makes the following note upon it, “*judicium quod*, Gen. iii. 15, *serpenti infernali interminatum*,” and he cites Is. i. 27—Matt. xii. 20, the place under consideration. Let us adopt the idea of Michælis with a modification: *namely*, instead of confining the word *judgment* to the condemnation pronounced against Satan, let us extend its signification to the whole of that first great judicial transaction recorded in Gen. iii.—which extended to man and *to the earth itself*, as well as to the serpent. In short, let us understand the word (*την κρισην*, the) *judgment* to signify the *curse* which God pronounced at the fall—by which we mean, not merely *the act of pronouncing judgment* against man and the earth and the serpent, but also the effects of that judgment upon the world, including physical nature. The casting of Satan out of this world, (John xii. 31,) of which he is the prince—the annihilation of his dominion, and of its effects—the expul-

\* The word *εκβαλλει* in Mark i. 12, implies in it a *force compelling*, as is proved by the parallel places in Matt. iv. 1, and Luke iv. 1. In the opinion of some persons, there were always some visible signs of the Spirit upon the prophets. They were (*πνευματοφοροι*) men agitated by the Spirit—men impelled or driven, and as the word *labourer* is used by Paul to signify a prophetic minister, we may see the peculiar significancy of the word *εκβαλη*, in Matt. ix. 38, where our Lord commanded his disciples to pray the Lord of the harvest that he will send forth (i. e. cast out or cast forth) labourers into his harvest. The expression implies that the mission of these labourers as prophetic ministers was not without some force from the hand of the Lord, that *casts them forth* into his harvest. It would have been better, therefore to have rendered the word in Matt. ix. 28, *cast forth*, or *drive*, as it is rendered in Mark i. 12, than by *send forth*, which does not necessarily imply the idea which has been just now suggested.

sion of all evil agencies, and of the curse itself, is a work which must of necessity precede the restitution of all things, of which God hath spoken by the mouth of all his holy prophets since the world began.—Acts, iii. 21.

Let us then substitute in the passage we are considering, for the words "send forth," *expel*, or *cast out*, for the word "judgment" the words *the curse*, and for the words "unto victory," *utterly*, or *entirely*, or *forever*. We shall then have the following reading, "A bruised reed shall he not break, and smoking flax shall he not quench "till he cast out the curse utterly," (entirely or forever).\*

\* It is to be observed that Matthew does not cite the LXX. *verbatim*, but the expression *αλλα εις αληθειαν εξοισι κρισιν*, in the LXX. is that which appears to correspond to *τωις αν εκβαλη εις νικος την κρισιν*, in Matthew. The whole expression in the LXX. runs thus, "A bruised reed he will not break, nor extinguish dimly burning flax, but he will bear forth judgment unto truth." In Matthew—"A bruised reed he will not break, and smoking flax he will not quench, until he cast out the judgment entirely," that is to say, he will never break the bruised reed nor extinguish the smoking flax, but will preserve them until the final consummation of the present state of things and afterwards, when a new economy shall be introduced, and when the church which is symbolized by the bruised reed, &c., shall enter upon her triumphant state, of which a bruised reed will not be a fit emblem. The expression is a Hebraism signifying *never*. See Rom. v. 13, for an example. For *until* the law, sin was in the world, (*αχρι*) &c., and so it was *afterwards*. Michal had no children till (*τωις*) her death, i. e. never had any. Isaiah xxii. 14; 1 Sam. xv. 35; 2 Sam. vi. 23. The expression of the LXX. being absolute, implies as much. A bruised reed he will not break, or *never* break, *but*, &c. It is not so easy, however, to see the equivalency, between *εις αληθειαν εξοισι κρισιν*—and *εκβαλη εις νικος την κρισιν*. If it be admitted, however, that the expressions are not equivalent, we must give the preference to the inspired evangelist rather than the uninspired version of the LXX., and even as between the Hebrew text and the evangelist, the preference must be given to the latter. It is not unfrequent that a later prophet is inspired to foretell the same things more minutely than his predecessors.—Whether, therefore, we consider Matthew as an inspired commentator upon Isaiah, or as foretelling the same things more intimately or with further particulars, or more definitely, he is the chief authority, and therefore his expressions should not be curtailed or abridged of their meaning in order to bring them into exact correspondency either with the LXX. or the Hebrew text. Bearing this principle in mind, it may be remarked, that the phrase above cited from the LXX. expresses perhaps the same, or nearly the same idea as that of Matthew, though in a different form. Schott, in the judgment of Tholuck (see Commentary on John i. 9.) has shewn that *το αληθες* denotes "that which may be depended upon." If the allusion here is to the present condition of things, and to that altered condition which it is the purpose of God ultimately to introduce, we may understand by the expression "bearing forth (the present

We must now ask the reader's attention to a few observations upon the first part of this passage. It is a quotation with some modification, as the reader doubtless knows, from Isaiah xlii, and

condition of things as) the curse or judgment (of God has made them) and substituting for them that new order which is according to the original creation, which was according to the will of God, and which when restored will not again be marred, or changed. According to this sense, Christ came to bear witness to the truth. And the question of Pilate, "what is truth?" called for an answer, which could not be understood by him, or by any, until its realization shall be manifested in the restitution of all things. No believer, it is presumed, will deny that the earth is not now what it was when God pronounced it very good. Nor will any believer deny that this altered condition was introduced by the just judgment of God, which followed the first transgression. Nor will he deny that the present order of things is destined to pass away. *Παραγμὶ γὰρ τὸ σχῆμα τῶν κόσμων*, 1 Cor. vii. 31; 2 Pet. iii. 7, 13. And Paul, citing Hagg. ii. 7, "Yet once more I shake not the earth only, but also the heaven" gives us this commentary on the expression *yet once more*—"it signifieth the removing of those things that are shaken," &c., "wherefore we receiving a kingdom which cannot be moved," &c.—a true kingdom—one which can be depended on—which will be in the new creation. The idea, then, which it is suggested this expression of the LXX. conveys, is, that Christ will carry or bear out, or change the effects of the curse upon this world, into the truth, or an order of things, which may be depended upon; that is, he will expel the curse utterly from the earth and restore all things to the excellency in which they were created. Such a state of things will be true or agreeable to the will of God, and will therefore endure.

It is also to be observed, that Matthew uses the article with *κρίσις* in the place we are considering, whereas the LXX. do not. Winer says ἡ *κρίσις*, in the New Testament, means the judgment of the world by Messiah. In several places it does undoubtedly signify the judgment of the great day, which will be ushered in by the advent of the Lord Messiah in glory—Matthew xi. 41, 42; Luke x. 14; xi. 31, 32, and without the article, the connexion in several places shews that such must be the meaning—Matt. x. 15; xi. 21, 22; xii. 36; Mark vi. 11; 2 Pet. ii. 9; iii. 7; Jude 6; 1 John iv. 17; Rev. xiv. 7; John v. 29; Heb. x. 27; Matt. xxiii. 33; 1 Tim. v. 24; Heb. ix. 27. But the judgment in question, cannot be that future judgment, because it is something which shall be cast out. There would be no sense in saying that the judgment which the Messiah shall exercise or execute shall be cast out. No body supposes that to be the meaning. In fact the word *ἐκβαλεῖν* has a different and a forced sense given to it, in order to get a meaning for the entire phrase, which is intelligible and according to the supposed analogy of the faith. And as we have seen, even the word *κρίσις*, judgment is, by one learned commentator, made to mean "Gospel" in this place for the same purpose, though it has not that meaning in any other place of the New Testament. In

it may throw light upon it to take a brief survey of that chapter. In the first eight verses, the prophet describes the first advent of our Lord and the establishment of the gospel among Jews and Gentiles. This was his advent of meekness. He was unobtrusive, gentle, persuasive, inviting, (See an illustration of this remark at the end of the 11th chap. of Matt. verses 28 to 30)—Yet for all that the prophet tells us, he will carefully watch over and tenderly yet powerfully preserve all that put their trust in him. The bruised reed and the dimly burning flax are emblems by which his followers individually and collectively (or as an existing church on earth) are here represented. These are not only fit, but beautifully expressive emblems of humble, afflicted Christians; and they just as well represent the church itself in its present condition. Every Christian, with his weaknesses and sorrows, is in fact an emblem of the whole body of the church itself. As every member suffers and will suffer during the dispensation of the church militant so long as he lives on earth, it cannot be otherwise than that the whole body should be a suffering and an afflicted body, till the time of the end, when the kingdom shall be given to the people of the saints, and they become kings and priests unto God and reign with Christ their Head.

Our blessed Lord said to his first disciples, and through them he says to all believers, "In the world ye shall have tribulation." He assured them of the hatred of the world, and the prophet Daniel (vii. 22,) foretold that the little horn will prevail against the saints until the time come when the saints shall possess the kingdom.

But not to cite more proofs, the passage may teach that our Lord will preserve his militant and afflicted church (the bruised reed,) from being broken or crushed, (the dimly burning flax) from being extinguished, until he shall (at his second coming,) cast out Satan

fact, while the translators of the English version in common use, have rendered it *accusation*, 2 Pet. ii. 11; Jude ix.—and *condemnation*, John iii. 19; v. 25—and even *damnation*, v. 29—and *judgment*, in the sense of the *day of judgment*—and also in the sense of judging, they have no where rendered it *gospel*. What then is the judgment  $\kappa\alpha\tau' \epsilon\lambda\theta\omicron\chi\eta\upsilon$ ? or the particular judgment which the article seems to point out? What judgment so memorable as that which came upon all men to condemnation, Rom. v. 16, and upon Satan, Gen. iii. 14, and the ground itself, Gen. iii. 17? Was not this a judicial transaction to which the word  $\kappa\epsilon\iota\sigma\iota\varsigma$  may with propriety be applied? If so, may not the word, without any unnatural or even unusual figure, be used so as to include the effects of this first judgment, as well as the act of judgment? And if this also be conceded, may not the word  $\epsilon\kappa\beta\alpha\lambda\eta$  be understood in its obvious and primary sense, of expelling or casting out? Let the reader only get his own consent to understand the phrase according to the primary import of the terms composing it, without troubling himself by a search after the analogy of the faith, and what is more plain or simple? Why should it be thought incredible that God should expel the curse from the world and restore all things to their original perfection?

and the curse, and achieve a victory over every evil agency whether spiritual or physical, which hitherto has afflicted it.

At verse ninth of this chapter, the prophet pauses: he announces that the predictions relative to the dispensation of the gospel to the Gentiles—meaning the dispensation now present—are, come to pass. By a bold figure, he goes forward and takes his stand at the last day of this dispensation, and looks over into the new economy which is to succeed—"The former predictions; lo! they are come to pass"—that is, the predictions relative to the present dispensation of the gospel—"New events I now declare unto you—before they spring forth I make them known unto you," that is the predictions concerning this new age or millennial economy which is appointed to succeed the present: then the prophet, by another bold figure, calls upon all mariners and things in the sea—the distant sea coasts and the inhabitants of the continents to which they belong—the deserts, and the cities, and the villages, and they that dwell in Kedar.—In one word—the whole world that now is, to sing a new song to Jehovah, and utter his praise in prospect of the series of events which he is now about to declare. This is the preface to the prediction that follows. It is not addressed to those who *shall live* in that future dispensation, but to the men of the world in its present state. The prophet then announces the second advent of our Lord, and in all its parts, the description of it is a sort of antithesis to that which he had given of the first advent.

"Jehovah shall march forth as a hero—like a mighty warrior shall he rouse his vengeance—he shall cry aloud—he shall shout amen—he shall exert his strength against his enemies. I have holden my peace, (during all the gospel dispensation from his first advent,) shall I keep silence forever? Shall I still contain myself? I will cry out like a woman in travail breathing short and drawing in my breath with violence."—(See Lowth's translation.)

The second going forth marks the epoch of the utter expulsion of the curse and the end of this present dispensation, until which the church, though afflicted and bruised, though tossed and not comforted—though oppressed like the widow (mentioned in Luke xviii. 1—8) by a mighty adversary, shall be preserved.\*

This forty-second chapter of Isaiah, then, has respect to the two advents of our Lord, and the interval which divides them; and the verse in Matthew, which we have been considering, teaches, that Christ will preserve his church, feeble as it is, and always will be, during its militant condition, until the restitution of all things, at the second advent, when the Lord will come forth like a mighty warrior, and shall cast out (*εβαλει*) the curse (*την κηρην*) utterly and forever.

If, then, this be the true meaning of the passage, and if such a condition as may be fitly represented by a bruised reed, and smok-

\* Nicolas de Lyra gives the following gloss upon the words translated *till he send forth judgment unto victory*. "Id est donec veniat ad exequendum extremum judicium in quo manifestabitur sua victoria. Tunc enim inimici ejus ponentur plenarie sub pedibus ejus ut habetur in Ps. viii. Omnia subjecti sub pedibus ejus."

ing flax, be a mark of the true church, during the whole of the present dispensation, it does not belong to the Roman Catholic church, which for centuries swayed the political destinies of Europe, and had the power to humble the proudest and most mighty of its monarchs, at the feet of her chief pontiff. The kings and the potentates of Europe have been as reeds bruised and crushed under the anathemas of the so called spiritual (though in truth the secular) power of the See of Rome.

---

"DOCTRINES AND PRACTICES" OF THE CHURCH OF ROME.

*No. 2, of the Controversy with the Domestic Chaplains of the Archbishop of Baltimore.*

THE NECESSITY OF THE REFORMATION.

THE Reformation of the church in the 16th century, constitutes a grand epoch in the history of Christianity. It was a glorious revival of religion, wrought through the instrumentality of Luther, Zuingle, Calvin, and other illustrious men. It was a mighty revolution which changed the entire character of the religious and political world, and produced effects which will be felt to the end of time. It subverted principles which had long been revered as divine, it introduced new modes of thought and action, and created an extraordinary excitement throughout the whole of Europe. It agitated the learned in their universities, the nobles in their castles, the monks in their cloisters, and the populace in their peaceful homes.

Ecclesiastical revolutions are always momentous, and never proceed from insignificant causes. They always exert a mighty influence on the community for good or evil, and nothing but imperious necessity can ever be plead in their justification. Such moral convulsions dare not be attempted on slight and insufficient grounds.

Protestants maintain that Christianity was restored to its primitive, scriptural simplicity and integrity by the Reformation of the 16th century,—that the temple of the Lord was purged of the foul abominations which had tarnished its glory for ages,—that the doctrines, precepts and ordinances of God were cleansed of the excrescences which had been permitted to grow upon them.

Was there any necessity for the Reformation of the Church in the 16th century? Had she degenerated so far in her doctrine and morals as to justify the measures of the Reformers?

These questions will be answered by considering the corruptions in *doctrine, worship* and *morals* that universally prevailed in the Church prior to that remarkable event.

It will be observed, that the errors which prevailed, were not of an unimportant character, which might be tolerated in consistency with Christian orthodoxy, but they affected the foundations of the Christian faith, and entirely subverted the system of doctrine and morality taught by Christ and the Apostles.

Numerous *doctrines* were imposed upon the Church as divine, which are not even mentioned in the Scriptures, nor are they sanc-

tioned by primitive antiquity.—Let it be remembered, too, that the same doctrines are to this day, maintained by the Church of Rome.

1. *The infallibility of the Bishop or the Church of Rome was universally held.* The testimony of Romish writers alone shall be adduced in support of this doctrine. "The pope," says Bellarmine, a standard authority in the Church of Rome,—“is absolutely above the Catholic Church, and above a general council,—that the pope, when he instructs the whole church in things concerning the faith, cannot possibly err.” “He cannot err, he cannot be deceived,” says another, “it must be conceived concerning him that he knows all things.” Three or four councils have ascribed infallibility to the pope, particularly that of Florence, under pope Eugene, in opposition to the decision of the Council of Basil. Bellarmine again asserts,—“If the Pope should command vice and prohibit virtue, the church would be bound to believe vice to be good and virtue to be evil.” “It is evident,” says the Canon Law, “that the pope who was called God by Constantine, can neither be bound nor loosed by any secular power, for it is manifest that a God cannot be judged by men.”

2. *The Pope's sovereign power over the universal Church was maintained.* “The supremacy of the pope”—says Bellarmine—“is the main substance of Christianity.” It was held that every Christian under pain of damnation, is bound to be subject to him,—that no appeal can be made from him, and that he alone is the supreme Judge, but cannot be judged by any one on earth. Hence Bzovius says, “The pope is monarch of all Christians—supreme over all mortals. He is judge in heaven, and in all earthly jurisdiction supreme, and arbiter of the world.” And Boniface VIII. says, “It is necessary to salvation that all Christians should be subject to the Roman Pontiff.”

3. *The dominion of the Popes over the temporal governments of the earth, was arrogated by themselves and defended by their parasites.* They maintained the right of deposing princes, absolving their subjects from their oath of allegiance, and transferring their dominions to whomsoever they pleased. This extraordinary power has been frequently exercised. Bellarmine himself counted eighteen popes who have occasioned the dethronement of princes. No man can recount the usurpations and rapine, the perjuries and murders, the treason and rebellion, the confusion and desolation which the assumption and exercise of this impious authority have occasioned in the world.

4. *The absurd doctrine of Transubstantiation was universally held.* The Church of Rome contended, and of course now contends, that the consecrated bread and wine in the Lord's supper, are actually so transmuted in their essential qualities as to cease being any longer literal bread and wine, and henceforth become literal and proper, and substantial and material flesh and blood. The Council of Trent says, “That if any one shall deny that in the most holy sacrament of the eucharist, there are contained truly, really, and substantially, the body and blood, together with the soul and divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ, and therefore the whole Christ, he is accursed.”

This monstrous absurdity was established as an article of faith, in the Lateran Council, under Pope Innocent III., in the year 1215.

5. *The celibacy of the Clergy was universally inculcated.* The first pope who condemned the marriage of priests was Siricius, almost four hundred years after Christ. The Council of Trent anathematized all who say that the marriages of priests are valid.

The recital of the enormous wickedness which followed the adoption of this doctrine, would fill every delicate ear with horror. The practical libidinousness of the unmarried clergy was carried to such a shameful extent, and such was the dread entertained of these reputed representatives of the Holy Ghost, that in some places, the people required them to live in concubinage in order to prevent them from disturbing the peace and purity of their families. In the remonstrance which some divines of Germany presented to the pope, soliciting permission for the clergy to marry, they assert, "that among fifty Catholic priests, hardly one will be found who is not notoriously libidinous."

6. *The doctrine of the seven Sacraments was and is now universally held by the Church of Rome.*

To Baptism and the Lord's supper, were added Confirmation, Penance, Extreme Unction, Holy Orders and Matrimony. Hugo de St. Victorie and Peter Lombard about the year 1144, first taught that there were seven sacraments, and the Council of Florence held in 1438, first determined this number, contrary to all correct interpretation of the scriptures.

7. *The doctrine of merits was universally taught.* The Council of Trent taught (Sess. 6, Can. 32) that the good works of justified persons are truly meritorious; deserving not only an increase of grace, but eternal life and an increase of glory; and it has anathematized all who deny this doctrine. The scriptures on the contrary teach, that we are justified by faith without the works of the law, and that while good works will proceed from genuine faith, yet that they are not meritorious.

8. *The distinction of sins into venial and mortal was every where inculcated.* The *venial* were those which might be forgiven, and the *mortal* those which incurred censure or the penalty of death. The Douay Catechism reduces the *deadly* or *capital* sins to seven in number—pride, covetousness, luxury, anger, gluttony, envy and sloth. Now when we consider that sin, in every form and degree, is the object of the divine abhorrence, and that the wrath of heaven is revealed against unrighteousness without exception,—that it is the alienation of the heart of man from God that constitutes the guilt of the sinner in his sight—what must we conclude of this unauthorized distinction of sins? It opens the door to all iniquity, and this has ever been its legitimate results.

9. *The doctrine of purgatory was and is an essential article of the Romish faith.* "Purgatory is a place in which the souls who depart out of this life are suffered to expiate certain offences, which do not merit eternal damnation. It rests upon the distinction of sins into venial and mortal. In purgatory, they say, the righteous will make expiatory satisfaction for their venial sins by suffering dreadful punishment and thence be translated to heaven." This

doctrine entirely sets aside the atonement of Christ, for it is declared of him that he should finish transgression, make an end of sin, make reconciliation for iniquity and bring in an everlasting righteousness. Dan. ix. 24, Heb. x. 12, 10. Closely allied to that of Purgatory was the doctrine of *Indulgence*. The Roman Church maintained that all the good works of the saints over and above those which were necessary to their own justification, are deposited, together with the infinite merits of Jesus Christ, in one treasury. The keys of this were committed to the pope, who may open it at pleasure; and by transferring a portion of this superabundant merit to any particular person for a sum of money, may convey to him either the pardon of his own sins, or a release for any one in whom he is interested, from the pains of purgatory. This doctrine has ever since been the fruitful parent of all wickedness, for it operates as an encouragement and even a permission to commit sin.

11. The last corruption under this head that shall be mentioned, is *Tradition*. It consists of certain doctrines and precepts, which Christ and the apostles are said to have spoken, but which were never committed to writing. These doctrines and precepts are said to have been delivered by word of mouth, from one age to another—and to have come down to us as pure and uncorrupted as the written word contained in the gospels, and to have the same authority. The Church of Rome, under pretence of Apostolical traditions, obtrudes on the Christian world, as matters necessarily to be believed and practised, many things that are doubtful and uncertain; many that are trifling and puerile; many that are plainly false and injurious, directly contrary to the scriptures and to primitive doctrine and practice.

Many other errors in doctrine, entertained by the Church anterior to the Reformation, might be mentioned, but it is presumed that the reader is satisfied with those already enumerated. These of themselves are sufficient to show the necessity of a Reformation, but we shall exhibit the corruptions of worship in the Church, which will, if possible, more forcibly demonstrate the truth of our proposition.

The Church of Rome has grievously departed from that *rule of worship* which Christ has left us, and has established a worship of her own invention in direct opposition to both.

The *worship of God in an unknown language*, is the first corruption under this head that shall be mentioned. It is well known that nearly all the worship of the Romish Church, is to this day performed in the Latin language. Of course, very few of the worshippers understand it. It is so plainly repugnant to the scriptures, (1 Cor. xiv.) that it is unnecessary to dwell on it here. It is also contrary to the practice of the primitive Church. This their own writers grant, and besides, many distinguished Roman writers acknowledge it would be better to have the public service in the language of the country.

Another corruption is the *propitiatory sacrifice of the mass*. The Council of Trent declares it to be an unbloody sacrifice, in which the priest offers to God the same Christ who hung on the cross, as

an atonement for the living and the dead. This is plainly contrary to the scriptures, Heb. vii. 27; ix. 25—28; x. 10, 14, 18, where the apostle argues the perfection of Christ's sacrifice above those of the law; but if Christ be daily sacrificed in the mass, the sacrifice of Christ must be much more defective than those of the law, for one sacrifice of expiation for the whole congregation of Israel, was thought sufficient for the whole year, whereas the sacrifice of Christ's body in the mass is repeated every day, yea, for one single person he may be sacrificed a thousand times over, and yet this repeated a thousand times more may not procure the release of that one poor soul out of purgatory.

Another instance of gross corruption was *withholding the cup from the laity*. The Council of Constance admits that Christ instituted and administered the Eucharist in both kinds, yet say they, "for the avoiding of some dangers and scandals, the custom is upon reasonable grounds, introduced, that it may be received by lay people under the kind of bread only."

These "scandals" are such, as the danger of spilling the wine, —of carrying it from place to place,—defiling the vessels by being touched by laymen, &c. &c. &c.

*Paying divine honors to the consecrated host*, is another corruption. After the wafer is consecrated, they worship it under the false presumption that it is no longer bread, but transubstantiated into the real body and blood of Christ. No one will pretend to advance any scriptural ground for this absurd rite.

*The veneration of images*, is another gross corruption. It is not necessary to transcribe the many passages of Scripture in which God prohibits and expresses his abhorrence of this sin, and dreadfully threatens those who practice it. Images were not introduced into the churches until the fourth century, and for 600 years after Christ, the popes themselves were opposed to the homage paid to these senseless objects.

*The invocation of Saints* was another corruption. This practice of the Church of Rome is so utterly unfounded, that Cardinal Perron and other learned doctors of that Church, acknowledge that neither precept nor example for it is to be found in the scriptures.

*The veneration paid to the relics of Saints*, was another absurd practice of the Church of Rome. By relics they understand not only the dead bodies of reputed saints and all parts of them, (their nails and hair not excepted,) but all those things that belonged to them. It is not necessary to show that this is condemned by scripture and reason, and that nothing like it was practised by the primitive Christians for more than 300 years after Christ.

This, then, was the state of the Church before the Reformation as respects her *doctrine* and *worship*. It is the state of the church now.—In the next communication, the state of her morals anterior to that glorious event, shall be exhibited, and then the reader may judge whether a reformation was necessary or not,—or in other words, whether Protestants do not hold the religion of God in its scriptural simplicity and integrity.

## THE RESULT OF THE EFFORT MADE BY THE 'SLAVE HOLDERS' CONVENTION' AT ANNAPOLIS.

IN our number for March, the reader may remember, we published a *Remonstrance* against the *Petition* of the 'Slave-Holders' Convention,' referred to above; and gave a syllabus of the plan dictated by that Convention to the Legislature of Maryland for the perpetuation of slavery in this commonwealth, and for the total ruin of its 62,000 and more, free blacks. The Bill which was brought into the popular branch of the Legislature, by a large and influential committee of the house, was far worse than the project of the Convention; and exhibited a system of injustice and impolicy the most indefensible that was ever, in our knowledge, seriously proposed to the people of this state, by any party, on any subject. We add with deep regret, that this Bill, somewhat amended, but yet retaining its main features, passed the House of Delegates by a majority of ten or eleven votes out of some eighty odd that constitute the body.

No serious alarm was felt by the public generally, that the Legislature would lend itself to such proceedings, until the Bill actually passed the lower house; and then only about twelve days remained, before the Assembly would be compelled, by the constitution, to adjourn. An immediate and overwhelming burst of public indignation was heard in nearly every part of the state; and in some portions of it, as in the city of Baltimore, the opposition to the Bill, was, apparently, almost unanimous. We doubt whether the advocates of the Bill, even though led by our old friend, CHARLES H. PITTS, *Counsellor, &c. &c.* (favourably known to our readers by his connexion with the case in which *James L. Maguire, Esq'r, Colonel, &c. &c.* prosecuted the editor of this journal for libel, two years and a half ago;—could have commanded one in fifty of the votes of this city for their abominable measure. The result was that the senate rejected the Bill, by a vote, as we understand, of fifteen to six. And so the matter stands for the present.

We have reason to believe that this movement in Maryland, is not by any means isolated and unpremeditated; but that it is part of a concerted plan covering all the border slave states, if not the entire slave interest; and that it will be renewed from time to time, here and elsewhere, in various forms and under various pretexts—as the ambition of party leaders, or the reckless folly of heated partizans may suggest. Let the friends of public order and peace, of moderate councils, of the progress of civilization, and of the union of the states, therefore, consider the signs of the times, and what their duty calls them to do.

There can be no doubt, that throughout all the slave holding country, a state of sound, thoughtful and enlightened sentiment, upon this whole subject, is far more extensive and far more mature, than superficial observers have any idea of. We have watched this subject for above twenty years, with deep interest and fixed attention, and with no ordinary opportunities of making up a true judgment. And we unhesitatingly assert, that in our opinion, the

violent proceedings, counsels and opinions, uttered by newspapers, politicians, and loafers, do not express the views of the great mass of the people in the whole slave-holding states. The people are not in favour of cruel, violent, or unreasonable measures or principles. We appeal to the recent developments of public sentiment in Kentucky and Maryland, in proof and illustration of what we say.

It is a great element of truth for all practical purposes connected with this whole subject, and which no wise man, and especially no man who loves the Union can overlook, that the physical and political condition of the question, as a general one, is shifting every day, and with ceaseless and irresistible force; whereas all standing still, much less all going back, is not only impossible in the nature of the case, but it is too ridiculous to be thought of, by men with cool heads and large views. The thing cannot happen, in the nature of the case; it is therefore supremely idle, to attempt to force it, by means which only defeat themselves. When South Carolina was as strong as the whole state of New York, she had one position; when she is hardly as strong as *the city of New York*, she has another. When Maryland ranked with Pennsylvania, she was what she was; when she falls behind Illinois, she is what she is. When the slave states were twelve thirteenths of the Union, as they were when the Federal Constitution was adopted, the slave interest was quite another thing from what it is now, when its physical and political power is as one-third, or as it will be at the next census when it will be perhaps one-fifth. This is the silent, certain, irrepressible result of causes which abolitionists never had any thing to do with, which pro-slavery men are utterly powerless in resisting, and which, whatever we may think of them, have been working, are working, and will go on to work, their own end, by their own inherent force.

Nothing, then, is more clear, than that this matter of slavery, like every other human problem, must work out, in some form or other, its own solution; and that bad laws and projects, are just as certain to disturb as good ones are to promote the process. Whatever may be wise or right elsewhere, Maryland determined, before most of us now alive were born, that this problem could receive only a particular solution in her borders; a solution clear, natural, just, politic, practicable, beneficent. For fifty years, has she adhered to this opinion. And in our poor judgment, every motive and argument that ever commended to her the policy she has so long pursued, still exists with undiminished force. Let her execute it fully and faithfully, and coming generations will bless her venerable name. And she will do it. And they who wish her now to depart from her fixed views, will find, unless we greatly err, that the lessons she has so long taught her children, have been well learned, and are hard to forget.

We had a word to say, in regard to the 'Maryland State Colonization Society,'—and its policy and opinions, lately and formerly avowed by itself or its organs. But we forbear; remarking only, and hoping not to be obliged to recur to that part of the subject, that, in our opinion, *the cause* never stood higher, nor *the society* lower, than at present.

INEDITED LETTER OF CATHERINE DE MEDICI, TO POPE PIUS IV. IN  
RELATION TO THE HUGUENOTS.

THE French Protestants have suffered more and longer for their religion, than any other portion of the Reformed church. They are, on that account, as well as many others, worthy of the very special interest of every other portion of the household of faith; and there is hardly a better sign of the Christian temper of our age than the reviving attention of God's people every where, to this precious portion of his flock.

The horrors of the Parisian massacre of the Huguenots on Bartholomew's day, August 24, 1572, have generally been imputed to the treacherous dissimulation, and ferocious bigotry of Catherine de Medici the Queen Regent of France, in connection with the sanguinary ambition of the Guises, who then were so powerful at her court. Notwithstanding, a letter from Catherine to Pope Pius IV. written about ten years prior to "that deed of darkness," has recently been discovered and published, which proves that at that period, she had very little attachment to the superstitions of popery. The original is found in the Royal Library at Paris, Volume 8476, among the Bethune Manuscripts. The Queen Regent thus wrote :

"Considering, most Holy Father, how great is the number of those who have separated themselves from the Roman Church, it is impossible to subjugate them either by law or by military force.—The Nobles and the Magistrates, by their example, draw the multitude to that faith. Happily, in this withdrawal from Rome, no monstrous opinion has succeeded, either Anabaptist or Anti-Trinitarian. All of them recognize the twelve articles of the Apostles' creed; which if they could be allowed to hold, it would be the best means to consolidate the two Churches. To secure that result, would it not be useful to multiply Conferences, and to command the preaching of peace and charity? We must avoid also, an unhappy obstinacy, that would cause the further separation of those who still adhere to the Catholic Church. I would also propose to you, Most Holy Father, to SUPPRESS ALL WORSHIP OF IMAGES; to administer *Baptism only with water and the word*—the Communion should be *in both kinds*—THE PSALMS SHOULD BE SUNG *in the vulgar tongue*, for those who approach the holy table—in fine, *the festival of the Holy Sacrament should be abolished.*"

This extract unfolds the great extent of the principles of the Reformation; the very excellent character of the Huguenots of that period; the reasonableness and necessity of the Protestant demands for additional amendments; and the profound conviction among all orders of society, that Image-worship is idolatrous; the Popish exorcism, superstitious; the mass, anti-Christian; the use of the Latin language in public worship, wicked; and the Roman festivals, corrupting and abominable. It is a very important document on behalf of the Reformers of the sixteenth century.

SIR ROBERT PEEL'S TESTIMONY IN FAVOUR OF FATHER MATTHEW'S  
TEETOTALISM.

No nation on the earth but the Irish could all become *teetotallers* and drink nothing; and yet drink more spirits than they did when they all drank with all their might. The soberer they are the more, it appears, they drink.—“Fathers,” said one of our brother Washingtonians, “if you are not in danger, your children may be—or if you have no children, some of your daughters may have.”—So may all temperance people say to “Father Theobald Matthew” and his army of 5,000,000 of *teetotallers*, “Brother teetotallers, if you all get drunk together you will hurt the character of all the sober ones amongst you, or if none of you are sober, remember your brethren here, and give them the recipe for being sober drunkards, and hard drinking teetotallers.”

It is a very odd affair, and needs surely, some explanation; for which we will be thankful to any one well versed in Irish teetotopery. For the last newspapers from England inform us, that the British prime minister, Sir Robert Peel, stood up in the Commons House of Parliament, about the middle of March, and said that there had been a steady and regular increase, in the consumption of spirits throughout Ireland, since July 5, 1841; that is, for eight and a half months immediately preceding;—that this increase was so steady as to be capable of regular estimate at six and a half millions of gallons; and that it was so certain and permanent, that a part of the deficit of the revenue of the empire, might be safely relied on, as accruing from a tax on spirit drunk in Ireland; and accordingly an amount from this source equal to \$1,250,000 per annum, is placed in the financial projet of the premier.

Now the queer part of the story is, that up to July 5, 1841, “Father Theobald Matthew,” the great Reformer of Ireland, and all that, had given the pledge to about two-thirds of all the inhabitants of the country; and during the eight and a half months, from that period to the time of Sir Robert Peel's astounding communication to the House of Commons, this army of teetotallers was in full and perfect discipline all over Ireland, and the song of their almost miraculous reform, sung all over America, and perhaps in the very Islands of the sea! Here is a new thing under the sun; a new result of temperance and revenue. In Ireland there were no teetotallers, a moderate revenue from spirits, and general drunkenness. The nearly inspired “Father Theobald Matthew” arose and administered the pledge to three-quarters of that part of the people that drank most, embracing two-thirds or more of the entire population; and the immediate result is, a vast increase in the consumption of spirits, and a steady hard-drinking sufficient to afford, in the way of tax to government, a million and a quarter of dollars a year! If all could be sobered in the same way, it might very decidedly help the deficient finances of the Tory ministry of England!

Our readers well know that we have repeatedly expressed our distrust of the whole movement of ‘Father Matthew,’ judging it to be essentially papal, for papal purposes and on papal grounds. Each successive development has but the more confirmed our original suspicions; and now we have one, on the highest and most indubitable authority, that seems to put the whole matter to rest, so far as it pretended to be a temperance reform. These benighted millions who sign the pledge of “Father Matthew,” and pay him half a crown sterling for his ribbon, certificate, and button, and about a dollar a year afterwards, in the way of contribution; no doubt, help popery to large sums of money. And the oath, the badge, the mustering and the superstitious observances, afford a kind of organization by which the priests may and do increase the efficiency of their complots

against Protestantism, and against the British Government. But as to there being any *temperance* in the affair, much less any *abstinence*, that is another matter.

We hope the American worshippers of "Father Matthew," will look a little into this singular business, and tell us whether the whole of his great national reformation is a mere Irish Bull; or whether its temperance aspect is any thing more than a blind to cover one of those preparatory movements that precede such reforms as the massacre of 1641, or that of St. Bartholomew? What is the meaning of the thing? What do such contradictions and astounding developements signify?

In sober seriousness, is it not strange, that papal temperance societies are purely *sectarian*? That they are all under the controul of the priests? That they produce vast sums of money? That they are united by obligations unknown to those not initiated? *And that the more they extend, the more spirits are consumed, showing that they have nothing to do with temperance?* Have our readers examined the state trials which, not long ago in Ireland, disclosed the wide-spread conspiracy of the "*Ribbon-men*?" And do they remember that "*Matthew's tectotalism*," arose simultaneously with the overthrow of "*Ribbonism*?" Study the history and principles of the Jesuits, and then reflect on these things.

All our readers may not be aware, that a leading Tory, *Lord Alvanly*, during last autumn, published a pamphlet on the state of Ireland; in which he sets out to prove, that the only method of restoring tranquillity to that country, is for the British Government to enter into relations with the Pope of Rome, and take the whole papal hierarchy of Ireland into its pay; that is, virtually, to make popery the state religion of Ireland. It is a somewhat remarkable fact, that this plan is warmly commended in the *Edinburgh Review* (the great Whig quarterly,) for January, 1842; in a studied and elaborate article.

The spirit of Infidelity and Puseyism in England and Scotland respectively seems to keep pace with that of Jesuitism in Ireland; and unless appearances are deceptive, the cause of Christ and that of true civilization, in the United Kingdom, are on the eve of great trials.

---

#### NOTICES, ACCOUNTS, RECEIPTS, &c.

Hugh Nelson, Esq'r, Petersburg, Va., \$5, for 1841 and '42.—Peter Hoy, Esq., Phila., name added from Jan'y '42, and back Nos. sent.—Rev. D. J. Auld, S. C., \$5, for '41 and '2.—In reply to the letter of Rev. Mr. Stanton, Woodville, Miss., we say the Nos. were regularly mailed for himself and Mr. Kellogg from the commencement of the year; but having miscarried, the first three Nos. were sent again to each, on the 24th of March.—J. W. Maxwell, Balt, \$2,50 for '42.—Rev. B. M. Smith of Va., \$8, of which 2,50 for Hugh G. Guthrie, for '42, and \$5,50 for Rev. Wm. Brown, which pays for '41 and '42, and leaves 50 cents over.—Rev. Samuel Steel, Hillsboro, Ohio, \$2,50 for '41.—Mr. Charles Fishback, Staunton, McCoupin Co., Illinois, name added from Jan'y '42, \$2,50 paid, and back Nos. Jan. to April sent. This should have been done two months earlier than it was, but the address was mislaid by us.—Mr. James Crony of Ky., \$10, in full to the end of '42, paid Rev. W. L. B. for us.—Rev. R. Bursleson, Somerville, Ala., name added, by order of Rev. N. A. P., and back Nos., Jan. to April, sent.—By the hands of Mr. Holloway, \$8, of which \$5 for J. S. Berryman, Fayette Co., Ky., for '41 and '2; and \$3 for Rev. J. F. Price, in full to the end of '42: the odd Nos. written for by Mr. P. in his letter of March 7, (which came to hand April 5) sent by mail: in regard to the bound vols., we did not see Mr. H. and therefore did not hand them to him, and will hold them in readiness, subject to the directions of Mr. Price or Mr. Berryman; they will remember, however, that we have no vol. for '38, though, from the odd Nos. we have, and those they may command,

it is most probable a vol. for that year can be made out, if they attend to it soon.—This work has been regularly sent to Rev. H. McDonald, Philadelphia, Nashoba Co., Miss.—but, since the receipt of his letter of March 18, all the Nos. except the one acknowledged, have been sent a second time: the account of Rev. J. N. Waddel stands thus on our books, he subscribed in October 1840, and paid at that time \$5 in Alabama money, less 50 cts., postage—\$4,50; discontinued at the end of '41, say 14 years, \$3,12½, leaving \$1,37½ due him; which is credited to the account of Mr. McDonald.—Rev. J. L. Montgomery, St. Francisville, La., \$5, in full till June, '42.—Benjamin Snodgrass, West Hanover P. O., Dauphin Co., Pa., returns the March and April Nos. the former in a most dilapidated condition, and causes us to pay postage for the valuable information that a vol. of our periodical is rendered useless; it is a great mystery to us, how gentlemen who can permit themselves to act thus, should ever have thought of subscribing for our periodical.—Rev. John J. Carroll, Harmony, N. J., name added from April, by order of Mr. A. McLain.—P. M. Lexington, Ky., under date of April 4, informs us that the Nos. sent to Samuel Laird and A. Logan are refused, those sent to Mrs. Dallam and Dr. Marshall remain in the office, and that to Mrs. Clarke should be sent to Boonville, Mo.: what friend in Lexington will get us five subscribers and remit the money?—John McAllister, Danville, Va., returns the March and April Nos., sends us a pamphlet he got from some other quarter, taxes us with postage, and ruins a volume of our work; we have reason to be thankful the case is no worse.

*Money paid D. Owen.* Executors of Samuel Richards of Phila. \$11,75; Dr. Wm. McDowell, Phila., for '42; Gen'l McDonald of Balt., for himself and for Mr. James Canan, N. Y., for '42, \$5; M. Newkirk of Phila., in full and discontinued;—J. B. Cambden, Mo., Mr. W. Tunstall, do., Dr. G. O. Tenchard, Md., Mr. George Dunn, Va., Robert Ritchie, do., Col. James McDowell, do., each \$2,50 for 1842.

The following persons have paid D. Owen, at various times since Jan'y last, in reply to his circular; where nothing is said, their payment is in each case, up to the end of 1841, that is, in full for the former work; those with the star (\*) added, discontinued from that time; who will get us new names in the place of them?—Col. George Thompson, Ky., \$10; J. Allemong,\* Va., \$6; M. C. Davis, Pa. \$5; Rev. Mr. Spottswood, Md., \$2,50; Charles Macalister, Esq.,\* Phila., \$10; M. L. Bevan,\* Phila., \$5; James Donaldson,\* N. Y. city, \$15; J. Butler, Md., \$2,50; A. Symington,\* Phila., \$2,50; Gen. John H. Cock of Va., \$11,25 (to the end of '42); A. Robertson, Esq'r, Phila., \$5; Moses Worman, Md., \$10; A. D. Pool,\* do. \$12,50; John Kitton,\* Pa., \$3,50; Rev. Upton Beall, Va., \$3,75, (to the end of '42); Solomon Allen,\* Phila., \$10; Rev. S. McDonald, Md., \$2; Rev. P. Harrison, Va., \$5, (to the end of '42); Dr. A. W. Mitchell,\* Phila., \$2,50; Rev. J. C. Watson, Pa., \$2,50; Rev. Dr. S. S. Smucker,\* Pa., \$7,50; Gen. M. C. Stanley,\* Pa., \$5; J. L. Hawkins, Pa., \$10 (to the end of '42); W. Tate,\* Va., \$2; Rev. J. M. Caldwell, N. C. \$5; J. B. Brackinridge, Esq. Va. \$7,50; Rev. J. Hendren,\* Va. \$2,50; J. McAllister,\* Va. \$3,50; Rev. T. Aitken,\* N. Y. \$3; Rev. A. Penick, N. C. \$5; Willis Collins,\* Ky. \$1,75; James Robinett, Pa. \$2,50; Mrs. J. B. Bibb, Ky., \$2,50, (subsequently paid R. J. B. \$2,50 for '42; ) Judge Broadnax, do. \$2,50, (also paid R. J. B. \$2,50 for '42); Henry Grider,\* Esq. Ky. \$2,50; Matthew Grier, Pa. \$2,50; Rev. Mr. White, Va. \$2,50; Mr. Taylor, Va. \$2,50; Rev. Dr. Potts of N. Y., \$15, (of which \$3,75 on the present work); Rev. R. Steel, Pa. \$5; B. Borden,\* Ala. \$11,30; Mr. S. D. Schoolfield, N. C. \$4, (of which \$1,50 on the present work); Mr. R. F. Witherspoon, Ala., \$5; Mr. Wm. F. McRee, Salma, Ala, \$5, (2,50 for '42 subsequently received by R. J. B. along with the names of three new subscribers, and \$7,50 for their subscription for the current year—which is credited and the back Nos. from Jan'y to April sent to each; with thanks to Mr. McRee.)

# SPIRIT OF THE XIX. CENTURY.

---

---

VOL. I.

JUNE, 1842.

No. 6.

---

---

THE RULE OF FAITH.—A DISCOURSE TO VINDICATE THE INCARNATE WORD.—DELIVERED BY ORDER OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA FOR 1841, BEFORE THAT FOR 1842.—BY ROBERT J. BRECKINRIDGE, MODERATOR OF THE FORMER ASSEMBLY.

Faith should not stand in the wisdom of men, but in the power of God.—  
1 Cor. ii. 5.

I. THE service which I am now about to perform, Fathers and Brethren of the General Assembly, and the theme which I am to discuss, were both assigned to me by your immediate predecessors in this venerable court. Called to address them while then in session, and by them, thus, a second time distinguished,\* only on account of my known devotion to the great principles of the Reformation, and my humble but abundant labours in defence of the common doctrine of the Reformed Churches; I hail with joy these proofs of the reviving interest of the people of God in these great subjects, and proceed to the discussion of the one before me, as to that which presents one of the broadest lines of demarcation between an age of darkness and an age of light, between a church in bondage and a church set free, between a pure and evangelical faith and a blind, perfidious and cruel superstition. For that faith which rests upon the wisdom of man, cannot fail to be unstable, contradictory, corrupt and false as the nature of him, who at his best estate is altogether vanity; while that which stands in the power and demonstration of God, must needs be like himself, perfect and eternal.

There is, no doubt, an apparent resemblance between the religion of the Bible and that of Rome; a resemblance strengthened by the addition of the name, *Christian*, to those of *Catholic*, *Roman*, and *Apostolic*, adopted by the followers of the Pope; and still farther, in our age and country, by vague and hollow claims of fellowship with us, by those whose creed demands our blood, and whose annals are crowded with their cruel mockings and pitiless butcheries of our brethren in Christ Jesus. But this resemblance exists only in appearance, and vanishes utterly before the slightest inspection of the two systems.

\* See printed Minutes of the Assembly of 1841, p. 432, and p. 437.

Thus, there is an apparent resemblance in this, that both the Bible and Rome teach the unity of the Godhead, as the grand distinction and chief foundation of revealed religion. But the Bible holds up to us, the one only and self-existent God—as the sole object of all religious worship, and denounces all worship rendered to any other object, or even to this glorious God himself by the intervention of images, as heinous sin. Rome, on the contrary, teaches that divine worship is due to the Virgin, to the consecrated host, to the true cross; and that religious adoration is to be paid to angels, to departed saints, and even to their relics, yea to pictures and images. So that they whose faith stands in the power of God, differ from those whose faith stands in carnal wisdom, even as to the grand and fundamental question of the object of religious worship.\*

So as to the way of access to the only true and adorable God, and the whole method of salvation for sinful men—the religion of the Bible and that of Rome, however apparently alike to the superficial observer, are in fact wholly irreconcilable. For the one teaches us, that the only access to God is by the blood of a divine Redeemer, who is Christ the Lord, and who is the way, the truth, and the life; and that it is solely through faith in his name, effectually manifested in godly repentance and new obedience, that we are made partakers of the benefits of his work of redemption. But the other teaches, that there are multitudes of intercessors for us with God, to whom we ought to apply and to whom an important part of our salvation is to be ascribed; that the merit of our good works is efficacious with God, and a proper ground of our hope before him; that the sacraments have an inherent power to commend us to God; and that faith in Christ is not the true method of a sinner's justification. So that their teachings are precisely opposite to each other upon the most vital parts of practical religion.†

Again, as to the nature of sin, of holiness, and of the retributions of the world to come, however, at first sight, we may suppose a certain resemblance to exist, there is in reality an exact contrariety. The Bible teaches that nothing is sinful but want of conformity unto or transgression of the law of God, but that every sin deserves his wrath and curse; Rome, that the transgression of her commands is heinous sin, that the violation of many of those of God is only a venial offence, and that separation from her communion draws after it the perdition of the soul. The Bible teaches that holiness of heart and life is the fruit of free grace, and the efficacious work of the divine Spirit in the soul of man, and that without this holiness no man shall see God's face in peace: Rome, that men are regenerated by baptism, kept in an estate of salvation by confirmation, confession, penance, fasts, alms, the sacrifice of the mass, &c. &c., and finally assured of salvation by virtue of

\*See Stillingfleet's "Discourse Concerning the Idolatry of the Church of Rome;" and his Defence of that Discourse, entitled, "An Answer to Several late Treatises;" &c.—See also the Decrees of the Council of Trent.

†See Decrees and Canons of the Council of Trent, on Justification, the Sacraments, the Mass, Indulgences, and the Invocation of Saints.

indulgences, absolution, and extreme unction; the doctrine of the new birth as held by all Christians of all ages, being pronounced by her, not only false, but accursed. The Bible teaches that this life is our only season of probation, and that after it the bodies of men remain under the power of death till the great day of God Almighty, at which they shall be re-united to the souls, which, if they be of the just, have been in heaven, or if of the unjust, in hell—since their separation; and after that the judged enter upon an unchanging state of punishment or blessedness: Rome, that there is a purgatory, which is neither heaven nor hell, that souls in it are purified by sufferings more or less protracted, and make satisfaction more or less complete, and that the prayers of the faithful here and the power of the church are efficacious towards the relief of souls from this place of torment. Thus showing a difference as thorough in regard to the state, the necessities and the destiny of man, as in regard to the nature and influences of true religion; and the character and claims of God.\*

Thus, too, in regard to that great department of religion which concerns its outward manifestation, and treats of the visible church, the communion of saints, the nature of ecclesiastical power, and the whole extent of discipline and government; the difference is not less absolute. Rome teaches that God has established on this earth, in the person of the pope; a vicar, who is invested with all the direct powers in and over his church, which Jesus Christ himself would exercise if personally reigning upon earth, and with all such indirect authority over the nations, as is necessary to protect and extend the church; that this church, of which he is the visible head, is endowed with miraculous gifts, infallible knowledge, and the perpetual and extraordinary gifts of the Holy Ghost; and that subjection to it is not only necessary to salvation, but that conformity with it, is to be enforced by the power both of the temporal and spiritual sword.† On the contrary, the Bible teaches that Jesus Christ is the only King and Lord in Zion; that his word of inspiration is the only statute book of his earthly kingdom; that the miraculous and extraordinary gifts of the Holy Ghost, have long ago ceased; that the bond of union between his people is a spiritual bond; that the visible church has no commission but to preserve and to extend the revealed truth of God, and that by means exclusively spiritual; and that the soul of man, is, and from its own nature, as well as that of true religion, must be exempt from every species of physical violence. So that not the honor of God only, nor the concerns of the soul only, nor the issues of eternity only, but all these, and all the present and outward interests of man, whether socially or individually considered, are directly involved in this controversy between Christ and Anti-Christ.

It is not, then, to be wondered at, that those who differ so thoroughly in regard to the matter of their religious belief, should

\* In addition to the Decrees and Canons of the Trent Council already referred to, see those on *Purgatory, Baptism, Confirmation, Eucharist, Penance, Orders, Extreme Unction.*

† See Bellarmin, *De Summo Pontifice, and De Ecclesia Militante.* Also the *Corpus Juris Can. Tom. iii. Part ii. Titulus vi. De Judiciis.*

differ equally as to the sources of it, and the proper methods of arriving at a comfortable assurance concerning it. They whose faith is so opposite could hardly be expected to agree as to the rule of faith itself; and I shall best fulfil my present duty by clearly explaining that of the Church of Christ, and in contrast, that of the church of Rome.

II. And what is the precise meaning of the terms in which our subject is expressed? A *Rule* in things *physical*, is a measure of the proportions of material and sensible objects; in things *intellectual*, it is a measure or law by which we determine a thing to be *true* or *false*; and in things *moral*, whether they be *good* or *evil*. It is, in general terms, a measure, by agreement or disagreement with which, we judge of all things of that kind to which it belongs. *Faith*, though often and properly enough used in a general sense, yet as a term in theology, technically means, *the belief of truth upon divine authority*. The *rule of faith*, must, therefore, needs be, that measure by which we regulate our belief, in divine things. And the precise question between us and the papists, is, *what is the rule, or measure, or law, by which we are to judge what things we ought to receive, as revealed to us by God?*\*

"The first creature of God," says the profoundest of all thinkers, "in the works of the days, was the light of the sense: the last was the light of reason: and his sabbath work ever since, is the illumination of his Spirit. First, he breathed light upon the face of the matter or chaos; then he breathed light into the face of man; and still he breatheth and inspireth light into the face of his chosen." Thus, "truth," he saith, "which only doth judge itself, teacheth, that the inquiry of truth which is the love-making or wooing of it, the knowledge of truth which is the presence of it, and the belief of truth, which is the enjoyment of it, is the sovereign good of human nature."†

Truth, then, is the sole object proposed by God, to our belief, which is indeed its sweet enjoyment; and the light of reason in all human things, to which in all moral ones, that of conscience is superadded, and in all heavenly ones the illumination of God's gracious Spirit; is that by which our inquiry for her must be guided, and our assurance of her presence certified. Truth, which, "though this ill hap wait on her nativity that she never comes into the world," as Milton saith, "but like a bastard, to the ignominy of him that brought her forth; till time, the midwife rather than the mother of truth, have washed and salted the infant, declared her legitimate, and church'd the father of his young Minerva from the needless causes of his purgation;" yet is she "as impossible to be soiled by any outward touch, as the sunbeam;" for "truth is but justice in our knowledge, as justice is but truth in our practice;" "the daughter, not of time, but of heaven, only bred up here below in Christian hearts, between two grave and holy nurses, the doctrine and discipline of the gospel;" and to universal knowledge, "strong next to the Almighty," needing "no polices, nor stratagems, nor licensings, to make her victorious."‡

\* See Tillotson on the Rule of Faith.

† Lord Bacon's First Essay.

‡ Milton.—Tract on Prelatical Episcopacy.—Dedication of the Doct. and Dis. of Div.—Eikonoklastes, Sec. xxviii.; and Areopagitica.

In seeking after truth, God has furnished us with means and instruments to use, some of which are common to every search we undertake, some more peculiar to special occasions and kinds of knowledge. He has endowed us with great faculties, with deep emotions, with vast desires; and set before us every motive, here and forever, to seek, to know, and to love the truth. He has endowed our minds with power to perceive intuitively, the unmixed and fundamental truths of nearly every part of knowledge; and in minds of the highest mould this precious gift is carried so high, that observation and reflection nearly supply the place of all instruction, and reason to them is more an instinct than a faculty.—He has blessed us with capacities to prove and try all sorts of things, of which those are the methods to arrive at certain knowledge; and our minds are so, by him, created, that we may not only assure ourselves by proof, but that we cannot without proof, believe such things, of which proof is the appropriate evidence. He has established such relations between certain kinds of truths, that they are capable of being subjected to that compact process which we call demonstration; and our minds are not only made capable of receiving this evidence, but when rightly trained, incapable of rejecting it. And to all these he has added that mighty power of truth to verify itself, known to its inmost votaries; that all-pervading sympathy of truth with truth, all fortifying all throughout creation; that lofty freedom of the human soul, as from the highest mount of truth, it overlooks “the errors, wanderings, mists and tempests in the vale below,”—capacious to discern amid the general chaos, every piece into which wicked deceivers have hewed the lovely form of truth; in search of whose mangled limbs her sad friends go up and down, gathering them as they may be found, and looking for the Master’s second coming, who then “shall bring together every joint and member, and shall mould them into an immortal feature of loveliness and perfection.”\*

The highest kind of truth, is doubtless, that which concerns God, and our relations to him. That this should be excepted from the influence of those principles which regulate our inquiry, our acquisition, and our belief of all other truth, is in itself absurd; for in all things else, the higher we mount upwards the more rigid is the force of general laws. Nothing, then, can be more clear, than that if truth in general is the only thing proper to be believed, divine truth is the specific thing on which religious faith must rest. But as divine truth is concentrate, at last, in the mere word of God, the rule of divine belief can be no other, than that word which is itself the truth. And the grand difference between this and other cases, lies chiefly here, that God has given to his word of truth, a power, an efficacy, and an unction beyond all other truth, and that he has added therewith the enlightening, convincing, life-giving Spirit.

Thus, then, stands our case. God has given to us a nature, one of whose strongest impulses is a religious instinct, insatiable but in the fruition of himself. He has endowed us with faculties capa-

\* Milton, *Areopagitica*; Bacon, *Essay on Truth*.

ble of directing the out-goings of this profound emotion. He has set himself before us, as the sole object of our supreme and everlasting love. That lost image of himself in which we were created, he has restored to us, through a Redemer, by a new, spiritual and divine creation. And now he proposes to us, as the sweet, infallible and perfect rule of faith, of duty and of love—his own unerring statement of his own glorious being, high decrees, infinite grace, majestic works, eternal providence. And to crown all, he sheds abroad within our hearts, the eternal Spirit, the inspirer and Spirit of truth itself, to keep us clear lighted on our heavenly way, and fast bound, in the free, unbroken covenant of his love. Oh! blessed faith that binds to such a God! Oh! blessed rule by which to keep that faith!\*

In all fair reason, there can be but two questions perplexing the Christian's firm conviction. Is this, our rule of faith, indeed the word of God? If so, what does God say?

To the *first*, we might well say, it is no question between us and Rome; for while she has impiously added to the word of God things which he never uttered, she admits as his, all that we assert to be so. But besides this, it is enough to add, that the authenticity, the inspiration, and the uncorrupted preservation of the divine oracles, are not only capable of being impregnably established, upon such and so high evidence, as is most perfect in such inquiries; but, it is not too much to say, that human ingenuity cannot demand in its most perverse mood, a body of proof so overwhelming, as that on which the heavenly rule of faith rests its claim to our acceptance. Let him who doubts, but make the trial.

To the *second* question the answer is not less clear. God has revealed to us a rule of faith and obedience declared, by himself, to be perfect. The means by which he requires us to ascertain what he has thus revealed, are, in part, those common to the acquisition of knowledge laid up in other written records. To these, peculiar helps are added in the ordinances, teachings, privileges, and sacraments, of his visible kingdom. And all is crowned by the guidance and teaching of the promised and purchased Spirit. And so effectual are these means, that in all lands and in all generations, this rule has conducted all God's children to the same Saviour, by the same faith, through the same baptism of fire and of the Holy Ghost.

For it is never to be forgotten, that the perfect sufficiency of the Holy Scriptures to make men wise unto salvation, the absolute completeness of the power of God to the entire exclusion of man's wisdom as the sure foundation of our faith; has been, from the beginning, the universal testimony which martyrs have sealed with their blood,† the unanimous confession of every true church of Jesus Christ,‡ the very germ and heart's-blood of the blessed re-

\* On the general subject of the perfection of Scripture as a rule of faith, consult *Turretin, Institutio Theologica, Pars Prima, Loc. Sec. questio 16, 17*; and his two tracts *De Scripturæ Sacræ Authoritate*, published in his *Disput. Miscell.*—Chillingworth's *Religion of Protestants a Safe Way*, &c. Also De Moor, *Com. Per. in Joh. Markii Comp.*, the whole of the second chapter, in which a vast body of matter is drawn together in the compass of a few hundred pages.

† See Fox's *Acts and Monuments*—Beza's *Icones*, &c.

‡ See the *Magdebourg Centuriators*, for the period preceding the Reformation; and the *Corpus et Synagma Confessionum*, for that subsequent to it.

formation of the sixteenth century,\* and the clear, reiterated, and ever-living assurance of God himself, by the mouths of all holy men who spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost.†

This last consideration is, by itself, conclusive with every truly renewed heart, as it should be with every reflecting mind. The religion of God is a matter of pure revelation, in every thing that regards its essential form, substance, sanctions and issues. By it alone, are we taught that we can be saved by faith‡ in a divine Redeemer crucified for us,§ and in no other way;|| and that this faith is itself the fruit of a divine operation of the Spirit of God,¶ and the act of one born of him.\*\* But the very same authority assures us that the only infallible rule and guide of this saving faith, is, respectively, the word†† and Spirit‡‡ of God himself. Fortified, then, by the plain declarations of revelation concerning our duty in that about which we know absolutely nothing except through the medium of this very revelation; we are not only infallibly assured that we are right when we reject the wisdom of man and choose the power of God as the foundation of our faith; but in the nature of the case, it is wholly impossible to prove that our rule can be wrong, or that any other can be right. Nor can a case be made which shall even conduce to an opposite result, which will not, as the facts exist, subvert the possibility of all divine faith whatever, by attacking on the one hand the competency of man as the receiver, and on the other the veracity of God as the impartor of divine truth.

Stand firm, therefore, Brethren and Fathers, in this faith, so clearly delivered, so firmly held, and so precious to the saints. Hold fast to this rule, made plain to our souls by a spiritual demonstration full of divine power. Contend earnestly for the freedom of the human spirit; the priceless freedom of a sure and open access to God. Uphold the majesty of the divine Lawgiver, the all sufficiency of the Incarnate Word, the infinite efficiency of the Spirit of truth. For in these questions lie hid the destinies of this ruined world, and of the church which Jesus Christ has purchased with his blood.

III. But the church of Rome proposes a *rule of faith* which she asserts, is more simple and more certain than the mere word of God! A bold proposal, and so daring in its impiety and folly, as to seem nearly beyond the limits of human presumption; yet set forth, in every form, and by every authority in that apostate body, within the few last centuries; and particularly in the decrees of its last General Council, that of Trent, and of its universal creed, that of Pius IV., made out of the Trent Decrees, and issued in the form of a Bull in the year 1564.

This creed, to which every follower of the pope is obliged to swear as a bond of papal unity—is later, by many years, than all the principal creeds of the Reformed churches. Later, for exam-

\*Consult D'Aubigne's *History of the Reformation*—Passim.

†See John xvii. 17, and v. 39, and xx. 31; Luke i. 3, 4, and xvi. 29; Rom. i. 16, and xv. 4; 1 Cor. ii. 5, and x. 11, and xvi. 3; 2 Tim. iii. 15, 16; Heb. i. 1—3, compared with ii. 1—4; 1 James i. 21; 2 Peter i. 19—21, &c. &c.

‡Eph. ii. 8—10. §1 Cor. i. 23, 24. ||Acts iv. 12. ¶Gal. v. 22. \*\*John i. 13, 14.

††Gal. i. 8, 9, and 2 Tim. iii. 15—17.

‡‡John xiv. 26, and xvi. 13—15.

ple, than that of Augsburg, which is the creed of the Lutheran body; than the Helvetic Confession, which exhibits the faith of the Swiss churches; than the French Confession, which contains the faith of the glorious Huguenots; than the Belgic Confession, which is that of the Reformed church of the Netherlands; and finally, amongst others, than those of the Bohemian, the English, and the Scottish nations.\* So that the boasted antiquity of the faith of Rome, and her derision of the novelty of that of Christ's Church, are but tricks to blind the simple. Our summaries of faith are more ancient than her own, as well as more pure. And if she will go behind her present standards to some more ancient, and thereby confess her faith has varied, and so give up her boasted infallibility, on which all her other claims repose; why then we will prove the sin of schism on her. For all the Reformed churches have always believed and openly professed the ancient creeds of Nice, of Chalcedon, of Constantinople the first, of Ephesus, as well as those commonly called of Irenæus and Athanasius; and yet holding these, are curst and cast out by Rome; although Rome herself, in this very Council of Trent, and until the Council had made the matter for a new creed, had none to use, whereby to show her public but long-forsaken faith, but one of these.† Or if she will go behind them all, up to the pure light of God shining directly from his eternal word, then will we see in her deformed and monstrous state, the true secret of her mortal hatred of that light which makes her manifest; and the full force of that confession, extorted in the very front of this creed of Pius IV., that it is the symbol, not of the *Christian*, but of the "*Roman church*."‡

What, then, is the rule of that faith, thus confessed and sworn to be of Rome, rather than of Christ?

1. Can you believe it, when you are told, that it is in part at least, the same as our own—the holy word of God? Can you credit it, that Rome with all her hatred of the Bible, teaches her subjects to say, "*I also admit the sacred Scriptures?*" It is even so. Rome admits that the Bible is *part* of her own rule of faith. Thus confessing that God has some right to speak to us, and we some capacity to understand him; that some parts of the Scripture are in theory at least, innocent and intelligible; and that the Christian rule of faith has some show of reason and some foundation in truth.

But here as every where, the agreement between Rome and us is only apparent. For while adopting the word of God, theoretically as a portion of the rule of her belief, she has carefully provided that all edifying, much less all common use of it, shall be impossible. For, in the first place, she has corrupted the written word of God, by adding to it whole books, and a number of them,

\* Consult the *Corpus et Syntagma Confessionum*.

† *Historia del Concilio Tridentino*, Lib. ii. F. Paolo Sarpi. The English translation of this great work goes under the name of *Polano*—an anagram on the author's real name.

‡ The reader will find this Creed of Pius IV. at the end of every edition of the Decrees of the Council of Trent.—Also in *Labbius and Cossart*, vol. xiv. pp. 944—6. Also, in English and Latin, in *Cramp's Text Book of Popery*, p. 337, and p. 450. Also in English in the *Spirit of the XIX. Century* for February, 1842, p. 75. Also in Latin and English in the *Baltimore Literary and Religious Magazine*, for February, 1835 p. 32.

as inspired, which have no seal of the Holy Ghost upon them: thus polluting the waters of life at the fountain head, and braving the terrible curse of God. In the next place, she has by a solemn and formal decree, made the ultimate appeal to that which is not scripture at all, in any proper sense; declaring the Latin version, instead of the Hebrew and Greek originals, to be "*authentic*;"† and handing over to damnation, every soul of man that will not take as the last answer to his enquiries for the mind of God, that voice of man, instead of this of God. In the third place, she has effectually closed her work, by prohibiting the free printing of the scriptures even in the dead tongue, the free translation of them into any vulgar tongue, and the free use of them or any version of them;‡ all which acts of insult to man, and audacity towards God, are backed by the common argument of Rome to gainsayers, "let him be accursed," who would ward off such strokes aimed at the very root of our salvation.

2. Having made her end sure against the form of God's word, under the pretext of receiving it, she next proceeds against its sense. "*I also admit the sacred Scriptures according to the sense which the holy mother church has held and does hold.*"§ Such is the first limitation. God shall be heard so often as he uses the mouth of "holy mother church." So much of his word as escapes the corruption of Apochryphal additions, so much as shines through an imperfect version in an unknown tongue, so much as eludes the prohibitions of spiritual tyrants; that much, if it will consent to array itself in the speech of Ashdod instead of that of Canaan, and to be superscribed, "thus saith Babylon the Great," instead of "thus saith God;" why then it shall be, so far, a rule of faith and practice. That is, it shall be if Rome shall ever condescend to give the world, what she has never yet done, an exposition of Scripture judged by herself to be infallible.

"According to the sense" of "holy mother church." Who is she? Where is she? How is her sense to be obtained? Is it the whole body of the faithful? Their sense has never yet been taken; nor did the thousandth part of those in the Roman communion ever read over the hundredth part of the Bible. The whole priesthood only? The prelates only? The General Councils? The Pope alone? Who is this holy church, "mother and mistress of all churches," that we should stop our ears to God and listen to her only? Is it Rome Arian, with Pope Liberius and the Councils of Sirmium, Selucia, and Ariminum, as her expositors? Or Rome Infidel, with Leo X. guiding her infallible interpretations? Or Rome Pelagian, cursing the evangelic faith of God's elect, by the mouth of Clement XI., in the constitution *Unigenitus*? Or Rome governed by strumpets for generations together, and so sunken into worse than heathen pollution while divinely illuminated to expound Christian morals, that her own

\* Decrees of the Council of Trent, Sess. IV.

† Labbius and Cossari, Tom. xiv. p. 746—7.

‡ *Index Librorum Prohibitorum*, Rome, 1819, pp. ix.—xiv.

§ Second Article added to the Creed of the first Council of Constantinople, by the Creed of Pius IV.

historians call fifty popes in succession apostatical rather than apostolical? Or Rome drunk with the blood of martyrs, and staggering under her load of murdered saints, that shall teach us lessons of charity and good will towards men? Or Rome, divided between two and three rival popes, and tearing out her own bowels in mutual rapine, that is to be our instructress in the great doctrines of the saints' communion, and the church's unity? Or Rome, even down to our own day, and to the reigning pontiff, leagued with tyrants and fulminating curses against the sacred and indefeasible rights of human nature, from whom we shall acquire, with all docility, lessons for good doing to our fellow men?

Alas! that we can no-where find this "holy mother church," to whom "it belongs to judge of the true sense and interpretation of the holy Scriptures;"† who alone is "holy, Catholic, and Apostolical"—"the mother and mistress of all churches;"‡ who alone holds and teaches that "true, Catholic faith, out of which none can be saved;"§ who, though the Trent Council, by a strange and fatal oversight failed to define or even to describe her, yet if we should ever find her, will be infallible,—for whoever or wherever she may be, one thing is certain, she "cannot err in faith or morals."|| Infallible? That is a hard doctrine; and it is hard to say whether it be true or false, of one who can no-where be found. It is easy to show that the General Councils, the Popes, the saints, yea saints working miracles, the universities, the doctors, the prelates, and the priests of this church of Rome, have all erred, and that most egregiously, themselves being judges ¶ If all these can err in every thing, and yet their "holy mother" still remain the infallible expositor of Scripture, and her decisions the infallible rule of faith; then it is clear that both her rule and herself, even though infallible, are worse than useless; since her followers have fallen into the most fatal errors on every point of Christian doctrine, and in every part of Christian practice; and her hierarchy, for above twelve hundred years, has filled every land to which its power extended, with ignorance, misery, and crime.\*\*

3. Next to this imaginary and undefined corporation, comes a monster with three crowns, two swords, and keys *ad-libitum*, before whom we are required to fall prostrate as we say, "I promise and swear true obedience to the Roman Bishop, the successor of Saint Peter, the prince of the Apostles and the vicar of Jesus Christ."†† The ultramontan faction in the papacy, which now wields all the spiritual power of the whole body, sustained by its most accredited doctors with Baronius and Bellarmin at their head, and backed by many Councils, in front of which stand those of Florence and Latran under Popes Eugenius and Leo, calls the Pope the "church virtual," and pronounces him infallible. And while they and all the rest differ as to the subject matter, and whole extent, of this infallibility, all admit that it extends to all his official and

\* See Genebrard IV.—Platina, 123—Du Pin, 2, 156.

† Creed of Pius IV. ‡ Idem. § Idem. || Catechism of the Council of Trent, p. 102.

¶ Edgar's *Variations of Popery*, puts this part of the controversy to rest.

\*\* For a very clear refutation of the pretended infallibility of the church of Rome, see Bayle's *Critique Generale de L'Histoire du Calvinisme, de Maimbourg, Lettre xxix.*

†† Thirteenth article added by the creed of Pius IV., to that of Constantinople the first.

authorised decisions touching the faith. The popes, therefore,—all popes, past, present, and to come, enter, in some form, into the Roman rule of faith; and that by virtue of a solemn oath. Whether as Roman Bishop, or universal pastor; whether alone, or with a General Council, or after universal consent of the faithful; whether personally, or only when speaking *ex cathedra*; whether in questions of fact and discipline, or those of morals and faith only; these are points for the faithful to decide, when their oracle has spoken, in order to ascertain whether his infallibility be then infallible or no. For us that are without, let the question come unto us in its simplest and strongest form—and so we meet it, with a flat denial, that Peter was ever Christ's vicar—that the bishops of Rome are Peter's successors or Christ's vicars—that any Christian man owes them any obedience on any of these grounds—or that any one of them was infallible in any thing whatever. And as these are all questions of fact, which before it is lawful to believe them must be proved, and which if true, are readily susceptible of being proved; we then join issue and demand the proof.\*

And for further plea, we say, first, that no man knows, or ever can know, how many of the two hundred and fifty or sixty pretended bishops of Rome, have come in canonically, or been true popes, according even to the judgment of Rome herself. Therefore no man can ever know, how many of these so-called popes, were, in any sense, infallible. Moreover, that as there have been, according to the Jesuit Mainbourg, twenty-nine schisms in the bosom of the papacy, dividing that body between different heads; and as the mode of electing the pope has suffered fundamental changes, not less than thirty times;† it is wholly impossible for us to be assured, that any pope, from the time of the first schism and the first fundamental change in the mode of election—ever was truly bishop of Rome; just as at the Council of Constance, "it was morally impossible to decide who were true popes and who antipopes," as the same Jesuit tells us—and therefore the council rejected and deposed all three then exercising the functions of Christ's vicar; as we, for a like reason, may reject all. And, further still, admitting all who ever claimed the office, or any part of them, to have truly held it; still it is impossible for us to know what so many persons have said and written in so many centuries, as to the true Christian faith; and therefore their opinions, which in the nature of the case we can never know, cannot form any part of our rule of belief. Or even if we knew all their opinions, not one of them could be a rule of divine faith to us, without gross impiety, until its author was shown to have uttered it by divine inspiration; which cannot be shown without contradicting that Scripture, which Rome has already conceded to be a portion of the true rule.

This added plea we reinforce, by this second argument. Judging the holy Scriptures to be a divine rule, which Rome herself confesses; and knowing the illumination of the Holy Spirit to be

\* The reader will find in Barrow's '*Treatise on the Pope's Supremacy*,' a learned and candid exposition of that whole branch of the controversy with Rome.

† *Histoire du Grand Schisme D'Occident*, pp. 2—15.

not only real, but indispensable; it follows, that as no man can know infallibly, that this divine illumination is ever, much less constantly bestowed upon another particular man; no man can ever be infallibly assured that any other man is qualified infallibly to guide his conscience. If any shall pretend that the Scripture guides his conscience for some other man, he makes himself above the Scripture, and usurps at once the office of the Holy Spirit and dominion over the human conscience. But a man may far more certainly know whether he himself understands the word of God, than whether another man doth; whether the Spirit illuminates his own mind, than whether it doth that of another man; whether his own conscience inwardly approves as good what his mind receives as true, or whether that of another man doth; and no man can know of any other, any thing more certain than this, viz.: that no other man can be so good a judge of his religion as he is himself. So that we are not only obliged, from certain knowledge about which it is impossible to err, to reject the claims of the Roman Pontiff; but it is because he assumes this infallibility over the word of God and the consciences of men, that Christians call him Antichrist; who, the Scripture tells us shall "sit in the temple of God"—as it were opposite to God, "exalting himself above all that is called God, or is worshipped."\* "That is to say, not only above all judges and magistrates, who though they be called Gods, are far beneath infallible; but also above God himself, by giving law both to the Scripture, to the conscience, and to the Spirit of God within us."† It is God that gives the word, the Spirit that enforces it, the conscience that is sanctified by it; but if the meaning of the word is to be given infallibly by the Pope—then is he lord of all; and claiming this, then is he Antichrist.

And for a third argument, we say it is inconceivable that a pure, wise, and righteous God, ever selected as his vicars or the infallible expositors of his most holy will, such men as the great mass of these Roman pontiffs have always been. 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, and a murderer. Gregory VII. is pronounced by Cardinal Benno and by the Councils of Worms and Brescia, guilty of simony, sacrilege, magic, sorcery, treason, impiety, fornication, adultery, heresy, perjury and murder. Boniface VIII., to every other enormity added that sin for which Sodom perished. John XXIII. has come down to us, black with every crime and villany, proved upon him by the General Council of Constance. Sixtus IV. was an assassin and debauchee. 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. Julius II., was a drunkard a Sodomite, and a man of blood. Leo X. was an unchaste sensu-

\* 2 Thess. ii, 4.

† Milton's *Treatise of Civil Power in Ecclesiastical Causes.*

alist, and most probably an Atheist and a Sodomite. Besides these, who are but specimens of most of these "servants of the servants of God"—many have been heretics, simonists, persecutors, corruptors of the earth, men of immoral lives, perjured persons, sinners exceedingly both against God and man. Indeed of all that have reigned since the apostacy began, that is to say for these twelve hundred years and more—the fewest number have been men of blameless lives, and almost none have exhibited the genuine marks of true Christians.\*

Now upon this state of fact we demand, is it credible that God has chosen these men to be his vicars upon earth? That he has invested them with authority to decide what faith his children shall cherish? That he has set them up as models of that belief and practice, by which a guilty world is to be won back to him? Did he know them? Is he thus supremely indifferent to virtue and to faith? Does he select his chosen representatives, the predestinated vicars of his own thrice glorious, nay God-like presence amongst men—amongst the very outcasts of human filth and crime and beastliness?—When light and darkness are all one, when sin and virtue are twin-sisters, when the chaste spouse of Christ and the vile whore of Babylon become the same, when God and Mammon, Christ and Belial all sit down on one divided throne; then will that faith which stands in carnal wisdom, be fit for union with that which stands in the mighty power of God.

4. The next general limitation put by Rome around the word of God, hindering its free course, is the decrees of what she calls her General Councils; according to the sense of which, the voice of God is to be understood. For in her doctrine, those Councils which she admits to be œcumenical, are, as to all definitions of faith, guided immediately by the Holy Ghost, and therefore cannot err. And so she teaches her subjects to say, "*I profess and undoubtedly receive all things delivered, defined, and declared by the sacred Canons and General Councils.*"† What relates to the "sacred Canons" will be noticed separately. As to the Councils, it is obvious, the article in the creed is much broader than the mere subject of faith; and it is notorious, that the divisions in the Roman sect have been as fierce, as thorough, and as various, in regard to the infallibility of Councils, as to that of popes, or that of the church itself; about which some thing has been already said. But we need not here transcend the limits of the immediate subject, and as to that, every papist is sworn to receive with undoubting conviction, and as a portion of his rule of faith "all things delivered, defined, and declared, by the General Councils, and particularly by the holy Council of Trent."

How many ecclesiastical Councils may have met in the bosom of the nominally Christian church, since that first grand assemblage of "apostles and elders and brethren" at Jerusalem, whose decisions inspired by God and left on record in his holy word,‡ settled,

\* See *Variations of Popery*, by Edgar, pp. 109—125, for a full citation of authorities and references, on this part of the subject. Consult also De Potter's *L'Esprit de L'Eglise*, Tom. iii. iv. v. and vi. Also Platina and Baronius.

† Creed of Pius IV., last article but one.

‡ Acts xv.

for us poor Gentiles, our enduring Christian liberty; it passes the knowledge of man to-tell. That many of these have done well and wisely, none will deny. That many have met only to establish their own sinful ends, who can doubt? As they have done well or ill—to their own master, they stand or fall. But that any, or all of them, since the Lord's apostles all fell on sleep, should be set up as rules of divine faith, without whose guidance we cannot understand that plain word of God now in our hands, and which itself guided them, so far as they went right; is an absurdity so monstrous, that even they who propound it seem scarcely to believe themselves. Are individual men infallible? Then surely each can guide himself. Is every priest, and every prophet, and minister of religion, inspired? If so, the Council cannot control the voice of God within them. If not, the union of a thousand fallible men cannot make an infallible council.

That councils, and they the largest and most ecclesiastical, may err, and that out of all bounds of reason, of pity, and of truth, will stand an eternal stigma upon our race, until the record of that great council of the entire then visible church of God,—that madly preferred a murderer to the Lord of life, and with wicked hands, by God's determinate counsel, took and slew the Prince of Peace, is blotted out from under heaven. And that the true successors, in spirit and in deed, of those bad counsellors, have often since assembled, even in the name of him their fathers did betray; none can truly gainsay, while the blood of whole nations butchered in the name of God cries to his throne for vengeance, and the memory of the confessors and martyrs of the Most High, abides the rich heritage of his struggling church. Away with your infallible-councils. We take our Master's cross, in preference to the judgment of his murderers; our brethren's bloody winding sheet and fiery bed, rather than guidance from hands goary with the warm currents of their life. Councils infallible! Councils in which the Holy Ghost did dwell! Beleaguered by strumpets, beset with fiddlers and buffoons, cursing God's truth, and leaving tracks strewed with bastards and dead men's bones! Councils, the very names, order, and number of which, papists themselves dispute; and know not which or how many to propound to us, as inspired. Holy Councils; and above all that of Trent!! Which by the amazing wrath of God, cursed with judicial blindness and seared consciences, did gather into one vast monument, those scattered proofs which covered the long track of ages, and those errors and corruptions bred in the slime and filth of the whole apostacy; and reared them up, with patient and laborious vice, through eighteen years of God's long-suffering, the final land-mark, the last limit of his endurance with this great, bloody and drunken Babylon. So that when Rome teaches her children to condemn, reject, and curse, as she makes them swear they do and will, all things contrary to her God-forsaken Councils, and chiefly that of Trent; she brands upon their foreheads the proof that she and they are alike apostatised from God; and establishes them in ways that lead to death.\*

\* For a very clear argument on the authority of Councils, see *Calvin's Institutes*, book iv. chap. ix. And for a short statement of the matter of fact as to the number, names and acts of the so-called General Councils, see *Papism in the XIX. Century*, pp. 44—56.

5. "The sacred Canons" too, as we have seen, as well as "all constitutions and observances"\* of the holy Roman church, form an important part of that confused and heterogeneous mass, which she calls her rule of faith.

The *Canon Law*, is the system of authorised jurisprudence in the papal body. The Canons of the Greek church, appear to have been originally used by Rome, and to have formed the basis of her code. About the beginning of the sixth century, the code of *Denys le Petit* became the standard; and with the Decretals of the popes from Siricius to Anastasius, constituted the body of the Canon Law down to the eleventh century; and with the Capitularies of Charlemagne, was generally adopted in the Latin church. Upon the basis of this code repose what are called the Liberties of the Gallican church, which are known to be wholly inconsistent with many of the claims of the papal see—and which are sustained by rejecting every thing of a subsequent date, added to the canonical jurisprudence, and also all the Decretals of popes preceding Siricius; the former as no way binding, the latter as false and forged. But the Roman see adding the before unknown Decretals from St. Clement to Siricius, the confusion became so great as to render a new modelling indispensable, and in 1151, *Gratien* published his work entitled "*Concordance of Discordant Canons*," which became thenceforth the foundation of the code of Rome, and which professes to give the sense of the Bible, the Councils and the Fathers, upon all matters ecclesiastical. To *Gratien* the Benedictine, therefore, Rome assures us, all must go, who would go to heaven. The Decretals of popes from 1150 to Gregory IX. in 1229, form a kind of second part of the Canon Law. In 1297, Boniface VIII. continued this collection of Decretals to his own times. John XXII. added to it, under the name *Clementines*, the constitutions of Clement V., his predecessor, in five books; and subsequently twenty constitutions of John himself under the name of *Extravagants*, and some other constitutions of his successors, were added. All these things, viz., the dicta of Councils, the guesses of fathers, the rescripts of popes, the sophisms of ecclesiastics, the vagaries of popish doctors, and the Roman conjectures of the sense of scripture, unitedly form that mass of folly, cruelty, and chicanery which published in three folio volumes, goes under the title, '*Corpus Juris Canonici*;' which every papist swears he receives as a portion of his Christian faith, and by the light of which the Bible itself must be interpreted, in order to be understood.

The simplicity and excellence of this infallible portion of the Roman rule of faith, must be so manifest from the mere statement of its contents and of the manner of their being brought together; that nothing more need be said in commendation of it, unless it should be to add, that it has been no unusual thing for Protestants to edify themselves by large collations of multitudes of its provisions, flatly contradicting not only the word of God, but each other.†

\* The first article and the last but one, added by Pius IV., to the Creed of the Council of Constantinople the first.

† At the end of the *Synopsis Papismi* of Andrew Willet, is generally printed his *Te-trastylon Papismi*, in the iv. Pillar, and 4th part of which, he gives 100 contradictions of the Canons against themselves.

A most important privilege of infallibility; and one which the Jesuits, the best subjects of the pope, have so used in their instructions touching practical morality—as to prove, that as one may believe contradictory propositions and still be consistent with an infallible rule of faith, so may he also perform opposite moral acts and be still under the guidance of an infallible religious authority.\* So that the practical as well as the rational end of the matter is, that to him who is infallible, all faith and all practice, is the same; for being a guide unto himself, the truth of principles and the morality of acts, alter as he himself changes. Which, in the logic of protestants would be equivalent to this, that as we are all sinful and blinded creatures, and therefore certain to go astray when left to ourselves; any pretence of infallibility which renders all admission and correction of error impossible, forces us when once we get wrong to be wrong forever; and obliges us, every time our belief or conduct is inconsistent, to defend opposite things as equally true, and so to destroy all true faith and all sound morality; the result of our infallibility being that we must infallibly and incurably err. And so thoroughly does the fact agree with the reason of the case, that we may easily find in the infallible Canon Law—a positive provision or an implied rule, directly at variance with every leading duty and every practical truth of the Christian religion.

The existence and uses of this Canon Law, suggest one of the most palpable arguments against what is by sufferance called the church of Rome, but what is in reality far more a state than a religion. The Pope of Rome calling himself a vice-God, and his see the imperial, the sacred, and the eternal city—claims a dominion and authority extensive as the family of man. He parcels out the kingdoms and commonwealths of the earth amongst his lieutenants whom he calls patriarchs, primates, and bishops; and gives to them larger or smaller territories and powers as his own supreme will dictates. In these he establishes tribunals, erects prisons, collects taxes, distributes honours, inflicts punishments, administers justice; in short, reigns. This Canon Law, is his code of judicature, which supersedes alike the codes of God and of the nations—and reveals its authors and prime administrators, as at once audacious usurpers of the prerogatives of heaven and systematic oppressors of the human race.† Thanks be to God, who has allowed the interests and hopes of man, even in this world, to be so indissolubly connected with the glory and permanence of his own authority, that this accursed Antichrist cannot destroy us without dishonouring him; and that the same acts which vindicated his own eternal majesty, released a world sighing for deliverance.

6. The impiety of Rome, forms a regular climax. To the church, the Pope, the Councils and the Canons, she adds, as infallible expositors of the mind of the Spirit, and so infallible guides in matters of faith, those she calls "*the fathers*," of whom she teaches her children to say, that while they "*admit the sacred Scriptures*,"

\* See Pascal's Provincial Letters; and De Pradt's *Jesuitisme Ancien et Modern*.

† The reader will find the argument glanced at in this paragraph developed with great eloquence and force by M. Jurien, in the "*Prejuges Legitimes Contre La Papisme, Première Partie, chap. xii. and xiii.*"

they will never "take or interpret them otherwise, than according to the unanimous consent of the fathers."<sup>\*</sup>

Who "the fathers" are, in the sense of the Roman standards, is a question never yet settled. And it is probable no binding decision will ever be made on the subject; since the object of all these impious decrees is not to settle the substance of faith, but to establish the supremacy of Rome; and the more uncertain it is what men ought to believe, the more complete is the authority of that See, subjection to which is indispensable to salvation. What "the fathers" really wrote, how much of that which has come down to us under their names was really theirs, and how far it is possible for us to understand their mind truly, from those mutilated fragments which constitute all that is left of many of the most respectable of them; are questions of literary history and criticism, about which learned men are entirely divided, in regard to which the mass of mankind never can arrive at a solid conclusion, and which being supremely indifferent to the peace and welfare of our souls, cannot, without the grossest folly, be alleged to have any connexion with the true meaning or perfect obligation of God's holy word. The more ancient the fathers are, the fewer of them have escaped the wreck of time and chance, and the less do we know about their real sentiments; insomuch, that we have not the undoubted writings of more than seven or eight of those of the first three centuries, and even of some of these but fragments; and nothing at all, certainly known to be much, if any earlier than the middle of the second century. It is to be considered, also, that the Christian writers of those early ages, were engaged on topics so entirely different from those which now occupy our thoughts that their labors, even where they have been preserved, are of very little use in settling any dispute between us and Rome. For example, those of Justin Martyr, Tertullian, and some others, against the religion and the gods of heathenism; those of Irenæus and of the same Tertullian against the Gnostics; and those of Cyprian, who discourses almost wholly upon the virtues of the church and its discipline. But as to transubstantiation and the adoration of the host, the supremacy of the pope, the worshipping of images, and the like; perhaps not a man in the whole church of Christ, for the first three centuries, ever spoke or wrote upon one of them.—Moreover, let us never forget, that if we had full and unquestionable proof that many persons, from the earliest times, held to every dogma of Rome, it would be no better presumption in favour of the truth of those errors, than now exists in favour of those which, as we know from the New Testament scriptures, prevailed not only under the Jewish dispensation, but were, from the very beginning, insinuated into the churches of the new; so that if Rome could prove by the fathers, which indeed she cannot, the antiquity of all her heresies—it would be perfectly easy to prove, and that by more unquestionable witnesses, that those of the Pharisees and

<sup>\*</sup> Creed of Pius IV., second additional article. Council of Trent, fourth session, *Decree on the Edition and Use of the Sacred Books*; there were present at this session only fifty-eight persons, who, in the name of the universal church, perpetrated this horrible impiety.

Sadducees, of the Nicolaitans and many others, were more ancient—and therefore, by her own argument, more respectable.

The truth, however, is, that no age of the church can be selected in which her doctors and pastors have *taken and interpreted the scriptures*, with any thing approaching to a *unanimous consent*; and that if, instead of confining our inquiries to the earliest ages, we are obliged to come down so low as to the twelfth century in order to embrace St. Bernard, whom the papists class with the most renowned names of the preceding centuries; we shall find a heterogeneous mass of folly, propagated by learned teachers and high ecclesiastics, as incapable of being reduced to a general consent, or even to sense itself, as the tongues of Babel. And even the earliest and most respectable of 'the fathers,' have erred, not only singly but in companies, and have strenuously contradicted each other upon points of the gravest importance; and what is more perfectly *ad rem* in our present discussion, they have been often and utterly disallowed by Rome herself, in points precisely held by the most and the ablest of them, and in some of which they were beyond all controversy, right, and Rome wrong. Thus, it is evident that the ancient fathers, with Augustine, Chrysostom, and Ambrose at their head, believed that the virgin Mary was conceived in original sin; which the Council of Trent denies. Again, Melito of Sardis, Origen, Cyril of Jerusalem, Gregory Nazianzen, St. Hilary, Epiphanius, Athanasius, Ruffinus, and St. Jerome, are not only wholly at variance with the same Council of Trent as to the Canon of Scripture, but with nearly all antiquity fall under its curse for their opinions on that subject. So, too, Bellarmin himself admits,\* after Michael Medina who asserted it openly in the said Council of Trent,† that St. Augustine, St. Jerome, St. Ambrose, Sedulius, Primasius, Chrysostom, Theodoret, Oecumenius, and Theophylact, had all fallen into what he calls the error of Aerius, viz., that the difference between a bishop and a priest was not of divine but only of ecclesiastical right.‡

But whoever or whatever the fathers may have been, whatever they may have held, and by what means soever we may now ascertain their thoughts; nothing concerning them can possibly be more evident, than this, that they could not speak with the clearness, the authority and the conviction of God, and therefore cannot be indispensable to us in finding out his will from his own word. It is not pretended that they were inspired: but the prophets and the apostles were. While we receive, therefore, with gratitude, all the aid they can give us, in our progress to the eternal world; we recognise in them all, sinful men like ourselves, no better instructed in divine things than hundreds, perhaps than thousands, now in the flesh; and reject their pretended unanimity as a shallow imposition, and the sanctity and authority attributed to their opinions as an insult to the majesty of God.

7. The cap-stone of this temple to papal infallibility, built out

\* Bellarm. de Cler. l. 1, c. 15.

† *Historia del Con. Trid.*—F. Paolo, l. 7.

‡ Daillius de Usu Patrum.—Cave, *Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum*—Hist. Lit. Du Pin's *History of Eccl. Writers*. Sir Peter King's *Inquiry*. Taylor's *Ancient Christianity*; are sources of authentic information in regard to "the fathers"—so called.

of the defaced ruins of all divine ordinances and all human hopes, is laid with the confused noise of the rabble of apostate bishops, venal councils, and pretended saints—whose rescripts, dreams and rhapsodies they call "*apostolical and ecclesiastical traditions*," and not only oblige the subjects of the pope to say they "*most firmly admit and embrace*"\* them all, but have decreed infallibly, that they "*are to be equally received and revered, as the books of the Old and New Testaments.*"†

A declaration like this can escape the charge of blasphemy, only by the clearest proof that there are *unwritten traditions*, which having been received from Christ by the apostles, have come down to us in clear and unbroken succession. Upon this we take issue, and expressly deny that there are any such traditions; that there is even any Catholic tradition that such traditions ever were or should be; and in particular, that the present church of Rome, which is the synagogue of Satan, ever had any unwritten traditions of any kind committed to her, by any authority binding on us. We expressly charge, moreover, that this Roman Papacy, if she ever had any traditions committed to her keeping, has proved herself to be utterly unworthy of trust, in regard to them; for by her own admission, she, being made the depository of the written word of God, has kept it so faithlessly, that as she declares, several entire books are lost, and the originals of all the rest have become corrupted; a testimony, which though it be false, is fatal to her. Still farther we say, that this pretext of *tradition* corrupted the Jewish church, and was expressly condemned by Christ; that it is a pretence, which if allowed, permits corrupt popes to manufacture scripture at pleasure; and finally, that if the doctrine were true and the *unwritten traditions* established, they could not control the *written word of God*, upon any rules of evidence or interpretation ever allowed in any well ordered tribunal; the one being a divine record which proves and interprets itself, the other, idle words standing in uncertain and suspicious human declarations of mere hearsay, for eighteen centuries.‡

If any one will but reflect upon the manner in which these traditions have been preserved, and consider for a moment, the present sources from which they must be drawn; he will perceive that the only use of them is to obscure the way of salvation, and so to increase the necessity of reliance on a corrupt and tyrannical priesthood. For where are we to look for these unwritten traditions which are as much entitled to our reverence as the written word of God? Is it to the parish priest? Then he is to me, in the place of God, and vile as he may be, I become his abject slave; or refusing to be so, risk the salvation of my soul. Or if I be sent to the bishop or the pope, the result is the very same; and they by becoming the infallible expositors of God's unwritten will, become in fact, Gods themselves. But as popes, bishops, and priests have

\* Creed of Pius IV., first additional article.

† Council of Trent, IV. Session.

‡ Upon the general subject of tradition the reader will find important information in Tillotson's admirable Treatise on "*The Rule of Faith*?" in Title iv. and v. of the *Preservative against Popery*, especially chapter iii. of Title iv.—and in Du Pin, *Dis. Præ. sur la Bible*.

shown themselves, too often, to be cruel, false, and corrupt, this fearful authority can never be vested in any of them, without manifestly drawing after it the subjugation and degradation of the human race. Moreover, from the nature of the case, such an extraordinary investiture *from* God, can only be proved *by* God himself; seeing it is not possible for man, by himself, to prove to us, what happened between God and himself alone; and God has himself, provided beforehand the everlasting tests of these pretensions. Let the pope, the bishops and the priests, then, show us a plain declaration of God in his acknowledged word; or else let them work miracles in our presence. But, however the Roman church may attempt to prove the existence of this divine power in her priesthood, that proof, whether propounded in the form of miracle, of revelation, of argument, of evidence, or of force, must in the nature of the case, be submitted to the reason of every man in particular; and so we establish and sanctify the mother principle of Protestantism—the divine right of private judgment, to which Rome herself must take her final appeal. If she appeal to force, there is an end of religion, which to be true must be free. If she appeal to miracle, that is a resort to the bar of reason, and she must deposite her high pretensions, her blood basin, and her sacrificial knife—at the door of that sacred court. If she go to the word of God, behold it is our own glorious rule. Let the living hierarchy then stand aside; for they are not the depositories of these dread and mystical secrets.

Shall we resort next to buried generations, and seek amid the crumbling fragments and mouldering dust of unknown ages, for some glimmering light generated by the corruptions of the dead, to guide our footsteps along a path upon which the sun of righteousness sheds his own living rays? And whither shall we go? To the long line of pontiffs true and false, and grope amid their countless bulls and constitutions, their treaties of war and peace, their charters, laws, sermons, letters, and disquisitions; is it amid this mass through which no single mortal ever yet fully penetrated, that the child of God is to search until he finds the hidden and costly pearl? And lest there be some fragment still neglected, shall we then with patient toil hear one by one, the doctors, fathers, casuists, and schools, of ten or fifteen centuries; sifting and purging uncounted loads of chaff and blasted grains, to find one mustard seed buried and lost by chance? And then shall we go round the innumerable councils small and great, true and false, and with heavy hearts and weary limbs, like Isis searching for the mangled body of Osiris, seek amid these mitred tyrants, if perchance some fragment of the Lord's unwritten truth, neglected by his own blessed apostles, may not have been preserved by this priesthood of Antichrist? And lest we miss our end at last, shall we wake from their dread abodes, (like her of Endor pleasing a mad-man,) those crazed self torturers whom Rome calls saints, and listen to their howls, and moans, and maniac ravings, and idiot chattering, as if the sweet and ordered voice of heaven had ever mingled with sounds like these? Or, if not with popes, and fathers, and councils, and saints, and doctors—where, then, shall we find these lost messages of Christ?

Fathers and Brethren, God is not far from every one of us. His word is nigh unto us, even in our mouths and in our hearts. That word is his voice, speaking through his written law, and in his blessed gospel; and his promise is express, that if we will confess his Son, and believe his word, we shall be saved.\* Away then with all the inventions of men, all the devices of a corrupt priesthood, and all the snares of the great enemy of souls. By the mercy of God, his Bible has been enfranchised from the chains in which an apostate church, fearing its light, had long bound it. We have found out a better way, than any Rome can show us. We have learned our Master's voice, and will not follow the voice of strangers. We know him and the power and blessedness of his most precious truth; and shame and wo be unto us, if we cast away Christ and embrace the pope; or forsaking his pure, free, and sweet service, sell our liberty, our birthright and our hopes, for the bondage of a polluted, irrational, unscriptural, empty and tawdry superstition.

IV. Fathers and Brethren of the General Assembly, this is not a question of abstract philosophy; nor of curious research into dangerous but exploded errors; nor of difficult practical duty, about which men may differ, and yet walk together in Christian harmony. It is a question of daily and hourly application, involving the instant duties of every rational creature, determining the personal and spiritual estate of every human being, the position and destiny of man in his associated condition, and the rights of God himself to and over us. As it is decided one way or the other, and the decision thus made is consistently carried out, man must be personally, mentally and morally free or a slave; civil society must be independent and enlightened, sovereign and vigorous, or reduced to a condition of imbecility and blindness, abject dependence, and galling servitude; and the church of God must be a pure, free, and glorious spiritual commonwealth, whose only King and Head is the Lord Jesus, or a subjugated, shorn, and oppressed appendage of a cruel and besotted despotism wielded by the pope.

Such are the issues involved in this enquiry. For there can be but two ultimate grounds upon one or other of which it must terminate, and with it the whole spiritual destiny of man. We may appeal to authority, or we may appeal to truth; there is nothing else to which we can appeal. There are but these two foundations of religion. Starting from them, the argument of the one is force, of the other, reason; the handmaid of the one is ignorance, of the other, knowledge; the proofs of the one are addressed to a slavish superstition, of the other, to an enlightened conscience; the influence of the one is manifested in carnal observances and self-righteousness, of the other in a holy heart and a holy life; the effect of the one, is to degrade and enslave all the nobler faculties of man and so to obstruct the personal and social development of the race, of the other to stimulate and enlarge every pure aspiration of our being, and so to extend and fortify the triumphs of civilization; the ultimate sanctions of the one cluster around a

\*Acts xvii. 27—Rom. x. 8, 9—Deut. xxx. 10.

weak and sinful mortal like ourselves, whom they have invested with the authority of God, those of the other penetrate into the unsearchable bosom of eternity and rest upon the throne of the infinite majesty, at which every one must give an account of himself at last.

These are, respectively, the systems of Rome and of the Reformed churches, of God and of the Pope, of Christ and of Anti-Christ. For ages they have striven ceaselessly with each other. Behold them still face to face, in mortal conflict.

God has called us, in our day, to stand for his precious truth, for his adorable name, for his covenanted people. Let us gird ourselves with tried armour, and quit ourselves like men. So shall our faith be established like the everlasting hills, so shall our country be saved from impending danger, so shall our memory be precious to good men who come after us, so shall our end be peace and our reward certain and eternal.

---

[Continued from page 202.]

M O L I N I S M .

No. XVI.

XXIII. CONTINUED.—*The Account of the Bull Unigenitus continued*  
—*Christian Morals—Prohibition of the Scriptures.*

THE disputes between the Society of Port Royal and the Jesuits upon the subject of Christian morals, embraced a great many particulars. The propositions condemned by this bull do not comprise them all, but they do extend to the great principles concerning the nature of true righteousness upon which true Christian morals depend. The Port Royalists maintained "that the keeping of the law—that righteousness and piety do not consist in the exterior—that they are not the effect of fear—that they reside in the heart and in the will, and from thence influence the entire exterior conduct—that true piety consists in charity or the love of God," and with such sentiments they maintained the orthodoxy of the 47th, 44th, and 61st propositions condemned by the Bull.

*Prop. 47th.* "Obedientia legis profluere debet ex fonte; et hic fons est charitas; Quando Dei amor est illius principium interius et Dei gloria ejus finis, tunc purum, est quod apparet exterius. Alioquin non est nisi hypocrisis aut falsa justitia." *Obs. on Matt.* xxiii. 26.

*Obedience to the law must flow from a source, and that source is charity. When the love of God is the principle of it, and his glory the end, the exterior is pure. Otherwise it is nothing but hypocrisy and false righteousness.*

*Prop. 44th.* "Non sunt nisi duo amores, unde volitiones et actiones nostræ nascuntur: amor Dei, qui omnia agit propter Deum quemque Deus remuneratur: et amor quò nos ipsos, ac mundum diligimus qui, quod ad Deum referendum est non refert, et propter hoc ipsum fit malus." *Obs. on John* v. 29. (This observation is said to have been extracted word by word from Saint Leo, *Serm. 3, de Jejun. Septimi mensis.*)

*There are but two loves from which all our volitions and all our actions flow; the love of God, which does every thing for God; and which God rewards—the love of self and of the world, which does not refer to God that which ought to be referred to him, and which for that very reason becomes bad.*

*Prop. 61st. "Timor nonnisi manum cohibet cor autem tam diu peccato adducitur, quam diu ab amore justitiæ non ducitur." Obs. on Luke xx. 19.*

*Fear restrains the hand, while the heart is devoted to sin, so long as it is not drawn by the love of righteousness.*

The condemnation of these propositions authorised the doctrine of the Molinists or Jesuits upon the subject of Christian righteousness, which, as the reader has seen, is the source of frightful immoralities. We pass over the propositions relating to the sacrament of penance, for the reason suggested, and because it has already been sufficiently noticed: but there are several propositions relating to the power of the hierarchy, which are important for the influence they may have upon the conduct of persons in private life.

*Prop. 90th. "Ecclesia auctoritatem excommunicandi habet, ut eam, exercent per primos pastores de consensu, saltim præsumpto totius corporis." Obs. on Matt. xviii. 17.*

*It is the church which has the authority to excommunicate, to exercise it by the chief pastors, with the at least presumed consent of the whole body.*

The reader may remember the principles of the Jesuits upon the power of the popes. This proposition denies the absolute power which the popes claim, and which the Jesuits ascribe to them. It concedes, however, the primacy of the pope, and allows to him a power, of which the Scriptures know nothing. The next proposition condemned, has important practical bearings.

*Prop. 91st. "Excommunicationis injustæ metus nunquam debet nos impedire ab implendo debito nostro. Nunquam eximus ab ecclesia, etiam quando hominum nequitiam videmur ab eâ expulsi, quando Deo, Jesu Christo, atque ipsi ecclesiæ, per charitatem affixi sumus." Obs. on John ix. 22, 23.*

*The fear of an unjust excommunication should not prevent us from performing our duty. We do not go out of the church, even when we seem to be expelled from it by the wickedness of men, so long as we remain attached to God, to Jesus Christ, and to the church itself by love.*

This principle is adverse to the interests and policy of the Court of Rome. The papacy is a system of usurpation upon the religious liberties of men.

By proscribing this proposition, the Court of Rome opened to itself a wide career, in all those enterprises to which ignorant and superstitious men may be made subservient, by an ill founded fear of an unjust excommunication. Let a pope, for example, declare the subjects of a king absolved from their allegiance—let him forbid them under pain of excommunication, to obey their lawful sovereign—let him even order them to put their king to death as a public enemy under the like penalty, what course of conduct in such emergencies, could be expected from Roman Catholics who adopt the doctrine of the Bull?

The principle of this proposition, must have exerted a powerful and a controlling influence upon the minds of the Reformers.—What conduct could we have expected of Luther, if the fear of an unjust excommunication could have deterred him from performing his duty? Luther was conscious, notwithstanding the excommunication of Leo X., that he still remained in the church of Christ.—His proofs were his love to God, and to the Lord Jesus Christ, and to his church. The principle, then, which is here condemned, (even if it should be qualified by being confined to cases where the excommunication is *notoriously unjust*) justifies the motives and the conduct of the Reformers and in fact shows that the multitude of godly men who composed the first Reformed churches never lost their standing in the true church of Christ.

\* But the most extraordinary part of this Bull, is that which relates to the reading of the Holy Scriptures, and the instruction of Christians. We say the most *extraordinary*; perhaps we should say, the most striking to the mind of a Protestant Christian community. The sentiments condemned are the following.

*Prop. 80th.* "Lectio sacræ Scripturæ est pro omnibus." *Obs. on Acts. viii. 28.*

*The reading of the holy Scriptures is for all.*

*Prop. 81st.* "Obscuritas sancta verbi Dei, non est laicis ratio dispensandi se ipsos ab ejus lectione." *Obs. on Acts. viii. 31.*

*The holy obscurity of the word of God is not a reason why the laity should excuse themselves from reading it.*

*Prop. 82d.* "Dies Dominicus à Christianis debet sanctificari lectionibus pietatis et super omnia sacrarum scripturarum: damnosum est velle Christianum ab hac lectione retrahere." *Obs. on Acts xv. 21.*

*The Lord's day should be sanctified by Christians with pious reading, and especially with the reading of the holy Scriptures. It is damnable to wish to restrain a Christian from this reading.*

*Prop. 83d.* "Est illusio sihi persuadere, quod notitia mysteriorum religionis non debeat communicari fœminis lectione sacrarum librorum: non ex fœminarum simplicitate sed ex superbâ virorum scientiâ ortus est scripturarum abusus et natæ sunt hæreses." *Obs. on John iv. 26.*

*It is an illusion to persuade one's-self that a knowledge of the mysteries of religion should not be imparted to females by the reading of the sacred books. It is not from the simplicity of females, but from the proud science of men that abuse of the scriptures has arisen and hæreses have sprung.*

*Prop. 84th.* "Abripere e Christianorum manibus novum testamentum seu illis illud clausum tenere, auferendo eis modum illud intelligendi, est illis Christi os obturare." *Obs. on Matt. v. 2.*

*To take the New Testament out of the hands of Christians, or to keep it shut up from them, by taking from them that mode of understanding it, is to shut up for them the mouth of Christ.*

*Prop. 85th.* "Interdicere Christianis lectionem sacræ scripturæ, presertim evangelii, est interdicere usum luminis filiis lucis et facere ut patiantur speciem quandam excommunicationis." *Obs. on Luke xi. 33.*

*To forbid Christians the reading of the sacred scriptures, especially of the gospel, is to forbid the use of light to the children of the light, and to cause them to undergo a sort of excommunication.*

It is said that the whole of the one hundred and one propositions may be fairly reduced to one or another of the before-mentioned five heads. But the foregoing will suffice to show the doctrinal character of the Bull. The curates of Paris who favoured the party of Port Royal, in a letter dated January 2d, 1717, addressed to the Cardinal de Noailles say of this Bull that "the enemies of the church and of the state (by whom they mean the Jesuits) regard this Bull as the master piece (chef d'œuvre) of their power and of their cunning, and as the perfect accomplishment of the design, (for which they have so long laboured,) to make themselves the absolute masters of doctrine, and to substitute a system of morals unworthy of Pagan sages in the place of that which WISDOM itself has given us to be the rule of our conduct." Be this, however, as it may be, we may remark how absurd it is, in view of the motives in which this Bull originated, to ascribe to it the property of infallibility. Clement XI. took with him upon the papal throne, the unsound principles and paltry prejudices which he had previously imbibed. Add to this the disgusting intrigues of the Jesuits and the unworthy motives by which they were actuated during the whole course of the affair—these alone are enough to stamp the pretension to infallibility as a blasphemous absurdity. But when the reader turns to the matter of this Bull, and finds Pope Clement XI. (in the usurped character of the vicar of Christ,) condemning with so many abusive epithets as we have seen, such propositions as have been just stated relative to the reading of the scriptures, it will be impossible for him not to regard the pretension to infallibility, as an infamous imposture, designed to corrupt the truth of God and ruin the souls of men.\* In order, however, fully to show the

\*As the infallibility of the church is a capital point, it is worth the while to examine the grounds of the doctrine. God has promised to true believers the light and the guidance of his spirit, so that they shall not irretrievably fall into any fatal error. These true believers are a different body from the exterior or visible church, which is compared to a field in which tares are sown as well as wheat—to a net in which bad fishes are taken as well as good. The true church to which the attribute of infallibility belongs, is invisible. There is no exterior and visible church which may not err and fall away entirely from the faith, as experience proves. But although it is possible that any visible communion may thus apostatize, yet the promise of our Lord (Matt. xvi. 18.) will preserve at least some portion of the visible church from apostacy, though it may be that which is the least considerable in the eyes of men. Indeed the scriptures give us no reason to suppose, that great numbers—external propriety and power, are marks of the true church. They are rather the marks of Babylon, which is called a great city replete with riches and merchandise, (Rev. xviii. 10—13,) whereas the true church has ever been and ever will be during this dispensation aptly symbolized by the bruised reed—the dimly burning flax—the oppressed and feeble widow. The Romanists who claim infallibility for the papal church, are not agreed upon the question where it resides. Some attribute it to the pope, as the Jesuits—others to the pope in council—others to a council approved by the pope. But there is not a single text of scripture which authorises either opinion. In point of fact, popes have erred in fundamental points, as Liberius, who subscribed to the Arian heresy—and Honorius, when he embraced the sentiments of the Eutychians, and as

enormities of this Bull, it will be necessary to go into the consideration of the doctrine which the Jesuits deemed Catholic and

John XXII., when he denied the immortality of the soul. The Romanists pretend to found the doctrine on the words of our Lord in Matt. xvi. 18—"And upon this rock I will build my church," and upon Luke xxii. 32—"But I have prayed for thee that thy faith fail not," and John xxi. 15, 16, 17—"Feed my lambs," "Feed my sheep." This is not the place to enter upon a discussion of these texts. The reader will find the whole subject examined with great ability in the Essays on Romanism published by the Presbyterian Board of Publication. They have no bearing on the doctrine. The notion of the infallibility of Councils rests upon no better foundation than that of the infallibility of the popes. We find one council annulling the decrees of another. Some called œcumenical have certainly erred, as that of Ariminum (Rimini) which approved the impieties of Arius, and the second Council of Ephesus which authorised the errors of Eutyches. It would in fact be no easy task to enumerate all the errors of Councils. The expression of our Lord in Matt. xviii. 20, "where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them," cannot be used in support of this popish doctrine because the promise applies to an assembly of two or three pastors, or to a national council, (which they do not hold to be infallible,) as well as to an œcumenical council. Besides this, the promise is conditional—to obtain its benefit it is needful to assemble in the name of Christ, which is a condition of much import. The later councils, especially that of Trent, were far from being assembled in the name of Christ. That Council was governed by a spirit of cabal, of interest, of politics, which sought nothing less, than the glory of the Lord Jesus Christ. The Council of Trent was convoked by the pope against his will, and when he could no longer elude the demand of the church—but when he yielded he took such measures as would give him the control of it. He convoked it at Trent, which was but three days' journey from Rome. Not satisfied with presiding by his legates at the Council, he resolved that no proposition should be made except by their mouth, *proponentibus legatis*—and the propositions submitted were not examined in full council, but in particular congregations assembled with the chief legate, and when any difficulty occurred, a courier was despatched to Rome, who brought back the decision of the pope, which gave rise to a saying *que le Saint Esprit venoit de Rome a Trente dans une malle*, and after that the decrees were drawn up in order to be passed in council. And as the opinions of the Council were taken individually and not by nations as had been the practice in other councils, and as the bishops of Italy who were devoted to the pope exceeded in number all the rest, it is easy to see that the pope had the control of this council.

Such passages, also, as the following, are relied upon to prove this doctrine—"And lo I am with you always, even unto the end of the world." "And I will pray the Father and he will send you the Comforter," &c., "Howbeit when He, the Spirit of truth, is come, he will guide you into all truth," &c. These passages have a special reference to the apostles upon whom the Spirit descended. They were inspired and infallible teachers. But if it be insisted that they are applicable to ordinary pastors, each will have the same right in these promises as all together, and a national council may as well claim infallibility as a universal council.

As to the notion that a council is infallible, when headed by the pope, it may be said, if neither is infallible when separate, both will not be when conjoined, and the same may be said of the approval of the acts of a council by the pope. Pope Liberius approved an Arian Council held at Sirmium and it has occurred that one pope has approved the acts of a council which another pope had rejected. In fact this matter depends more upon the caprice of the popes than on any thing else. But does not Paul (in 1 Tim. iii. 15,) call the church of God the pillar and ground of the truth? Waving the criticism that what Paul calls the pillar, &c., is applied to the mystery of godliness of which he speaks in the next verse, we may ask what advantage the Romanists can derive from this text. Paul here speaks of a church which he calls the *House of God*, which must be understood of these believers with whom Timothy was then employed, *viz.*, the church at

orthodox upon the points to which these propositions refer, but this must be reserved for a future occasion. In the mean time, the reader will understand, that it is no part of our purpose to justify the doctrinal statements of the Jansenist or Port Royal party, farther than to say they were very much nearer the truth than Molinism, or the Bull *Unigenitus*. The *antitheses* thus exhibited between Jansenism or Port Royalism or Quesnelism on the one hand, and Molinism or (as we perhaps must regard it since this Bull) Catholicism on the other, will enable us to ascertain more easily and specifically the doctrinal errors of the Roman Catholic church.

---

[For the Spirit of the XIX. Century.]

PAPAL INFALLIBILITY.

THERE is no error so gross but that some minds will receive and hold it. The truth of this remark is so palpable, that it scarcely needs even an illustration. Look at the various systems of heathen faith. Look at the various doctrines of the Koran. Look at the multiplied forms of error on religious subjects in this country—Pelagianism, Mormonism, &c. &c. How gross? How absurd? Yet multitudes seem willing to risk their eternal salvation upon them. In contemplating such things, the mind becomes in a measure bewildered, and feels at a loss how to account for their existence. We wonder at the ignorance, the stupidity and incapacity to distinguish between right and wrong, truth and falsehood, which seem to oppress the great mass of minds. But amongst all the errors which prevail, and which cause the wonder and astonishment of the beholder, there is, perhaps, none more gross or absurd than that of infallibility claimed by popery. Next to universal supremacy the Romanists claim perfect and entire infallibility in reference to all articles of faith. Infallibility amongst men! Amongst

---

Ephesus, chap. i. 8. But after that time this very church which Paul so highly commends, calling it *the pillar*, &c., did fall away from the truth, as well as the other churches of Asia. But these words of the apostle in fact express simply the final end and destination of the church. They do not mean that the church will not depart from the truth, as is plain from the example of the church of Ephesus.

Another passage relied on is Matt. xviii. 17. "Tell it to the church." This certainly refers not to a universal council of bishops representing the universal church, but to a particular assembly of Christians. And the passage, too, has respect only to personal differences between Christians, not to the mysteries of the faith. After all, what need is there of an infallible tribunal? God has given us the scriptures, as the rule of faith. If our teachers follow them, we must obey. If they preach another gospel, we must remember what Paul says, Gal. i. 8, "Though we or an angel from heaven preach any other gospel, let him be accursed."

The falsity of this papal notion is shown by the history of Arianism, which once prevailed almost universally. With the exception of a few bishops, all the rest were Arians. Where was the church then? Was it needful to be an Arian, in order to be a good Catholic or orthodox? Councils and popes, the pulpit and schools and public authority were all in favour of Arianism. What has happened once, may happen again, and this ought to show even to a papist, how little the authority of his church can be depended upon.

sinners!! Yet it is claimed, and in virtue of it, all men are required upon pain of damnation to submit to the teachings of *holy mother church!* It is, therefore, worthy a few thoughts, and if upon examination, the claim be well founded, of course, as we desire to be saved, we must be found amongst the followers of his holiness, the pope of Rome. Let us, then, spend a few moments in examining this subject.

The first question to be solved is, where does this infallibility reside? Unhappily for the poor protestant, he cannot obtain any certain and positive answer to this question. The Romanists themselves have not settled this point. They claim infallibility, but when asked where it is certainly to be found, they seem as much divided as if no such thing existed. This very fact, therefore, presents a serious difficulty in the way of receiving this doctrine, by those who have not learned to yield implicit faith to the dicta of Roman priests.

One class of Romanists tell us that it is found in the pope personally, when on any point of faith he undertakes to give a decision. Another class supposes it to be found in each general council, viewed as the legitimate representative of the Catholic church. And still another class supposes it to exist in the general council, when their decision is sanctioned by the pope. If it exist any where, it must be found in some one or all of these depositaries. But if it can be shown to exist in neither; that is, if it can be shown, that all these have contradicted each other, time and again, then it must be admitted that the claim is not only groundless, but arrogant, presumptuous in the extreme, and blasphemous.

In reference to the infallibility of the pope personally, there is one fact which it seems difficult to reconcile with this attribute. In the sixth century, Pope Gregory said, "whosoever claims the universal episcopate, is the forerunner of Antichrist." *Greg. Magn. Epist. lib. vi. Epist. 30.* Can this declaration be consistent with the known and universally asserted claim of the Roman pontiffs? Have not Gregory's successors claimed this very universal episcopate? And does it not necessarily follow, either that they are the forerunners of Antichrist, which they will be slow to admit; or that Gregory has been guilty of fallibility? Can any other conclusion be drawn from this fact? Will they admit that the popes are the forerunners of Antichrist? If not, are they not shut up to the conclusion that Gregory has been guilty of fallibility? And that, not in a mere matter of opinion, but in a vital doctrine of the system.

Nor will the conclusion be any more favourable if we examine the testimony of impartial historical record, in reference to the decrees of councils. Out of a great number of facts we may select the following. In 754 a council was held at Constantinople, which ordered or decreed the removal of images from the churches, and prohibited image worship. But in 787 the second Council of Nice met and ordered the images to be restored, and established their worship again; and not only so, but anathematised all those who in the preceding council had been instrumental in abolishing this idolatry. Here then are two general councils directly at issue.

Are they both right? Or is one wrong and the other right? Both cannot be right. How then is the difficulty to be removed? Certainly in no other way than by admitting the fallibility of the councils.

But this is not all; on the subject of image worship, the greatest possible contradiction prevails among the councils. Not only did the Council of Constantinople forbid the worship of images, but the Council of Elvira, held by Constantine in the fourth century, had passed a decree of precisely the same import; yet the second Nicene Council superceded the decrees of both these.

Again, Charlemagne, Emperor of the west, held a Council of three hundred bishops at Frankfort in 794; which Council directly revoked the decree of the second Nicene Council, and prohibited the worship of images. And in 814 Leo, Emperor of the East, followed the example of Charlemagne, and by another council at Constantinople made the same decrees as that of Frankfort.

Thus both the east and west united in this object; but this union did not long continue; for we find that Theodora, the empress mother, during the minority of her son, called another Council at Constantinople, and in opposition to the preceding Council restored the decrees of the second Nicene Council, and re-established image worship. But previous to this, Louis the Meek, had called another Council in 824, and confirmed the decrees of the Council of Frankfort. Some difference of opinion, however, still existing in the east, in 879 another Council was called at Constantinople, in which it was again decreed that the decree of the second Nicene Council was orthodox. And not long after, the Latin or Western church yielded the point, and also adopted the second Nicene decree as orthodox.

In such a history of contradictions as this, where is the infallibility? Surely it must be delusion of the most wretched kind, for any one in view of facts like these to hug this phantom.

But this is not the only subject on which interminable contradiction prevails. In 1215 the fourth Council of Lateran, established by decree, under the sanction of Pope Innocent the third, the doctrine of transubstantiation, or a physical change in the bread and wine of the Lord's supper. This decree from the circumstances in which it was issued must be considered as the voice of the Latin church. And to fix the charge of infallibility upon her with regard to this subject, it is only necessary to see whether this doctrine was always held by her without dispute, from her own ecclesiastics.

From historical records it appears that this doctrine was not only not held, but is inconsistent with the united voice of the orthodox for nearly the first five centuries; and that when it was first started, it was by an acknowledged heretic. Those fathers who may be considered witnesses on this point, are Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, Cyprian, Augustin, Athanasius, Gregory of Nyssa, Theodoret of Cyprus, Gelasius, Facundus and Ephrem of Antioch. Clement of Alexandria says, the "wine is allegorically called blood."—*Paedag.* lib. i., c. 6, p. 104, and a mystic symbol, ii. c. 2, p. 106. Tertullian, in the second and third centuries, says "he

—Christ—gave the bread the *figure* of his own body; he consecrated the wine in memory of his own blood”—Adv. Marcion, lib. iii. sec. 12, 13, p. 209, de anim. in cap. de quinque sens. oper. p. 653. Cyprian, in the third century, says that “by wine the blood of Christ is shown forth.”—Ep. Caecil. lxiii. p. 153–4, Oxon. 1682. Cyril of Jerusalem, in the fourth century, calls the bread and wine types of the body and blood of Christ.”—Catechet. Myst. iv. p. 217. Chrysostom, in the same century, calls the Eucharist “spiritual food.”—Comment in Epis. ad Gal. c. v. oper. vol. ix. p. 1022. Augustine calls the bread and wine the *sign*; contra Euin c. xii. oper. vol. vi. p. 69, Calon. 1616, and *figure* of his body and blood. Enan. in Peal. xviii. oper. vol. viii. p. 397. Pope Gelasius, in the fifth century, says the substance or nature of the bread and wine ceases not to exist; and assuredly the image and similitude of the body and blood of Christ are celebrated in the action of the mysteries.”—See duab. Christ. Nat. cont. Nestor. et Eutyeh. in Biblioth. Ptr. vol. iv. p. 422. Facundus, in the sixth century, says, “the bread and wine are *not properly* his body and blood.”—Defens. Concil. Chalcid. Lib. ix. c. 5, oper. p. 144.

Here, therefore, we have certain evidence that the church for the first five centuries held no such doctrine. And here also we have the fourth Lateran Council against Pope Gelasius. Which of them is infallible?

There is still another method in which we prove the fallibility of the Roman church; i. e. in those instances in which they contradict the Scriptures.

1. With regard to the binding obligation of an oath, the Scriptures are very explicit. So much so, that they require the oath to be performed, though it be to the hurt or injury of him who takes it. If, therefore, the scriptures are the infallible word of God, and if it can be shown that the highest authority of the Roman church has pronounced oaths not to be binding when “contrary to ecclesiastical utility;” it necessarily follows that she is fallible. In proof of this point we find a standing decree of the third council of Lateran, being the eleventh oecumenical council, expressly declaring that oaths, “*contra utilitatem ecclesiasticam,*” are not to be considered in the light of oaths but of perjuries.—Concil. Lat. tert. can. xvi. Labb. Concil. Sacrosanct. vol. x. p. 1517. Now as we have before observed, if the Scriptures be infallible, this declaration of this oecumenical Council is and must be fallible. For it makes an oath binding or not, in proportion as it makes for or against the utility of the church. This feature of the Roman system is finely illustrated in the case of John Huss. The Emperor Sigismund had granted him a passport or safe conduct, but the hierarchy decreed that the oath of the emperor was contrary to ecclesiastical utility, and of course was not binding. In consequence, Huss was given up to the unrestrained malice, and persecuting rage of iniquitous ecclesiastics; and exemplified his attachment to the truth of God, and his aversion to popery, by dying at a martyr’s stake and in a martyr’s flame. It needs no eagle eye to discover in this iniquitous transaction, the basest perjury, and the most glaring fallibility.

2. Another instance in which the infallible decrees of an infallible council, have proved themselves fallible, is in the article of the marriage of the clergy. The apostle Paul, under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, declares that marriage is not only *allowable*, but *honorable* in *all*, whether minister or layman. But the second Council of Lateran, the tenth oecumenical Council, has declared that it is unlawful for the clergy of all orders, down to the rank of a subdiaconate inclusive. And this not on the ground of church order, or mere matter of temporary utility, but on the abstract and eternal principle of the unholiness of the marriage of the clergy. Thus, the Council declares it to "be an unworthy deed, that those persons who ought to be the holy vessels of the Lord should debase themselves so far as to become the vile slaves of chambering and uncleanness."—Concil. Lat. Sec. Can. vi. Labb. Concil. Sacrosanct. vol. x. p. 1003. The marriage of the clergy had also been prohibited by Pope Gregory VII., in the first Roman Council held in 1074. Labb. Con. Sacrosanct. vol. x. p. 326–328.

Thus we find that the Council and the Pope are both against Paul in this matter; and the question arises, which of them is right? If Paul, then the Pope and his Council have shown themselves to be grossly fallible.

Here then we might rest the argument; for we apprehend it has been sufficiently shown, not only that popes and councils have been arrayed against each other, but that council has decreed against council. And not only so, but that both the pope and council have contradicted the Scriptures, and that too in reference to matters of faith and practice.

The conclusion, therefore, must necessarily be that the church of Rome is fallible; inasmuch as she has contradicted herself in matters of faith and practice, and especially as she has contradicted the infallible word of God. Before dismissing the subject, however, there are several other remarks we wish to make.

It is urged by the papacy, that after all, God must have left some infallible test of truth for the support and preservation of the church in the absence of inspired teachers. To this we reply, that we cannot see any good reason why this should necessarily be the case. God is under no obligations to do any thing which he has not directly or indirectly pledged himself, by promise or otherwise to do. But he has no where specifically or even impliedly promised such an infallible test of truth to his church. It might be granted, that such a thing would be highly desirable; but from this we cannot determine that he has done so; and moreover, if we could, we every where find the existence of such a test contradicted by facts. No such thing, therefore has been given.

But this conclusion may be denied, and certain promises of our Saviour brought forward in support of the denial.

But to all these promises a very different interpretation may be given. The principal one, "Thou art Peter," &c., upon which this dogma is founded, is so manifestly, by fair interpretation, inconclusive, that no argument of weight can be built upon it. They may deny the interpretation we give, just as we do theirs; but if ours be sustained by facts, and theirs rests upon mere dogmatical

assertion, it certainly follows that we are correct, and they erroneous in the explication of the promise. But it may still be urged by them, is there then no method by which we can determine the truth, and form a definite conclusion? We answer, the Scriptures are a full, perfect and complete directory of faith and practice. If therefore we wish to arrive at certain conclusions concerning the truth of any doctrine of faith or practice, let us go to the law and the testimony; for if we speak or do not according to this rule, it is because there is no light in us. And if we differ here, it is a difference of interpretation, and can be decided only by a resort to first principles and the analogy of faith.

If after this there is a difference, there is no umpire, and the rule of the apostle must be applied, "let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind." This is the only probable and rational method of attaining to the truth; and in this manner excessive, insulated, or unenlightened private judgment, is excluded and the way open for a fair decision.

This conclusion may not suit the views of the hierarchy, but then it is the rational and common sense method of coming to a conclusion, and therefore to be preferred to any mere dogma of any fallible church.

There is one other argument which they adduce on this subject, but which, by every candid mind must be admitted to have no force. It is, that their doctrines and traditions are handed down to them in an unbroken chain, from the days of the apostles, and therefore must be correct. This argument would answer very well in the second or third centuries, when the successive links in the chain could be seen without difficulty; but at so remote a period as the nineteenth century, no such argument can be sustained. But the premises of the argument are untrue, for we have already shown that certain doctrines are held now, which were denied both by popes and councils to be the doctrines of the apostles. The doctrine for instance of a physical change in the elements used in the Lord's supper, is now held; but we have the evidence of pope Gelasius that no such doctrine was held by him or the church in his day. Now if it had been a doctrine or tradition of the apostles, he certainly would not have declared that the "nature, the substance or essence of the bread and wine remained unchanged or the same." Other instances might be adduced, but this is entirely sufficient. For if the claim of infallibility be disproved but in one case, it is lost entirely. If infallibility has been guaranteed to her at all, it must be uniformly exhibited, or no one will be able to tell when she is, and when she is not infallible. Hence, in view of the endless contradictions, and errors into which the papal church has fallen, no one with a mind free, and unprejudiced, can fail to pronounce her claim not only utterly groundless, but supremely absurd.

There is one fact which it seems to me should make the friends and advocates of popery, at least in this country, extremely slow to assert this claim. It is, that if she be infallible, she is now what she has always been, and vice versa. If so, then she still asserts supreme temporal as well as spiritual power—she sanctions as

righteous and just, the most bloody and cruel persecutions—she claims the right of dictating not only what every man shall believe, but what every man shall do, both in temporal and spiritual things. She still maintains that it is lawful to kill heretics, and declares that no faith is to be kept with them. She still withholds the Scriptures from the laity, and excludes all who do not receive her dogmas, from every hope of heaven. She once held these doctrines, unless indeed her own bulls, decrees, councils and historians have grossly slandered her, and therefore if she be infallible, she must hold them now. But how do these doctrines quadrate with civil and religious freedom? And what influence would they exert upon the institutions of this country if they should gain the ascendancy? If her advocates and apologists deny that she holds or teaches them now, they at once strip her of that which has been her boast, and destroy at once her vaunted infallibility. They are at liberty to do so if they choose, but they must remember at what cost they do it. If she has renounced them, let her say so, and thus confess before the world her enormous sins, and her flagrant arrogance; but let her not at the same time, continue to assert her infallibility.

It is evidence of unspeakable depravity for any one to claim this attribute, for it belongs in its absolute sense, alone to God. Men can become infallible, therefore, only by being transformed into gods, which is impossible; or by being inspired or controlled directly by divine influences, as were the prophets and apostles. If they claim infallibility on the first ground, they are to be pitied, as they thereby give evidence of their fitness only for a lunatic asylum. If on the second, they are not only utterly deficient in their proofs, but they degrade the exalted character of God and make him partaker of the most atrocious wickedness. Look at the horrible enormities committed by almost the whole order of the papal priesthood. The abandoned licentiousness of many, and the shameless infidelity of others, and who can believe for a moment, such men have been, are, or can be, the depositaries of infallible divine influences! "Credat Judaeus Apelles."—There is therefore no evidence from any quarter that she has been at any time possessed of this attribute, and it well becomes not only Christians, but all men, to resist by all reasonable and moral means, the increase and triumph of the papal system in this country. May God in great mercy deliver the churches and institutions of this country, from the "tender mercies" of this infallible church.

D. N.

---

WILL ANTICHRIST BE DESTROYED SOON?—LETTER FROM REV. JAMES C. BARNES.\*

*Dear Brother:*—IN a late No. of our *Missionary Chronicle*, we find the statistics of the Roman Catholic Church, taken from "The

---

\* This excellent friend authorises us to expect from him a series of communications for our pages on the subject of *The Latter Day Glory of our Redeemer's Kingdom*. This subject is one of exceeding great interest to every pious heart, and has, of late years, been strongly and extensively revived throughout most of the churches of God. Like all other subjects lying yet in the womb of time, it is as to its details, necessarily a matter rather of conjecture than of certain

Metropolitan Catholic Almanac, and Laity's Directory for 1842, published in Baltimore." Here we have before us a summary of the strength of this hierarchy in the United States amounting to 1,300,000. Also, their total number AT THE LOWEST CALCULATION, throughout the world, estimated at the round sum of 156,000,000! Now, if what is advanced by most Protestant writers since the days of Luther be true, that, this stupendous power is the ANTI-CHRIST, spoken of by Daniel the Prophet, the Apostle Paul, and John the Beloved; and, according to the views of some of Christ's servants, to be destroyed antecedent to the second Advent of Messiah and his universal reign on earth;—according to the prophet Daniel by the stone cut out of the mountain without hands; according to Paul, with the breath (or command) of Messiah's mouth, and the brightness of his coming; and according to John, with the sword of the Almighty Conqueror—(see Dan. ii. 44; 2 Thess. ii. 8, Rev. xix. 19—21.) the interesting question occurs—Is there evidence to satisfy the serious, inquiring mind, that this gigantic power is tottering to its fall?

This has been gravely asserted by some worthy and pious brethren and fathers, and published throughout christendom. This we believe is the general opinion of those who believe that the wonderful light of the present age will presently be swallowed up in the splendors of the latter day glory. Connected with this subject the question assumes considerable importance. What then are the evidences adduced to prove that the Roman Catholic Hierarchy is tottering to its fall? One of the most popular we have noticed is, the loss of influence among the crowned heads of Europe. It is asserted without much evidence, that no King or Emperor can now be found on the continent, who would stand as a servant to his Holiness the Pope, and hold his stirrup while he mounted, or kneel at his foot-stool and kiss his slipper. But few monarchs in past ages, ignorant and deluded as many of them were, that would thus have condescended. Crowned heads in general, as well as their subjects, are too much elevated in this literary age, to stoop in this manner; but we have no reason to doubt from what we know of the devout veneration in which Roman Catholics hold the Pope, that there are monarchs now in Europe, who would not only wait on his Holiness, and hold his stirrup—but who would consider it an honor to kiss his toe, although they might not be quite so willing to make it public as in past ages.

knowledge, and therefore peculiarly requires sobriety and moderation in dogmatizing about it. It is indeed a matter of plain revelation and of unquestioned faith, that the church of Jesus Christ will finally and triumphantly pervade the whole world; and that the Lord Jesus will in some very glorious manner, come again a second time without sin unto salvation. But the time, the manner, and the relation of these grand events in the great scheme of Redemption and prophecy—are questions of much difficulty, and have always divided the opinions of God's people. There are many reasons which make it very agreeable to us to occupy a portion of our pages with this subject; not the least of which is that it has a very striking and remarkable connexion with that great papal controversy to which a part of our labours have been, by God's providence, long directed, and to which this periodical has a somewhat special reference. It is to this aspect of the question that the present letter of Mr. Barnes, (which was published some time ago in the west, but is now communicated for this periodical in a corrected form,) particularly alludes.—[E.]

What evidence is there, that can be relied on, that in any one of the ten kingdoms into which the old Roman Empire was divided, the influence of the pope is destroyed; and where is there a crowned head now in authority, in any one of those kingdoms, who is not in one way or other engaged in advancing the interests of Rome? With one exception I believe [and that exception is nominal,] all are professed Catholics, and being such, they are bound by the very same ties to that hierarchy that bound monarchs centuries ago. A Roman Catholic in the nineteenth century is the same as a Roman Catholic in the sixteenth century. And altho' worldly policy and the spirit of the age may restrain the monarchs and princes of Europe from following in the bloody steps of the Duke of Alva, or acting over again the scenes of the Eve of Bartholomew; nevertheless all that is necessary to aid the Pope in grasping universal empire, and governing the world by a nod from the chair of St. Peter now is, and will be contributed in money and influence by the crowned heads, and royal blood in the popish communion in Europe. Another evidence of the decline of popery which is presented by some, is the cessation of persecution unto death. It can only be asserted with any shadow of truth, that persecution has ceased in popish countries in this one particular; Protestants are not now openly and publicly put to death for their faith; but has persecution ceased? Are the followers of the Lamb tolerated in their religion, and permitted to worship their God and Redeemer according to the Word of God and the dictates of their own conscience, in Roman Catholic countries? Are they received by Roman Catholics as brethren in the Lord and lovers of the same Saviour they profess to worship?—Far, very far from it. Protestant Christians are treated in the same manner now in the dominions of the Pope as they were three centuries ago, with the exception that they are not *publicly* executed. What if the fires of persecution at this period do not burn so fiercely as in centuries past?—What if the inquisitions are now closed—turned into barracks or warehouses?—Are we, therefore, to suppose, and to declare that popery is about to become extinct? Can any intelligent Christian believe it? Truly it is only a change of measures. All societies are fond of new measures; and it requires new measures to convert a new world to Rome!—Furthermore, can any Christian suppose because wealthy establishments of various orders in Italy, Germany, and Spain, are stripped of their overgrown resources which have been accumulating and rusting for ages, and those resources in consummate wisdom are now directed across the Atlantic to build churches, cathedrals, colleges, &c., among us; that therefore, popery is on the decline?—none can believe it. Who does not know that the distinguished Prince Metternich is now doing vastly more for the Pope, and the interests of Rome than ever the Duke of Alva, Catharine de' Medici, or any Inquisitor General ever did in their days of blood!—But there is another fact adduced by some to prove that popery is on the decline.—That is the advancement of literature, and the arts in this age of light, and the march of mind. It has been gravely asserted that the pope himself is about to commit suicide by building colleges in the old city of renown. We feel great veneration for the opinions of brethren and fathers, who may entertain and advance such views. But we can discover no evi-

dence from the scriptures of truth, or from matter of fact, that the light of science has in any degree in past ages, or ever will be the destruction of this hierarchy. What are the facts?—Every man at all familiar with civil or ecclesiastical history, well knows that during what are called the dark ages, the Roman Catholic Church was literally the sole depository of the arts and sciences. The polite literature of the world, now diffused over many nations was almost if not entirely confined for ages to that communion, while the rest of the world was comparatively in a state of semi-barbarism. And yet when the pious mind goes in search of the real spiritual church of Christ, and the living members of the living Head; he does not find either the one or the other, where he finds the arts and sciences—in courts and lordly palaces—but among the hardy mountaineers of Switzerland, Scotland, the persecuted Moravians, and others of a similar spirit, who were counted the filth and off-scourings of all things, of whom the world was not worthy. Nor do we find that the arts and sciences then monopolized by the votaries of Rome had any effect whatever in converting and spiritualizing that church, or removing the dreadful moral corruptions that were at length the occasion of Luther's attack on the man of sin, and bringing about that glorious reformation which turned the hearts of multitudes to the fountain of purification. True, Luther, and Calvin, and many of their associates were learned men, and doubtless they were thankful for their advantages in this respect. But their literature although in its proper place important, as was their bodily health, and strength, and a competency of the good things of life; it would be as correct to assert that Luther's strength of body or power of speech was the cause of the glorious Reformation, as to say that it was effected by the literature of these great men. The main spring of the whole work is to be found in the sound conversion of the hearts of the great reformers, by the Spirit of the living Saviour.—There were, no doubt, very many as sound literary characters in the Romish communion, as was Luther and his associates in their day, and probably many far more scientific, and yet they remained and lived and died in darkness and moral pollution, while he and his companions were brought into the light and liberty of the children of God.

Nor do we believe there exists a particle of evidence that the Reformers entertained the thought for a moment that the light of science would ever prove the destruction of Rome, which they uniformly call ANTI-CHRIST.—Literature and science, have ever been the boast of Rome—such is the fact at the present moment. Have they feared the light of science either ancient or modern? Do they fear the refined literature of the age? They do not.—Ten thousand facts prove that both in Europe and America, their greatest men are the firm friends and staunch advocates of the literature of the age. The best of all evidence on this subject is that they are devoting millions of dollars on both sides the Atlantic, with the lives and talents of hundreds of distinguished men in their communion to the advancement of literature in all its branches; and yet they remain strict, and faithful adherents of the Pope. Now, we are called in the face of all this evidence, gathered from the past ages, as well as the present—(which proves just the reverse,) to believe that literature, science, colleges and their adjuncts, are yet

to be the downfall of popery. For one, we would as soon believe that steam navigation and railroads, will hereafter convey the ransomed of the Lord to the New Jerusalem, that air balloons will be used to carry departed saints to the bosom of Abraham. In view of what has been advanced, it may be asked, is there scriptural evidence to believe that before the latter day glory, this gigantic power shall fall to rise no more?—We answer, in our humble opinion, there is. To the following passages of God's Holy word, we refer the disciples of the Saviour, who with the spirit of a little child are willing to sit at his feet and learn his revealed will. Dan. ii. 35—44, 45; vii. 24—26; xi. 45; 2 Thess. ii. 8; Rev. xviii. 1—21; Rev. xix. 19, 21. May the God of all grace give us understanding and grace to watch and pray and wait for the coming of the Lord.

J. C. B.

[For the Spirit of the XIX. Century.]

THE THEOLOGICAL EXAMINER.

No. V.

ΝΑΥΤΑ . ΔΟΚΙΜΑΣΤΗ.

O Jerusalem! Jerusalem! thou that killest the prophets, and stonest them which are sent unto thee, how often would I have gathered thy children together even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and ye would not!—Matt. xxiii. 37.

Is the doctrine of sovereign grace inconsistent with these words of our Saviour?

The difficulty in this passage of Scripture is precisely the same as that in those which enjoin duties and offer salvation to all mankind universally, whilst no one will perform those duties or accept of the salvation but they who are effectually inclined and enabled to do so, by the operation of the Holy Ghost upon their hearts, in accordance with the eternal purpose of divine election.

The alleged objection is this: "If mankind are unable to accept of salvation, without the aid of super-natural grace, it would seem to be insincere to make the offer of salvation, after determining to withhold the grace, and unjust to punish for the non-acceptance."

This objection is based upon the supposition—1st. That man is not under an original and immutable obligation to obey his Maker. 2d. That in what way soever man has lost the ability and the willingness to serve his Master, he is in no-wise *guilty* in relation to it; it is his *mere misfortune*; and consequently, 3d, Under these circumstances, it is insincere to inform him of his duty, unless the grace be imparted by which he can perform that duty; and unjust to punish any for disobedience, unless equal grace is given to all. Now since this is all mere assumption—a taking for granted of that which is false, and therefore inadmissible, the doctrine of 'salvation by grace,' can have nothing to fear from objections raised upon such a foundation, and it cannot be inconsistent with any passage of the word of God interpreted upon such principles.

But let us examine the matter a little in detail.

1. When the Almighty Creator made man in his own image, it pleased him, in kind condescension, to enter into a covenant with

the creature, by which eternal life would be the reward of perfect obedience; and eternal death the punishment of transgression. But to promise a reward for obedience was an act of *mere favour*, our obedience being no less due, though no reward had been proposed. For the simple fact that God is the author of our existence, is alone a sufficient ground of the most sacred obligation to obey his will concerning us. Our disobedience of the Divine will, therefore, whilst it forfeits the reward and incurs the penalty does not alter our relation to our heavenly Parent, *as his creatures*: this is a changeless relation, and is the basis of an eternally inalienable obligation to render him perfect obedience. Our rebellion cannot render us independent of our lawful Sovereign. Our sins do not release us from duty. Although sinners, we are still God's *creatures*, and as such, bound to obey his will, and liable to the consequences of transgression. This is true of every creature in existence, from the arch-angel before the throne to the meanest fiend in perdition. Now if it is the duty of the creature to obey the Creator, under all possible circumstances; whether in heaven, on earth, or in hell; there can be no possible impropriety in our being *informed* what our duty is—how to perform it—and that we shall be rewarded, or punished according to our deserts. And the *information* may be furnished in any way according to the pleasure of our Heavenly Father; either in the form of a simple precept, or prohibition; or as precepts and prohibitions mingled with promises and threatenings.

2. Man having sinned against God, is under a righteous sentence of condemnation. He is nevertheless, as responsible as though he had not sinned. This follows from what has been said: additional proof is found in the undisputed fact, that all unconverted men sin with the *perfect consciousness* that no compulsory force is exercised upon them; and that they not only sin *freely and willingly*, but also with approbation of their transgressions. Since then, whilst unconverted, we are perfectly conscious that we sin *voluntarily* and not by unavoidable constraint, it is contradictory to reason, to ascribe our sins to any foreign source; and absurd in the last degree, to attribute them "*to the withholding of Divine grace*"; for that being a mere *negation*, cannot be the cause of any thing. The cause of sin, therefore, must be in the sinner himself; and as this cause operates with the sinner's *free consent* and approbation, it is unquestionably just to hold him accountable for all the consequences of his sins, which *he is conscious* he commits voluntarily. But the sinner's inability to repent and turn to God, is the result of that spiritual death, inflicted in execution of the threatening "*In the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die.*" Gen. ii. 17. Now if it is unjust to punish a sinner after he has sinned, it must be because his sins render him *irresponsible*; than which nothing can be more absurd, for in that case, the way to be relieved from all obligation and all responsibility in future, would be to abandon ourselves to the commission of every crime. But all admit that it is perfectly just for the Righteous Judge of all the earth, to punish every sin of the creature. And the only ground of justice for him to do so is that the sinner's future responsibility is indestructible by any consequences of his former transgressions. If, therefore, a sinner continues responsible after the commission

of sin, so as to render it *just* for God to *punish* him; it follows *a fortiori*, that it is perfectly consistent with justice and sincerity to *address* him as a responsible being. And there is no possible way of doing this but by precepts, prohibitions, commands, threatenings and promises.

To illustrate the preceding remarks, take the following: "As I live, saith the Lord, I have no pleasure in the death of the wicked; but that the wicked turn from his way and live; turn ye, turn ye from your evil ways; for why will ye die?" Ezek. xxxiii. 11. In this the Lord informs the wicked, 1st, That it is their duty to turn or repent. This it is perfectly right for him to do; for repentance is the unquestionable duty of the impenitent, whether they ever perform that duty or not. 2d. The Lord swears by his own eternal existence, that he has not determined their perdition in consequence of any pleasure or delight which he takes in their misery. 3d. He calls upon the wicked to declare the cause of their perdition, if it be not their *voluntary* determination to do that which justly deserves eternal death. If, therefore, the cause of a sinner's ruin is his own *wilful* sins, he alone is to blame, and not the Lord for withholding saving grace, which not being due to any, may be withheld from all.

Again, when our Saviour said to the Jews, "Come unto me all ye that labour, and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest,"—he not only *informed* them that it was their duty to come unto him as their Saviour, but also encouraged them to come by promising them rest. Now to prove that he was insincere in making this promise, it will be necessary to show that it was *not their duty to come to Christ*; and that *he did not intend to bestow the gift, if they had come to him*. The fact that they were unable of themselves to come to him, resulted neither from physical necessity, nor from his sovereign pleasure in withholding grace; but from the guilt of sins *wilfully* committed; *they, and they alone*, were responsible for their rejection of him, and he could not be insincere in giving the invitation. And after they had sealed their doom by finally rejecting him, what could have induced him to disregard the loud hosannas of the adoring multitude, when descending Mount Olivet, (Luke xix.) he beheld the holy city in its gorgeous splendour?—What but deep sympathy for its devoted thousands could have caused the shedding of those tears which fell but for others' woes? And when exhorting them for nearly the last time, every argument appearing to fall powerless upon their hardened hearts, did he not in the very form of that touching lament, "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem!" the most beautiful that language can express, evince at once the sincerity of all he had done to save them; and that they having wilfully resisted all the efforts of his grace, and the strivings of his Spirit, were guilty of their own perdition?

Salvation is of God—perdition is of men. This is the consciousness of every sinner, when brought to the test. He prays for mercy, pardon, and heaven, as things to which he has no claim. He asks them, therefore, not in his own name, but in the name of him who shed his precious blood for the guilty. He acknowledges they may be justly withheld from any, because they are due to none; and he feels that his sins have earned the wages of death, and that the righteous law of God would approve the sentence, should he

be finally condemned, though eternal life, the gift of God, be bestowed upon all the world beside.

J. P. C.

SOME ACCOUNT OF THE LATE REV. JOHN H. REDINGTON, WITH PARTS OF HIS CORRESPONDENCE AND ILLUSTRATIVE NOTES THEREON.

Article Third.—*Letters written in 1838.*

Moscow, Livingston Co., N. Y., May 5d, 1838.

*My Dear Brother:*—Grace, mercy, and peace to you. I wrote you a letter from Wilksbarre, Pa., 21st Oct. last, which I know not whether you received. It, however, required no answer. I have since frequently thought of writing to you again, that you might know a little what was taking place in Moscow and in this region, but I have not till now actually set myself about it.

And now what shall I say? Why "the Lord reigneth, let the earth rejoice." O that I had more "*faith in God*," and could with a spiritual eye, see him upon the throne, working all things according to the sovereign good pleasure of his will. "All things work together for good to them that love God." Am I among the number? Then why am I fearful? "He hath said I will never leave thee nor forsake thee, so that we may boldly say "the Lord is my helper and I will not fear what man shall do unto me." Blessed assurance! O that it were mine!—But I am to tell you, dear brother, some thing of our concerns. And first, the Lord has been gracious and merciful to myself, wife and little child, so that we have wanted nothing for our temporal comfort. As to my soul, it is quite too *lean*. I am almost like a dry stick—grace seems *weak*, corruption *strong* within me. "O wretched man that I am, who shall deliver me from the body" of sin and death which I carry about with me? I thank God there is hope, even for *me*, through Jesus Christ.

In the providence of the "only wise God," I have been called to pass through some conflicts within months past—Without, have been "*fightings*," within, "*fears*," yet I thank the Lord Jesus, he hath upheld his poor servant hitherto. Except a small remnant who hold to the Assembly, my sword is against every man, and every man's sword is against me in this region. The last year's Assembly and its doings are held in utter execration, by the great majority in this quarter—and dear brother, let not Satan stir your pride when I inform you that upon your own name, is poured out an extraordinary measure of abuse. You are accounted chief among your brethren, in the curses the adversaries bestow. But the day may come (which may God grant,) and will come, if the great and good work of *Reform*, so happily begun in our church last year, be duly carried on and finished, when those who had a principal hand in giving the first successful blow, will not be forgotten in the grateful recollections of after pious generations, however they may be treated now.

As to the state of things in this church, I remark they are far from being so well as I could wish.—There is "no king in Israel" here, so that every one does "what is right in his own eyes." Be assured this state of things is a great grief and vexation to my soul, but I cry to God for patience and hope for better things.

The opposition has been very strong, ever since this church went back to the Assembly. The enemy is indefatigable, and leaves no stone unturned to defeat the truth. Three of our elders out of six, have of late staid away from our session meetings altogether. Many of the New School stay away from the sanctuary, and the public ear is filled with all sorts of evil reports and scandals against that part of this church which holds with the Assembly. The minds of some of our weaker and less established

orthodox brethren have been shaken by the mis-statements which have continually been buzzed in their ears, so that now the male members of the church are about equally divided as to Old and New School. We should long ago have called our refractory members to an account, if the state of public sentiment in this community, would have sustained us—but we all knew it would not. And further, we were not certain whether the next Assembly would confirm the doings of the last, and so thought we had better wait the issue of the meeting of that body, before proceeding to deal with those members who set the authority of our church at defiance. We intend to trust in God and do our duty, when called to it. If the New School prevail in the next Assembly, of course the orthodox in Moscow, if they will maintain their integrity, must go out and build on a new foundation. But if the Old School prevail, what shall we do with those who will not submit? Shall we commence a regular judicial process against them, and make them conform or cut them off? This would be a very tedious and difficult matter, and I hardly know how it would end. I have thought of another way; and submit it for your opinion. If the doings of the last Assembly are *confirmed* by the next, why cannot we go through our church in Moscow and ascertain of every member, whether he or she, will or will not abide by the Assembly's decision, and write down their names. Then in respect to those who expressly and finally refuse to submit to the authority of the church, let the session by a single act declare them all out of the church, in the same manner in which the Assembly proceeded with the four Synods? Why may not this session act upon a corrupt part of this church, as the Assembly did upon the corrupt Synods, the reason of the action being the same in both cases? Certainly it may be considered that individual members of a church came in under the plan of union, and that plan being annulled, and they refusing to conform to our standards, will it not follow that they are out of the church? Please let me know your mind.

I have another question to propose. The opponents in our church and society (this last is a very loose thing, and it is difficult to say who belongs to it,) own about two-thirds of the meeting house. Now suppose the next Assembly confirms the last, of course the orthodox in this church and society, would in the eye of the law be the true Presbyterian church and society of Moscow; but suppose the others being the majority, should attempt to exclude us from the house, would you advise to "appeal to Cesar," or to go to law for our legal rights, or quietly go and build anew? In the latter case, we shall get rid of all the rubbish at once—in the former, we should have the Herculean task of cleansing the sanctuary and making the crooked things straight. There is a vast amount of wood, hay and stubble in our churches. None but God can effect a thorough reform.

I hope you are appointed to the next Assembly. It may be a case of complaint from the Presbytery of Susquehanna, against the Synod of New Jersey may come up. The ground of it will be the Synod's refusal to give us a Presbytery in this region. If the Assembly have the constitutional power, under the circumstances to do for us what the Synod refused, I think it would greatly aid the cause of orthodoxy in this quarter, for the Assembly to give us a Presbytery immediately instead of sending the matter back to Synod; but perhaps it would not be regular—if so, by no means let it be done. May God, for Christ's sake pour down his Spirit upon the Assembly. The time is at hand. Let the friends of truth be "instant in prayer." I hope there will be no temporising—no going down into the "plains of Ono." The orthodox must plant themselves upon the standards of the church, and reject every thing which does not conform to them. I get your Magazine. I see you are not without troubles. May the Lord give you the wisdom, prudence, and fortitude which you need. Do you find time to pray, in the midst of your press of affairs? "Pray without

ceasing"—pray for me and for *Moscow*. The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you.

Affectionately yours,

Rev'd R. J. Breckinridge, *Baltimore*.

JOHN H. REDINGTON.

Tell me how things are likely to go in the Assembly.

Should the orthodox remnant here be hardly pressed and unable of themselves fully to sustain a minister, and should it be for the interest of truth, and for the glory of God, stoutly to maintain this post against all opposition, could we get a little pecuniary aid from our brethren at a distance without applying to the Board of Missions? If we could pick up a little here and there, it might answer us. The orthodox here are disposed to do all they well can.

J. H. R.

*Moscow, Livingston Co., N. Y., May 10th, 1838.*

*My Dear Brother:*—I wrote you on 5d inst., and without waiting for a reply, now address you again. Since the date of my last, I have learned that you have been appointed a commissioner to the next Assembly. For this I thank the Lord. Whatever faults you may have (for doubtless you have a share of what falls to the common lot; and I have yet to learn that you set up any claim to *perfection*;) I think you could be ill spared from the highest judicatory of our church, in the approaching great crisis. And may "grace, mercy and peace, from God our Father, and Jesus Christ our Lord" be with you and with all whom he has called, or shall call to put their hands to the great work of reformation in our church. Great indeed it is, and in view of it, we might at once sit down in hopeless despair of its happy accomplishment, were it not for the promise of Him who said "*upon this rock I will build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.*" I confess my heart would utterly melt within me in view of the abominations in our Zion, did I not remember what God, in times past, has done for his church when her enemies seemed just ready to destroy her forever. It pleases the Lord, to give me by degrees, some faint view of the present deplorable condition of the Presbyterian church—and O that he would enable me to sigh and cry (see Ezek. ix.) for the evils that exist! You may see some of my poor thoughts on this subject in the Presbyterian of the 5th inst., under the head, "*healing the hurt slightly.*" I thank the Lord, dear brother, that I have no fears that you will be among the number of *slight healers*, but I greatly fear that others will. Perhaps my apprehensions are too much excited, being surrounded as I am with *New Schoolism* in all its forms, and knowing as I do, that in every one of these forms, it is the deadly enemy of our old Presbyterian system. I repeat, that there is no form of *New Schoolism*, in this region, not excepting that which would pass for first rate *Orthodoxy* in New England, but what is the determined and implacable foe of *Presbyterian Old Schoolism*, properly so called. I speak advisedly and from knowledge, and with the very kindest feelings towards the persons of all who oppose us. If the thing can possibly be done, in consistency with truth and righteousness, (and this I trust you do not doubt, i. e. as to the *right* of the matter) maintain fully the position taken in the Assembly of last year, in regard to the four Synods; and if the thing is not done, it will be a *suicidal* act—it will be nothing short of *moral self-murder*, committed by the whole Presbyterian church, through her delegates, lawfully convened.

I would therefore beseech—yea, charge you, in the Lord, beloved brother, to set your face "like a flint" against any and every proposition from whatever quarter, to admit the four Synods, or any part of them, into our church again, on any general examination or representation of things. Should any Presbytery, in the three excluded Synods of N. Y., present itself at the bar of the Assembly, and claim admission on the ground that it is *strictly Pres-*

byterian in doctrine and in order, do not believe it for a moment. There is no such Presbytery in all this region. Would to God there were!—Be assured, dear brother, and let every one who holds with you be assured, that there is no such Presbytery in all this quarter, unless those who deny the doctrines of original sin, atonement and imputation, as plainly laid down in our standards, are to be considered as *strictly Presbyterian*. And if so, farewell to our standards—farewell, in short, to every thing worth the name of *Presbyterian* in these United States, under the present organization of this body. I remember well what you said to me in a letter last September, and I remember too, what was expressed in the resolutions of the Presbytery of Baltimore, about the same time. No doubt those things are freshly remembered by you, and I should do you great wrong to suppose your mind had in the least changed. If, then, the four Synods, *as such*, are admitted on any terms, I shall confidently expect, if no one else makes a move, to see brother R. J. Breckinridge, under God, lead off, in the formation of a *new Presbyterian church* worthy of the name, with just as many as with heart and soul will follow him.\* Alas for our poor church! Many are her wounds! Is it possible she can be healed? “Is there no balm in Gilead? Is there no physician there?” The reports which you will have from Synods of their complying with the direction of Assembly, in causing all Presbyteries and churches in their bounds to become strictly Presbyterian in doctrine and order, will, I fear, in most instances be a mere evasive *sham*. Is the Presbytery of *Montrose* and *Col. Jessup*, for instance, strictly Presbyterian, and yet I doubt not you shall have such a report.—But perhaps I trouble you, and may seem officious, and were it not so, I must close for want of room. Yet before doing so, I have a favour to beg, and it is, that

\*The editor of this journal thinks it is due to himself and to historic truth to say, that he was always and utterly opposed to the secession of the orthodox portion of the Presbyterian church from its bosom; and that he never, at any time or under any circumstances failed to oppose this plan. The alternative presented in the closing paragraph of the *Act and Testimony* adopted in the spring of 1834, and which it is known he drew up by special order of those who issued it—was in substance this, that the orthodox would continue their efforts till they had reformed the church, or purged it, or been themselves ‘cut off.’ It is indeed true, that many persons amongst us, and at various times, going back as far as the Assembly of 1831, did contemplate secession; and that this calamitous result was, with great difficulty avoided, on several occasions. It is also true, that the Assembly of 1837 met, with a fixed determination on the part of a large portion of the orthodox members of it, to secede on the rising of the body, if our troubles were not settled during that session. It was, in fact, with this alternative before our eyes, that the majority in that Assembly acted throughout. And the writer of these lines, now says, as he has often said before, that while he sincerely believes every leading act of that body was in itself right, and under the circumstances indispensable, and while indeed he is ready to be held, as he ought to be held, responsible in a large measure for most of them; yet, he then thought, and he still thinks, a better and a more efficacious settlement of our affairs could have been made, if matters would have borne greater delay, and a more patient and thorough dealing. And that they would not bear it, was the result of a public sentiment which he had no share in producing, (for he was in Europe from March ’36 till May ’37;) with which he did not entirely sympathize; and which he respected and obeyed, simply because, being right in its general direction, and just in its general aims, he judged it impossible to resist its minor requirements without involving the church in ruin. It is but just to say, that the conduct, principles, and avowals of the New School party, especially in the Assemblies of 1836 and ’7, rendered all delay extremely dangerous, and all trust in them very nearly allied to fatuity; and that nothing but unlimited confidence in the constancy, piety, and devotedness of the orthodox, could justify any one in desiring or recommending less than the most energetic action. It is right, also, to add, that every subsequent development has proved the New School party to have been both a worse and a stronger party, than most persons believed them to be, even in 1837.—[Ed.]

so soon as it is certainly known how matters are likely to go in the Assembly, you will drop me a line of information; it may greatly help us in Moscow, to be informed of this at the earliest possible date. We are in great trouble and confusion here. I do not know but the Lord designs me to leave this place. Let his will be done. Have a kindly, watchful eye upon —, of —,\* I see he is delegated to the Assembly. He did *orthodoxy* a mischief in the Synod of New Jersey last fall. The Lord Jesus Christ be with you.

Affectionately yours,

Rev'd R. J. Breckinridge, Phila.

JOHN H. REDINGTON.

Moscow, Livingston Co., N. Y., June 12, 1838.

*My Dear Brother:*—Your letter of 6th inst., was received last evening. I give God thanks for it—it refreshed my spirit in the Lord. You who are surrounded with dear brethren who hold and speak the same things, can hardly conceive of the situation of one circumstanced as I am. I have very few with whom to take sweet counsel. The nearest actual member of my Presbytery (Susquehanna) is 47 miles from me. I mean Bro. Platt of Bath. Good old father Denoon of Caledonia, is only 12 miles off—and I some times see him and get some strength and comfort; but he is aged and infirm, and does not stir much from home. He is not yet in connexion with our Presbytery, not however, through any want of inclination. His infirmities have prevented his meeting with us. These are the *only* two ministers in my vicinity, besides myself, that have taken any firm stand for orthodoxy. There are a number of others that have *talked* well at times, but I have not heard of their *acting*. Indeed, my dear brother, I hardly know what to make of some men. This, however, is more and more plain to me, that “a double minded man is unstable in all his ways,” and that it is very unsafe to meddle with them that “are given to change.” For my own part, I have had my share of troubles and perplexities in common with “all in every place,” who have made a bold stand for the truth. But the Lord Jesus has hitherto upheld me; in whom also I trust, that he will still uphold, and may his grace always be sufficient for me, so that with Paul, I may “glory in my infirmities.” You told me last fall, that my enemies would ruin me if they could. It was a word of timely caution. That they have not ere this, accomplished the thing, has not, I think, been for lack of will on their part. Blessed be God, who hath not left me a prey to their teeth! Hard and bitter things are said—but I let them pass. God helping me, I shall hold fast my integrity unto the end, let men or devils say or do what they may or can. I am a worm of the dust—weak in more respects than one—and altogether insufficient in myself to cope with the difficulties in which I am involved,—but I thank my God through Jesus Christ, that there is not the least misgiving in my mind, as to the propriety of the course which I have taken. Come what will, if the Lord help, I shall stand or fall with the truth.

But whither am I wandering? I should adhere to the point.

I thank God for your letter—and you also for your kindness in writing. I like a man of your plain speech, and plain dealing. There seems to be no double-mindedness in you—and you need have none, and should have none in the great cause in which you are engaged. I say *you* and not *we* for though, as to *will* in the ease, and freeness from a double mind, I may perhaps claim some affinity to you in this matter,—yet as to what I have been actually able, by God's grace to accomplish, why, it is nothing, and

\* We judge it best to withhold this name. The *owner* of it will probably have no difficulty in recognising himself; and there seems no need of more. We have hesitated about taking even this liberty with the text: but, on the whole, have deemed it best.—[Ed.]

not at all sufficient to give me the least just claim to have my name enrolled among the reformers of our church.

I would thank God for the use he has been pleased and is still pleased to make of you, dear brother, in carrying on his great work in our church. May he use you more and more, and all to his own glory. And may he strengthen you with all might by his Spirit in your inner and outer man, and make you ready and able in every good work.—I have read to-day, your account of your contest with "Everett."\* The Lord did help you of a truth, and you have done well to ascribe all the glory of your success to him.

The late session of the Assembly was a great and glorious one. I entirely agree with you as to the issue of the suits. In any case, great and everlasting good must result to us (if we are faithful,) in consequence of the secession of the New School. But, dear brother, is all the old leaven now out? I fear there is yet some of the poison lurking in some shape among us, which may yet work our ruin, if not vigilantly watched and kept in constant check. The devil is a deceitful worker. Let us not be ignorant of his devices.

You speak of my responsibilities here. I thank you—Would that I felt them more, and had more strength to discharge them. I would most gladly help you to the articles on "Western N. Y." which you mentioned—but I have not sufficient data or materials from which to frame them. Others, however, may have, and I will make some inquiry.

As to forming Presbyteries in "Western N. Y." according to the acts of Assembly, let me enquire of whom will they be composed? This has been a query with me. Not, however, that my own judgment is not formed in regard to the matter. It is formed, and I am for straight, thorough work. Let me ask a question. What is the mind of the leaders of our reformation, about admitting any more *Hopkinsianism* into our church, on any terms? For my part, I hardly know how to act, not knowing the minds of the leaders of Israel. For myself I could act, and my action, were the matter left to me, would be rigidly to exclude all sorts of modern N. E. theology, from our church. That is, as to future applicants. Those that are already in, are in, and the best must be made of it. I should wholly despair of ever seeing the Presbyterian church, "arise and shine," her "light" being "come," if a door for *Hopkinsians* is left open. Our work of reformation would soon require all to be done over again.

If Presbyteries are formed in this region, no doubt some men of this stamp will apply for admission, and what shall we do? I would gladly have your mind on this subject. If the scattered orthodox could be gathered together in this region, most gladly would we see you among us, as you suggest. But my dear brother, I tell you what we want, and that is a missionary or two of the right kind, to range thro' the length and breadth of Western N. Y., inciting, exhorting, and strengthening the dispersed of Israel and gathering them into a head.—Cannot a man be sent us immediately, acting under the Assembly's Board? What a great and glorious field! It would be worthy the labours of any man, however prominent in our church could he be spared from other parts. If you can snatch time, write me immediately. I do not know but I shall be forced to quit Moscow soon—but other doors are open near by. The Lord bless you.

Affectionately, yours in Christ,

Mr. R. J. Breckinridge, Baltimore,

JOHN H. REDINGTON.

P. S.—The idea of the general *missionary* in Western N. Y., I think a

\* The curious reader will find the matter here alluded to, in the *Balt. Lit. and Rel. Magazine* for June 1838, (vol. iv. pp. 280—8 of that work.)—The thing spoken of was a public and protracted debate with a Universalist preacher, who had done much mischief in Baltimore; which, by God's mercy, was followed by the early departure of the deluded man from this community.—[Ed.]

very important one. He should be a fit man, and such a one, with God's blessing, would do immense good among us at the present time.\*

Moscow, Livingston Co., N. Y., July 12, 1838.

*My Dear Brother:*—I am ashamed to trouble you so often—or rather I should be so, were it on my own account. Yet when I consider, (so far as I know my own heart,) that my object in so doing, is to serve the cause and kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, I am not ashamed—and for the same reason, dear brother, I trust you will not be weary of me. We are not our own—we are bought with a price. All that we are and have is Christ's. I doubt not this truth is familiar with you, and that you endeavour, according to the grace given, to frame all your doings accordingly. The Lord has cast abundant labours upon you, and I thank him that he sustains you under them. It is a very difficult matter to live near to God, when we are oppressed with a variety of affairs—yet the grace of Christ will be sufficient, if we trust in him. "I can do all things," says Paul, "through Christ who strengtheneth me." May the Lord strengthen you, my brother, for every good work. But you need not my preaching.

Your letter of 3d inst., was duly received, and I thank you for your counsel. I had previously received one from Dr. Green, abounding in good advice. May the Lord long spare this venerable patriarch in our Israel! It has pleased the Lord to make a breach in the circle of your near connexions. May God sanctify this to you all—especially to the bereaved husband.†—May he from the heart be enabled to say, "the Lord gave and the Lord hath taken away, blessed be the name of the Lord." It is easy for the *lips* to say this—the language of the *heart* is another matter—"Lord increase our faith."

I thank you in the Lord's name, and in the name of all this region, for your kind efforts to have them send us some able missionaries, to gather together the dispersed of our Israel—though I fear some of this dispersion are too well pleased with their present condition. I frankly confess, my dear brother, that I have no great expectation of seeing the professedly orthodox brethren in Western N. Y. make any general move to organize a Presbytery or Presbyteries, according to the acts of the last Assembly—and if I had a tender heart, I could *weep*, while I say so. What such brethren as Bull, Hunter, Hart, Barnard, and others of like stamp, intend ultimately to do, I know not. But in my judgment there is no good prospect of their making a move very soon. If the truth must be spoken, the most of these brethren, being now in possession of a snug living, and not having influ-

\* If this idea had been acted on,—if those who could have done it would,—if those who ought to have done it had had the heart,—who can estimate the effects that might have followed? Like other suggestions, from the same quarter, this was judged by those who had the means of carrying it out, not worth pursuing. Nothing has more crippled the operations of the Presbyterian church than the influence of a narrow, local, incompetent spirit, which has long, alas! too long, sat upon, rather than conducted its general affairs. A spirit of enterprise, of large vision, of great views, of catholic operation—what might it not have done for us, if, by some blessed chance, it had taken the place of the spirit of a paid agency, of ecclesiastical corporations, and of a local hierarchy after 1837?—[Ed.]

† The allusion is to the death of the first wife of the late *Dr. John Breckinridge*. Alas! how are the excellent of the earth cut down around us. How solemn is the providence of God! He who wrote words of comfort, and he for whom he offered prayers to God—so lately both in the prime and vigour of manhood, in the noble and ardent career of usefulness—are both snatched away. And as for this guilty world, both are already as completely forgotten by the great mass of those they laboured to bless, as if they had never lived! The fate of such men—worn out in thankless toil, lost to memory as soon as to sight—is enough to make one detest the world, as much as in other moods we pity it.—[Ed.]

ence enough to carry their churches over to the Old School side, they shrink from the consequence of making a stir. Besides, the New School are courting them in every possible manner—while the few who have already gone back to the Assembly, they avoid and treat with marked neglect. Now some of the men above named have great influence in this region, and their doubting, halting course, operates exceedingly against us, who by the grace of God, long since made a stand for the truth. Still, I thank the Lord, we are not without hope. Orthodoxy gains in this immediate vicinity. And if we obtain a Presbytery no other way, we think we shall doubtless succeed next Oct., in getting the Synod of New Jersey to divide the Presbytery of Susquehanna; so that the New York part of it, under a new name, might spread itself over this region. We have now three ministers and five churches in this state (i. e. in the bounds of the excluded Synods,) and not very far distant from each other, now in connexion with the Presbytery of Susquehanna, and we know of three other ministers of the right stamp, and perhaps another church, ready to go into the same connexion—which in all, would make six ministers and six churches—and this is enough for a respectable Presbytery. If you ask why we who are already members of the Presbytery of Susquehanna, do not procure a special meeting of that body, and taking letters of dismission, unite with others in forming a new Presbytery, on the plan of the last Assembly?—I reply that this course has been suggested, but then we see not how the Presbytery can dismiss the churches, now in connexion—and without these, there are not churches enough to form a new body.

But I am spinning out a long letter, and have not come to my principal object in writing at this time.

We are in a strait at Moscow, and apply to our brethren at a distance, for help. The cause is this. The New School in this place, by that kind of management in which they excel, have succeeded in securing a small majority of our society, *as such*, on their side—while a majority of the session and of the male members of the church, stand firm on the Old School side, and are determined to adhere to the Presbytery of Susquehanna. Now as the majority of the society, *as such*, (many of whom are very far from any religion,) can according to our laws control the meeting house, we expect they will soon turn the Old School majority of the church, *as such*, out of doors into the streets, unless indeed they give up their orthodoxy. Now as our side are very desirous to be separated from the others, we should care nothing for being turned into the street, if we had any other fit place to meet in. But we have not—nor are we able to build at present. Our friends in Moscow, by being pretty spirited and liberal might perhaps sustain an orthodox minister, with little or no help, but they could not do this and build a house too. We think Moscow an important post, especially as the eyes of both enemies and friends have long been fixed on us, awaiting the issue of our contests in this church for the truth. We thank God that he has hitherto sustained us, almost beyond the expectations of the most sanguine—but if we go down at last, the enemy will greatly triumph, and it will unfavourably affect the orthodox round about us. Indeed I do not think we should go down entirely, even if we had no house to preach in, for there are some among us, who had rather meet in a barn than have no orthodox preaching at all. Still it is greatly desirable that we have a house, and that we have it *immediately*. Conviction of this, dear brother, has emboldened me to address you on this subject. Such a house as we would put up for the present, would cost \$600 or \$700. And if we could get \$100, or \$150 of this sum from Baltimore, we would give thanks to God and to our brethren. I have written to New York and Phila., on this subject, and may write to some others, and when the answers come, we can decide whether we can build this season or not. I know, dear brother, our city churches have many calls—still “there is that scattereth and yet increaseth.” Will you consult with the brethren of your city and let me hear from you as soon as consistent. I thank my God for your

prayers and beg their continuance—and may the Lord Jesus Christ be with thy spirit, brother.

Affectionately yours in Christ,

Rev'd Rob't J. Breckinridge, Baltimore.

JOHN H. REDINGTON.

Moscow, Livingston Co., N. Y., Sept. 8th, 1838.

*Dear Brother:*—Your letter of 3d Aug. last was duly received, and contents carefully noted. I sorrow with you, that so more has been done in Western N. Y. for the cause of orthodoxy. A few names of us, however, can say, that by the grace of God, we have done what we well could, under our circumstances, to maintain the truth. And we thank God, our efforts have not been altogether in vain. We trust in the Lord to have a Presbytery in this region, as soon as the Synod of New Jersey meets, which will be on the 16th Oct., at Morristown. I shall attend its meeting, if God permit.

I agree, also, with you, dear brother, in what you say about not fleeing from our post. By the grace of God, so far as I am concerned, this shall not be. The New School have for a long time been endeavoring to drive me away from this region—but they have not as yet succeeded, and I trust in God, they will not. When *He* bids me go, I shall, and not before, let the wind blow as it will.

In regard to the orthodox leaving our meeting house, there was no alternative. We were constrained either to do this or to abandon our principles, and we thank God, he did not permit us to hesitate long what choice to make. We have been worshipping separately for six or seven weeks. The orthodox met in a school house to worship the God of Israel, according to his word, and the standards of our church. The others met in the old place. Our little band is united, and I hope God gives us some faith and confidence in him.

We are going on with our new building. The Lord is raising up friends to help us. Our building will cost more than the amount mentioned in my last. It will probably reach to a thousand dollars. We still hope to get \$100, or \$150 from your city. We think our dear brethren in Baltimore, would in the issue, see that their bounty had not been in vain. You seem to intimate in your letter that a personal application in this case may be requisite. If necessary I might perhaps visit your city (if God permits) when I go to Synod, but I hardly know how to spare the time. My presence is much needed here—and however small my circle, and inconsiderable my influence, I have many things to attend to, that require my utmost diligence. May God make his grace sufficient for me!

I would gladly, dear brother, have an immediate answer to this letter, that we may know about what we may depend upon from Baltimore—and whether it will be necessary for me to go there in person. I must confess it would be a great pleasure to me to see you, and other brethren there, if I had time, and duty did not call in a different direction. Bank bills, certificates of deposit, or drafts, can easily be sent by mail.

We thank the Lord Jesus, that we are not cast down or discouraged in our minds, though we meet with much opposition here, from all quarters. Our hope is in God. I beg your prayers, my brother, for myself and for Moscow. May grace, mercy and peace be to you and yours.—Grace be with all them that love our Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity.

Respectfully and affectionately,

Your unworthy brother in Christ,

Rev'd R. J. Breckinridge, Baltimore.

JOHN H. REDINGTON.

# SPIRIT OF THE XIX. CENTURY.

---

---

VOL. I.

JULY, 1842.

No. 7.

---

---

## THE CALLING OF THE CHURCH OF CHRIST.

*A Discourse to Illustrate the Posture and Duty of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America. Delivered at the Opening of the General Assembly of 1842, by ROBERT J. BRECKINRIDGE, Moderator of the previous Assembly.*

---

We pray always for you that our God would count you worthy of this calling, and fulfil all the good pleasure of his goodness, and the work of faith with power.

2 THESS. i. 11.

---

FATHERS and Brethren, chosen representatives of a great and wide-spread communion, I stand before you this day to perform one of those remarkable official acts required by Divine Providence of but a man here and there in successive generations, and as yet, with us, of no man a second time. Deeply impressed with the solemnity of the occasion, let us fervently rejoice in the many evidences upon which we are allowed to trust that the God of Jacob, the God of a chosen people, is still with us as our refuge and our strength; let us reverently seek in his dealings and his commands, for the knowledge of our peculiar posture and vocation as an important portion of his visible kingdom; and let us humbly address ourselves to him for grace to be found worthy of our high calling, and for faith to fulfil all the purposes of his infinite goodness towards us.

I. The Church of the living God, is one, and is eternal. It is the light and the hope of this guilty and ruined world. The real history of man, when truly read, is a history of religious ideas, in their progress, revolutions, and results. Though these have been often wrong and often disastrous, yet in all their manifestations they establish the universality and the intensity of the religious constitution of man. And amid the mass of deplorable errors which have covered and polluted the earth, a stream of clear and life-giving truth, issuing from the throne of God, has urged its way, onward and onward through perishing generations, and has rolled its increasing and purifying waters even as far as unto us.

The perversity of man, which forfeited the benefits of the covenant of works, in an aggravated form has availed to deprive our race of the full blessings of every successive developement of the

covenant of grace. The antediluvian dispensation of personal visitation from the heavenly intelligencies, the Abrahamic covenant which brought with it a visible and gathered Church, the Mosaic economy which was replenished with the blessings of a permanent, written revelation, and the personal ministry of the Lord of glory, God descended amongst men to perfect his work; all these passed away, leaving but a very small remnant to save the whole earth from the fate of Sodom. The free dispensation of the Divine Spirit early perverted by an incipient hierarchy, was at last swallowed up, over the whole Western Church, by the successive corruptions of a spiritual oligarchy, tyranny, and despotism; until the bride of the Lamb, driven into a waste and howling wilderness, sat for weary centuries, weeping over her murdered children and sorrowing at the long delayed coming of her Lord.

Prone as man is to every false religion and greedy of every corruption of the true, no lesson has been more sternly taught him, than that the spirit of all these falsehoods and corruptions is fatal even to his earthly hopes. It was not therefore without resistance, though often ill-conceived and ill-directed, that Antichrist rose to such authority and ruled with such absolute sway. The civil power throughout Europe sought in vain to curb his iron rule, and to reform the church upon the bosom of which he sat proclaiming himself a God. The whole learning of the west banded itself against him again and again, only to make manifest its emptiness in such a conflict. The Church itself over which he reigned, often and by its most numerous and powerful councils, sought without success its own reformation in its head and in its members, confessing before earth and heaven and trembling at the sight of its dreadful apostacies. And more than all, the true children of God, throughout these fearful and protracted ages, lifted up their voices in solemn testimony, from the depths of dungeons, and from the dust into which they were trodden, and from the racks on which they perished. At length when the cup of abominations was full and that of suffering had been drained to its dregs, the Spirit of God, in infinite compassion, re-visited the earth; the light of the Incarnate Word broke forth once more upon the nations; and down-trodden men arose and shook off their gross darkness, and flocked with mingled lamentations and rejoicings to be healed by the beams of the bright and blessed day-star. Thought, which had slept for ages, awoke as a strong man refreshed by slumber. Inquiry, which as to all useful objects had been fettered, and as to most stifled, burst a bondage no longer possible when thought was free. The conscience, long blinded, partook of the same impulse that enlightened the understanding, quickened the perceptions, and sharpened the faculties of man; and his moral emancipation followed immediately, if indeed it did not, step by step, accompany his intellectual. And then the triumphs of personal and public liberty crowned and adorned the glorious fabric of the Reformation.

There is a profound and pervading sympathy amongst all the grand interests of man. Even the convulsions which his sins and follies render necessary, subvert obstacles otherwise irresistible, and consolidate a progress which would be imperceptible and uncertain.

The advance of modern civilization, and the developement of all those great elements which constitute the grandeur and strength of our present social state, have been co-ordinate with the progress of that spiritual revolution which, though it had long worked, gained its first decided victories in the fore part of the sixteenth century. Nor is the unity of the religious standards of the Reformation less striking than the co-ordinance of all the great interests of society, with the spirit of the Reformation itself. The various national churches which emerged from the apparent chaos of that tremendous struggle, were all designed to be constructed, and except where untoward obstacles in a few cases hindered the work, were all constructed on the same plan, from the same divine model; evangelical in doctrine, pure and strict in morals, simple and free in order, faithful and exact in discipline—they were, with a few exceptions, essentially apostolical, Presbyterian. And from that day to this, as states and communities have most thoroughly felt the power of those great principles on which repose their highest glory and success, they have, in a corresponding degree, cherished the true spirit of Reformed Christianity. The era of the Synod of Dort, or that of the Westminster Assembly, or that of our own Assemblies of 1837 and 1838; the case of the Puritans, the Covenanters, or our own; the struggles and results in Switzerland, in Holland, or in Scotland, where nature has done least, and where, of all the old world, the principles of the Reformation had the freest scope; the synchronous rise of liberty and Christianity in our own land, their mutual relations, and their widely diffused and increasing influences, starting from our bosom and operating through so many channels and in so many lands; all these things and ten thousand like them, are so many proofs of this sympathy which we assert, this unity which we observe amongst all the elements of human progress. A progress easy to be traced whether in its grand combination, or in its separate elements moving side by side across the track of ages. A progress which has been not only real and immense, but *total*, that is in all things; and which for three centuries past, has advanced, and is still advancing with a progressive ratio inconceivable to those who have not attentively compared successive generations with each other, and all with the standard of eternal truth.

It is not pretended that this progress has been uniform; nor even that its separate elements have been steadily developed. We have already shown how in regard to religion, the basis of all, it has been remarkably otherwise; and in regard to freedom, to knowledge, to civilization, and to every other element, the same truth, which on our theory would be inevitable, might easily be separately established upon indisputable proof. Nor is it for us to say that this progress either separately or generally considered, will be more uniform in the ages to come than in those that are past. It is our part to learn what has been, and what is: and while we survey with steadiness and intelligence our present position, and courageously perform our present duty, meekly but confidently commit the future, into his hands with whom is the disposal of all its issues. And blessed be the name of God, whether he condescends to use

our poor services or not, one thing is certain, he will never forget them.

II. There can be but two aspects in which religion can be presented, in its last analysis. It is of God, or it is of man. It ascribes every thing to God; or it ascribes something, more or less, to man. And this something, however minute, so that it be essential, conditional, and meritorious, makes it, as the hinge of our destiny, man's work and religion and not that of God. Under the grand dispensation of revealed truth, from the first Prophet to the last Apostle, the form in which this fundamental and all-pervading error most frequently exhibited itself, was in the way of dishonour to the person and glory of the Lord Christ. For these eighteen centuries, its prevailing manifestation has been in derogation of the work of God the Eternal Spirit. Whether it be the man of sin who claiming that vicariate of Christ, which Christ himself hath assigned to the Holy Ghost, thereby blasphemes unpardonably; or whether the teachers of that subtle infidelity, which, in various forms, impeaches the personal existence of the Divine Spirit; or whether that pest of Christianity which passes under the name of Pelagius, and reasons away the necessity of his Almighty work; or whether that madness of wild sectaries, which claims his miraculous powers and inspiration; or whether that boastful and obdurate reliance on a mere form of godliness, in which no power abides; still, and alike throughout, it is the person, the work, and the glory of the ever-blessed Spirit, which men attack.

The innocence of error is amongst the most absurd imaginations of a corrupt and shallow philosophy. It is indeed our duty to maintain with modesty all possible opinions, since nothing is more certain than that even the wise and the good have erred; and to extend even to apparent errors, a charity heightened by the remembrance that our own foundations are often esteemed immoveable, only because we have not carefully examined them. But to maintain the innocence of error, is to confound all the distinctions of good and evil, truth and falsehood, to obliterate the characteristics of our moral and rational nature, and remove the very foundations of all religion. So far otherwise is the truth, that the worst errors in religion have their origin far more in the derangement of our moral, than in the mistakes of our intellectual faculties. And it seems unquestionable, not only that heresy in general is to be classed with moral delinquencies, but that each particular form of it is invested with its own peculiar and uniform moral character, which will be found to differ as widely from the standard of righteousness as its opinions do from that of faith.

The grand mission of the Church of Jesus Christ is to perpetuate and extend the truth committed to her. The great obstacles to her success are corruption in her own bosom, and oppression from the outward and surrounding kingdom of Satan. When she has been openly pursued with fire and sword, when she has been terrified into silence, when she has been bribed into unholy support of wicked rulers, when faithless intruders have been forced upon her, when she has been seduced into adulterous union with

secular authorities—when she has sunk down into a sinful conformity to the world; in all such cases, we see her hallowed mission arrested by the influence of outward wickedness upon her. But when we see her resting in dead forms and outward ceremonies; opening her arms to embrace as her children, those who have nothing of the spirit of her Master; throwing wide her portals to the entrance of every form of doctrine; mitigating her testimony against sin, explaining away the glorious but hated peculiarities of her faith, lowering the exalted tone of her piety, shorn of her eager and intrepid zeal; then it is the working of inward folly that defeats the end of her sacred vocation, and reveals her self-convicted before God. Who shall say that the dangers from within are less than the dangers from without, or that less grace is needful to deliver a Church from false but pretended friends than from open enemies, to restore her from an insidious poison consuming her vitals than to sustain her under storms beating upon her head?

Fathers and Brethren of the General Assembly, it is to the work of inward purification of our beloved Church, and thereby of her perfect preparation for the whole performance of her divine mission, that we have been called. This has been emphatically our lot, the matter for which God did set us. And as it was the temper and fashion to consider the danger but small, until we had well nigh been swallowed up; so, is there now danger that we shall consider the signal deliverance but little more than ordinary, and the work complete before all its blessings are obtained. I thank God for this peculiar opportunity to testify to the greatness of that work which he has wrought for our Zion; to record as her organ, her grateful sense of his blessed interposition; and to exhort her, in his name, to perfect in faithfulness that to which she has set her hand.

For that form of renunciation of God's religion and adoption of man's religion—which, under the general assault upon the office and work of the Spirit of life and grace, goes under the name of Semi-Pelagianism; and which, under a form of sound words, attacking the very essence of religion in the soul, as well as the very ground of man's acceptance before God, manifested, both towards God, the sinner, and the church, a shameful perfidiousness as its chief moral characteristic; had so entered amongst us, and so spread its insidious spirit, and so shot forth its roots and branches, that it remains an equal wonder how it so grew, and how, having so grown, it was ever cast off.

In the year 1801, a treaty under the name of "A Plan of Union between Presbyterians and Congregationalists in the new settlements," was formed between our General Assembly and the General Association of Connecticut, by force and virtue of which the outward form of Presbyterianism, was, to the whole extent of the operation of the treaty, prostrated, for the benefit of the peculiar and antagonist principles of Congregationalism; but with the avowed purpose of ultimately transferring the interests that might grow up under the treaty, to the sole care of this General Assembly. This extraordinary act, performed under the hope of advancing the general interests of Christ's kingdom, was steadily used to

ruin those of the chief party to act itself. Though by its very terms it was in derogation of Presbyterianism, and therefore upon the clearest principles was to be strictly limited to the cases specified in it; yet was it used as a pretext for every thing needful to be done to break up our church order, and substitute one the opposite of it in many important particulars. Though it related exclusively to church order and discipline, it was made the instrument of introducing, fostering, and spreading amongst us every sort of doctrinal and speculative error. Though it was, by its terms, confined to frontier and destitute places, it was adhered to and the interests growing up under it consolidated and extended until it covered four entire Synods, had insinuated itself extensively into three or four others, and had affiliated, as its friends boasted, six hundred ministers and sixty thousand communicants in a single section of the church, who, as the event proved, had adopted our standards without embracing them, and in order to wield the whole power of those who really believed them. Though it was meant to be temporary, it was, after more than thirty years of forbearance mixed with anxious and oft expressed solicitude on our part, and on theirs with solemn and repeated protestations calculated to soothe our inquietude, at length claimed to be eternal and unalterable. And the final result is, that the system generated under this treaty—the bastard union of Presbytery and Independency impregnated with Pelagianism—has set itself up not only as the *best*, but as the *true and only* representative of the Presbyterian Church in these United States, and has appealed, and notwithstanding its signal discomfiture still appeals to the civil tribunals to maintain itself in this honest, moderate, and conscientious claim.

They who believe that God has revealed a system of Church order for the government of his people in their associated character, as nearly all Christians profess they do believe; and they who hold that the Presbyterian system embodies all the principles of this revealed government, as every Presbyter, whether ordained to teach and rule or only to rule, has solemnly declared he does hold; must see at once, that if no question beyond one of Church government had been involved in this case, conscientious men had no alternative, but that proposed by the Assembly of 1837 to the four Synods; and that conscientious men ought never to have proposed, and never could accept that put by the Seceders, to the Assembly of 1838, and rejected by it. "Become real Presbyterians, as you have long been nominally, and abide with us in peace; or remain what you please, and leave us in peace;" was the language of the Assembly to the four Synods in 1837. The reply was, "We will alter nothing; we will not be Presbyterians, which we have sworn we are; we will continue what we are, and still be Presbyterians." In 1838 the demand of a riotous secession was, "Take back the four Synods, as they are, and as though they were Presbyterian, which they refuse to become; or else we, a minority of yourselves, will become forthwith, and by an act of mingled fraud and violence, the only true Presbyterian church." And even without awaiting an answer, they proceeded by preconcerted and perfidious counsels to attempt the violent revolution of a church whose tribunals they

had bound themselves by covenant to obey, and whose peace they had vowed they would study. Guided even in their last extremity by that master instinct to which their whole career had been subordinated, they pronounced themselves to be the church which they forsook, as soon as it was apparent they could not thoroughly undo it; and concealing their final attempts to destroy it, under expressions of reverence and love, made the extinction of the church, as then organized, the indispensable condition even of a peaceful separation.

But the fate of our Church was staked on questions far more momentous than any relating merely to her outward organization. Infidel theories of moral and mental philosophy, shallow views of the doctrines of grace and salvation, false principles of action, wild impulses and methods, had sprung up afresh in the land. And while all the Christian denominations were, in their turn, troubled with heresies and disorders, from which it was hoped the Church, having tried and rejected most of them before, was finally delivered; the Presbyterian Church, became, from many causes, the battlefield on which was to be decided, once more, a contest between the religion of heaven and that of earth. For a long time, attempts were made to prove that the new theology was not essentially different from the old. Then it was conceded that there was an apparent difference, but it was zealously contended that this lay more in terms and forms of expression, than in substance. After this came the apparently frank admission that there was a real and substantial variance; but then it was argued that this regarded only the philosophy, and not at all the facts either of morals or theology. After another interval, came another change, and then the proclamation went forth that the new system and the old were indeed fundamentally different; that the former was not only most consistent with common sense and the Scriptures, and in a signal manner owned of God the Spirit in his using it and its adherents to convert sinners, but that the old system was absurd and ruinous to the souls of men. And when at length, in the Assembly of 1836, the long sought hour of complete triumph had apparently arrived, the leaders of the party stood boldly forward and said, "The time is come to decide whether men who hold such dangerous errors can be tolerated any longer." And they proceeded to acquit and discharge men condemned for grievous heresy; to vindicate in *these* opinions subversive of the doctrines of grace; to destroy our cherished plans of benevolence; and to deny, for the benefit of voluntary corporations, the great, important, and before unquestioned powers of the Church in the prosecution of her Master's work. But even in such a crisis this extraordinary party could not lay aside its moral characteristics; and after doing so much to destroy the church and corrupt its faith, they drew up and recorded a confession not only at direct variance with their own published declarations, but more orthodox than many who dreaded and opposed them, ever held.

During all this period, a period so far from brief that its origin is laid in the days of our fathers, this mass of persons professed to have received and adopted *ex animo* the forms of doctrine, order,

and discipline of the Presbyterian Church. And yet they could have had no settled views at all, and were constantly varying their opinions; or, what is perhaps worse, they were firmly holding doctrines directly opposite to those they publicly confessed, and were by little and little revealing their real sentiments as they supposed they had prepared the minds of men for their reception. And when obliged to defend such conduct, they did it on principles utterly at war with all sound morality. Some said they never meant to be bound more than "*for substance of doctrine*;" and claimed the right to be exclusive judges of the sense in which they made an unqualified adhesion to public standards, as well as of the sense of the standards themselves. Some said it was not clear what the supposed standards really contained, nor perfectly certain what constituted the standards; whence came the practical inference that as the subject matter of the oath was vague, men might swear positively and precisely to that in regard to which they were wholly uncertain. Others more dexterous, swore not at all; but evading all open compact with those towards whom they had premeditated a breach of faith, declared themselves to be of us, gained entrance through bye-paths to us, and assumed station and authority amongst us. At the bar of conscience it is perfectly clear that none of them were ever for one moment lawfully entitled to so much as a shoe latchet from that church, which even until now they claim as absolutely and totally their own; and that such proceedings instead of being defensible on Christian principles, are incompatible with the well being, if not the existence of any social system whatever.

Such conduct and such principles were united to a theology equally intolerable. What was the peculiar doctrinal system against which we have been called, in the fear of God, to contend so earnestly, can never be a matter of doubt to any honest inquirer. In the newspapers, periodicals, and more permanent and systematic works of the prominent persons in the ranks of the new theology, that system as expounded by its teachers and embraced by their disciples, remains for the impartial judgment of posterity. In the formal testimonies and deliberate decisions of many of our church courts of every class, the doctrines of the orthodox and their judgment upon the heresies that have so vexed and polluted the church, stand also, along with the writings of such of our brethren as have publicly defended God's truth, for the judgment of coming generations. This venerable court, attentive to its high calling and sacred obligations, has not failed to bear its formal and repeated testimony against those deplorable errors, which, at the last, it so firmly, and through God's mercy, so triumphantly withstood; and especially in the years 1835 and 1837 adopted detailed statements of those which it judged to be most common and most dangerous. The earliest, the simplest, and the most remarkable public proceeding against the disorders which had inundated the church, was perhaps "*The Act and Testimony*," issued by a few persons, met in the city of Philadelphia, on the 27th of May, 1834, and which, before the meeting of the next following Assembly, had received the adhesion of five Synods, thirty Presbyteries, and above two thousand minis-

ters and ruling elders of the church. In that instrument the errors charged are classed under the following seven heads, viz., 1. Our Relation to Adam. 2. Native Depravity. 3. Imputation. 4. Ability. 5. Regeneration. 6. Divine Influence. 7. Atonement. On all these fundamental points, it sets forth "doctrines and statements" which it rightly pronounces "dangerous and heretical, contrary to the Gospel of God, and inconsistent with our Confession of Faith," and which it asserts had extended so far and been so long connived at by the church courts, that there appeared no escape for the church from "dissolution," or "corruption in all that once distinguished its peculiar testimony"—but a solemn appeal for instant and effective action, to the "ministers, elders, and private members" of the church. That appeal it proceeded to make, and by God's blessing it so resulted, that within five years from that time, the General Assembly of 1839 in providing for the commemoration of its fiftieth anniversary, no longer had occasion to warn the church against wide-spread errors and disorders in her own bosom; but could call upon her to rejoice that the first "great cycle in her history had been characterized by a series of remarkable deliverances from imminent dangers which threatened her purity, her peace, her Christian order, and her sacred liberty."

Well did it become the church thus to rejoice; and well does it become her still to keep fixidly in her remembrance the nature and extent of those deliverances in which she rejoiced, and the character of that work to which this blessed interposition so plainly calls her. We never rejoiced, as we have been falsely accused of doing, in the misfortunes and exposure of such multitudes who once called us brethren; much less, would be glad because of their rejection of the truth, or because of all the evils which must overtake them on that account. But we should and do rejoice, because God allowed us not to fall after the same manner of unbelief; and because he allowed not them, having thus fallen, to subject us to their yoke in the house of our fathers. We rejoice not that our church should be diminished in numbers, and shorn of much wealth and power and many distinguished names; but we do and will rejoice that while thus curtailed in outward circumstance, she is more pure, united, and efficient than she ever was before, and that she has a better title to the favour of God than she ever had before. We do not pretend that the work has been complete. But while we pray for grace to perfect it in the fear of God, we rejoice in the benefits already conferred both upon us and others. Those who injured us so deeply, and who meditated evils so much more serious against us, even they have been led, in many instances, to pause and examine more carefully that for which they have paid so great a price; and there is perhaps less deep and pervading error in the ranks of the new theology at the present moment, than during the heat of their contention with us. Sister churches, which stood by in cold distrust, careless of the truth, and such as in carnal self-seeking, hoped by a feigned neutrality to gain at our expense; left to us the whole burden and odium of the strife, and therewith the whole glory, but not as we rejoice, the whole blessedness of a victory, which if they be faithful now, will many ways

strengthen their ancient foundations. The world around us has been obliged to hear discussions which have made all men more clearly understand the great doctrines of Christ, and the peculiar errors that now assail it. Society at large has profited by the firm and righteous settlement of some of the most difficult questions which are to be reconciled in establishing the absolute freedom of the churches and the legitimate supremacy of the civil power. Error, long bold and insolent, has been stripped and abashed, and has learned to dread the truth whose long-suffering she despised, and whose strength and courage she misdoubted. And the church itself, roused by the fear of losing its most precious deposit, has come to love that treasure more, by how much she was agonized at the prospect of its loss; and her true members, valuing more justly those rights and mercies now assured unto them, feel more keenly the obligation to bestow them upon those perishing for lack thereof. Nor is it too much to say, that, dating from 1831, the church has, by divine grace, done more for the cause of her adorable Lord within the intervening ten or eleven years, both in what she has pulled down and what she has set up, than in any period of double the same length, since her first plantation on this continent; nor to add, that nothing but want of fidelity to her Master and of faith in his name, can prevent her from advancing with increasing power on her bright and holy career, wherever that may lead, or however it may be marked by sufferings or by triumphs.

Fathers and Brethren, let us accomplish our destiny as becomes men whom God has set for a chosen service. The indications of Divine Providence are extremely remarkable. The posture of the church as well as that of the nations, indicates an immense revolution already wrought, and one still more stupendous ready to be achieved. A body such as ours, covering so large a portion of this vast empire, embracing such and so great elements of power and influence, combining so many and such varied resources, moving side by side with the progress of the country from its first settlement by civilized men, imbued with the spirit of its institutions and identified with all the elements of its strength and glory; such a body, thus placed at an era like the present, cannot fail to be the means of incalculable good or evil to mankind. Let us then prove ourselves worthy of our lot. Let the spirit of our high calling burn within us. As long as God is in our midst we cannot be moved. Let us but be assured that the Lord of hosts is with us; then we will not fear though the heathen rage and the kingdoms are moved, and the waters roar, and the mountains shake, and the earth itself be removed. And whatever may be our perils by sea or by land, in the city or the wilderness, from our own countrymen or from strangers, from public oppressors or from pretended brethren, we shall still fight the good fight, keep the faith, finish our course with joy, and receive at last, from the righteous Judge, that crown laid up for all "that love his appearing."

III. In contemplating the nature and extent of the mission which God has entrusted to his church, every reflecting mind must be struck with awe, at its majesty, its difficulty, and its boundless scope. The religion of Jesus, is the religion of universal man.

No truth is more clearly revealed, more cordially embraced by every child of God, or more thoroughly incorporated with the practical life of every real soldier of the cross, than that the healing streams must flow till they have effaced from the whole earth, the last trace of sin and the curse.

Labourers together with Christ—depositaries of that truth by which a world is to be saved—separated unto God by his own eternal and free calling as chosen instruments of his most gracious purposes—how illustrious, how sublime is the vocation of his people!

And yet, themselves by nature the children of wrath even as others, prone to mistake alike the truth and the providence of God, and by their sins and their follies coming short in all things; cast too upon a battle field where every combatant is armed against them, every power of earth and hell in league for their destruction, and the fundamental principle of their whole warfare blazoned in letters of light upon their bloodstained banner, rendering all peace or even truce impossible; how appalling to the carnal heart, are the difficulties of this glorious calling!

And then the scope of the work! From the creation of this apostate earth God has had a church in it: and yet, after sixty centuries of long suffering, perhaps not a sixtieth part of its inhabitants truly know or honour him. For eighteen centuries and more, the Lamb of God has been held up to the view of a ruined world, as the only and the all-sufficient remedy for its wretched inhabitants, sunken in guilt and misery; and yet who shall venture to estimate the overwhelming proportion of its buried generations who lived and died without Christ, or who can contemplate, without a shudder, the millions and tens of millions and hundreds of millions now living in the flesh, who are without God and without hope? We have indeed scarcely broken the first ranks of the King's enemies. The church has only gathered in a few early ears of a harvest not only ripe but rotting before her face in its boundless profusion. The light of life has but dimly glanced upon the edges of the perishing nations.

Oh! do not our hearts burn within us as we catch the inspiration of a subject so stupendous—of a theme so awful! Instead of being discouraged, every noble and every holy emotion should be mightily stirred within us. If we can do nothing else for the truth, we can seal its testimony with every treasure of our lives; if we cannot save our perishing brethren, we can embrace them in the arms of our love and pour out our sorrows over them; if we cannot serve our Lord with profit and acceptance, we can at least go and die with him, and if need be for him.

But, blessed be God, if we can do nothing worth, our Master can do all things. All our fitness, all our sufficiency is of him. It is by *faith* that the church is built, established, delivered, enlarged. By *faith* we not only perish not with them that believe not; but by it we work righteousness, receive the promises, wax valiant in fight, subdue kingdoms, and turn to flight the armies of the aliens. By it, confessing our own emptiness and nothingness, and clearly discerning the vanity and worthlessness of all human

devices in accomplishing the decrees of God, we yet learn not to despise the day even of smallest things; since with him who rules all things by the same infinite wisdom and power, nothing is great and nothing small except as his favour or his frown is upon it. And well do we know that he who makes the death of one accused and reputed a malefactor, the only life of the world, is able even by "things which are not," to bring to nothing all the powers of darkness.

This principle is the very life of the church of God. By it we "acknowledge ourselves naked of all virtue, that we may be clothed of God; empty of all good, that we may be filled by him; slaves to sin, that we may be liberated by him; blind, that we may be enlightened by him; lame, that we may be guided; weak, that we may be supported by him; divested of all ground of glorying, that he alone may be eminently glorious, and that we may glory in him." Away then, with all human trust, all human contrivances. With a doctrine taught of God, an order revealed by him, an efficiency communicated from him, a mission entrusted to us of him; all carnal devices of whatever kind are at once a hindrance to us, and an insult to the majesty of heaven. God has laid for himself the model of his kingdom: why should we mar, by our foolish additions, the workmanship of infinite wisdom? He has committed to his church, as his church, the means of saving the world: why should she with an imbecility at once faithless and presumptuous, confessing herself an insufficient *agent*, and claiming at the same moment to be an all-sufficient *counsellor*, turn over to others, no matter to whom, her own appropriate, nay her express work? The germ of all apostacy is concealed in this defection. For if the objects set before God's people are not addressed to their *faith*, they come with no obligation to his church: but if they do address themselves to our *faith*, then they specifically appertain to the kingdom of Messiah. In the one case we divest the sacred investiture of Christ; in the other we substitute as his, the commandments of men. In either case, a principle is enthroned in the bosom of the church, which is sufficient, if fully acted out, to remove every landmark established by God, and to bring in every invention ever devised by man. It is a defection whose principle covers the totality of revealed religion. For the instant we settle it, as the mind of God, that the office of his church is, not *to do* his work, but *to see it done*; then the whole position of the church as well towards God and his people, as towards this guilty world, is utterly changed from the ground on which the apostles, the confessors, and the reformers have all placed it. But until this be done, there is an end of all reason by which to justify the least departure from the simplicity of faith.

To our immediate portion of the kingdom of Christ, these considerations are of the more importance, as it has been in some sort the especial vocation from generation to generation, of that part of the blood-bought host, to testify for the simple and sacred appointments of God. To testify for them, in all their completeness, and spirituality; or, if men will have it so, in all their nakedness. We have no catch-words, nor cant-phrases, nor reserved helps,

nor short methods, nor royal ways either by land or water, whether by Oxford, by Rome, or by Purgatory. We lay no stress on the efficiency of this or the other rite, ordinance, compliance, conformity, or succession, any more than on might, or power, or blood, or the flesh, or the will of man. They who make these things stand in the place of the powers of an endless life, and they who so far imitate such madness, as to deface the truth they really teach with such pitiable follies, are, surely, already enough and to spare, and have won over to these idle and wicked fancies, enough and to spare of our fallen race. Why should we, at this late day, turn aside from our long descended testimony, and seek to build upon the foundation upon which Christ has established us, such miserable wood, hay, and stubble? The period of a great deliverance is rather the period to cultivate with fresh ardour a spirit appropriate to our great and peculiar work. To stand more boldly than ever for our distinctive testimony. To contend more earnestly for those heaven appointed ways in which we have found salvation, those doctrines of grace which are the support of our souls. To uphold with renewed zeal the established ordinances of God, and to resist with redoubled energy every thing that even tends to impair or dishonour what he has established.

IV. There are two aspects, both of them peculiar, in which the nominally Christian world, as it exists before us, must impress every close observer. The first is the position of Christianity with respect to all other religions; the second is, the relative position and spirit of its own various sects.

The most accurate modern scholars estimate the whole population of this earth at about six hundred and fifty or sixty millions of souls. Of these, about two hundred and thirty millions are nominally, but alas! to a woful extent only nominally Christians; while the remaining four hundred and twenty or thirty millions, excepting four or five millions of Jews, are divided between various degrading forms of superstition and idolatry.

There can be no question, in any rational mind, that Christianity in name and form at least, must assuredly and perhaps rapidly extend over the whole world. Indeed it is extremely remarkable that it has not done it long ago. For perhaps every system of religion now existing, with a single exception, is, in its present form, of later origin than Christianity; and that only exception, the religion of the Jews, by the universal dispersion of those professing it and by their clear and enduring testimony to some of the fundamental truths of all true religion, would have appeared fit rather to have prepared the way of Christianity, than to have permanently obstructed its progress. But when the present posture of the various religious professions amongst men is considered, it is obvious that every element of power and stability, as well as all means of enlargement, are wholly with Christianity, and against all other systems. Whatever of liberty, commerce, knowledge, civilization, or national wealth, power or glory exists amongst men, belongs out of all proportion, it might almost be said exclusively, to those nations that profess the Christian religion; and to them also belongs, nearly alone, the spirit of intense and eager proselytism.

It is not only well nigh inconceivable that any other solution except the universal spread of Christianity, in name at least, should result from the present position and action of human society; but if the mode of conversion common in all ages before the reformation were now resorted to with vigour and perseverance for a few generations, there is nothing in the condition of the world to prevent its early and entire success.

The grand divisions of nominal Christianity when stated as they were for ages contemplated would give to the churches of the west about one hundred and sixty millions; and to the oriental churches, principally to what is called the Greek church, about seventy millions. Dividing the churches of the west again into Papal and Protestant, giving to the latter about fifty millions and to the former about one hundred and ten millions (of whom however many millions are geographically amongst the oriental rather than the western churches;) and we have the three general, grand divisions of Christendom. Although the papal element is still numerically the largest separate element of the three; yet it is to be remembered that three centuries ago, the combined anti-papal portion of Christendom instead of being, as it now is, decidedly the strongest, both numerically and otherwise, was in fact protected against the pope either by its obscurity or by the shield of anti-Christian powers. To this let it be added that several of the principal anti-papal powers of the earth, as Russia, Prussia, Holland, and these United States, have been created since the reformation; that England, perhaps the leading nation of the world, has quadrupled her power within the same period; that no papal power in the old world has increased its relative strength, and very few their positive, and that some, as Spain, have rapidly and decidedly sunk, in the same time; and a clear idea is obtained of the progress and position of the parties. The probability is that, all things considered, the actual force of the three great divisions of Christianity is not very unequal, at the present moment; and that the Protestant and Oriental elements have at least as much affinity for each other, as either has for Popery. It is to be conceded, however, that as most of the oriental churches are prelatical, and God has never yet blessed the world with the sight of a pure prelatical church; if the issue ever seriously comes, the oriental churches, following the spirit now so painfully manifest in Anglican and Anglo-American Episcopacy may prefer a relapse into popery, before a thorough reformation.

With these facts before us, it becomes a question of overpowering interest and importance—in what form shall Christianity be the religion of the world? Shall it be Popery with its dark tyranny, its ferocious spirit, its besotted ignorance, its open idolatry, its shameless immorality? Shall it be the cold, dead, childish, stagnant, formal superstition that has so long reigned in most of the oriental churches? Shall it be glorious Protestantism, with her open Bible, her universal education, her regulated liberty, her wise and vigorous spirit, her noble institutions, her benign influences?

It is as vain as it is unworthy to shut our eyes to an issue so stupendous and so inevitable. The Protestant and the oriental churches, might indeed, exist together, permanently on the earth,

so far as the original spirit and inherent principles of both, in their best estate, are concerned. Not so with Popery. With it, there is no other question but death or Papism. It offers to mask it but this alternative, to embrace it or to extirpate it. And there is too much reason to apprehend—whether we examine the character of this great apostacy, or reflect on the course of God's providence, or ponder his divine revelation—that this terrible arbitrament is hastening apace, and that it will be submitted at last to the edge of the sword. The world's destiny must be decided on the field of Armageddon when great Babylon shall come in remembrance before God, to give unto her the cup of the wine of the fierceness of his wrath.

All that is worth contending for on earth is involved in this contest. It must be vehement; it may be protracted. The power of Antichrist is immense and thoroughly consolidated. More than a hundred millions of the human family wait on his nod. A stupendous ecclesiastical organization, extending from his throne to the remotest corners of the earth, and controlling with absolute authority, the minds, bodies, and goods of all who have received his mark, are obedient to his will. Many kings and potentates, many principalities and powers, wear his yoke as an ornament of gold; and prostrate nations adore him as the vicar of God abiding in the midst of his invincible hosts. All the corrupt propensities of our fallen nature cry, day and night, for the advance of his standards; and the dregs of our generation, impregnated with the very genius of disorder and excess, work without ceasing for the overthrow of every barrier against his progress. He proposes as the rewards of success, in this world, signal vengeance, uncontrolled indulgence, unlimited power, absolute supremacy; in the world to come, endless glory. What a mixture of power, enthusiasm, passion, and superstition! What a force—what a prize! But his spirit is adverse to the better spirit of the age; his system revolting to the common sense of mankind; his despotism odious to every good impulse of our nature. Every enlightened motive that stops on this side the grave, impels every good man amongst his own followers, to forsake him; and every one that penetrates that dread future beyond the tomb, eagerly requires every being not subdued to his debasing sway, to strive for the liberation of the world. With us are freedom, light, the whole force of movement, the power of knowledge, and the consolations of eternal hope. God and the right are ours. And though we wait long and suffer much, we look with unshaken *faith*, for the glorious appearing of the great God, our Saviour Christ, to raze this synagogue of Satan, to destroy the mother of harlots who has ruled in it so long—to bring to nothing the kings of the earth drunk with the wine of her fornications, to lead forth to victory and to glory his saints whose blood has been ever found in her, and amid the rejoicings of heaven and earth, of all blessed and of all-redeemed things, to establish a throne upon which he will reign King below, as now he reigneth King in the highest!

V. Fathers and Brethren beloved in the Lord, there are two duties so imperative upon us, and so obvious in a crisis like this,

that they can hardly fail to command your cordial assent. The first is to cultivate assiduously in our own hearts and in the hearts of our people, the spirit of our high vocation—our great mission. The second is to cultivate an intimate and cordial union and co-operation with all the true followers of our divine Redeemer. These two reflections seem to me to contain the sum of that practical wisdom, to which these meditations would conduct us.

When we reflect how absolute has been the wreck of all human organizations, how invincible is the destructive force of time and chance, how certain is that fiat that every thing which can even be shaken, must be one day removed; it is not the dictate of modesty, wisdom, or grace, to rely with certainty on the permanent endurance of the best works of our hands. Where Paul planted, and Apollos watered, and God himself gave the rich increase, the glorious Master and the faithful servants have been alike forgotten. Alas! what are we, and what the objects of our care and love, to deserve a different destiny? But though outward ordinances perish, and visible organizations pass utterly to nought, the spirit which forsakes their lifeless remains neither perishes nor passes away. Let this be the object of our incessant cultivation—the spirit of our calling and of our work. If any thing can eternize the institutions we so much love, it will be to baptize them into the spirit out of which they grew; and if nothing can, the transmission of that spirit in undiminished vigour and untarnished purity, is a better and holier end, than all the boastful nothingness of an empty and vapid existence, spun out in ignominy to the end of time. Wherever God's people are, there is God's church; which indeed "may exist without any visible form"—as Calvin truly saith, but which cannot exist, at all, without the power of his indwelling Spirit. A holy zeal for God's ordinances, an unquenchable love for his truth, a consuming earnestness in his service, an intense eagerness to save men's souls; this is the spirit that we need; a spirit without which, we shall do nothing worthy of our name, our era, our calling, or our hopes.

Such a spirit is the farthest possible from bigotry and intolerance. It is indeed the only spirit in which we can establish on true and permanent foundations, the intimate fellowship of the true followers of the Lamb; since truth is the basis on which we must unite, love the power that binds us to each other, and faith the living and moving principle of the whole spiritual bond.

Nothing is more unjust and absurd than the common outcry against the Reformed churches on account of their alleged diversity of faith. It is unhappily too true that many who pass under the Protestant name, like the bulk of the members of the Latin and Greek churches, are Christians only in profession; and that some whose views of divine truth are more scriptural, are governed too much by the temper of that apostacy from the midst of which God, in tender mercy, called their fathers. But the undeniable truth is, that the great body of Reformed Christians are and have always been essentially agreed in their faith; and that the largest branch of this great family has been so truly one spiritual body, as to have used the same confession, or interchangeably the confessions of each

other. What is now insisted on is, that this oneness of spirit and faith, and as far as possible, of order and practice, is a matter of exceeding great importance and value; that where it exists it should be carefully cultivated; and where it may have been broken or allowed to sink into forgetfulness, all favourable occasions should be eagerly seized to restore it. And it is believed that the peculiar dispensation upon which we have fallen and into which we are still further hastening, imperatively calls upon all the Protestant communions that sincerely love the Lord Jesus, to draw closer and closer the bonds that unite them to each other; while the peculiar character and position of the body represented in this General Assembly, eminently fit it to take a leading part in a work so good and so necessary.

How far the bonds of Christian union can be extended, it is not possible to decide until the experiment has been made in humble and earnest dependence on God. But the wonder is that it has not been more thoroughly cemented between those great families of Christians, who not only agree entirely in every important part of religious faith and duty, but actually use, and have long used the very same formularies of doctrine, discipline, and order. The Presbyterian body throughout the world forms by far the largest portion of Protestant Christendom; and that portion of it scattered over Great Britain and her dependencies, and the United States, is by much its most numerous and powerful part. And these latter without exception, so far as they adopt the Presbyterian name; also adopt the standards arranged by the Westminster Assembly, to express their views of Christian doctrine and practice. They are really, and should be visibly, as far as possible, one body.

We are drawing very near to the second centennial period of that illustrious Assembly. The first day of July, 1843, will complete the two hundredth anniversary of its meeting. If any thing effectual is done towards commemorating on that great occasion, the remarkable event it recalls, it seems to devolve on this General Assembly to do it, and to begin the work during its present sessions. I have not felt myself at liberty to omit a suggestion, which, if properly taken up by this venerable court, cannot fail to produce very precious and lasting results. And I am the more emboldened in this when I recall, with gratitude to God, the circumstances attending the first suggestion of the general religious observance of our late semi-centennial period, and contemplate the results, actual and probable, of that movement. That the occasion is capable of being so used as greatly to promote, under God's blessings, the highest interests of truth, the mutual love of God's people, and the general strength of his kingdom, seems not to be questioned.

It is true we are nothing, and of ourselves can do nothing. Mourning confessions, and but the more humiliating as we behold how much is to be done, and how unspeakably important it is that it should be done well and at once. But through Christ strengthening us we can do all things. And when we consider his promises—when we contemplate the excellency of the work set before us—when our conceptions dilate to the vastness and grandeur of

the assured results ; then it is we know the sweetness and fulness of the truth that God is indeed with us, our refuge and our strength. Oh ! may he abide with us continually, and make us a joy and a praise in the whole earth. The work is his, and the faith whereby it may be accomplished is his free and divine gift. The vocation is his, and it is only of his mere good pleasure that he doth fulfil by it his infinitely beneficent purposes towards those he has purchased with his blood. The power is all his, and so shall be all the glory.—Amen.

[Continued from page 267.]

M O L I N I S M .

No. XVII.

XXIV. *The Effect of the Bull Unigenitus, upon the Clergy and the Public generally, and the measures taken to enforce its adoption.—A brief Description of the Court of Louis XIV.*

THE first impression made by the Bull *Unigenitus*, upon the minds of the Gallican clergy, was various. Some regarded it as very obscure,—and the reason of this impression (it is said) was that that Bull was assumed to be sound in its doctrines, and conformable to the writings of the fathers. Hence there was a necessity for recourse to forced explanations in order to make it conform to this preconceived view. Another portion of the clergy, not being satisfied with such forced explanations, addressed Pope Clement XI. directly, and asked of him the elucidation necessary to render it clear. The object of this portion of the clergy was in truth, to induce the see of Rome to allow this Bull to pass into oblivion ; for they hoped that if they could draw the pope into an attempt at explanation, he would be made to see how repugnant it was to the Scriptures and the fathers. They did not like to offend the pope by declaring the bull heretical—although evidently they thought it so—and therefore they took the method of *supposing* it to be conformable to the truth, though *very obscure*. The pope, however, thought the bull clear enough, (and so it was,) and he gave them to understand that they were less concerned to *explain* it, than to *obey* it. Another part of the clergy took the honest course of appealing from the bull to a future Council, thus treating it as a document which condemned important truths, and sanctioned the peculiar errors of the Jesuits. Another part of the clergy received the bull through motives of interest or prejudice without taking the trouble to inquire as to its meaning.

The publication of this bull also produced an extensive and powerful effect upon the French nation generally. Cardinal de Noailles had promised the king, that he would condemn the book of Quesnel, as soon as the see of Rome should do so ; accordingly he condemned the book, and withdrew it from the hands of the Catholics under his control, but without imputing any error to it. The king convoked an Assembly composed of bishops, who happened to be at Paris, and of those who were specially called, which

Assembly convened the 16th of October, 1713, and continued till the 5th of February, 1714. Cardinal de Rohan (a creature of Tellier, the king's confessor,) was at the head of it; and De Bissy, bishop of Meaux, took the most active part in its proceedings. This bishop had formerly approved of Quesnel; but his connection with the Court and the prospect of a cardinal's hat, which he afterwards obtained, changed his language if not his opinions. By force of intrigues and threats of the king's interference, the bull was accepted with explanations contained in a pastoral letter, and was so represented to the French clergy, while the pope was given to understand, that the bull was accepted purely and simply. This pastoral letter was signed by forty bishops of the Assembly. Cardinal de Noailles and seven others took no part in it. The letter was exceptionable on many accounts, though designed to save the faith of the Roman church from further corruption by the obvious sense of the bull. These eight prelates took the course of writing to the pope and of urging upon him the necessity of explanation. They wrote, also, to the king, explaining the motives of their conduct. De Noailles, after this, viz. on the 25th of February, 1714, by a public act, declared that he was waiting for explanations, and forbade any act of jurisdiction relative to the bull, or the reception of it independently of his authority.

The Court, (at which Tellier and the bishops of his party predominated,) was extremely irritated at this conduct, and Noailles was forbidden to appear any longer at Court, and the others (seven bishops) were sent into their dioceses by *lettres de cachet*. The next step was to draw up letters patent for the publication of the bull, in which the king *exhorted* the bishops and then *enjoined* them. The Parliament did not like these expressions, and made some difficulties about the matter, but finally the express and reiterated commands of the king prevailed, and the letters patent and the bull were registered with modifications, which showed that the Parliament thought the obvious sense of the bull contrary to the laws of the realm, especially in the propositions relating to unjust excommunications.

Before proceeding farther, it may be useful to take a brief survey of the Court, with a view to show the sort of influence which directed these transactions. The reader is aware that Louis XIV. was, at the time in question, king of France. During his minority he had for his confessor, Father Paulin of Orleans, who died in 1653, and was succeeded by Father Dinet, confessor of Louis XIII. His next confessor was Father Annat of Rhodes, of whom some mention has been made. This Jesuit swayed the conscience of the monarch sixteen years. During this period, the Jesuits, as has been shown already, were very powerful at Court, and the influence of this confessor served to shield them from ill consequences in their enterprizes. It has already been stated that Annat, Peter de Marca, and Mazarin formed a sort of triumvirate, and they in effect convoked the bishops to decide that the famous five propositions were the substance of the *Augustinus* of Jansenius. It was this Jesuit, too, who influenced Louis XIV. to cause the declarations concerning the formulary to be registered in 1664 and

1665. The reader remembers the chagrin of Annat at the peace of Clement IX., which he represented as a calamity to religion and to the state. At the age of seventy, Annat retired from his office, though he took care that it should devolve on another member of that Society;—this was John Ferrier, a man of like spirit, and the real author of the formulary. Ferrier succeeded to this office in 1670, and exercised it till 1674, when he died. La Chaise succeeded Ferrier in 1675. As soon as La Chaise became the king's confessor he became also in fact the head of the Gallican church. It was his opinion that a bishop should be a man of the world and a politician. Accordingly his influence was given for the promotion of men of that character. Madame de Maintenon, who also meddled in ecclesiastical matters, made less account of talents and services than he did. Fenelon, in a letter which has been preserved by Rulhieres and D'Alembert, gives him a character far from being enviable or estimable. La Chaise, in concert with Madame de Maintenon and Louvois, concerted and decided upon the revocation of the edict of Nantes, an iniquitous as well as impolitic measure, and which inflicted a deep wound upon the prosperity of France. Afterwards, however, there was less cordiality between this lady and La Chaise, owing to his connivance at the irregularities of the king. She tried to displace him, but without success. La Chaise had the sagacity of a courtier, and by representing those who were named to the king for the office of confessor as devotees or Jansenists, he succeeded in retaining the place. Quesnel accused him of being the cause of all the evils which had afflicted France during five and twenty years. He died on the 20th of January, 1709, after having been confessor of Louis XIV. thirty-four years. A few days before his death he said to the king, "Sire, I ask it of you, as a favour to choose my successor in our company. It is strongly attached to your majesty—it is greatly extended, very numerous, and all are passionate for the glory of the Society. One could not answer for it in a disgrace, and a bad blow is soon struck." The king was surprised at this proposal. He must have been even alarmed at the request, as it gave him the alternative either of confiding his soul to men of lax morals, or of fearing a *bad blow*.

Michael Le Tellier succeeded La Chaise. His character was odious. He abused the old age of Louis XIV., to elevate his Society upon the ruins of the opposing sect. He incited the king against the Parliaments which protected the Jansenists. The first year of this Jesuit's reign was signalised by the downfall of Port Royal. So powerful was the influence of the Jesuits with the king, that he compelled the persons of his family to choose their confessors from among the Jesuits. But few of the clergy had the courage to brave the tyranny of this Jesuit. The mass of them feared him. A crowd of ambitious persons beset him continually, and he, like La Chaise, disposed of benefices, although he was obliged upon nominations to come to an understanding with Madame Maintenon, who at the suggestion of Cardinal de Bissy, meddled with those matters, and sometimes exercised a predominating influence.

The character of Louis XIV. is too well known to need a detailed description. More influenced by splendor than utility, corrupted by luxury, libertinism, flattery and despotism, he allowed himself to be governed by Madame Maintenon, who wished to exalt to the pinnacle of honor, the bastard issue of that monarch. Louis XIV. surrounded himself with magnificence and pleasures, while his subjects were suffering extreme poverty, thousands of whom he sacrificed in wars undertaken to gratify his pride. During his reign, the appearance of devotion was associated with libertinism. The exterior of public worship in the royal chapels was pompous, while prostitutes under the name of mistresses a multitude of bastards, and a Jesuit confessor, (such as has been described,) were among the worshippers.

It is said of Louis XIV., that as he knew nothing of religion, but wished to save himself, he flattered himself all his life, with doing penance on the back of another—on that of the Calvinists or the Jansenists, whom the Jesuits taught him were equally heretics; yet he suffered remorse of conscience, and was greatly agitated, as he saw his end approaching. He had proscribed all liberty, and his conscience was so alarmed on his death-bed, on the subject of his persecutions, that he expressed his sorrow for them to the Cardinals de Rohan and de Bissy, and offered to remedy the evil he might have done. He asked them to tell him if there had not been passion in their conduct?—He said he should have no repugnance to see Cardinal de Noailles. But Le Tellier, who observed these last movements of the heart of the king, stifled them by saying if he received the Cardinal, he would destroy, in a moment, the work of his whole life; and one of the Cardinals added that he could not see the Archbishop of Paris without abjuring all he had done. The Cardinal de Noailles did not see the king in his last moments. Another author informs us that Le Tellier caused a letter to be written to Cardinal de Noailles, informing him that the king would see him, provided he would receive the bull. The same author also relates that the king said to the Cardinals de Rohan and de Bissy, that they well knew he never understood any thing of the affair—that he had followed their advice, and put himself upon their conscience, and that they would have to answer for it before God. These prelates replied, with a confidence which made some of the persons present (who did not believe either in the goodness of their cause or in their good intentions) shudder, that they would willingly become sureties for his majesty—that he ought not to feel pain for having followed the pope and the bishops—that for themselves, they had had in view only the glory of God, the service of the church, and the acquittal of their own consciences.

This brief account of the Court of Louis XIV., which has been taken chiefly from the "*Histoire des Confesseurs des Empereurs, des Rois et d'autres Princes par M. Gregorie, ancien eveque de Blois, etc.*," will enable the reader more justly to appreciate the difficulties with which the better part of the Gallican clergy had to contend. But to resume the narrative.

After the bull had been registered as has been mentioned, the Court took measures to have it received by the Faculty of Theology of Paris. The bull was taken into the Sorbonne, with a lettre de cachet from the king, on the first of March, ordering that it should be received, which was before the pastoral letter was made public. The Syndic was a creature of the Jesuits, and by threatening the doctors with the displeasure of the Court, unless they would receive the bull, he deterred many of them from being present. By artifice he succeeded in having the bull and lettre de cachet inserted in their registers, in a manner different from what was proposed in that body, and then by having it printed differently from the register, he represented the doctors of the Faculty as submitting to the bull as a rule to which the faculty would conform with pleasure, so that the Court felicitated itself upon the acceptance of the Sorbonne.

At subsequent Assemblies of the Faculty, several of the doctors protested warmly against the manoeuvre practiced upon them, and as the best way of getting rid of the embarrassment thereby created lettres de cachet were issued by which several of the chief, were sent into exile. Among the exiles were the Abbé Bidal, M. Hulot, Brageologue, Habert, and M. Witasse professor of theology. The assemblies of the doctors in Sorbonne, on this occasion, were tumultuous. Clamours and threats drowned the voices of those who were opposed to the bull, and several of those who could not obtain a hearing, afterwards wrote letters to Cardinal de Noailles, in which they declared their sentiments—(See these letters collected in a book in 12mo, entitled *Temoignage de l'université de Paris, &c.*, printed in 1716.) In one of these letters—(written by the Abbe of Asfeld,) after giving his sense of the doctrinal character of this bull in various particulars, he concluded by saying, *et je ne fais aucune difference entre le recevoir et tomber dans l'apostasie.* "And I put no difference between receiving it (viz., the bull) and falling into apostasy." This sentiment will not appear extravagant to those who carefully study the system canonized by the bull. Yet the Jesuits had already embraced that system, and by the judgment of this author, were apostates, and afterwards the major part of the Catholic clergy not only in France but elsewhere, (it is to be feared,) embraced it. At least this bull teaches the theology of the popes and of the Court of Rome.\* Their system forbids

\* Bishop Kenrick in his *Theologia Dogmatica*, (Phil. 1840,) vol. 2, p. 267—8, cap. iii., de gratiæ efficacia, No. 98, concludes a brief notice of the bull thus:—"Post multas turbas *Constitutio* obtinuit plerisque ad obedientiam sanctæ sedi debitam redeuntibus; jamque agnoscitur in universa ecclesia." If the bishop is good authority upon this matter, (as we suppose he is,) the theology of that bull is now universally received in the Roman Catholic church. In other words, Molinism is the system universally approved in that church. The errors of this system have, as we have seen, been invented principally since the reformation, and they are among the worst which have obtained currency with Roman Catholics. Those Protestants who desire to know minutely what these errors are, should study that bull, and the authors which have explained it. Or they may consult the writings of those Jesuits whose system was in effect adopted by the bull. *Les Hexaples on les six colonnes sur la constitution Unigenitus*, (*Amsterdam*, 1721,) already several times referred to, contain a vast amount of learning

them to recant a doctrine once advanced, or to retrace a step once taken. *Nulla vestigia retrorsum* is the maxim of Rome. In the judgment, then, of this Abbè, Rome, by imposing such a system of doctrine as is contained in this bull upon the clergy of that communion, thereby became (if she was not so before) apostate. To conclude this topic; similar methods were adopted to compel the acceptance of the bull by the Theological Faculties of Rheims and Nantes. Letters patent of the king were sent into the different dioceses of France enjoining them to receive the bull. Some did so, with the pastoral letter of the forty bishops. Others received it with qualifications and explanations different from those of the forty bishops. Some who were favourable to the Jesuits adopted it without qualification. Among these was the Archbishop of Cambray,\* in respect to that part of his diocese which was out of

upon the subject, and this work will point the reader to the most ample sources of investigation. Will not some of our learned Protestant theologians undertake an examination of the theology of the Bull against Baius, and the Bull *Unigenitus*, especially of the latter? More attention should be given to this subject in our theological seminaries. Very few Protestants are aware of the enormous heresies of the Roman Catholic clergy upon the doctrines of grace.

\* Fenelon favoured the Jesuits and their system of doctrine, while we have seen that Bossuet wrote in defence of the book of Quesnel. In a pastoral instruction of Fenelon, in the form of dialogues, the following passage occurs, which will show what his sentiments were on the doctrine of grace and man's accountability. "Voici comment je parlerai a Dieu, &c. See how I will speak to God:—Lord, (votre grand docteur Augustin,) thy great doctor, Augustin, and all his disciples, the most rigid, have taught me that *pleasure is the only spring that moves my heart*. Now I feel that the pleasure of virtue has no force upon me, and that that of vice alone reigns over my will. Wouldst thou (voudriez vous) punish me with infinite torments for having yielded to an invincible and all powerful attraction? I should believe I should be doing thee (vous) the most cruel injuries if I supposed it. But in fine, even though thou wouldst punish me for that which in no respect depends upon the free choice of my will, this necessity would not be the less invincible to me. Thunder, overwhelm, crush (tonnez, foudroiez, ecrasez) thy creature eternally—have no compassion on his weakness; it (viz., the creature) will be none the less powerless to obey (vous) thee, nor less necessitated to violate (votre) thy law. Either change his pleasure;—thou (vous) who art able to change it (le maitre de le changer) in a moment, or cease to expect that the threat of pain, which is only future, can prevent my will from following a present pleasure which in respect to it is invincible. *Necessè est.*" Fenelon had said just before, "With two words of Saint Augustin, which I shall not fail to say to God in his judgment, I shall efface all my sins, I shall frustrate the devil of all his pretensions, I shall extinguish all the flames of hell; *necessè est.*" At page ten of the same pastoral letter is the following sentiment: "I am too much persuaded of the justice and goodness of God to believe that he will punish eternally by the torments of hell almost all men because they shall not have conquered by their feeble will a pleasure which is all powerful over them. I have horror of such blasphemy. To teach this scandalous impiety is to destroy the idea of Divinity and make the Atheist triumph."

The author of the fourth column of the Hexaples, (vol. 2, p. 49, Ed. 1721,) from which the foregoing extract is taken, remarks, "according to the system of this prelate, (who in this point is but the echo of the Jesuits,) it is a blasphemy, a scandalous impiety—it is to destroy the idea of the Divinity, and to establish Atheism, to believe that man, a sinner by his birth, to whom God refers his omnipotent grace, (which overcomes creature delights) deserves eternal punishment when he being abandoned to himself, violates the law of his Creator. Did Pelagius and the impious Julian run to a similar excess?" Fenelon's attachment to Molinism is very discernible in his "Letters upon divers subjects concerning Religion and

France. But the bishop of Montpellier took a very decided course against the bull. His course of reasoning was very brief. "The religion of Jesus Christ is true, therefore this bull shall not pass. The religion of Jesus Christ is true; and the bull cannot be allied with the religion of Jesus Christ." This sentiment (which amounts to as much as that before quoted of the Abbé of Asfeld,) regulated the conduct of this bishop, and he performed a distinguished part in subsequent transactions.

During these difficulties, a national council was proposed, but Rome would not consent to that measure through the fear that it might adopt some measures not favourable to her. At last, however, the Court of France resolved that the opponents of the bull should feel its utmost indignation. Many ecclesiastics were exiled—others were imprisoned—others fled to escape imprisonment. The king finally resolved to hold, what is called in France, his *lit de justice*, and because his officers refused to present the bull, he resolved to come into the Parliament in person. The procureur general was displaced, and another was appointed. *Lettres de cachet* were prepared for those who should resist. It was resolved to proceed to extremities against Cardinal de Noailles—so at least it was rumoured, and the public were in consternation. But the king suddenly fell sick, which prevented him from going to Parliament. He grew worse daily till the 1st of September, 1715, when he died. After his death, the regent emptied the prisons of state, which Le Tellier had filled with the opponents of this bull, and that Jesuit was himself banished to La Fleche, and afterwards to Amiens, where he died in 1719.

---

#### THE FUNERAL OF THE MASS.

##### CHAPTER IV.—*Against the Real Presence of Christ's Body in the Host, or Consecrated Wafer.*

1. THE Romish Doctors affirm, that immediately after the priest, in the celebration of the Mass, hath pronounced these words, *this is my body*, the body of Christ is really present in the Host, and that it is whole and entire in every part and point of the Host; which doctrine I destroy by these following arguments, the first whereof is this:

2. If a thing be created in a place, either it must be produced there, or it must come or be brought thither from some other place; for it is impossible to find out a third way of putting any thing in a place. And the Romish Doctors have hitherto been able to invent but one of these two ways of putting Christ's body in the

---

*Metaphysics*," translated from the Paris edition of 1718, into English, and published at Glasgow in 1750. "Liberty," he says, "consists in a sort of equilibrium of the will between two different objects," &c. "He," *that is, man*, makes himself either good or bad at his own choice—he turns his will towards good or evil, and he is, like God, master of his inward sentiments and operations," &c. "He is his own, he deliberates, decides and has a supreme empire over his own will," &c.

Host, the Jacobins telling us that it is brought thither from some other place, and the Jesuits that it is produced there. But the body of Christ can neither come, nor be brought thither into the Host, nor can it be produced there. Therefore the body of Christ is not in the Host.

3. First, The body of Christ cannot come, or be brought into the Host from any other place, because it can come from no place but heaven, being no where but in heaven. But Christ's body neither comes, nor is brought from heaven into the Host, which I prove thus: When a body comes, or is carried from one place to another, it must leave its first place. For example, if a man would go from Paris to Rome, he must leave Paris. But the body of Jesus Christ never leaves heaven; for *the heavens must contain him until the time of the restitution of all things.* Acts. 3. Therefore Christ's body neither comes, nor is brought from heaven into the Host. Besides, it is impossible that Christ's body should come or be brought into the Host, without passing through the space that is between heaven and earth, where the consecrated Hosts are; because a man cannot pass from one extreme to another without passing through the space that is between them. But the space between heaven and earth is too vast to be passed through in a moment (for these doctors will have it, that immediately after the pronouncing of these words, *this is my body*, the body of Christ is brought into the Host.) Moreover, it must in a moment be in all the heavens, and in all the airs between the highest heaven and this earth where the Hosts are, (because a man cannot pass through a place without being there) and then it would have three sorts of existences at once, viz., one natural and glorious existence in heaven, one sacramental existence in the Host, and one airy existence in the air. But seeing all these things are absurd, we must conclude that Christ's body neither comes nor is brought into the Host.

4. Secondly, Christ's body cannot be re-produced in the consecrated Host, because a thing that is produced already, cannot be produced again, without a preceding destruction; for as a dead man cannot be killed, nor that be annihilated, which is annihilated already; so neither can that be produced which is produced already, nor that receive a being which hath one already. This common conception of all men is founded upon this principle, that every action, whether it produceth or destroyeth a thing, must necessarily have two distinct terms, the one called in the schools, *terminus a quo*, that is, the term from which the thing comes, and the other *terminus ad quem*, that is, the term to which it comes. But according to this principle, that cannot be annihilated which is so already, nor that receive a being which hath one already, because the term from which it should come, and the term to which it should come, would be one and the same thing; contrary to the maxim already laid down, viz., that the terms of action must necessarily be distinct, and that one of them must be the negation or privation of the other.

5. Here perhaps it may be objected, that by transubstantiation the substance of Christ's body is not newly produced, but only a new presence of him in the place where the substance of the bread

was. But to this I answer, that in all substantial conversions and actions, a new substance must be produced, as in accidental, a new accident must be produced. But transubstantiation (according to the Romish doctors), is a substantial conversion. Therefore by transubstantiation a new substance must be produced. And seeing that the new presence of Christ's body in the place where the substance of the bread was, is not a substance, but an accident of the *Category* which the philosophers call *Ubi*, it is evident that by transubstantiation, the presence of Christ's body only is not produced in the place where the substance of the bread was; and seeing that the substance of Christ's body is not produced there (as hath been proved in the preceding number), we must conclude that there is no transubstantiation nor real presence of Christ's body in the Host. This instance doth also destroy the adduction of Christ's body into the Host, which hath been already refuted in number 3.

6. My second argument is this. In a true human body such as Christ's body is, there is something above, and something under, right and left, before and behind; for the head is above the neck, and the neck above the shoulders, the shoulders above the breast, the breast above the stomach, the stomach above the belly, the belly above the thighs, the thighs above the legs, &c. But all the world knows that in a point there is nothing above or under, right or left, before or behind. Therefore Christ's body is not in a point, and consequently it is not in every point, or part of the Host. To this I add, that the quantity and greatness of Christ's body is nothing else but its length, breadth, and thickness, which cannot be in a point. Lastly, The quantity of Christ's body is nothing else but its extent, as we all know; and a body is extended when it hath its parts one without another, that is, they are not one within another, as all the Jesuits expound it. But the doctrine of the presence of Christ's body in the Host, puts all its parts one within another, because it puts them all in a point. Therefore such a doctrine takes away its extent, and consequently its quantity.

7. My third argument is this. To move and not to move at the same time, to be eaten and not to be eaten at the same time, to be in a point and not in a point at the same time, to occupy a place and not to occupy it at the same time, are contradictory things. But if the body of Christ were in divers consecrated Hosts, it would move and not move at the same time. For example, when a priest carries a consecrated Host to a sick person, the body of Christ which is pretended to be in it, moves with the Host, for it leaves the altar and goes with the priest towards the sick person's house, and at the same time the body of Christ, which is pretended to be in the other Hosts that remain on the altar, moves not; and so the same body of Christ at the same time moves and moves not, which is a contradiction. Seeing then it is impossible that one and the same body, at one and the same time, should move and not move, it is likewise impossible that Christ's body should be in divers Hosts at the same time. In like manner, if Christ's body were at the same time in heaven and in the Host, it would be eaten and not eaten at the same time; for it would be eaten in the Host by the

priest, and, at the same time, it would not be eaten in heaven. Also it would be in a point and not in a point at the same time; for in the Host it would be in a point, and in heaven it would not be in a point at the same time. Therefore seeing it is impossible that one and the same body, at one and the same time, should be eaten and not eaten, should be in a point and not in a point, it is also impossible that Christ's body should be both in heaven and in the Host at the same time.

8. The fourth argument is this: Two relatives are always different, as the father and son, the husband and the wife, &c. And relation is always between two things that really differ; as the equality between two ells, the resemblance between two crows, &c. In a word, nothing can have relation to itself, but whatsoever hath relation must necessarily have it to something else, as appears by the definition of relation: But to be distant is a relative and not an absolute term; for when we conceive an absolute term we conceive but one thing, as when we conceive a crow, but when we conceive a relative term, we necessarily conceive two things. For example, we cannot conceive a crow to be like, without conceiving something else to which it is like. Seeing then we cannot conceive a thing to be distant without conceiving something else from which it is distant, it is evident that to be distant is a relative term; and that distant things are relatives, and consequently are really different. Whence I form this argument: Relative things are really different, as hath been proved. But the body that is at Rome is distant from that which is at Paris, by reason of the space of about 300 leagues that is between those two cities; and the body that is in the highest heavens, is distant from that which is upon earth, by reason of the many thousands of leagues that are between heaven and earth: therefore the body that is at Rome is different from that which is at Paris; and that which is in heaven, is different from that which is upon earth; and consequently, one and the same body cannot be at the same time at Rome and at Paris, in heaven and upon earth; else one and the same body might be distant and different from itself, which is a contradiction: Therefore seeing Jesus Christ is not distant and different from himself, it follows that he cannot be at the same time in heaven and in the Host, nor at the same time in the consecrated Hosts at Rome and at Paris.

9. But perhaps it may be said that a body, being at the same time in two distant places, is not distant from itself, but that the places only are distant; and, therefore, that Christ's body in heaven is not distant from itself in the Host, but it is the places only, viz., heaven and earth (where the Host is) that are distant. To this I answer, that it is only the distance of places that makes the distance of things existing in those distant places. For example: The reason why Peter that is at Rome is distant from Paul that is at Paris, is not because they are two things really different, else they would be always distant, even when they are in one bed together (for they are always really different), but all the reason of their distance is, because they are in two distant places. Seeing then (according to our adversaries) that Christ's body is in two

distant places at once, viz., in heaven and in the Host, at Rome and at Paris in divers Hosts, it follows that Christ's body is distant, and different from itself. And seeing it is impossible that it should be distant and different from itself, it is evident that it cannot be in two distant places at once; and consequently not in heaven and in the Host.

10. Besides, suppose that Peter could be at Rome and at Paris at once, and that Peter that is at Rome should have a mind to go to Paris and should go accordingly; and that the same Peter that is at Paris should have a mind to go to Rome, and should go accordingly, it is certain that Peter would draw near to himself and meet himself. But things that draw near to each other, must of necessity have been at a distance before, and therefore if a body draws near to itself it is certain that it was distant from itself before. And hereupon I would fain ask our adversaries, whether, when Peter should meet himself, he would let himself pass, or not? and if he should let himself pass, whether Peter going to Rome, would step aside and give way to himself going to Paris, or else the contrary? But if he should not step aside and give place to himself, I would ask whether he would hinder himself from passing or not? and if he should not hinder himself from passing, whether he would pass through himself, and so make another Janus with two faces, &c. Whatsoever answers they shall make to these questions must (I am sure), be very absurd and ridiculous.

11. The fifth argument is this. It is a perfect contradiction, that a body should be one and not one. But if Christ's body should be at the same time in the heaven, and upon earth in the Host, it would be one and not one; for it would be one by our adversaries' own confession, and it would not be one; which I prove thus. That a thing may be one, it must neither be divided in itself, nor from itself, as appears by the definition of unity; and it is certain that nothing is divided or separated from itself. But if Christ's body be at the same time in heaven, and upon earth in the Host, it will be divided and separated from itself, that which is in heaven being divided and separated from that which is upon earth, because it is not in the space between both.

12. Here again it may be objected, that a body in divers places is divided from itself locally, because the places in which it is are divided; but not entitatively, because it is still one and the same entity of body. To which I answer. I. That entitative division (which is nothing else but a plurality of beings, or a plurality of things really different) is no true division, for then the three divine persons which are really different, would also be really divided; and the body and soul of a living man which do really differ, would also be really divided. II. I say, that if a body be divided and separated from bodies which it toucheth, it is also divided and separated from bodies which it doth not touch; and if a body be divided and separated from bodies to which it is near, it is also divided and separated from bodies that are far distant from it; but especially the division is true, when between two there be bodies of divers natures, to which there is no union. Therefore, seeing that between Christ's body, which is really in heaven, and the same

body, which is pretendedly upon earth in the consecrated Hosts, there be divers bodies of divers natures, to which it is not united; it is evident by our adversaries' own doctrine, that Christ's body is really divided and separated from itself, and seeing it is impossible it should be separated from itself, it is also impossible that it should be in heaven and in the Host at the same time. III. I say, that local division takes away entitative division, and things that are divided locally, are also divided entitatively; that is, they are also really different; else no reason can be given why two glasses of water taken from the same fountain, are really different, seeing these waters are alike in all things, except in reference to place; and there can no reason be given why the ocean is not one single drop of water only, reproduced in all places occupied by the ocean, except it be that one drop of water cannot be reproduced in all those places, but if it be possible, then reason obligeth us to believe that it is really so, because God and nature do nothing in vain; and it is in vain to do that by many things, which may be done by one thing; and if it be really so, then it follows, that all the sea battles that ever have been, were fought in one drop of water, and many thousands of men have been drowned in one drop of water, and people since *Adam* have drunk but one drop of water, which things are absurd and ridiculous.

[To be Continued.]

---

ARE RULING ELDERS PRESBYTERS OR NOT? IF THEY ARE PRESBYTERS, HOW SHOULD THEY BE ORDAINED? AND WHAT PART SHOULD THEY TAKE IN PRESBYTERIAL ORDINATIONS?

We take the following paragraph from the *Presbyterian of the West* (published at Springfield, Ohio,) for June 2.

"The question mooted by some few individuals, respecting the right of Ruling Elders to assist in the ordination of ministers was decided, by an almost unanimous vote, to adhere to what has been the almost uniform practice of the church in former days. This will be followed, I presume, with a protest from Dr. Breckinridge."

The initials (J. S. G.) signed to this paragraph—which was part of a letter written from Philadelphia during the late sessions of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian church in the United States of America—seem very plainly to designate the *Rev'd John S. Galloway*—a very respectable member of that body from the Presbytery of Miami, in the Synod of Cincinnati. His allusion to the editor of this periodical, by name, in such a matter—though evidently not intended in the way of compliment, is not taken unkindly at all. It is true, Mr. G. seems to think our opinions on the important subject referred to, are against those held by nearly all the members of the last Assembly; and also against "the almost uniform practice of the church in former days." This may be so, or it may not. One thing we beg our brother Galloway to bear in mind, and his public allusion to us, may justify this reference; however we may have been obliged, more than once, within our

comparatively brief career in the ecclesiastical courts, to stand up against "almost unanimous votes," and against "almost uniform practice"—we have never yet taken such a stand, without afterwards seeing on our side, and that very soon, the great majority of our ministers, elders and people. We stood nearly alone, in 1831, in resisting the seating of a committee man for a Ruling Elder, in the General Assembly. How many are now for such a practice? We stood nearly alone in 1832, in pronouncing the church of Rome to be the synagogue of Satan; how many now differ from us, in our communion? We stood nearly alone, five years ago, in opposing paid agencies and ecclesiastical corporations; how long will it be, before both are laid aside? We stood absolutely alone, as late as 1834 in urging the restoration of the office of deacon in our churches; who now opposes it? And here we predict, that with God's blessing, ten years will not pass, perhaps not five, till the office of Ruling Elder is restored to its rights and dignity, and that by a consent as general, as in the cases above stated, and divers others that might be enumerated.

The facts in the present case, so far as the action of the last Assembly is concerned, stand thus. On Tuesday morning, May 24, being the 5th day of our sessions, the Committee of Bills and Overtures, reported overture, "No. 11, A communication from the Presbytery of the Western District on the subject of allowing Ruling Elders to unite in the imposition of hands in the ordination of Bishops." The Committee with a flourish of trumpets, which was just so much breath wasted, condemn the practice. At the same time, the same Committee reported "No. 13, An overture from the Presbytery of South Alabama, on the subject of ordaining Elders and Deacons by the imposition of hands." And here, with another flourish, the committee recommend that each church session "determine the mode of ordination in this respect;" although God in his holy word, had plainly determined it already. And the house, without more ado, adopted both recommendations without debate, question, or examination—as we were informed. We were out of the house at the moment; and when we ascertained what had been done, we procured a motion to reconsider both votes, to be made, and had that motion laid over for consideration, at some time of leisure on the part of the Assembly. No such moment arrived; and by general consent, both votes were afterwards reconsidered, and the whole matter, with much other business, referred to the next Assembly—simply because the last was unable to attend to it.

So far then as the votes of the Assembly go, there is about as much proof that the body was for as against our opinion. But we fear the bulk of our ministers really have a sort of notion that they are somewhat more than mere Presbyters; and we are not without apprehensions, that if the vote were now taken, the majority of them would so decide. But this is nothing. They are generally learned and candid men, and a little examination of the merits of the question will bring every thing right. Or if in this we are mistaken, and the leaven of high-churchism on one hand and Independency on the other, still so far works amongst us, as to make

the bulk of our ministers desirous of being semi-prelates themselves while they reduce the Ruling Elders to a state of ecclesiastical inanity; why, in that case, the controversy will only have to be prolonged, till our Elders, who are of right the majority in most of our church courts, get to see the absolute ruin that impends over their office, which indeed Christ has established—and then the end of the matter is clear and sure. We ask nothing, but that the subject be carefully, candidly and scripturally examined.

It was our purpose, when the subject should come up in the last Assembly, to offer a minute expressive of those principles which it appears to us, are clearly set forth in the word of God on this matter. We therefore drew up the paper printed below, and should have advocated the adoption of it, if a suitable occasion had presented itself. We now print it, hoping that, as the subject will probably be before the next Assembly, this notice of it, may have some influence in encouraging its more careful study, before our highest church court is called to decide it. It will certainly be a great evil in itself, and would tend only to evil, to have such a question erroneously decided by that venerable court.

*The proposed minute.*

I. There are three modes of ordination; viz., 1, By a single Bishop, which is Prelacy. 2. By the whole brotherhood, which is Independency. 3. By the Presbytery, which is Presbyterianism; and this last, we judge to be the true, scriptural mode of ordination, whether of ministers, elders, or deacons. For the church session is a parochial Presbytery; and evangelists and committees of Presbytery, act by the authority of the Presbytery.

II. The particular method of ordaining church officers, set forth in the word of God, is by prayer and imposition of hands, attended with fasting.

III. Ruling Elders, are Presbyters, ordained by a parochial Presbytery, or by authority of a larger Presbytery. They are ordained for permanently bearing rule in a particular congregation, as members of the parochial Presbytery; and are to sit by delegation of the church session as representatives of the people, in Presbytery and Synod; and by delegation from the Presbytery in the General Assembly. They constitute an organic portion of all our church courts, and in all except the church session, should be at least as numerous as the ministers, and in the church session more so.

IV. in answer, therefore, to the two questions put to this Assembly by lower courts, it is replied, 1, That Ruling Elders, being Presbyters, must be Presbyterially ordained, viz., by such a Presbytery as they permanently belong to, that is, a parochial Presbytery—or by the authority of a larger Presbytery; and this ordination, is to be by prayer and imposition of hands, with fasting. 2. That Ruling Elders, members of church session ought to partake in the ordination of new Elders; and that Ruling elders who sit in Presbytery should partake, in all ordinations by their Presbytery—laying on their hands with those of the Preaching Elders, in ordinations.

ARCHIBALD MCQUEEN, APPELLANT FROM A DECISION OF THE PRESBYTERY OF FAYETTEVILLE, BEFORE THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH, IN A CASE OF INCEST.—OPINION DELIVERED BY ROBERT J. BRECKINRIDGE, ONE OF THE MEMBERS OF THE HIGHEST-SPIRITUAL COURT.

MODERATOR. I ought not, perhaps, to trouble you and this venerable court with more than the conclusions to which I have come in this case. For it has been argued at very unusual length and with much ability by the gentlemen respectively representing Mr. McQueen and the majority of the Presbytery of Fayetteville.\* And what has been advanced by members of the court called by the clerk before reaching my name, has been, as it seems to me, so conclusive, as to render further elucidation of the views I take of this case, the less necessary. It is, however, obvious, that a difference of opinion upon the principles that controul this case exists in this body; and members whose minds incline to opposite conclusions, have been urgent with me, to explain the grounds of my own fixed judgment in regard to it. A duty, I the more readily undertake, as I cannot help thinking that the decision to which this General Assembly will come in this case, will either tend greatly to arrest a most pernicious practice which is extending in the country, or will break down one of the last barriers against the general toleration of a connexion, which our standards pronounce incestuous, and which, I believe, is prohibited by God. In such a case it is greatly to be desired that our decision should be clear, final, and if possible, with common consent; and no one has a right to withhold any suggestions that may, by the divine blessing, conduce to such a result.

On the 5th day of January, 1842, the Presbytery of Fayetteville, being met at Bethel church, in the county of Robeson and state of North Carolina, proceeded on the ground of *common fame*, according to our forms, (*Dis. ch. iv.*) to arraign the Appellant in this case, *Archibald McQueen*, then a minister in regular standing and a member of said Presbytery—on a charge of *Incest*, for having shortly before that taken to wife Mary McCloud, the sister of his deceased wife. It appears from the record that this marriage was celebrated on the sabbath day; and it is known, *aliunde*, that it was the third marriage of the appellant. Upon this arraignment and charge the Presbytery convicted Mr. McQueen, and proceeded to suspend him from the gospel ministry and from church privileges—until he repent. From this decision Mr. McQueen took his appeal, at first to the Synod of North Carolina; but afterwards, viz., on the 1st day of April, he appeared before the Presbytery, then met at Centre church, in the county and state aforesaid—and at his own request, was allowed to prosecute his appeal directly to this General Assembly.

When the record in this case, was put into my hands at an early

\* REV. DR. KREBS of New York, and REV. MR. McIVER of N. C.—The case having been taken up at first on *general rumor*, there was no prosecutor.

day of our present sessions, as the chairman of the Committee on the Judicial business of the Assembly; I brought the questions of form involved in it distinctly before the house, and advised that the case should not be tried; 1, because the usual and orderly course of discipline required it to go first to the Synod of North Carolina (Dis. ch. vii. sec. iii. sub. sec. 6;) and there were no special reasons known to us, why this established and most proper order should be departed from in this case: 2, because it was inconvenient and irregular if not illegal, to try the case at all or to consider it prosecuted at all, in the absence of the appellant (Dis. ch. vii. sec. iii. sub. sec. 11.) especially as there are no reasons known to us, which justify such a procedure, even though requested by him, in his absence. When the Assembly overruled these suggestions and the Judicial Committee directed me to report the case as in order and ready for trial; I again attempted to give a different shape to the business, and moved a resolution remanding the cause for trial below, and expressing the sense of the Assembly as clear and fixed that the doctrine of our standards on the subject of prohibited marriages is in full accordance with the word of God and ought to be righteously enforced without respect of persons. But when it seemed evident, that the Assembly thought it would not only be best to meet the question at once, in which I fully agree; but also to decide it judicially rather than abstractly, which was contrary to my opinion; I withdrew all farther opposition to the present proceeding. Whatever immediate damage, therefore, the unfortunate parties here implicated may come to, through any instrumentality of mine in upholding the great and permanent interests of truth, will be against my wishes and contrary to my judgment as to the proper manner of adjudicating this case.

Mr. McQueen assigns upon the record, five reasons of appeal. The substance of the 1st reason is that the decisions of our highest judicatories have not uniformly sustained the illegality of such marriages; of the 2d, that if affinity is made a ground of prohibiting marriages, the peace of many virtuous families will be disturbed; of the 3d, that the members of the court below were governed by the Confession of Faith, though they doubted the scripturalness of their own decision; of the 4th, that the minds of the persons who tried him below were made up as to his guilt, before they tried him; of the 5th, that the decision of the Presbytery condemning him "is evidently at variance with God's word." The first four of these reasons do not seem to me to require any special notice, or to possess any particular weight, in the present aspect of the case. Even if they were all true, they would afford no justification, nor even an excuse to a minister of the gospel to commit an offence of the nature of that here charged; and cannot surely be deemed sufficient to acquit him here. The 5th reason goes to the whole ground of the proceeding; and though it is very unusual to hear one of our ministers plainly denying the truth of our standards, and attempting to shield himself from the discipline of the church by openly denying its doctrines; yet, if indeed the assertion of our Confession of Faith (chap. xxiv.) that God forbids such marriages as it is proved and confessed the appellant has per-

petrated, and the sentence of the Presbytery upholding this assertion, are not true, nor consistent with, but "evidently at variance with God's word"—as is asserted; then indeed great injustice has been done, and we are bound to redress it amply. For however we may venerate our Confession of Faith, we do so because it seems to us to embody and set forth the plain and precious doctrine of God. And I liken the present case, not as some who have preceded me do, to that of a suitor at the bar of a civil tribunal impeaching the very constitution of the land; but rather to that of one trying the laws by the constitution itself, and invoking the court to look back to the sacred fountain of all law. And I the more willingly admit such a defence to be made out, if it can be done, because, besides the solemn duty we are all under to hold for God's will nothing but what is his will—we are also obliged, as I think, to be always ready to prove those standards which we gather up out of God's word, to be rightly and truly composed out of divine truth, and impregnably established thereupon.

The whole question, therefore, now submitted to us is this—*Does God in the Holy Scriptures, forbid a man to marry the full sister of his deceased wife?* If he does, Archibald McQueen is guilty; if not, he may be innocent.

1. In deciding this point, the *first* consideration, and the one which appears to me to lie at the foundation of the subject—may be expressed in the question, *Is there any law of marriage revealed in the word of God?* If there is not, then this trial and this discussion are at an end. For we sit here a court of the church of God, not a court instituted by the law of nature or that of the state; a court to try and decide no other than spiritual offences, that is, offences against that religion revealed by God. If God has revealed no permanent law about marriage, we have no jurisdiction about marriage; and in that case amongst the largest and most important parts of those duties which fall under what we commonly call the second table of the law, that is the last six commandments, cease to be moral obligations; and the violations of them, though involving the deepest turpitude and spreading the widest misery, cannot properly affect the religious standing of men, nor subject them to spiritual censures. These things are too absurd and too horrible to need refutation. And yet, if God has revealed any law of marriage and armed it with any prohibitions—that very law and those very prohibitions, are the rules which it is necessary to make void, upon some pretext or other, in order to allow the connexion now under consideration. For it is all one, whether we deny that God has given any law of marriage; or whether, while we admit in general terms that he has, we abrogate that law, by making part of it relate to uncleanness, by nullifying part of it as belonging to the ceremonial system, and by frittering away the remainder by our glosses.

A great deal has been said about the instinct of our nature, the public sentiment, and the general principles of all law—as a safe basis for this question of the allowed degrees of blood and affinity in marriage. But it seems to be forgotten that it is an instinct, a sentiment, and a law enlightened and regulated by a Christian

education and tracing back to these very divine institutions which it is sought to overthrow, that can alone be trusted, if they can be even then, to decide such questions. For the most defiled of the brute creation have not gone to more revolting extremes, than many polished nations have done on these very subjects; and no people, destitute of the Bible, has failed to allow and practice enormities, at which all of us shudder. The Romans and Greeks allowed the very nearest relations not in the direct line of decent, to intermarry; and brothers and sisters of the half blood, and uncles and nieces of the full, have been no where prohibited by law from forming such connexions. Amongst nearly every oriental nation of antiquity, the marriage of parents with their children was not only allowed but common; and learned men tell us, that amongst the ancient Persians whose religion was more rational and their manners purer than those of most of their neighbours, the Magi, who were their religious teachers, were men begotten by sons of their own mothers.

It is impossible, I think, for the candid reader of the Bible to deny that it is full of passages wholly incapable of being understood except upon the distinct admission, that it contains a clear, full, and explicit declaration of God's mind in regard to the solemn contract of marriage; which, however it may be regulated by civil forms, or founded upon ultimate principles of nature, neither of which do I question, is as to its institution and fundamental laws, unquestionably divine. Such are the declarations of God before and when he created Eve, and his directions to Adam when he delivered her to his longing embrace—(Gen. ii. 18–24.) Such is the evident foundation of the fifth, the seventh, and the tenth commandments. Such is the sense of our Saviour's repeated discourses on this very subject—(Matt. xix. 4; Mark x. 6.) And such the instruction constantly given by his apostles—(Eph. v. 22–33; 1 Peter iii. 1–6, &c.) I conclude, therefore, that God has revealed a law of marriage.

2. The second question to be determined is this, *Does the divine law of marriage appertain exclusively to the Jewish dispensation whether political or ceremonial, or does it form a part of the permanent and universally binding law of God?*

The considerations which lead me to decide that it belongs to this latter class, are such as the following. In the first place, marriage was not a part of the ceremonial dispensation, nor did it appertain exclusively to the political institutions of the Jews; it appertains to the universal race, and to every possible state of man's being in this life. It is therefore as unreasonable to maintain that the divine laws regulating marriage are abolished by the coming of Christ, as that those regarding any other equally permanent interest or relation of the human race are. When to this reflection we add the plain declarations of our Saviour, that he came not to destroy the law, but to fulfil it, and that not a tittle should pass from it till all is fulfilled—(Matt. v. 17–19,) it seems impossible to avoid the conclusion, that as long as marriage exists amongst men, God's law regarding marriage must remain in full force.

Again, it is to be remembered that the divine law of marriage was revealed long before the Jewish state existed or the ceremonial law was given to it; nay, as we are taught both in the Old Testament and the New, "from the beginning of the creation"—(Mark x. 6; Gen. i. 27, ii. 18:) and that, after the ceremonial law was abolished and indeed after the doom of the Jewish state was finally sealed, this law of husband and wife is placed on the same footing as the law of parent and child, master and servant, nay as that of universal brotherhood and Christian charity, and so pressed upon the consciences of Christian people as permanently obligatory—(Col. ch. iii.) It is therefore wholly impossible to limit this law to the polity of the Jews, or abolish it with the ceremonial dispensation.

Nor can we forget, that God has once and again condemned and deeply chastised nations for transgressions of the law of marriage, when it is confessed on all hands, those nations could not possibly know, and were under no sort of obligations to obey, the ceremonial regulations or the political institutions of the Jews. The determination of God to destroy the old world for its enormous wickedness ages before Moses was born, is recorded in immediate connexion with the alleged general violation of the law of marriage and the substitution of carnal passions in the place of divine commands on this very subject; and it is not a little remarkable, that after an interval of nearly thirty four centuries, one of these violated laws is again carefully expounded, by an inspired apostle to a Gentile church—(Compare Gen. vi. 1-7, with 2 Cor. vi. 14.) And so when God reiterated to the Jews the very prohibitions which we are to interpret in the case before us, he put on record for everlasting instruction the fact that both the Egyptians whom he had already so fearfully visited, and the Canaanites whom he was about to cut off, had committed all the abominations—for so he called them—thus prohibited; and he plainly declares, that for "these abominable customs"—amongst which incestuous marriages were prominent—the land itself was defiled and vomited out her inhabitants—and God visited it and them in terrible wrath—(See the xviii. ch of Leviticus, throughout.) With such facts before us, how absurd is it to say that the divine law of marriage, and of course of incest, was not and is not, of permanent and universal obligation?

It is proper to be observed here, that the only restrictions on marriage, on account of nearness of blood or affinity which are contained in the Bible, must stand or fall as we decide the question now immediately under consideration. If the law against incestuous marriages revealed by Moses, is not obligatory on us, then there are no prohibitions in God's word, which render it improper for men to marry—as they did whom God destroyed by the flood—according to the unbridled dictates of lust—"and take them wives of all which they choose."—(Gen. vi. 2.) If there be no law about marriage, then as I have before shown, there can be no moral obligation and no sin about it. If the prohibitions on marriage are to be reasoned away, because they are found in their full force and in detail no where but in the Pentateuch; then, even though

there remain a divine law of *marriage*, there is no divine law of *incest*, and men may, at pleasure, marry their own sisters, or if they prefer it, their mothers or their daughters, by the same scriptural warrant that they marry the sisters of their deceased wives. So horrible is the conclusion at which we arrive if we deny that the divine law of marriage, and that too in its great and general features as plainly set forth by Moses, is of permanent and universal obligation. I conclude therefore that this law is still binding.

3. The *third* question to be considered is this. *Do those prohibitions which we find connected with what has been proved to be a permanent law of marriage, in fact restrain marriage connexions, or do they relate only to uncleanness?*

I suppose, by all fair exposition the prohibitions must relate to the subject matter of the law to which they are attached; and that they must be considered as permanent as the law itself. And as the law has been shown to relate to marriage, and to be universally binding, so must the restrictions also. But as it is strenuously contended, that the prohibitions in the book of *Leviticus* do not necessarily apply to the institution of marriage, and doubt is thus attempted to be thrown over the whole subject of incest; I will suggest such considerations as make me judge differently.

And in the first place it is to be observed that the words of the command are as general and as precise as they possibly could be. "None of you shall *approach* to any that is near of kin to him, to uncover their nakedness"—(Lev. xviii. 6.) The words necessarily forbid marriage. Whatever else they may mean, they do not admit of being translated, much less interpreted so as to exclude marriage; and such has been the general opinion, always. All sexual intercourse, between certain persons, is absolutely forbidden. Who the persons are, will be subsequently considered; but the nature of the prohibition, cannot, I should suppose, be a matter of reasonable doubt.

Let it be remembered, moreover, that all sexual intercourse, out of wedlock, was already and universally prohibited; so that this and similar *special* prohibitions, would not only be useless, if that was their sense; but their direct effect would be to weaken, by limiting, the previous and more express and general commandment. Besides, if it were to be so understood, it is hard to see how they who would so interpret it, could, upon their principles of exposition, fail to make the law allow all uncleanness not precisely forbidden. And thus we shall have incestuous marriages allowed universally, and uncleanness except in a few prohibited cases between near kindred.

But again, if we consider the whole of the special enactments following the general principle asserted in the sixth verse, we cannot, I should think, fail to see that the restrictions are really upon marriage, and not upon illicit intercourse only, which, as I have said, is, by other prohibitions unlawful in all cases. For example in the 18th verse, "thou shalt not take a wife to her sister," &c.; if the word wife, really means *wife* here—and it is hard to see how it can mean any thing else—then my present argument is complete—and these prohibitions belong to the law of marriage. Again,

in ch. xx. 14, "if a man take a wife and and her mother," &c. the same truth is apparent. I therefore conclude that these are restrictions on marriage, prohibiting it in certain cases; and that it is against the law of God and incestuous to marry within these degrees.

4. The fourth question which we must determine is this:—*Are these prohibitions founded on consanguinity only, or also upon affinity?*

The mere perusal of the law would seem to settle this question. In Leviticus xviii. 6—18, the general principle is first laid down, and then thirteen specifications are given under it; or if we count the specification in the 7th verse as double, though the relationship is the same precisely, then we have fourteen specifications. Now in six or seven out of these thirteen or fourteen specifications, which contain expressly and most fully the law of incest—there is not the slightest consanguinity between the parties who are forbidden to marry, under the severest penalties; not one drop of common blood exists—but *affinity* only, is the total ground of the prohibition.

In order to make the laws of God obligatory on mankind, it is not indispensable that we should be able in all cases to penetrate his eternal councils, and draw forth the secret ground of reason or goodness on which he lays them. Nor is it indispensable to the upholding of the divine institutions, that we should be able to point out to the satisfaction of all gainsayers, their superiority to those vaunted instincts of man, laws of nature, and principles of general polity. In the present case, however, God has been pleased to explain to us, the principle on which he selects the wife out of her family and the husband out of his, and makes them alone of all their respective families bear, each to the family of the other, the very same relation they do to their own; that is, the ground on which he places these prohibitions of *affinity*. Out of a portion of the first man did God make the first woman, and gave her to him, to be his wife; and Adam said "this is now bone of my bones and flesh of my flesh." And God added that the relationship thus formed was nearer than that of parent and child, for "they shall be one flesh"—(Gen. ii. 21—25.) A doctrine emphatically reiterated by our divine Saviour, (Matt. xix. 3—9;) and used by the Apostle Paul (Eph. v. 22—33) to illustrate the real but mysterious union of Christ and his church. However inexplicable this oneness produced by a marriage approved of God, may be in its nature, it is nevertheless real, and as to the effects which flow from it touching the matter now in hand perfectly simple. I therefore conclude that affinity is as really and as decisively a ground of divine prohibition of marriage, as consanguinity. As to the present matter, a sister by affinity, is in the sight of God as really a sister, as a sister by consanguinity.

5. These preliminary questions have now conducted us to the main point. *Do any of these prohibitions of God's law cover the case here litigated?* This is a matter in regard to which we cannot give a wrong decision at the present time, without doing such evil as we all shrink from committing. May God enable us to decide it truly and righteously.

The most obvious consideration which suggests itself here is, that this question is by no means new; and that there has been comparatively but little diversity of opinion in regard to it. The doctrine of our own standards is perfectly explicit. "The man may not marry any of his wife's kindred nearer in blood than he may of his own, nor the woman of her husband's kindred nearer in blood than of her own."—(Confession of Faith, ch. xxiv. 4.) Unless, therefore, Mr. McQueen was permitted by the law of God to marry his own sister, he was not permitted to marry the sister of his wife; and, so far at least, I the more confidently rely on the considerations I have already advanced, as they conduct me to the same abstract conclusion at which the illustrious men who formed our standards arrived, viz., that consanguinity and affinity stand in precisely the same category. I quote the words of our standards not as *conclusive*, since the appeal is by common consent to the Scriptures; but, they are surely *prima facie*, at least to us; and it is the more important to state our common doctrine clearly, as it has been argued and asserted on this floor, that our standards are not without some obscurity in the premises. It seems to me also, that as these standards are a common bond between us all, to which we have formally and solemnly given our assent—a mutual and public covenant, highly important to peace and general confidence amongst us; the true posture of the business before us, is not as it has been argued, that the appellant must be acquitted unless it can be shown from the scriptures, and independently of our standards that he is guilty; but that he stands before us, *prima facie* guilty, under the rule he has himself voluntarily adopted—and that when he denies, at this late day, and after the act committed, the scripturalness of this portion of his solemn covenant with us and with God's church—it is his part to prove the alleged iniquity of our common confession. I do not ask him to prove himself innocent; but the marriage being proved and confessed, and the mutual covenant between him and us pronouncing that marriage to be incest, he alleges (in his 5th reason of appeal,) that this is contrary to scripture. The *onus* therefore is on him; *prima facie*, the word of God is against him; and instead of begging for the benefit of our doubts, as has been done for him, those doubts are legitimately with our standards and not with him.

The past decisions of the church courts are also referred to in the appeal, and largely insisted on in argument. I draw from these a conclusion opposite to that arrived at by the advocate of the appellant. It is true that for more than a century past, marriages within degrees of affinity judged by our Confession to be prohibited, have been occasionally contracted by members of our church, and brought before the church courts. I also admit, after an attentive examination of most of the adjudicated cases, that our lower courts have decided such cases variously; and that the highest court has not been perfectly consistent with itself, nor always gone to the full extent of the definitions of our Confession or the requirements of our Discipline. Nevertheless, I must insist that the spirit of all the decisions of this General Assembly from its very origin, and the general drift of all the decisions in all our church courts,

taken in the mass, upon the subject of incest—are with and not against my construction of the law of God. I do not find a single case, in which a single principle on which the act of the appellant can be justified, was established; but many condemning his main reasons of appeal. I do not find that this Assembly ever relieved a party appellant at its bar, by a judicial sentence reversing a sentence of a court below, in any case of incest. I cannot discover that as near a case of affinity as the present one was ever brought up here before, except the case of McCrimmon, nearly twenty years ago, from one of the churches of this same Presbytery of Fayetteville, and with which therefore Mr. McQueen was probably familiar; and in that case the Assembly gave no relief, and the Presbyteries, on the question sent down for the alteration of our doctrine of incest, refused by a decisive majority to make any change. I therefore take courage from the whole current of decisions, and confidently assert my conviction to be that an attentive study of them from the origin of our church organization in this country, would lead us to place its general testimony along with its authorised Confession as evidence conducing to show that God's word, rightly construed, condemns such marriages as the one under consideration.

If we turn our attention to the general current of opinion in the church of God in all ages, we shall see reason to be convinced that our own branch of the Redeemer's kingdom has not been singular in its judgment on this subject. The Apostle Paul rebuked the Corinthian church, for tolerating a man who had committed incest with his father's wife, (1 Cor. v. 1;) and John the Baptist lost his life for his fidelity in warning the tetrarch Herod that it was not lawful for him to have his brother's wife—(Matt. xiv. 3, 4; Mark vi. 18.) I am aware the force of these scriptures is attempted to be parried by playing on the word *wife*; but any one who will examine the scriptures will find *wife* put for *widow* so continually, that I consider such criticisms unworthy of special notice; especially when it is remembered that, by the law of God, the taking of any body's *wife*, while the husband lives, is so plainly forbidden and was so perfectly known both to Paul and John the Baptist, that their laying any special emphasis on the affinity in these cases, provided the first marriage still subsisted, is wholly unintelligible. There has been an attempt made, also, to prove that these scriptures cannot mean what they are cited to prove, since the Jews (as their Reader, Mr. Lessor of Philadelphia and others, are quoted to prove,) never considered the law of incest as forbidding a man to marry the sister of his wife; and therefore John the Baptist at least must be differently understood. In reply, I cite Philo Judæus, who says in so many words, expressly writing of the laws of his people, that "two sisters were not permitted to marry one husband, either at the same time or successively."—(*Philonis Judæi, &c. Basil. 1554, p. 490. De Specialibus Legibus.*) John Selden, too, has been referred to as establishing the fact that the Jewish church so construed the laws of Moses as to permit a man to marry his wife's sister. This is an error; Selden expressly asserts the contrary, both in his *Hebrew Wife* (Lib. i. ch. 1,) and in his *Law of Nature and Nations*—

(Lib. v. ch. x.) Grotius, also has been cited, to the same point; but he also is mis-quoted; for treating expressly of the matter he says (in his book *On the Law of War and Peace*, lib. ii. cap. v. sec. xiii. and xiv.) that the prohibitions, both on account of consanguinity and affinity, which are contained in the xviii. ch. of Leviticus, are obligatory on all men; and supports his opinion by a variety of considerations, amongst which, (contradicting the judgment and assertion of Mr. Lessor,) is the judgment of the ancient Hebrews, which he proves by citing Moses Maimonides in the text, and Philo Judeus in a note. An effort has also been made to cast odium on the restriction which our standards after the divine law establish, by saying it had its origin in the church of Rome; to which I reply, many of the earliest Christian councils whose decrees have come down to us, show that this notion is entirely incorrect. The second canon of the Council of Neocæsaria, held A. D. 314, is levelled against women that married two brothers, and men that married two sisters; and excludes such persons from the church while they live in this forbidden connexion. The Council of Elvira or Illiberrita, held A. D. 305, in its sixty-first canon forbids a man to marry the sister of his deceased wife; which Mendoza (ch. xlix.) specially notes was a virtual abrogation by the Christian church of the old Roman law; and Apuleius (Apol. 2,) shows to have agreed with that of the Jews. These decisions were rendered at least two centuries before the earliest date assigned for the commencement of the Roman apostacy; and before the church of Christ was corrupted by worldly prosperity. And if there was need, abundance of similar proofs could be produced that the doctrine of the primitive church was the same as our own on this whole subject.

Certainly no question ever received a more thorough or more anxious investigation, than this of the binding obligation of these prohibitions of marriage did at the era of the Reformation of the sixteenth century; and none was ever settled by a more unanimous consent of the learning and piety of mankind. Henry VIII. of England had married the wife of his deceased brother, had lived many years with her, and had several children by her; when becoming uneasy in his conscience, he sought long, earnestly and in vain, from the pope, a dissolution of the marriage, which had been contracted at first upon a dispensation from Rome; but which the Pope, through fear of the Emperor, Charles V., who was nephew to the Queen of England, long delayed, and at last refused to grant. Upon the suggestion of Cranmer, the question was submitted to the principal universities, scholars and ecclesiastics of Europe; and it is known, that nearly with one accord, the decision was that the marriage was null, as being contrary to the law of God; an opinion in which nearly all the reformers appear to have concurred, and which was engrafted into the faith of all the reformed churches. It is at least curious, that the very thing God had denounced, and which Henry so much apprehended, occurred nearly as threatened; for not only did all the king's children, by Catherine, die without issue, but though he had a large family, of whom no less than three mounted the throne, his race ended in the first generation.

When we reflect that the spirit of God has been in his church always, and that such things as have been generally received by it, as taught in the divine word, have a powerful if not a controlling presumption in their favour; we ought to be extremely clear in our convictions, before we set ourselves openly against a doctrine thus established. I therefore consider such testimonies not only legitimate but very weighty, in conducting to show what the true sense of the scripture may be; and the more difficult the passage, the more importance should we attach to such helps in ascertaining its true meaning.

To the law, however, and to the testimony? What saith God? "None of you shall approach to any that is near of kin to him, to uncover their nakedness: I am the Lord"—(Lev. xviii. 6.) Here is the general statute. It runs in the terrible name of Jehovah; "I am the Lord." Let those who violate it remember with whom they have to do. This is followed (verses 7-18,) by various specifications, of such "near of kin" as are forbidden to marry; of which, as I have said, there are fourteen particular cases, seven of the fourteen being cases of *affinity only*. So that on the face of the law, *affinity* is "near of kin;" and its very terms forbid such marriages.

Here then is the *reason* of the law. Certain persons must not wed because they are "near of kin." And here is its own exposition—persons become "near of kin," within the meaning of the law, by *affinity*. And that *reason* of the law is founded on this consideration (verse 17) that for "near of kin" by affinity to wed, "is wickedness;" which is farther enforced (ch. xx. 21,) by this additional consideration that such marriages of "near of kin" by affinity—are not only "wickedness," but are also "an unclean thing." No law was ever based on clearer reasons or backed by more explicit statements; and no terms could more precisely cover such cases as that before us.

Now the principle of affinity being thus incorporated in the law and based upon such considerations, the question is, within what compass do the specifications of that principle confine its operation? How far does it reach? I will state the seven cases of affinity. A man may not marry, 1, his father's wife, (verse 8,) 2, his father's brother's wife, (v. 14,) 3, his son's wife, (v. 15,) 4, his brother's wife, (v. 16,) 5, his wife's daughter, (v. 17,) 6, his wife's grand-daughter, (v. 17,) 7, his wife's sister, (v. 18.) In regard to the 18th verse, I will speak more particularly again. But it will at once be seen, that if we leave that verse wholly out of the question, then of the remaining six specifications, two, the 1st and 3d, though in the direct line, cannot be said to be as near as the case before us, at least it cannot be affirmed that a man is more of kin either to his father or his son (of each of whom the common blood with his own is just one half,) than he is to himself; one, the 4th, is of the very same degree as the case before us; and the remaining three, the 2d, 5th, and 6th, are evidently more remote. All these cases are called (verse 6) cases of '*near kin*;' cases 5 and 6, which are more remote than the one before us, are called (verse 17,) cases of "wickedness;" and case 4, which is precisely the degree before us, is called (ch. xx, 21,) "an unclean thing."

The principle, therefore, on which affinity restrains marriage, not only applies with entire force to this case, but the case is in the front rank of nearness, in the prohibited degrees, and it is of its degree in special that the crowning charge of *uncleanness* is specifically made. It is a case forbidden not only by the general enactment, but by the specifications also. All this reasoning is entirely irrespective of the 18th verse, which is, for the present, left out of the computation, because though some understand it as expressly forbidding in terms the very marriage before us, others give it another sense; and I therefore rely not on it in this analysis.

If we determine the sense of this law by its scope and spirit, as we have done by its reason and principle, we must come to the very same result. The law tells us what it intends, to wit, amongst other things, the prevention of marriages within certain degrees of affinity; and it explains the grounds of this intention, to wit, that such marriages are in the sight of God wicked and unclean. Shall we then dare to say that a marriage coming within the scope of any of these prohibitions, much less of the very nearest prohibited degree, is not contrary to the mind of God? What would such a decision be, if not trifling with the majesty of his law, and handling deceitfully his eternal truth? Shall God say two brothers must not marry the same woman, because it is an unclean and wicked thing for such near kindred as a brother-in-law and sister-in-law to marry; and shall we say this law allows two sisters to marry the same man, although thereby a brother-in-law and a sister-in-law marry? Are not two sisters as "near of kin" to each other as two brothers are? And is not the sister-in-law just as near of kin to her brother-in-law, in one case as the other? And is not nearness of kin, the entire ground of all the prohibitions? It seems to me nothing can be plainer.

And what is alleged to weaken the force of truths so clear? We are told that as the particular marriage of a man with two sisters is not prohibited in terms, (supposing verse 18 not to do it,) we have no right to consider it prohibited by implication—as they call it. I have shown that the general enactment, (verse 6) in terms forbids this marriage. But even if it be allowed that verse 18 means something else, which may well be doubted, and that the very terms of the law in verse 6 do not forbid this marriage; can any thing be more certain than that we are as much bound by that which follows by good and necessary consequence from the word of God, as by that which is revealed in so many words? And this canon of interpretation is as universally received and of as extensive and constant application, as any whatever; as none here will, I suppose, question. But was any consequence ever more clear and certain than that when God forbids a brother-in-law to marry his sister-in-law, for the reason of her near affinity to him, he means every sister-in-law? And is not a wife's sister, a sister-in-law? Nay, must we not consider the prohibition general and positive, rather than inferential, in cases where the implication is so direct and so violent, even if no general terms were used such as are contained in verse 6? At least we have here a double and irresistible inference.

It is also argued that these positive statutes of the divine law-giver are to be strictly construed. Why? Because they are positive statutes. And are not all the commandments of God positive statutes? And is the real mode of understanding the scriptures such, that no man is bound by any thing that is not set down in terms? If so, we have indeed a short method with the Bible; one that extirpates Christian doctrine and morality more effectually than the Roman way of suppressing the word of God entirely; since it is a more fatal stab at it, to deny virtually that it means any thing, than to claim the ultimate right of saying what it does mean. Nor does it mend the matter to say, what I suppose was intended, that these prohibitory statutes are in a sense penal, and for that reason should be construed strictly. It is true that human tribunals acknowledge this distinction, partly to favour liberty and partly from a sense of their own imperfections, that they may not by error of law or of fact punish the innocent. But what they mean is, that penal laws shall not be extended beyond their terms; as for instance, that a law prohibiting "near of kin" to marry, should not be construed to restrain *remote* kindred, nor wrested from its terms so as to make it forbid *uncleanness* instead of *marriage*. But are not all God's laws addressed to ruined and condemned sinners, as much penal as these? And does God favour the liberty of sinning, and that by the law itself? Or is God distrustful of the perfection of his law or of his ability to execute it righteously? The excellence of this new mode of scripture interpretation is easily tried. By these specifications a man is forbidden in terms to marry his uncle's wife and his wife's grand-daughter—which, therefore, he cannot do without committing a wicked and unclean thing, which God hates; but he is not forbidden in terms, nor even by implication, except upon the principles I contend for, from marrying his own daughter, which therefore by this new canon he may do, and be pure, law-abiding, and accepted of God! Are we prepared to adopt principles which are equally absurd in themselves and revolting in the consequences to which they lead?

I have several times referred to the 18th verse of the xviii. chapter of Leviticus. It is largely insisted on that this verse contains at least an implied permission to contract the marriage in question. It is in these words, "Neither shalt thou take a wife to her sister, to vex her, to uncover her nakedness, besides the other, in her life-time." This verse has received various interpretations. Many learned men understand it to be a simple prohibition of polygamy; this is perhaps the common interpretation, and the one most consistent with the scriptural use of the terms in which it is couched. Others understand it to convey a plain prohibition of precisely such marriages as we are now considering; and amongst these are some of our most sober and judicious expositors. It is contended by those who favour such marriages as this of Mr. McQueen, that the words are to be taken in the literal sense of our English version; and mean that a man must not marry two sisters at a time. Upon this they raise the implication that he may marry the second sister after the first is dead. It seems then after all, that *implication* is a just method of ascertaining the sense of the divine law?

If so, does not the prohibition against marrying two sisters, raise as good an implication that a man may have two wives who are not sisters, as the prohibition to marry two sisters at once does that he may marry them in succession? What seems to me very clear is, that what is singularly plain from other scriptures, should not be obscured by forced and untenable inferences from such as may admit of various interpretations.

It is argued that as the law of God absolutely required a man in one particular case, to wit, when his brother died childless, to take his wife and raise up seed unto his brother (Deut. xxv. 5—9,) thus, in this instance annulling the general law against this marriage, there can be no moral impropriety in the connexion itself; and therefore a man may now marry his wife's sister. Here again they who thus argue, depart from their own principles; and by the very argument concede that we may conclude from the case of the brother's wife, to the case of the wife's sister; but without advantage to their cause. For if the general principle prohibiting a man from marrying the wife of his brother, required an express exception in the law itself, to allow a departure from the principle in a single and most urgent case; the conclusion is most absurd that therefore the general principle which forbade a man to marry the sister of his wife, to which there was no exception, may be violated in every case. The inference is just the contrary; and proves that if there is any real distinction between the case of a brother's wife and that of a wife's sister; then a man may not marry his wife's sister without a positive command from God: and as there is no such command he may not do it at all. It is moreover a very unsafe way to argue that what God has permitted or directed under special circumstances, is a good test of his judgment as to the general character of an action; as for example, it could thus be shown that it is, in general, expedient and innocent for men to marry their own sisters, which they not only did, but by God's appointment could not avoid doing, in the first age of the world; and I see not, but that the conclusion is as good in the one case for marrying a sister by blood, as in the other for marrying a sister by affinity. And again, it is to be remembered, that this case with its general principle and particular exception in special circumstances is not different from all others that involve our duties to each other and many of those to God also, and the moral laws that regulate them. "Thou shalt not kill," is one of the great general laws; and yet how many times did God require departures from it; and how clearly do we see that departures from it may still be allowed, and yet the binding force of the general law receive no permanent abatement? Thou shalt not commit incest, is a great general principle also; and it seems utterly ridiculous to contend, that because its application was waved by its divine author, in very special circumstances and by express command, in a particular case, for a limited time, and for avowed reasons which were wholly transient—therefore the general law never had a moral character, and is not obligatory now, when the ground of the special exception is removed and the foundation of the original law is left unbroken!

I am therefore obliged to conclude, that it is clearly against the

law of God for a man to marry the sister of his deceased wife ; that the doctrine of our standards on this subject is true and wholesome ; and that the decision of the Presbytery of Fayetteville, in the case of Archibald McQueen, instead of being, as he has alleged in his appeal, "evidently at variance with God's word," is in full accordance with it.

7. It is scarcely worth while to say any thing in regard to those alleged considerations of prudence and propriety, convenience and advantage, which, it seems to be supposed, render marriages of this sort excusable, if not indeed commendable. My own views are entirely different, and it appears to me, that every reason of a personal, domestic, and public kind, forbids them. But we must not forget, that if God who has considered all these things in enacting his laws, has seen fit to disregard them all and set them aside, it does not become us to revise his determinations, but to submit to his wise and righteous ordinations. Our wisdom and our happiness as well as our duty, require us to keep, not to tamper with, much less make void, our Master's statutes.

Nor is it proper to give controlling weight to those purely personal considerations, which are always found to mingle with every case of discipline, and which often render it so very painful for us to discharge our duty. There are no reasons in this case, which may not be urged with equal or greater force in most cases like it, to mitigate a strict adherence to the doctrine of our church and our Redeemer. There are difficulties which I would gladly avoid if I could consistently with my duty. But the longer we connive at this evil, the greater and the more powerful become the personal and public embarrassments that obstruct our way.

I am aware that there is an impression on the minds of some of the members of this venerable court, that although it is clear the offence has been committed, and the standards of the church and the word of God forbid it, yet the punishment is too great. I cannot agree with these respected brethren. For, if the mind of our Creator is to be taken as the rule of our judgment in this case, the offence is very heinous in itself, and the more to be resisted as there is unhappily a proneness not only to commit but to justify it. And, moreover, if there is any offence at all in the case, it is continual, renewed from day to day, a public and standing scandal in a minister of the gospel of Christ. I cannot see that there is any alternative between finding that there is no law of marriage or incest in the word of God, or at least, that the present case is not embraced by it, and therefore the appellant is wholly innocent and ought to be acquitted ; or finding that he is guilty of incest, and that in a very near degree, and confirming the decision which suspends him from the ministry and from church privileges—till he repent.

Moderator, if I had any serious apprehensions that this venerable court would falter in its decision of the great and vital principles involved in this case, I should be filled with sorrow and dismay. I thank God I have none. His blessing has been of late years too manifestly with us, for me to distrust his presence now. And I am not ashamed to say I consider it providential that this matter did not come up here, in times of defection, but under circumstances that

will render your decision of it the means, through the mercy of Christ, of great and lasting blessings to the church and to the world. If, however, I am deceived in the hopes which I repose on the fidelity of this body to God and to his truth, I clear myself, in the sight of earth and heaven, of all connivance at a sin, which will surely bring down the anger of God upon our land, if it be not arrested; and I warn you of the fate which, as a church, we shall certainly draw upon ourselves if we forsake the law of the Lord. Whatever we may do against God's truth, he will do so to us and more also; and from being a light in the world, it will be easy for us to become a hissing and a bye-word, as soon as the glory of God's presence is departed from us. We cannot tolerate sins like this, especially in our ministers, and expect a continuance of the divine favour. We cannot pervert judgment and prostrate the truth in order to screen flagrant offenders against the discipline of the church, the doctrine of our standards, and the purity of society, and long escape the anger of the Lord.

(On the afternoon of Friday, June 3, the calling of the roll of the Assembly was concluded, and the final vote was taken, viz.:

*Shall the appeal be sustained?* And the votes thereupon were recorded as follows, viz.:

*To sustain*:—Messrs. Reed, Huntingdon, Benedict, Hale, F. A. Ewing, Studsdorf, Wynkoop, Aikin, Stanton, McRee, McCombs—11.

*Not to sustain*:—Messrs. (Sherwood, Davidson, Carlo, Beers, Baldwin, Ramsay, Dumont, Clark, Foster, Platt, Sargent, Macklin, Dulty, Janvier, Breckinridge, Cazanove, Moody, Nelson, Betts, W. R. Smith, Greer, Hassinger, W. T. Smith, Hill, Swift, Morrow, Lea, J. G. Wilson, James Montgomery, Colledge, Hutchinson, Shearer, Denton, Stone, Fullerton, Galloway, McDonald, McIntyre, Lattimore, Smock, Prince, John Montgomery, D. Montgomery, Bell, Newell, Harbison, Templeton, R. Stuart, Preston, McFarland, B. M. Smith, L. F. Wilson, Pryor, M. Wilson, Anderson, J. Brown, Cummings, Frontis, Reynolds, Harris, Fosbrook, Caldwell, English, M. Mac Lean, J. B. Thompson, Finley, E. T. McLean, Weatherby.—68.

*To sustain in part*:—Messrs. Fox, Andrews, Walker, Kerr, S. M. Wilson, Todd, S. K. Talmage, Hadden.—8.

*Excused from voting*:—Mr. Lacy.

*Non liquet*:—Messrs. Lord, Jenks, Cozad, Riggs, Stuart.—5.

It was also, on motion, recorded, that Dr. Krebs, as having been the counsel of Mr. McQueen, was, by the constitution, precluded from voting.

Whereupon, it was on motion,

*Resolved*, That the judgment of the Presbytery of Fayetteville, in the case of the Rev. Archibald McQueen, be affirmed, and that the appeal be dismissed.)

#### NOTICES, ACCOUNTS, ANSWERS TO LETTERS, &c.

*Payments.* Wm. Garvin, Esq., Louisville, Ky., by the hands of Rev. W. L. Breckinridge, \$20, of which \$5 are for 1842 and 3, and the rest in full for the former work.—C. Barrie, Esq., \$4, in full for the former work.—James Wilson, Esq., Marietta, Lancaster Co., Pa., \$5, of which \$2.50 for himself for 1842, and \$2.50 for Miss H. Hays, for 1840, (if our books are correct).—P. M. Cumberland, N. C., \$3, for Rev. N. McKay, which over-pays for 1842, by 50 cents.—We have received from Rev. J. Le R. Davies, of N. C., \$2.50, which added to \$6 paid in May, 1838, and \$2 paid in April, 1839, makes \$10.50, in all; subscription from January, 1836, till December 1842, seven years, at \$2.50 a year, \$17.50; balance due, to the end of this year, if our books are correct, \$7.—We received from Rev. R. J. Leach, (in May) \$2.50; he had previously discontinued in December 1841; his subscription is for 1837—41, five years, at \$2.50 a year, \$12.50; his payments, March, 1839, \$2.50, December, 1841, \$5; and now the above credited \$2.50,

sent, \$10 due us, \$2.50, to say nothing of discontinuing last autumn, in arrears.—Rev. J. Carroll, of N. J., per A. McLaine, \$2.50 for 1842. [ ] The P. M. would have fringed the letter, if Mr. McLaine had asked him, and saved us double postage [ ]—P. M. to Rev. J. D. Dixon, Shelbyville, Ky., \$2, which by an over payment last year, pays to the end of this year.—Rev. A. D. Montgomery, Halifax Co., Va., \$2.50, for 1841, by the hands of Rev. Dr. Plumer.

*New Subscribers.* Rev. Donald McQueen, Sumpterville, S. C., by order of Rev. J. C. Coit, from Jan'y, 1842, and the back numbers from Jan'y to May sent.—Mr. William Miller and Mr. Archibald Sample of Philadelphia, by order of Rev. A. Mackin, from Jan'y, 1842, and the back Nos. delivered.—P. M., Kanawha C. H., Va., for Rev. S. Rinsason, \$2, whose name is added and back Nos. from Jan'y to May sent.—Names of Levi Dickson, Phila., and W. H. White, Fredericksburg, Va., added from Jan'y, 1842, and back Nos. sent to both, by order of the latter.—Wm. H. Dillingham, Esq., Phila., from Jan'y, 1842, and back Nos. sent, and \$2.50 paid.—Rev. Thos. E. English, Bishops-ville, S. C., from Jan'y '42, and back Nos. delivered.—James B. Reynolds, Esq., Clarksville, Tenn., name added from last Jan., and back Nos. to June inclusive sent.—Mr. James Miller, Mill Point P. O., Pocahontas Co., Va., name added from Jan. last, and back Nos. to June inclusive sent, and \$2.50 paid by our friend, Col. Wm. H. Allen, whose direction is changed to Green Valley, Bath Co., Va., after the June number was sent off.

*Discontinuances.* By order of P. M. Albany, N. Y., Ananias Platt, Esq., who has been a subscriber and pessenger since 1837, but has at last, at a good old age, and in full enjoyment of the confidence of all good men who knew him, gone to be with Jesus; we have stood by his side in the troubles of the church militant, and we hope, through grace, to meet him in glory.—Delphian Institute, Union College, Schenectady, N. Y., refused, in arrears. In the year 1819, the editor of this work, in company with about a dozen friends, all of us boys, founded this Institute; which being now of full age, treats its parent thus cavillously. We wish it well, nevertheless.—Maj. R. M. Garvin, Tuscaloosa, Ala., refuses by the P. M.; subscription for '40, '41, and '42, \$7.50; cash paid, \$2.50, in July '40; balance, \$5, which we are ready to receipt for when paid.—Rev. Abraham Rick, by the P. M., Cincinnati, Ohio, formerly of Indianapolis, Ind., refuses; subscription for '40, '41, and '42, \$7.50; benefit of clergy (what sect?) per contra, balance in full.—P. M., Leesburg, Ky., for Col. Wm. Cogswell, removed to Missouri, refuses; subscription 1838-'42, five years, at \$2.00 a year, \$12.50; no payment is credited on our books; but our friend, Maj. Curry, tells us in a letter dated May 7, that Col. Cogswell said he had paid Mr. Thomas Dolan of Lex., Ky., part or the whole; about which we fear some mistake, as Mr. Dolan himself refused through the P. M. a year ago; at the worst, we can put it on the debit side of profit and loss, as many better men have to do these disjointed times.—P. M. for James A. Ramsey, Clinton Co., Ill., tells us to stop, and adds "if you do not stop it you will be accountable for the postage, nothing more, only remaining yours, &c: J. C. Shelton, P. M.;" indeed, that is quite enough; to lose our labour, (Mr. Ramsey owes us \$2.50,) and pay postage besides, both ways, for Mr. Shelton, though post master, did not frank his own letters; who is Mr. Ramsey?—Rev. Dr. Jas. Blythe, late of South Hanover, Ind., by request of P. M., bill sent to him. Will not some friend in the West, send us a brief sketch of his life, labours and death of this venerable, faithful, and excellent servant of God? Will his worthy successor at Piquet, do us this favour, or have it done? It is probable that the best public testimony made by this venerable man, (who died on the 20th May, at an advanced age,) was his "Letter to the Presbyteries," printed in our May No. (p. 213-45); a testimony worthy of a dying soldier of the Lord Jesus.

*Corrections, Changes, &c.* The error in the entry of Rev. Mr. Bell of Va. (crediting a payment to '42 which should have been to '41,) corrected by his letter of May 23, and the No. for May sent to him again.—Nos. lost, re-sent to Rev. Mr. Smith, of Charleston, S. C., Rev. Mr. Reid, of Lynchburg, Va., Mr. John S. Scott, of Columbia, S. C., and Mr. Robert Marshall, of Madison, Ind.—Rev. S. D. Campbell's direction changed from Lexington to Natural Bridge, Va., after the June No., was mailed.—In reply to Mr. John Sanger, of Albion, S. C., we have to say, that his account appears to have been mixed up with that of another gentleman of his own name, so that we must rely on his memory for the period at which his subscription commenced; when he tells us this, we can make out his account.

[ ] When receipts are given privately, either by the editor or by D. Owen & Son, the payment is not again publicly receipted for. The published notice, is in place of the receipt where none can be conveniently given.

[ ] We, perhaps, owe some apology to our readers for occupying so unduly large a portion of the present and the last preceding Nos. with matter from our own pen. It seemed not to be avoided, consistently with the proprieties of the case. The argument on the question of Incest, printed in this No., would not have been written out, but that there appeared to us to be a concerted attack made in some of the northern organs on the decision of the last Assembly; and as we had some small part in that most righteous decision, we thought it but right, to bear our share of the responsibility, and contribute our part towards its defence. If any man thinks he can answer the argument, let him try; our pages are at his service; not for *slang-changing*, but for a scriptural and rational examination of the subject. [ ]

# SPIRIT OF THE XIX. CENTURY.

---

VOL. I.

AUGUST, 1842.

No. 8.

---

A DISCOURSE IN MEMORY OF THE LATE REVEREND JOHN BRECKINRIDGE, D. D.; PRONOUNCED IN THE CHAPEL OF THE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY AT PRINCETON, N. J., AT THE REQUEST OF THE STUDENTS, ON THE LAST DAY OF JANUARY, 1842: BY JAMES W. ALEXANDER.\*

To the task which has been assigned me by the brethren of this Seminary, I approach with a diffidence, the causes of which are too manifest. For I am to offer my tribute to the memory, not of a stranger, but of one whose voice has often filled this house, and in the presence of those better able than your speaker to discriminate and portray this lamented servant of Christ. And I know of no peculiar fitness which I can bring to the work, save that which is derived from an affectionate intimacy of more than twenty years. It has been a disadvantage in preparing for this exercise, that I have enjoyed no sources of information not common to you all, except my own scattered recollections; a fact which will be my apology, when you find in the sequel how little I have to add to your previous information. A number of minor incidents in the life of this departed friend, will be purposely omitted, as being fully known to every one who hears me.

The Reverend John Breckinridge, D. D., was born at Cabell's Dale, near Lexington in the state of Kentucky, on the 4th of July, 1797. Both his parents were of old Virginian families of high respectability. His father, John Breckinridge, was a distinguished lawyer and statesman, an able and eloquent member of our national Senate, and for some time Attorney General of the United States. The pious and venerable mother of our deceased friend still lives, having survived a number of her children.

Thrown, as I am, almost entirely on my own remembrance, I hasten to observe, that my boyish recollections go back to the entrance of Dr. Breckinridge into the College of New Jersey, in the autumn of 1814. He was graduated in 1818, at which time I had myself become acquainted with him as a member of the College. During these years of academical study, he showed the same activity of mind and energy of character which have marked

---

\*The writer of this Discourse thinks it due to the friends of Dr. Breckinridge, as well as to himself, to say that it was composed just on the eve of a long and anxious absence from home; during the continuance of which it went to the press.

his later life. His high sense of honor and dauntless spirit, unchastened as yet by religion, brought him into more than one difficulty. But during this period, it was given to him to believe in the Lord Jesus Christ; and from that day to this, it may be truly said, he has lived the life of a devoted Christian. From the beginning he cherished high thoughts of the gospel ministry, and determined to devote himself to this work. Accordingly, in the year 1820 he was matriculated as a member of this Seminary, in connexion with which he continued more than two years, during a part of which time he was tutor in the College. In the latter of these situations he had it in his power, as I can testify, to manifest a tender interest in the salvation of the youth committed to his care, whom in a number of instances, he instructed and warned, with faithfulness and success. In the year 1822, he was licensed as a probationer for the gospel ministry by the Presbytery of New Brunswick; and shortly after was married to Margaret Miller, the eldest daughter of our venerable friend and instructor; an event the most auspicious, connecting him with one every way worthy of him, and who was, as he used to say, 'next to his soul's salvation, the best gift of God to him.' It was their joint resolution to give themselves to the work of Christ in the field of foreign missions; a resolution which however they saw reason to change, when they came to study more fully the indications of Providence, in regard to their duty.

The first settlement of Mr. Breckinridge was over the McChord Presbyterian church of Lexington, in his native state; in which relation he continued about three years. His youthful ministry was thus exercised in circumstances fitted at once to try his faith and stimulate his exertions.

In the year 1826 he became collegiate pastor with the Reverend Dr. Glendy, of the Second Presbyterian Church in Baltimore, where he continued about five years. It was his last and principal settlement as a pastor. By every form of public testimonial his friends and parishioners in that community have signified their respect and attachment. He was honoured and beloved, and had the signal blessing of being made instrumental in purging and greatly increasing a church which had become the subject of many disorders.

From Baltimore, he removed, in 1831, to Philadelphia, having been selected by the Board of Education, their Secretary and General Agent. It was in this situation that he developed those talents for the conduct of public affairs which rendered him invaluable to the church, and which, in the opinion of many, have left nothing equal to them in any individual. He found that institution dead: by a series of powerful operations, he elevated it to a state of prosperity. He came to the work with reluctance, at great expense of comfort, he carried it on with labour, against a strong current of objection, and even as I know by a careful examination of the documents in the case, in the midst of severe obloquy; but his success was surprising. No influence of an individual among us has been any thing like it, before or since. When he took the direction, the Board had 100 beneficiaries: when he left it, the

number was 600. It stands forth as the most prominent portion of his energetic life; an encouraging proof of what may be effected by burning zeal and indefatigable labour. That all his measures were the best possible, that the prudence and caution were as conspicuous as the enterprise of the administration, I will not assert; but to deny to it extraordinary energy and extraordinary success would be to deny the statistics of the Board.

It was during this period that Dr. Breckinridge became involved in an affair which gave him as much solicitous labour and as much notoriety as any event of his life, I mean his controversy with the Rev Mr. Hughes, now the Right Reverend Bishop Hughes. Our friend considered himself as forced into this controversy, which he conducted for about a twelve month, in the Presbyterian, a religious newspaper of Philadelphia. It was a weighty load taken upon his new and arduous labours. A learned controversy was scarcely ever undertaken at greater odds. And situated as I then was, I was a witness of its progress, and wondered at the power of endurance no less than the prowess of Dr. Breckinridge. His antagonist was a wily and accomplished priest, at home in the controversy, and unscrupulous about his weapons. There may be diversity of opinion as to the expediency of such disputations, or as to the wisdom of our brother in burdening himself, at that juncture, with such a charge: there can be but one, as to the self-devotion, the fearlessness, and the versatility of polemic tactics, with which he carried through the warfare. It was mentioned, as I know, in a Convent at Rome, in the presence of a friend of Dr. B., and in connexion with his name; and it has raised his opponent to the mitre. At a later period, Dr. Breckinridge engaged in an oral controversy with the same gentleman; and the substance of both these debates has been published in separate volumes. In this great contest between Protestantism and the 'Church of Rome,' he was always interested. Much of his private reading was in this field; and with reference to this, some of the most valuable parts of his library were selected.

In May, 1835, Dr. B. was elected by the General Assembly, Professor of Pastoral Theology and Missionary Instruction in this Seminary. The question thus forced upon him was in no common degree an agitating one. On the one hand, he had expended great labour on the Board of Education, and had seen several of his plans carried out into successful operation; and the Board earnestly solicited the continuance of his services. On the other hand, his frame demanded repose. He was harassed and worn away by the frequent journeys and incessant toils of his secretaryship, and sighed, after these repeated changes, for the quietude of home. His attachment to this place, and this institution, was great. The demand for increase of funds, was urgent, and it was believed that no man so well as he could rescue it from pecuniary embarrassments. To these latter considerations he yielded, and took up his abode among us. And here if any where, it is proper for me to say, the Princeton Seminary owes a debt of lasting gratitude. How he laboured in its behalf, how he expended his strength in its cause, and in gaining friends in its necessities, is

known to many who hear me. But Providence seemed, by successive removals, to be warning him that this was not the place of his rest. His known zeal for foreign missions as well as his known capacity for the conduct of public enterprises of benevolence, led the Executive Committee of the Board of Foreign Missions, in 1837, to elect him as their general agent. At first he entered on these duties for a few months only, but in the summer of 1838 he resigned his professorship.

The epoch was marked by his greatest earthly affliction. On the 16th of June, 1838, his beloved wife was removed from him by death. For many months she had been gradually sinking. Effort after effort, journey after journey, proved inefficacious. It was the will of the Lord to take her to himself. In the anguish of the hour, he was the more easily persuaded to leave his professional cares, and assume more stirring and absorbing duties. He accordingly entered on the general agency of the Board of Foreign Missions, in which he continued until the spring of 1840. The same year he was elected President of Oglethorpe University, an appointment which it was earnestly desired that he should accept.

When visiting as a missionary agent the destitute regions of the south-west, including the republic of Texas, he became known to the people of New Orleans, from the church in which place he was called as its pastor. It was a new embarrassment, and none but those who saw him very nearly, can know how great was the anxiety which he suffered from these doubtful questions of duty. It seemed as if Providence would not allow him to take rest in any spot on earth. His countenance expressed his cares. I have no hesitation in declaring my belief that to these cares he fell a victim. For many months his friends observed with pain that his health was on the wane. He still preached and laboured, even beyond his strength. The lingering malady under which he laboured caused him great lassitude, depression and pain, but such was that sanguine energy to which he owed so many of his successes, that almost until the last, he entertained some hopes of recovery; and such was his earnestness for the progress of Christ's kingdom, that he certainly desired it. And here I judge it best to quote the words of one who attended his death bed.\*

"He spake often of a certain dulness, and darkness of mind, but never seemed, for a moment, to distrust the fulness, the infinite sufficiency of Christ, nor the reality of his own interest in him. His utmost doubts were uttered in words like these: *to distrust him, would be as much as to say I have served a hard master.*"

After a calm adjustment of his temporal affairs, he added, "that as to this world, his last duties were done; and as to death, he desired only that we should not allow him to encounter it unawares, but inform him in due time, of the approach of the last struggle."

"The principal seat of his disease was in the throat; and for several months before his death, that eloquent voice, which had filled so many hearts and thrilled so many spirits, with all high and tender emotions, was already hushed to the lowest whisper. At the same time his frame was reduced to the last degree of ema-

\* See Balt. Lit. and Rel. Magazine, vol. vii. pp. 475-90.—(October, 1841.)

ciation (though he daily rose and dressed himself, almost to the last,) and his nervous and vital energy so much prostrated, that he could not endure the least excitement. While these circumstances render his great and enduring self-possession and composure, the more remarkable, they explain also, how it was that the last months of his life were months of solitude and silence."

"For several days before his death, it was evident that he was sinking rapidly; and his bodily distress, which was great during many months, became excessive, and sometimes overpowering, as his end drew nigh. It seemed to be his earnest desire that his departure should be peaceful and without bodily suffering. But the conflict seemed protracted, and sometimes the last enemy struggled fearfully; and at such times his desire to depart was very strong. The night of the 3d of August was one of constant distress, restlessness and suffering. The next morning, he seemed convinced that his hour was nearly come, and calling his two brothers to his bed-side, he extended a hand to each of them, and said, "*I am dying: remain with me.*" As the progress of dissolution was made known to him, his countenance would light up, and an ejaculation of praise or hope broke from his lips; and as the promises and consolations of the gospel were, from time to time suggested to him, he constantly assented—"oh yes—true—true."

"To the end he was in full possession of his reason. "*Nothing.*" said he, "*is impossible with God.*" And a little after—"God is with me"—these were his last words."

Thus died our beloved brother at the age of 44 years, at the place of his birth.

In speaking of the private character of the deceased, I scarcely know whether to regard it as an advantage or a disadvantage to do so in the presence of so many who knew him. For while even an imperfect sketch will revive the picture in your affections, the failure of exact portraiture will be the more obvious. No man, it will perhaps be agreed, in all our acquaintance had a more distinct and marked personality. Every thing about his mind and manners was prominent. He rises before you, dignified in person, scrupulously decorous in habit and gesture, with a countenance careworn and grave but to an extraordinary degree versatile and obedient to the play of the emotions. His enemies never undertook to deny that wherever he went he imprinted a mark. I knew no man of whom it could be more truly said, that he never left any company without leaving a distinct impression. This arose in a good degree from the characteristic earnestness of his soul, imparted to his manner. He entered into every thing with all his heart, and awakened all around him, at least for a time, to a sympathy in the same objects. This tension of mind was very striking, and was some times such as to give a cast of anxiety to his manner, which communicated itself even painfully. As he was never without some high plan of usefulness, and was generally employed in the practical furtherance of it, his discourse was singularly animated, and resembled that of an advocate in a capital case. This was the secret of his wonderful success as a public agent. Such earnestness would give momentum even to ordinary powers, but when

joined to such fertility, ingenuity and adroitness as his, it was well nigh irresistible, as hundreds remember to whom he applied for benefactions.

Not that he never relaxed. Men who never relax are seldom very intense in action.

*In culpa est animus qui se non effugit umquam.*

No man had a keener relish for wit and humour; no man oftener used these as the vehicles of important truth, or more fully dissolved his circle into healthful mirth. But no man was more free from levity. In the intercourse of many years, I never knew him to trifle, to cheapen himself by a buffoonery, or to forfeit the dignity even of the moment. Looking considerably at his whole demeanour, I reflect on this as one of his most obvious characteristics. Thus while he was the life of every company, and while his flow of conversation won him access, where men of equal merit but inferior manners could not have found it, he retained that hold upon his hearers which made it possible at any time for him to approach them as the minister of Christ.

It is almost needless to say after this, that he was a gentleman. He was such by birth and breeding, and association all his life with the highest models of courtesy which our country possesses; but inasmuch as not every one who enjoys these influences attains the same standing, I must add, he was a gentleman from principle, from temper, from conscience, and from benevolence. Not such gentlemanhood was his, however, as that which evinces itself by the adoption of the world's latest fashion, in dress or equipage, or by the bow and the grimace, but that 'benevolence in little things,' which made every man with whom he conversed seem the special object of his attention, and every sharer of his hospitality assure himself of welcome. Assiduity of attention, and persuasive language, marked the manner of Dr. B. to every person with whom he had an interview. If the universality of this should cause doubt as to its sincerity, it ought in justice to be said, that in every instance known to your speaker, and in a multitude touching his own personal interest, there was as much promptness of performance as there had been heartiness of profession. It was in part the courtliness of the old school in which he had been educated, but chiefly the earnestness of the individual, which produced this manner.

As the son of an eminent statesman, as chaplain to Congress, as a pastor in two of our most polished state capitals, as a favourite preacher in our three greatest cities, and as a welcome traveller and guest in every part of our union, Dr. B. had of necessity moved in that very current which more than all others produces ease of manner and knowledge of the world. Perhaps no minister in our church was on terms of familiar intercourse with so many of the leading political men of the day. With these, it was always striking to observe, that his manner was that of an equal. As a man he was profoundly courteous: as a minister of Christ he was almost lofty, certainly unbending. This has repeatedly been forced upon my notice in journeys with him. He never kept his clerical character in reserve: it was the prominent object. In that character he always spoke, and was perpetually producing the impression,

that he magnified his office, that he claimed respect for it, and that he would challenge its honour in any company on earth. This manner could not perhaps have been carried further, without fault. Indeed, notwithstanding the comity and persuasiveness of his manner, Dr. Breckinridge possessed an extraordinary tenacity of opinion, and persistency of purpose, and a self-respect which forbade him to risk even the appearance of truckling: his faults were much more on the side of pride than of vanity. Neither was he one of those toneless amiable men who cannot say a hard thing in the way even of duty. He could and did utter rebukes which were as the piercing of a sword. And to this may be attributed the opposition which he met with in many public enterprises. Particularly his contempt for what was unfair or dishonorable, in church affairs, often drew from him reproof and invectives which were almost insupportable. The dignity and the courage of the man both contributed to this. In his most playful hours, at his own fire-side, by the way, or in his sick room, he was always dignified in his demeanour. Perhaps this is best expressed by saying, that he was one with whom no man ventured to take liberties; or if the arrogance of folly ever attempted it, as the moth ventures on the candle, it attempted it but once.

And as to personal courage, it is a chapter in the history of our lamented friend which deserves a notice, while it least of all demands it. Who ever doubted it? Who ever heard his name mentioned without some connexion with this quality? Intrepid by nature, he was trained in a country and society where timidity is the infrequent exception, and where contempt of danger is not merely cultivated but overrated. It was a part of his character upon which he probably did not value himself, as he scarcely conceived of his being other than he was in this respect. The faults of such a temper are many; to subdue them demanded continual effort in our brother. On the reception of an insult, the impulse of the moment doubtless was to avenge his honour on the spot. Where he failed to do so, it was not fear but conscience and Christianity which forbade the act. To the very extreme of life there was a youthful sensitiveness to all that respected reputation and honour, which showed how delicately the instrument had originally been strung, and which while it was a preventive of every thing abject or equivocal, called for special grace to prevent its degenerating into an undue respect for what is at best a worldly good.

But how shall I venture to approach that shrine and dwelling-place of personal virtues, where if any where on earth, the real character shines out—the domestic hearth! Especially when every day reminds me how the coals of that hearth have been scattered and the lights of that home extinguished. If there ever was a man who was in danger of carrying these affections to an extreme—it was he of whom I speak. If he were an idolater, his idols were the *lares*, his house-hold gods. In his case, these feelings burnt with the fervor of passions. The strongest glow of domestic attachments continued and evinced itself by ardent, enthusiastic and even romantic expressions, long after the period when such

tokens become unusual, and even to the close of life. Of the conjugal relation, he had those thoughts which have ever characterised the purest minds, and he would have trampled on the ignorance and the effrontery of such as exalt an uncommanded celibacy, or disparage God's ordinance, as not knowing that so doing they serve the cause only of impure lust.

" Far be it I should write thee sin or blame,  
Or think thee unbefitting holiest place.  
Perpetual fountain of domestic sweets,  
Whose bed is undefiled and chaste pronounced,  
Present or past, as saints and patriarchs used.  
Here love his constant shafts employs, here lights  
His constant lamp, and waves his purple wings."

Not without reason did Breckinridge value his home. Its reigning charm was no common one. May I be allowed to drop a tear over the grave of her who was the tutelary genius of his life, who never ceased to rule over his spirit with all the romantic power of youth, and who was lovely even to the last? My memory goes back almost thirty years, to the day when we were children together, when our parents were in their prime, when brothers and sisters gambolled about us in these green fields, some of whom are gone. I stood by her grave—and saw there deposited as much innocent beauty, as much simplicity, as much of the charm of infancy carried into womanhood, as I ever expect to behold in this life.

Frequent bereavements marred these joys, but strengthened the affections; no circumstances can ever persuade me that Dr. Breckinridge ever lost the passionate fondness of heart. It was impossible—and most of all impossible for him. No, "her refinement—her patience—her humility—her cheerfulness in trial—her fortitude—her readiness to forgive—her faithful, constant love—her self-devotion to her children—her personal charms—her domestic virtues—her fine graces" [the enumeration is from his own pen] could never be blotted from so sensitive a heart.

From these afflictions of our greatly afflicted friend we are naturally led to consider him in the character which is most of all important, and in which he most shone—that of a child of God. No words could describe him better, than to say that he was devoted to God in heart and life. This shone so conspicuously that he was always pointed out as a man of zeal, and by some as a zealot. In his earlier years of profession, being thrown among the people of this world, he placed himself in the posture of bold resistance to their maxims and vanities, and became the object of much rebuke and ridicule. His influence was always on the side of a strict life and against conformity to the earthly ways of the age. Those who saw most of him can best testify to the frequency and solemnity of those private exercises by which the flame of holy love is kept alive. The character of his religious sentiments was pensive, reverent and awful, and he lived manifestly under an impression of impending death and judgment.

To say that he was eminently conscientious, fearing sin, and solicitous about the way of providence and duty, is to add little to the previous representation. His standard of Christian integrity

was very high, so that his whole life was eager and almost restless, as of one who strove for the mastery. This impressed itself on his countenance and gave alacrity to his motions. He was ready for sacrifices in the cause of the church, even of that which he prized beyond most men, the delights of home, and the blandishments of domestic affection; a readiness exemplified by his frequent removals, consuming labours, and vexatious journeys.

His religion was an animating principle, which combined most happily with the extraordinary warmth of his temperament. The steadfast persistency of his purposes gave a propulsion to every thought, word and effort. In labours, therefore, he was abundant, not merely in public but in private. It was his maxim, not uttered so far as I know in profession, but carried out in practice, to make all his intercourse even with worldly men the means of urging religious truth upon their minds. Few persons have more uniformly acted on this purpose, and instances of a memorable kind might be given, where his casual exhortations have led to saving results. In performance of this duty, he certainly did not err as most of us do, on the side of reserve; and no height of reputation or office in the persons addressed formed any hindrance to his efforts.

Under his great trials, the anguish of his soul bore a fair proportion to the depth of his affections, and the natural resistance of his will. A man less accustomed to carry his purposes would have suffered less. The work of resignation was a strange and a painful struggle, but through divine grace it was accomplished. He vindicated the ways of chastening Providence, and composed himself under strokes which crushed all the powers of mere nature.

How warmly and cheerfully he entered into every measure for the cultivation of piety in all the places where his lot was cast, how frequent were his visits to social assemblies, how solemn his warnings, how fervent his prayers, how multiplied his private counsels, will be remembered by Christians in a hundred different congregations. For the afflicted and the oppressed, he was never slow to stand forward, and that in full armour. The cause of the African in a special manner engaged his sympathies as long as he lived, and while he feared and abhorred the mock philanthropy of those fanatics who under the guise of love for the black race have increased their perils and rivetted their chains, he underwent labours and made sacrifices in the cause of this down-trodden people, such as will be sought in vain among the annals of abolition.

But it was in seeking the salvation of souls, by the ministry of the word, that his pious emotions found their chief vent. With the popularity which he enjoyed, he might have made his public performances occasions of theatrical ostentation. Those who prized him least, have never whispered such a charge. In looking towards ministerial duties, he regarded less the preparation of the intellect than of the heart; and the impression which he left was always one produced in a good degree by the sympathy of his hearers, with his own profound feelings, perhaps rather suggested than distinctly expressed.

It is, however, as a preacher, that Dr. Breckinridge was most widely known and will be most remembered. For this he was

trained, with all the aids which the best instructors of our country could afford, and to this he perpetually looked, as the grand business of his life. His preparation in the way of learning was more that of diversified information than of minute research. He was a sound classical scholar, and was familiar with the choicest portions of our own literature, which a quick and retentive memory made him prompt to apply. Throughout his ministerial course, he entertained lofty sentiments with regard to his office, never regarding it as a mere trade or a means of personal display or emolument. It was impossible to see him in the pulpit, without feeling that he was penetrated with a sense of his high vocation. By the public stations which he occupied, and by his repeated and great journeys, in almost every state of our Union, he made himself heard by an incredible number of persons, and there is no instance of his having ever withheld himself from the most laborious efforts, even when his strength was on the wane.

The fact is undeniable, that he was one of the most acceptable preachers in our country, to the great body of our people. In New York, in Philadelphia, in New Orleans, in Baltimore, his public services were demanded with avidity, and attended by admiring auditories. While this is well ascertained, it is more difficult to analyze the sources of his reputation and influence. His performances were unequal, and exuberant, and far from being faultless. His style and elocution were strikingly peculiar, and became him as they would become no one else. He rose with an air of uncommon solemnity, which affected his posture and his tones. The advantages of a melodious voice, fitted for the uses of pathos, were employed by him to the utmost. The earlier portions of his discourses were preparatory and tentative, and the success of his subsequent effort depended much on his rising to that warmth which was the native element of his eloquence. When he did thus rise, the effect was often astonishing. Never was the elevating power of passion more exemplified. His style became instinctively more simple and perspicuous, and the native earnestness of his heart urged him forward with a torrent of energetic, ardent, and some times overwhelming diction.

His sermons were not logical arguments of linked regularity, like the pulpit dissertations of Tillotson; nor the methodized passion of the elegant French school; nor the faultless and elaborate structures of Hall, perfect in polish and articulation. No: he most succeeded, when he most forgot all rule. His lavish fulness overleaped all conventional limits, and while he was never coarse, and seldom abrupt, he was bold, impassioned, and wild. It would be as unjust to put such effusions to the test of rhetorical canons as to apply the rule and compass to the forest pine, or the tropical palm tree.

Such a manner could not be great except when informed with the highest emotion. It was not in the purely didactic therefore, but in the impassioned or the tender, that his great strength lay. His argument took the garb of persuasive invitation, or legal menace, or indignant invective. Here as elsewhere, the source of power was his natural earnestness. The flame enkindled in his

own feelings burst forth and caught in the hearts of his hearers. As a matter of observation, it will not be denied, that his highest efforts were attended with an impression which more correct and equable orators might sigh after in vain.

It is higher praise to say, that in every sermon he evidently aimed at the salvation of those who heard him. He loved to preach the great distinctive doctrines of free and sovereign grace. And his labours were not in vain in the Lord. There is reason to believe that he will be met by multitudes to whom the word at his lips was a message of salvation. In more than one instance he was favored with extensive awakenings, as the fruit of his ministry.

It would not be easy to name a preacher, of such popularity and extent of service, who has left so few available records of his pulpit labours. His preaching was for the most part, extemporaneous as to the language, and his mode of preparation with the pen, though often laborious and as extensive as if intended to be rehearsed, was of such a rapid and fragmentary kind, that his manuscripts must remain little else than a cipher, to those who shall examine them. It is certainly a great disadvantage incident to this most natural and most effective way of preaching. Yet 'his works do follow him,' and however we may lament or except against any accidents of his preaching, its influence will doubtless continue to be felt, as a means of urging forward the work of God in this generation.

But the pulpit labours of Dr. Breckinridge, though the most frequent, were not the most remarkable of his efforts as a Christian orator. The church laments his loss, as that of a public agent in her great benevolent enterprises, to whom she could show no superior, if indeed any equal. If this language seems strong, I submit to be corrected by those who have been most familiar with our ecclesiastical operations. There were combined in our friend, two classes of qualities equally important in this work, and not often found together; those which relate to the plans, projects, and economy of an enterprize, and those which relate to its presentation to the mass of the people. As it regards the former, he was as fertile of expedient as he was rapid and energetic in execution. We have men who can plan with great ingenuity, and men who can carry out the devices of others: Dr. B. could do both. He was no dreamer of dreams, nor idle schemer. Others might have more caution, and more technical exactness, but when he contemplated a great object, he seemed really in pain until a chain of means for its accomplishment rose before his mind, and the moment of such a suggestion was the moment of his beginning to realise his idea. His plans were great—too great for his own strength—too great, alas, for the supineness of the religious world. If met by a corresponding public spirit on the part of the church, such methods would save our country; but selfishness still reigns among us. *We want public souls*, says Bishop Hackett, *we want them*. His was a public soul. All domestic and personal considerations gave place to this. Thousands of miles were rapidly traversed by him on his agencies, and within a few months he was exploring or soliciting in Boston and in Texas. It has been my

lot to be his companion in such expeditions, and I have seen him, the moment he has entered a steambot, open his books and papers on the table, and during several hours turn the cabin into an office for missionary business. The Boards of the church and this Theological Seminary have just cause to remember his indefatigable exertions in their behalf. It was proverbially current that no man could approach his success in the collection of funds for any great object. Such were his address, his perseverance, his ingenuity, his courage, his persuasive force that resistance seemed vain. In public addresses, on the great charities of the day, he was in his proper sphere. It was on these occasions, under the stress of high enthusiasm and the stimulus of opposition, that he rose above himself, and displayed far more than in any other situation, his power as an orator. Some of his defences of the American Colonization Society, in which his affections were greatly interested, can never be forgotten by the thousands who heard them. Playful wit, retort, sarcasm, and invective, here found their place, and threw his opponents into confusion. In the affairs of our beloved church he took the side of severe, ancient Presbyterianism, both as to doctrine and polity. It was not in his heart to be a cool or tame adherent of any cause. Even those who differed with him could not but admire the active zeal, and ever youthful enthusiasm with which he sought to carry forward our ecclesiastical enterprises. In these he was indefatigable, sanguine, nay, I might almost add chivalric; and hence many of his modes of action are less valuable, now that his own guidance and support are removed from them. We will not, then, forget him, when we number up those who have been the benefactors of the Presbyterian church.

But he has entered into rest. That rest which he never allowed himself on earth, he has found in the paradise of God; and surely he does not regret that he consumed himself in holy service. It is his fervent zeal and indefatigable labour, which more than any thing else should remain in our memories as an example.

We are admonished, beloved brethren, to work while the day lasts, and to look for our rest and our happiness in another world. If, in looking forward to the gospel ministry, your minds are reposing on scenes of literary ease, domestic affection, or personal contentment—check the thought—crucify the worldly desire. Here is not your rest. The more useful you are, the more likely, in this world, to suffer tribulation. The time is short. It remaineth, that both they that have wives, be as though they had none; and they that weep, as though they wept not; and they that rejoice, as though they rejoiced not; and they that buy, as though they possessed not; and they that use this world, as not abusing it. *For the fashion of this world passeth away!*<sup>\*</sup>

<sup>\*</sup> Though known to the hearers of this discourse, it may very properly be stated here, that about a year before his decease, Dr. Breckinridge entered anew into the marriage relation, with Miss Mary Ann Babcock, of Stonington, Connecticut. This lady survives, to lament an early and most trying bereavement.

[Continued from page 312.]

M O L I N I S M .

No. XVII.

**XXV.** *A change in the aspect of affairs at the death of Louis XIV.*  
 —Temporary disgrace of the Jesuits—These expectations frustrated.—Four bishops appeal from the bull—An accommodation which proves abortive.—Persecutions renewed.

THE reign of Louis XIV. was long. He was born on the 5th of September, 1638, about thirty-one years after the termination of the congregations *de auxiliis*. He succeeded his father on the 14th of May, 1643, when he was but four and a half years of age. He died at the age of seventy-seven years, nearly. Consequently his reign continued about seventy-two years and a half. The majority of the kings of France was fixed at thirteen years and a day; consequently Louis XIV. reigned sixty-four years after his minority ceased. We have seen that during all this time he was under the controlling influence of Jesuit confessors. Louis XIV. was more than seventy years of age when Le Tellier became his confessor. Annat had the direction of his conscience when he was between the ages of sixteen and thirty-two years. Ferrier, when he was between the ages of thirty-two and thirty-six years; La Chaise then succeeded, and was keeper of his conscience during the best portion of his life. The Abbé Guibert, in speaking of La Chaise, said that he left but one regret, and that was of the day of his birth. Gregory thinks this sarcasm too severe in respect to La Chaise, but says it may be applied with justice to his successor. Without attempting to balance very nicely the demerits of either of these men, it may be said that they contributed more than any other to fix the bull *Unigenitus* upon the Gallican clergy, and consequently to maintain the ascendancy of the Jesuits in France.

At the death of Louis XIV. there was a change in the aspect of affairs. The duke of Orleans became regent, and he had not such strong prejudices in favour of the Jesuits as Louis XIV. had. He had seen the effects of their influence. Cardinal de Nonilles was recalled to Court, and placed at the head of the Council of Conscience. D'Aguesseau (who had been procureur general during the reign of Louis XIV., and had resisted with energy the violent resolutions with which that king had been inspired relative to the bull *Unigenitus*,) was made chancellor. The *leters de cachet*, which had been granted against the bishops opposed to the bull, were revoked—the prisons were emptied of persons confined for that cause, as well as on account of Jansenism—the exiles were recalled—and liberty restored to the University of Paris and the Theological Faculty. The Jesuits no longer had any influence at Court. The Abbé Fleury was made confessor to Louis XV. in place of Le Tellier—although Louis XIV. had designed the latter as the confessor of Louis XV. Fleury was the author of the *Ecclesiastical History*, and in making selection of him, the regent said, "I prefer you to every other. You are neither Jansenist nor Molinist

nor Ultramontain." This was a remarkable event because the Jesuits had directed the consciences of the French kings without interruption from the time of Henry IV.

This change in affairs at Court brought out a multitude of testimonies against the bull. The Theological Faculty of Paris declared it was false that they had ever received the bull, and they excluded from their body several doctors who were devoted to the Jesuits.

The Faculties of Nantes and Rheims also disavowed or revoked their acceptance of the bull, and multitudes of ecclesiastics in different dioceses gave public testimony against it. But these advantages did not furnish the means of destroying the bull, or of eradicating the various errors which had taken effect by the labours of the Jesuits during more than a century and a half. It was a temporary reaction only, and did not discourage the Jesuits. They still had the ascendancy in all the rest of Europe, and they knew full well they could regain their position in France. Besides, the obstinacy of the Court of Rome was a resource upon which they could depend. For a long time that Court had adopted it as an invariable rule never to recede from a position once taken. Many changes they knew might occur in process of time, and they would be ready to take the best advantage of them. It was with such views that Le Tellier said to the bishops of his party shortly after the death of Louis XIV., when he saw them discouraged, "Do you suppose, gentlemen, that the Jesuits have been so inexpert as not to have known how to make provision for seven years of famine during a hundred years of plenty?"

It would be tedious to follow these disputes in all their details, as well as foreign to the purpose of these sketches. In general it may be stated, there were three parties in France. First, there was the Jesuitical party, who were for receiving the bull simply and without qualification. Then there was a party opposed to the reception of the bull in any form, believing it to be essentially bad and incapable of any explanation, which should make it consistent with the truth. Finally, there was another party who were really opposed to the bull, but through motives of policy were inclined to adopt it with explanations. To this last party belonged the Regent, Cardinal de Noailles and the Chancellor D'Aguesseau. The drift of this party was to obtain explanations from Rome, to prevent, as they alleged, an abuse of the bull and of their acceptance of it, by interpretations which should favour error. This party was really in a false position, and that exposed them to embarrassments from which they could not extricate themselves. The plain obvious sense of the bull was favourable to error, and they must have known it, and it was no abuse of the bull to construe it so as to make it an authority for error. Besides, the main object of the Court of Rome was to establish the notion of the absolute supremacy of the popes, and there could be no greater evil in the church, according to the judgment of that Court, than the spirit which tended to confine its own power within defined limits. Clement XI, too, was at heart a Molinist, and that it was, which inclined him to promulgate the bull. He was wedded to the notion

of infallibility, and as it is said, though it is hardly credible, really regarded the bull as a production of the Holy Spirit. He was full of the notion that the bull had been already accepted in France, and he was therefore disposed to regard the affair as ended, and as he said, he felt himself bound in conscience to proceed to extremities against those who would not receive the bull purely and simply. The pope was as good as his word, and such was the connexion of the Gallican church with Rome, and the divided state of the clergy, that he had ample means of annoyance. But had there been no difficulty in obtaining explanations from Rome, it would have been impossible to induce the other party opposed to the bull to receive it with qualifications. In a letter to Cardinal de Noailles, the bishop of Mirepoix, uses this strong expression, "I will frankly confess to you, my lord, that I cannot but regard it (*viz.*, the bull,) as one of those gates of hell which God has promised shall never prevail against his church." In another letter from the clergy of St Stephen du Mont, there is this passage—"the subtleties of the human mind cannot correct the essential defects which it (*viz.*, the bull,) contains. It is not in the power of any body to make it signify any other thing than what it does by itself signify—explanations the most catholic (orthodox) cannot justify a decree which always will be what it is independently of all explanation, and which will infallibly ruin all the precautions which may be observed in receiving it."

The result was, that four bishops of this party appealed from the bull to a future council, and the appeal was signed on the 1st of March, 1717. The Faculty of Theology adopted or gave in their adhesion to the appeal by a large majority—(ninety out of a hundred)—and a large part of the secular and regular clergy of Paris also adopted it. Many of the bishops of France followed the example. The Court was displeased with this measure, and the four bishops had leave to return to their dioceses—the Faculty of Theology were forbid to continue their assemblies—the Syndic of the Faculty was exiled, and the notary who had received the act of appeal by the four bishops was arrested the next day and sent to the bastille. Thus the Court interposed its authority against the appeal at the beginning. But that did not prevent others from following the example of the four bishops.

This appeal was published on the 5th of March, 1717, which was three and a half years after the publication of the bull *Unigenitus*—three years after the decree of the Faculty before-mentioned accepting it—one hundred and six years after, Paul V. suspended his decision of the disputes which were agitated in the congregations *de auxiliis*, and fifty years after Alexander VII. had by his decree of 1667 enumerated among *problematical* questions, *the necessity of love to God in order to be reconciled to him*. It was the occasion of renewing the violence and bitterness which seemed to be somewhat allayed at the beginning of the regency. At first the Court did not take so decided a stand as it did afterwards; but from 1720, it may be said, it was entirely and decidedly opposed to the appellants. The bishops who supported the bull, accused the appellants of schism. They wrote, also, to foreign

bishops to get their testimony of adhesion to the bull. They obtained at first, about forty such testimonies, but afterwards the number was increased, by the efforts of Cardinal Bissy, and among those who sent their adhesion, were almost all the metropolitans of foreign churches. This is a proof how corrupt in doctrine that church had become, and it is remarkable that the greater part of these testimonies were founded on the notion of the infallibility of the pope, which these prelates regarded as an incontestable principle, and what may surprise the reader, several of them declared in the strongest manner not only that they had not examined the bull, but that they did not think it allowable to examine it after the pope had pronounced; the Archbishop of Grenada avowed, that there were bishops who had not read the bull for fear of polluting their eyes by reading the heresies condemned, which were inserted in it. Such testimonies were of slight value,—they add nothing to that of the pope—though they serve to show how extensively Molinism had pervaded the Roman Catholic body previous to the time in question. Verily the Jesuits had in their “hundred years of abundance made provision for a seven years’ famine.” And if the bull was correctly characterized by those opposed to it—if, as one said it was a gate of hell—and if, as another said, to adopt it was to fall into apostacy—if it could not be reconciled or allied with the religion of Jesus Christ, &c., then it follows that the Roman Catholic body, by this time, had become in the judgment of some of its own members, apostate from the religion of our Lord Jesus Christ. It is astonishing that with such views the sincere opponents of the bull could have remained attached to that body under the vain notion that a pope who held such sentiments was the lawful head and primate of the church of Christ.

The Court of Rome dissembled its surprise and alarm. Yet it omitted no means of putting a stop to the measure. On the 8th of September, 1718, the pope published the apostolical letters as they are called, beginning with the words, *Pastoralis officii*, by which he separated from his charity and the church of Rome, all who should refuse to receive the bull, whether bishops, archbishops or cardinals, and exhorted all bishops to do the same thing. These letters determined the Cardinal De Noailles to publish his appeal from the bull to a future council, which he did on the 24th of September, 1718, and afterwards he also appealed from the letters *Pastoralis officii*, intending thereby to tie the hands of the pope till the council should decide. Thereupon, Cardinal de Noailles was removed from being the head of the Council of Conscience. The University of Paris also appealed from these letters of the pope, and Cardinals de Bissy and Rohan separated, according to the pope’s exhortation, the appellants from the communion of the church. The Parliaments of France declared these letters abusive, and the procureur general complained to the Court that the pope wished to compel the subjects of the king to receive without restriction the bull which the Parliament had modified in their decree registering it.

Finally an expedient was suggested and urged by the regent, upon the opposing-bishops, by which they consented to receive

the bull—and that was to compose a new body of doctrine entitled *Explications sur la Bulle*, which the bishops joined to their acceptance of the bull. Eventually this expedient was equally displeasing to the bishops who opposed the bull, and to those who approved of it. The affair was concluded in haste, and in secret assemblies, and in derogation of a public appeal; and of the explanations themselves it was said that if the bull was *clearly bad*, they were but *obscurely good*.

But this accommodation only tended to divide the church and state into more parties. Before there were but three, but after it, there were five. One party, which was for the bull, refused to sign this body of doctrine annexed to the bull. Another was for receiving the bull, and the pastoral instructions of the forty bishops, and this body of doctrine, although they were quite inconsistent with each other. Another rejected the pastoral instruction, but received the bull and this body of doctrine. The fourth party adopted the body of doctrine but rejected the bull and the pastoral instruction of the forty bishops, and finally the fifth party followed the appealing bishops, and would not come into any compromise. Thus the confusion became greater and the bitterness of party spirit was not allayed.

But the king acting upon the basis of the accommodation, ordered the bull to be observed within his states—forbade an appeal, and declared that the appeals previously made should be of no effect. He forbade, also, the use of odious names, and the publication of any writing against the bull. This was done on the 4th of August 1720. Thus the power of the state and the power of the pope concurred in fixing this bull upon the Gallican church. It was followed by exiles, imprisonments and exclusion from their places, of those who opposed it. Nine hundred *letters de cachet* at least were issued as early as 1726. The number was greatly increased afterwards. Violence increased during the administrations of the Duke of Orleans, and the Duke of Bourbon, but was at its height during that of Cardinal Fleury.

It deserves to be noticed, that the office of confessor soon returned to the Society of Jesuits. Abbé Fleury desired to retire from Court in 1722. He was then eighty-one years of age. At that time, as we have seen, the partisans of the bull directed the rigors and fury of persecution against the opponents of it. Nothing seemed wanting to the Jesuits (says Gregory,) to insure their success, but to possess again the office of confessor to the king. They succeeded in getting it by a secret article in a treaty for the marriage of Louis XV., through the mediation of the Jesuit D'Aubenton, who was confessor of the king of Spain. The successor of Abbé Fleury was Claude Bertrand Taschereau de Lignieres. This man was confessor during the ministry of Cardinal Fleury, and the Cardinal's confessor was Pollet, an *evee* of the Jesuits, and fanatically devoted to them. This Pollet, who had performed a distinguished part in the destruction of Port Royal, exerted a strong influence on Cardinal Fleury. Cardinal Fleury died in 1734. De Lignieres was succeeded by Silvain Perusseau, another Jesuit, but he had little or no influence on Louis XV., who gave himself

up so entirely to debauchery, that he may be cited (says Gregory) as the modern Sardanapalus.

Clement XI. died on the 19th of March, 1721, and Cardinal Conti was elected Pope, who took the name of Innocent XIII. He was not favourable to the Jesuits. Still the notion of infallibility which had taken root at Rome, prevented him from disturbing the affair of the bull. Several of the Gallican bishops addressed him a letter, in which they expressed their sentiments with so much boldness as to give offence. Their letter was condemned by a decree of the council, and measures were taken to arrest the printer who was suspected of having printed it, but not being able to find him, his wife, though pregnant at the time, was seized and put in the bastile. This pope did not live long. He died on the 7th of March, 1724. During the pontificate of Innocent XIII., the Roman Catholic clergy of Holland elected an archbishop contrary to the wishes of the Court of Rome, who was consecrated by Varlet, bishop of Babylon. This Varlet had been obliged to leave Persia, because he would not receive the bull *Unigenitus*. The consecration took place on the 15th of October, 1724. This measure was received very ill at Rome. The archbishop elected was Steenoven. His successor was Barchman, who was consecrated by the same bishop on the 30th of September, 1725. Both these archbishops appealed from the bull *Unigenitus*. Barchman died on the 13th of May, 1733, and he was succeeded by Theodore Van der Croon, whom the same bishop consecrated on the 28th of October, 1734. It is believed that the archbishop of Utrecht is still in a sort of schism with the see of Rome, and has been since that time.

Benedict XIII. succeeded Innocent XIII. He was a Dominican. He addressed a brief to the Dominicans, in which he maintained the sentiments of that order upon the subject of grace and predestination. Yet he held the notion of the Pope's infallibility, which led him to deny that the bull *Unigenitus* of Clement XI. contained any thing contrary to the doctrine of Augustin and Thomas upon these subjects. Accordingly he maintained that bull, and as he was now the *third pope* who had supported it, the circumstance became an argument with many, why it should be generally received. Such persons supposed that three pontiffs could not err in succession, which would be true of one, if the doctrine of infallibility be true, and not true of three or any larger number, if it be false, as undoubtedly it is. The bull was, therefore, urged upon the clergy, during this pontificate, as it had been before, by the persecution, imprisonment, and exile of those who refused it. During this pontificate a number of Carthusian friars who had been ordered to receive this bull, were punished with exile, imprisonment and other cruel treatment, and in 1725 a new decree was made, ordering them, on pain of perpetual imprisonment, and to be fed on bread and water, and privation of the sacraments for their whole life, to receive the bull, and therefore thirty escaped to Holland, and took protection under the archbishop of Utrecht.

It would not be edifying to pursue these historical details further. It would, in fact, be but a repetition of similar transactions. The

whole kingdom was kept in commotion, by the intrigues and violence of the Jesuitical party—concurrent in by the Court, and by men of no religion. The more conscientious portion of the clergy were constantly the sufferers. During the reign of Louis XV., libertinism and impiety broke through all bounds. Infidelity became rife, and descending as it did from the higher orders, it infected all classes of society. This was the natural fruit of Molinism. It is true, that the order of the Jesuits was suppressed by Clement XIV., in 1773—(to be revived, however, as to Russia, in 1801—as to Naples, in 1809, and generally, in 1814.) But the Jesuits had done their work effectually during the two centuries preceding. The French revolution, was as truly the result of national infidelity produced in a great measure by the corrupt theology of the Molinists, as it was of political despotism, and there is great reason to believe the present activity of that Society will be chiefly instrumental in bringing upon France and the world, that final period of unexampled trouble which the Scriptures teach will precede the millennial glory of the world.

[For the Spirit of the XIX. Century.]

Critical Observations on 2 Peter III. 5, 7.

This is confessedly a difficult passage. Doederlein gives the following turn to it:—"The heaven formerly and the earth, which contains water in itself and is contained by water, existed by power of the Divine will; nevertheless (for so he translates the words  $\delta\iota\ \acute{\omega}\nu$ .) that former world perished by the deluge of water. In like manner this present world, being laid up, as it were, for future uses, is preserved for fire, that is, as formerly there was a sufficient apparatus of water in nature itself to destroy the world; so now, there is in nature an apparatus of fire, sufficiently great to destroy it; which God can use for that purpose."

The words  $\Delta\iota\ \acute{\omega}\nu$ , (verse 6th,) in our version are rendered *whereby*, which may refer to the facts stated in verse 5th, of which scoffers would willingly be ignorant, viz., the manner in which the earth and the heavens were formed, and the power by which they were formed and sustained; yet these facts did not prevent a destruction by a deluge of water. Hence the sense given to the words by Doederlein. These facts did not withstand or prevent a destruction by water, but *through* them and by them, God brought destruction over that creation which, at the finishing thereof he pronounced very good. The Divine constancy and the Divine power cannot therefore be appealed to, by ungodly men, as an argument or proof that the present condition of things shall not be changed, in opposition to his promises and threatenings, especially when we have an example of a similar judgment.

## THE FUNERAL OF THE MASS.

CHAPTER IV. (*Concluded from p. 317.*)—*Against the Real Presence of Christ's Body in the Host, or Consecrated Wafer.*

13. The sixth argument is this: Jesus Christ, as he is man, cannot be in divers places at once, if another man cannot be so too, because Jesus Christ, as he is man, *was made like unto us in all things, sin only excepted*, as the Apostle to the Hebrews observes. But another man cannot be in divers places at once, for example, Peter cannot be at the same time at Paris and at Rome, which I prove thus. It is impossible that Peter should be a man and no man at the same time, but if Peter could at the same time be at Paris and at Rome, he might at the same time be a man and no man, which I prove thus: He that may at the same time, be both dead and alive, may at the same time be a man and no man; because he that is alive is a real man, and he that is dead is no real man, but a carcass; but if Peter could at the same time be at Paris and at Rome, he might be both alive and dead at the same time; for he might be mortally wounded at Paris and die there, and at the same time not be hurt at Rome, but alive and make merry there. Besides, Peter might be divisibly at Paris, and indivisibly at Rome; (as Christ's body, according to our adversaries, is divisibly in heaven, and indivisibly in the Host:) but if at Paris (where he should be divisibly) his head should be cut off, he would die, and cease to be a man, and at Rome (where he should be indivisibly and in a point) his head should not be cut off, and so he should remain at the same time a living and real man, which is a contradiction. In a word, Peter might be at Paris in the midst of flames, and be burnt and reduced to ashes, and consequently should die, and be no man; whereas at the same time he might be at Rome in the river Tiber, sound and brisk, and consequently be a true living man, whence it follows that he might be a man, and no man, which is a contradiction.

14. To this may be added other absurdities that would follow from this position, that one body may be in divers places, at once, viz., that one candle lighted might give light to all the world, if it were reproduced in all places of the world: that a great army might be made of one man, reproduced in a hundred thousand adjoining places: that all the debts in the world might be paid with one crown, reproduced as many times as there be crowns due: that all the people in the world might quench their thirst with one bottle of wine, reproduced as many times at there be inhabitants in the world; that all the men in the world might drink in one and the same glass, reproduced as many times as there be men in the world: (whereupon a man might be so curious as to ask, whether, if this glass should be broken at Paris, it would also be broken at Rome, Constantinople, and other places:) that one man reproduced in an hundred thousand places, might at the same time marry an hundred thousand wives, and lie with them; whereupon a man might desire to know whether these women might not conceive,

and every one of them be delivered of a child at the end of nine months; and consequently it may be said that one man did in one night beget a hundred thousand children, &c.

15. The seventh argument is this: If Christ's body were in the Host, it would be seen there; for being there in its glory (as the Romish doctors say it is) it would be there more visibly than it was when he conversed amongst men here below, because the glory of Christ's body doth principally consist in the brightness and splendour of an extraordinary light, like to that which it had upon Mount Tabor, but who dares affirm that such a glorious body is not visible wheresoever it is; and yet it is certain that Christ's body is not to be seen in the Host, which is an evident sign that it is not there. But it may be said that Christ's body is under the accidents of the bread, and that these accidents hide it from us. To this I answer, that (according to our adversaries) Christ's body is in the place where the substance of the bread was;—but the substance of the bread was not under the accidents, and the accidents of the bread were not upon their substance, for then the substance of the bread and its accidents had been in two different places, above and under being two several differences of place, and that which is under is not above, &c. Therefore Christ's body cannot be under the accidents of the bread, and consequently the accidents do not hide it from us. And seeing (as our adversaries say) Christ's body is in every part and point of the Host, it must needs be in the superficies, and consequently cannot be hid or covered by the accidents of the bread. Here again it may be said that Christ's body is glorious, luminous, and visible of itself, but God hinders us from seeing it. To this I answer, that if God hinders, it is only because he is pleased so to do, and consequently if he were pleased not to hinder, he would not do it, but would permit it to be seen in the same posture as it is in the Host. Whereupon I would ask our adversaries in what posture it would be seen there, whether sitting, standing, lying, or in any other posture, or whether it would be in any posture at all? If it be in no posture, it must be without any external form, because posture or situation absolutely depends upon external form. But how can a man be seen without an external form of a man, and without being in any posture of a man, and how can Christ's body be without posture and without external form; seeing (as our adversaries say) it is whole and entire in the whole Host, and occupies the whole space of a great Host? But if it be sitting, or standing, or in any other posture, and with the external form of a man, and if (as they say) it be whole, and entire in a point of the Host, then it will follow that a man may be seen sitting, or standing in a point; and seeing a man that is standing hath his head above and his feet below, it will follow that Jesus Christ will be seen in a point of the Host with his head above and his feet below, though in a point there be nothing above or below. To this I add, that if it could be seen in the Host it would appear as big as the Host, because it would occupy the whole space of the Host, and it would appear round, because it would be bounded by the space that the Host occupies, which is round. Besides, if the Host

should be divided into two equal parts, it would appear less by one half, and in the form of a half circle, because it would be whole and entire in the half of the Host, and occupy the space of it. It would also appear a hundred thousand times less, and in a hundred thousand several forms; for, as they say, it is whole and entire in a hundred thousand parts of the Host, and occupies the spaces of them. In a word, there was never such a monstrous thing seen in the world, as Christ's body would be, if it were really in the Host in such a manner as our adversaries affirm it to be.

16. The eighth argument is this: either the manhood of Jesus Christ, which is pretended to be in the Host, can act there, or it cannot: if it cannot act, then it follows that it cannot see, hear, know, or love, or exercise any other function of the sensitive or rational soul: but if the manhood of Christ in the Host knows nothing, nor loves nothing, then it follows that it will not be happy, because happiness chiefly consists in the knowledge and love of God. Also the manhood of Christ in the Host will be different from his manhood in heaven; for it will know in heaven, and at the same time know nothing in the Host; it will love in heaven, and love nothing in the Host; it will see in heaven, and see nothing in the Host. But if Christ's manhood can act in the Host as it doth in heaven, then it will follow that it will open its eyes, and move its feet in a point; because, according to our adversaries, it is whole and entire in every point of the Host; and seeing, as they tell us, God can as easily put the whole world into a point, as he doth the whole manhood of Christ into a point of the Host; it will follow that all the parts of the world, existing in a point, may do in it all those actions which they now do in a vast space, as the parts of Christ's manhood existing in a point of the Host, can do in it all those actions which they do in heaven; and, so, in a less space than is occupied by a grain of corn the sun may move from east to west, the sea may have its floods and ebbs, and the English may have a sea-fight with the Spaniards. In a word, a sparrow may easily swallow all the world, seeing the world will not occupy so much space as a grain of corn doth; and yet the world which it shall swallow, will be as great as it is at present, even as Christ's body in the Host, is as big and as tall as it was on the cross, as our adversaries affirm.

17. The ninth argument is this: As a body cannot be in a place, except it be produced there, or that it comes, or be brought thither from some other place, so a body cannot cease to be in a place without being destroyed, or going to some other place; and, consequently, if Christ's body ceaseth to be in the Host after the consumption of the accident, it must necessarily either perish, or go to some other place. But Christ's body cannot perish, for *Jesus Christ dieth no more*, Rom. vi. And Christ's body goes to no other place, for if it should go to any other place, it would go to heaven. But it cannot go to heaven, because it is there already, and a man cannot go to a place where he is already. Therefore Christ's body doth not cease to be in the Host. Whence it follows, that either Christ's body still remains in the Host, and that it is impossible

that it should be consumed, or else that it never was in the Host. But every one knows by experience, that the Hosts are eaten and consumed, and that Christ's body cannot be there after the consumption of the accidents of the bread. Therefore it never was in the Host.

18. The tenth argument is drawn from hence, that the pretended presence of Christ's body in the Host, destroys the nature of Christ's body; thus, the properties of a species are incommunicable to every other species. For example, the properties of a man are incommunicable to a beast; for, seeing the properties flow from the essence, or are the very essence itself, it is evident that if the essence of a species be incommunicable to another species, then the properties of a species are also incommunicable to another. But the body and the spirit are the two species of substance: therefore the properties of the spirit cannot be communicated to the body, as the properties of the body cannot be communicated to the spirit. But there are two principle properties which distinguish bodies from spirits. The first is, that spirits are substances that are penetrable amongst themselves, that is, may be together in one and the same place, but bodies are impenetrable substances amongst themselves, that is, they cannot be together in one and the same place. The second is, that bodies are in a place circumscriptively, that is, all the body is in all the place, but all the body is not in every part of the place, but the parts of the body are in the parts of the place; but spirits are in a place definitively, that is, all the spirit is in all the place, and all the spirit is in every part of the place; because a spirit having no parts, must necessarily be all wheresoever it is. Whence I form my argument thus, that doctrine which gives to a body the properties of a spirit, changes the body into a spirit, and consequently destroys the nature of a body, seeing properties cannot be communicated without the essence. But the doctrine of the pretended presence of Christ's body in the Host, gives to a body the properties of a spirit, because it affirms that the quantity of Christ's body penetrates the quantity of the bread, and is in the same place with it; that all the parts of Christ's body are penetrated amongst themselves, and are all in one and the same place; and that Christ's body is all in all in the Host, and all in every part of the Host. Therefore the doctrine of the Romish church touching the pretended presence of Christ's body in the Host, destroys the nature of Christ's body.

19. The eleventh argument is drawn from hence, That Jesus Christ being set at God's right hand is in a glorious estate; and yet the doctrine of the pretended presence of Christ's body in the Host, subjects him to divers ignominies, viz. that his body goes into people's bellies, and amongst their excrement; that it is subject to be eaten by his enemies, yea by mice and other beasts. Hear what Claude de Xaintes, a famous Romish doctor saith of it, Repet. 5, chap. 2. *Of all these we exclude not one from the true and corporal receiving of the Lord's flesh in the sacrament, let him be Turk, Atheist, Infidel, or Hypocrite; yea, though he should be the devil himself incarnate.* It is also subject to be stolen, for, about 25 years since, a thief was executed at Paris for stealing out of a

church the chalice and this god in it; and the priest went to the prison in his sacerdotal ornaments, and falling on his knees before the thief's pocket, pulled his god out of it. And as it is a god that cannot keep himself from being stolen, so neither can he keep himself from being burnt, as it appears when the palace hall at Paris was burnt. In short, the Host, or god of the mass, hath been seen in the hands of one possessed by the devil, and consequently in the devil's power; yea, there are charms made by the Romish priests, to compel the devil to restore God to them. A horrible and prodigious thing, to put God into the devil's power, and into a capacity of being eaten by the devil incarnate, especially, seeing he is now glorious in heaven.

20. The twelfth argument is drawn from hence. That God doth no miracles without necessity. But what necessity is there that he should do so many miracles in this sacrament, viz. that accidents should be without a subject? That the bread should be converted into Christ's body, which is already? That Christ's body should be in a point, and a hundred thousand places at once? What necessity is there that it should be eaten by wicked men, by beasts, and by devils incarnate? What necessity is there that it should be carried away by the devil, that it should be stolen, burnt, &c. Can it be said that it is for the salvation of the soul of him that eats it? But reprobates, as our adversaries confess, eat it too; and the faithful under the Old Testament did not eat it, nor do the little children of believers under the New, and yet they are saved for all that. Can it be said with Bellarmin and Perron, that the Host being eaten, serves as an incorruptible seed for a glorious resurrection? But the faithful of the Old Testament, and the little children of believers under the New, will rise again gloriously, though they never participated of the Eucharist. And St. Paul tells us, Rom. viii. that this seed of the resurrection of our bodies is not Christ's flesh, but his Spirit, in these words, *If the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, he shall also quicken your mortal bodies by his Spirit that dwelleth in you.*

21. Lastly, The holy scripture is clear in this matter; for Jesus Christ is ascended into heaven, Acts i. 9. *And the heavens must contain him until the time of the restitution of all things,* Acts iii. 21, and he himself saith, *I leave the world and go to the father,* St. John xvi. 28. *The poor ye have always with you, but me ye have not always,* St. Matt. xxvi. 11. To which may be added what Jesus Christ saith, St. Matt. xxiv. 23, 26, viz. *In the last days false prophets will come that shall say, Christ is here or there, and that he is in secret chambers (or cabinets), which cannot be but by the doctrine of the Romish church, which puts Christ's body in divers places, and shuts it up in several cabinets on their altars; and it is very remarkable, that in the Greek it is  $\epsilon\upsilon$  ταμῆοις, that is in the cupboard, ταμῆον being properly a cupboard to keep meat in.*

[For the Spirit of the XIX. Century.]

MCQUEEN'S CASE.—MARRIAGE WITH A DECEASED WIFE'S  
SISTER\*

I make no objection to the decision in this case. The CONFESSION OF FAITH positively declaring "The man may not marry any of his wife's kindred nearer in blood than his own," and Mr. McQueen upon his ordination, as one of its requisites, having solemnly professed to "sincerely receive and adopt" this CONFESSION, "as containing the system of doctrine taught in the Holy Scriptures," the only question before the judicatory was between acknowledged law and wilful transgression—which should be sustained in judgment. But the discussion was of the merits of the law rather than of the case. This, on account of what I regard the cause of truth, I regret. It is a very unfavorable occasion to test a clause of a law, when the violation of it is under adjudication; conscientious duty must take the clause while in force for its rule; and common prudence can not refuse to execute it, when the refusal will form a precedent to undermine the whole law; the clause may thus be placed on the vantage ground of "*stare decisis*." The occasion, however, is a proper one for those who deny the propriety of retaining in the CONFESSION OF FAITH the clause first quoted, to advance their reasons. I am aware, that many consider this point as settled; but I am confident, there has not been that careful, candid and deliberate examination of the subject which its character, importance and bearing require.

No one more highly appreciates, than myself, the CONFESSION OF FAITH of our church. It breathes piety. There is not only truth but unction. It is not merely profitable, it is refreshing to inhale its spirit of pure and holy religion, fragrant of the reformation. I have no fellowship with the tenets that openly avow the reception of the whole, but tacitly discard whatever does not suit. Nevertheless the CONFESSION OF FAITH is the work of man: the clause objected to is not of the part setting forth of the great truths of salvation as revealed in the scriptures, so redolent of divine grace, but an exposition, under circumstances strongly tending to error and prejudice, of Jewish municipal law. Many reasons arising from habits, manners and state of society among the Jews, forming grounds for their municipal law, must have passed away from all knowledge in the three thousand three hundred years that have elapsed; our modes of thinking do not allow us properly to estimate much that we have on record; and it requires no common discipline of mind to determine how far Christianity by its elevating and purifying spirit rendering what was useful and necessary to them needless to us, has superseded it. The just reverence due to the Confession of Faith, inconsiderately attached to an incorrect

\* This article is from the pen of a most respectable and estimable gentleman; one whose name, if it were appended to his arguments, would give new and no small force to it—and that justly, both on account of his personal and professional character. In all fairness and courtesy, we feel bound and we are gratified to say so much. For the article itself, we print it without having had time to read it—knowing only that it is written to prove that according to the law of God, the marriage condemned by the last General Assembly is allowable; and having no doubt, that the ablest things that can be said are here arrayed against that important decision. We print, and will forever print, a free journal or none. We hold, and by God's mercy will forever hold, no opinion that any man will so far oblige us as to prove to be unsound. It is of exceeding great importance that the people of God should see alike on all questions, and especially on such as this; and to this end, free, candid and thorough comparison of opinions is indispensable. Our own views have been expressed in the preceding number of this periodical; views long pondered, thoroughly considered, and in regard to which our mind is as clearly and as undoubtingly made up, as upon any ever held or expressed by us. Still, let us hear the other side. Afterwards, we hope some hand abler than ours will say what may be needful in review of the present article.—[Ed.]

formula, may become superstitious; pure zeal insisting on the letter may degenerate into sternness and bigotry; disapprobation proceeding from peculiarity of education on a particular point, from accidental impression, or other prejudice, may be mistaken for conviction and strict conscientiousness; in many ways our opinions become settled, to our full satisfaction, without any foundation in truth or right. Hence law becomes oppressive, and the liberty of one is prostrated before the scruples of another. To one man, it may be matter of deepest interest to marry a sister of his deceased wife; the union may promise more for the kind and faithful training of the children of the deceased, and more for the comfort and well-being of the surviving family, than any that can be formed. While this may be the case with one, hundreds never in like circumstances, looking with coldness and unconcern upon the abstract question, and mistaking, for pious and pure, a sensitive antipathy, may cherish the law which stands between him and his true welfare. But "why is my liberty judged of another's conscience." It is not easy to attain to the magnanimity of Paul, or more properly, to the grace of the gospel in his instructions. "Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind." "Let us follow after the things which make for peace, and things wherewith one may edify another." The 18th of Romans contains useful instruction on this subject. A sentence from Doddridge's improvement is not inapplicable—"let us receive our weaker brethren with tenderness and respect: not despising those who scruple what we practise, nor judging those who practise what we scruple." That this matter is within the range of these sentiments, is obvious from the notorious facts, that learned and pious divines and eminent civilians in our nation clearly hold the lawfulness and propriety of marriage with a deceased wife's sister. The late Dr. James P. Wilson of Philadelphia, took this ground. For many years, in full practice at the bar, he stood among its most distinguished members, and was one of the best read lawyers in the United States; his manuscript notes filling his books, attesting unwearied diligence and thorough research. From conscientious motives leaving the bar for the gospel ministry, he was greatly respected for piety and learning in the calling of his choice. Upon a question of conscience proposed to him on behalf of a gentleman not a member of any church, he expressed an opinion in favor of a marriage with a deceased wife's niece. Another divine now living, deservedly held in as high estimation as any theologian in our country, has said in my hearing that he doubted no part of the Confession of Faith, but the clause to which I am objecting. Judge Story remarks, "In the collateral line, marriages between brothers and sisters by blood are deemed incestuous and void, and indeed seem repugnant to the first principles of social order and morality. Beyond this it seems difficult to extend the prohibition on principle." Upon the general aspect of this case, we are led to Paul's advice, "Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind," and "Let us not therefore judge one another any more: but judge this rather, that no man put a stumbling block or an occasion to fall in his brother's way."

The ground on which I place the objection to the clause in question is, that it is a restraint of Christian liberty. It is not admitted, that if the clause be doubtful, it should be retained; on the contrary, if doubtful, it should not be retained. With respect to a matter sinful in itself, of moral turpitude, we should well guard against the sin; and if we err, err on that side. But when a matter is wrong only because prohibited, we should take heed not to extend the prohibition to what is not forbidden. Liberty is too precious, to be restrained by positive prohibitions when fastidious, sensitively scrupulous, or not well grounded in truth. We may respect our own scruples, but not impose them as rules on others.

Let us proceed prayerfully to examine this subject. There is great responsibility, and a deep consciousness of need of wisdom from above. It is sought earnestly, and, as humbly hoped, with a contrite spirit that

trembles at God's word. Grace is implored, that these researches may be sanctified, that the truth may be discerned, and a just judgment formed according to the truth. It is not expected, that any new view will be presented; but care and pains will be used to exhibit so plainly the matter in debate, that all will be able to form an intelligent opinion concerning it.

The clause objected to is an induction. The 18th of Leviticus cited for its support contains no such position. By force of this clause marriage with the sister of a deceased wife, is prohibited; the 18th of Leviticus contains no such prohibition. Great confidence is felt in the assertion, that if the prohibitory verses of this chapter, instead of an induction from them, had been inserted in the Confession of Faith, marriage with a deceased wife's sister would never have been condemned. The fact of this clause being deemed necessary, and therefore added, is substantial ground for this confidence. The first clause of the paragraph "Marriage ought not to be within the degrees of consanguinity or affinity forbidden in the word," adopts explicitly the prohibitory verses of the 18th of Leviticus; so far as these verses could be relied upon, this first clause was all-sufficient; nothing further could be required: it must have been to answer some purpose not plainly resulting from these verses, that the clause objected to was superadded. This view is strikingly illustrated by three decisions cited by Dr. Wilson on the occasion above mentioned as having been made by the General Assembly of the Presbyterian church in the United States:—one in 1799, when a decision in North Carolina against a man for marrying his deceased wife's sister's daughter, was reversed: one in 1802 when a question of the very same kind, from Tennessee, was answered in the same way, and in 1804, when a reference from Pittsburgh, presenting the same point, was disposed of in the same manner. Dr. Wilson adds "so that with us this question may be deemed to be settled." Now marriage with the deceased wife's niece is within the identical reason so triumphantly assigned for the prohibition of her sister:—it is the same degree as the nephew and uncle's wife, expressly forbidden. The only principle on which the General Assembly can condemn the marriage with the wife's sister while it refrains from that with her niece, is that the clause objected to includes the sister but not the niece; while the Levitical prohibitions specify neither, but afford precisely the same ground of induction in respect to each. It may be added, that the statutes of 25 Hen. 8, and 28 Hen. 8, professing to make the prohibitions of marriage *said* to be contained in God's word, the law of England, *expressly* add the wife's sister, and these statutes have been relied upon as determining this point by their own force. But we are surprised, that in an age when the church through its Roman Catholic polity had supreme power in case of marriage, and had for the sake of lucre, as declared by another statute four years afterward, produced great inconveniences by "other prohibitions than God's law admitteth," we read in this stat. 28 Hen. 8, that "inconveniences have happened by reason of marrying within the degrees prohibited by God's word;" and we cannot help remembering, that among the most wicked acts of this wicked king, was his persecution of his wife Catharine of Arragon to obtain a divorce and quiet his conscience in separation from her. His pretence for desiring this divorce, was compunction of conscience for marrying his brother's widow; the real causes were "the decay of her beauty, together with particular infirmities and diseases, had contributed notwithstanding her blameless character and deportment, to render her person unacceptable to him," and his being enamored of Anne Boleyn. We cannot rate very highly the conscientious scruples of a man, who divorced two queens, consigned two to the block, was upon the point of murdering a third, and whose hands were stained with the noblest blood of his kingdom, and among others, that of the upright and pious Sir Thomas Moore; nor can we feel much respect for the adjudications of an age, nor fail to see the irresistible influence of a king, when all these things were accomplished

through acts of Parliament and judicial sentences. In this age and under this king it was, that these statutes were passed. We see plainly the interest of Henry. The strong argument now relied on against marrying a wife's sister, not specified among the prohibitions, is, that it is specified, that a man shall not marry his brother's widow; by reversing it—that it is unlawful to marry a wife's sister—becomes an argument confirming the unlawfulness of marriage with a brother's widow.—In this age and under this king it was, that all the universities of Europe pronounced the marriage of Henry with Catharine of Aragon forbidden by the law of God, with which no human authority could dispense, and that therefore even the Pope's dispensation was void. Let us examine this case in the light of common sense, looking into the facts and the law.

Catharine of Arragon in 1501 was married to Arthur, eldest son and heir apparent of Henry VII. This prince was not sixteen years old at the time of his marriage, and he died in a few months. After his death, Catharine, his widow, upon dispensation from the Pope, was contracted to Henry his brother, who succeeded him as heir apparent. Upon Henry's accession to the throne, as Henry VIII., in 1509 the marriage, with the advice of his council, was solemnized. These are the facts. The law is, if we take the law which God gave to the children of Israel on this subject, "thou shalt not uncover the nakedness of thy brother's wife: it is thy brother's nakedness."—"If brethren dwell together, and one of them die, and have no child, the wife of the dead shall not marry without unto a stranger: her husband's brother shall go in unto her, and take her to him to wife, and perform the duty of a husband's brother unto her."—Lev. xviii. 16; Deut. xxv. 5. The law of God, therefore did not prohibit marriage with a deceased brother's widow absolutely, but only in case he left a child; if he left no child, the law required the surviving brother to marry his widow. There can be no exposition varying from this. We have before us in these verses the law prescribed to Israel upon this subject: if we take one part and reject another, we have not the law. If we consider the law given by God to Israel in this matter as expressive of his will, if we do not observe the whole law, we do not conform to his will. Upon the death of an Israelite childless, leaving a wife and an unmarried brother, it was the will of God expressed in his law, that the brother should marry the widow; and disgrace was annexed to non-compliance. A stronger case upon the principles of natural justice and right for the application of such a law, never occurred, than this of Henry VIII. and Catharine of Arragon. She was the daughter of very royalty;—of Ferdinand and Isabella of Spain: her father a king eminent among kings, her mother a queen in her own right still more eminent: both distinguished in Christendom for rescuing, through extraordinary perils, and labors, its most beautiful region from the Mahometans. She was espoused by the heir apparent of the throne of England, a youth of surpassing merit, to be the wife of a king and the mother of kings. Upon his death childless, how could there be a stronger obligation in this respect, than upon his brother succeeding to his birthright to fulfil the promises of her original espousals? It is no answer, that the law requiring a brother to marry a brother's widow is an exception to the general law for a political reason. It is not an exception: it is a general regulation. Both parts of the law are of the same nature; both regulations of municipal polity for that nation: and the brother is required to marry the childless brother's widow, because the political reason for that is stronger than the political reason interdicting marriage in that relationship. It would be strange reasoning indeed, that the reason that is set aside is the better one, that the law which is superseded, is the best founded.

We thus see how it happened, that in the reign of Henry VIII. the prohibitions of the municipal law concerning marriage given by God to the Jews, became incorporated in the Law of England, making the prohibition

of marriage with a brother's widow absolute, and superadding a correspondent prohibition of marriage with a deceased wife's sister.

The inquiry arises, how this part of the Confession of Faith has become the law of the Presbyterian church in this country? The long Parliament commencing (1640) amid the troubles of the reign of Charles I., undertook to remove grievances of Church as well as state. For this purpose, (1643) an Assembly of divines was called at Westminster; and this Assembly aided by commissioners from the church of Scotland, prepared the Confession of Faith. "The English divines would have been content with revising and explaining the thirty-nine articles of the church of England; but the Scots insisted on a system of their own." The Confession of Faith thus prepared was presented to Parliament for examination. The doctrinal articles were approved; but other chapters were laid aside, and a great part of the chapter concerning marriage and divorce, including that involved in these remarks, "was referred to the laws of the land." "But the whole Confession, as it came from the Assembly, being sent into Scotland, was immediately approved by the General Assembly, and by the Parliament of that kingdom." It thus became not only the law of the church, but the law of the land; and being adopted by the General Assembly of the Presbyterian church in the United States, it is the law of that church in this country: we receiving in this matter, through the church of Scotland, the law prepared by the Westminster Assembly, approved by the General Assembly of that church, and passed by the Parliament of that kingdom.

The position "the man may not marry any of his wife's kindred nearer in blood than he may of his own," among collaterals, has manifestly no warrant from nature. Every one heeding her voice must say that his relation to his own sister born of the same parent, has no point of analogy to his relation to his wife's sister. A marriage between a brother and sister would raise abhorrence; but in what does marriage with a second sister differ from that with the first? On this point the language of Judge Story is commended to our consideration not only by his high judicial station and great attainments, but its plain, common sense, when he says, "the canon law seems to have made no distinction between consanguinity or relation by blood, and affinity or relation by marriage, though there is a very material difference in the cases."

A great English judge, Lord Chief Justice Vaughan, in two cases before him in which he manifests ability and most thorough and elaborate research, asserts, that were it not for the Statutes of Henry VIII. before referred to, "it would be hard to make out by persons of what learning soever, that we are obliged to the Levitical decrees: for we are not bound by the Judaical law; and how comes this part of it to be distinguished from the rest?" "It is further cleared, that this law was no more than other Judaical laws, given to the Gentiles." "There is no color of argument, that the prohibitions in the 18th of Leviticus were universal laws." I might add the suggestions, is Exodus xxx. 3, against kindling a fire on the Sabbath, or Deut. xxv. 4, "Thou shalt not muzzle the ox when he treadeth out the corn," or the law before cited, Deut. xxv. 5, on this same subject of marriage, requiring a brother to marry the widow of a deceased childless brother, binding? Such suggestions might be multiplied: these are intended to direct thought in this line: and thought in this line will not stop short of the conviction, that the municipal laws, as well as the ceremonial, given by God to the children of Israel, were intended only for that nation, for the regulation of their peculiar national polity; their government a theocracy, their Law-giver, God: wiser laws than other nations enjoyed, but the special blessing of God to them as his people; that they have become laws of other people or communities only by being approved and adopted as applicable to their condition and circumstances; that the Divine Author of our religion never descended into this province—

"Render unto Cesar the things that are Cesar's;"—"My kingdom is not of this world;"—"Who made me a judge or divider over you?" And that the passage Acts xv. 20, 29, was merely special and temporary for the sake of avoiding offence to Jewish converts, unless we can admit the obligation against things strangled and blood.—History will answer the Chief Justice's question, how these Levitical prohibitions became distinguished from the rest of the Jewish municipal law? The church of Rome made great use of the Old Testament to build up her hierarchy. By means of the Old Testament that church acquired mastery of the consciences of men, and employed this tremendous power for every purpose of oppression, from the pitiful exaction that extorted from the laboring poor their hard and scanty earnings to the grand measures of policy which despoiled kingdoms of their wealth. Prohibitions against marriage were a fruitful source of revenue, because of the fees that were paid to obtain dispensations: the more numerous the prohibitions, the more numerous the dispensations, and the greater the amount of fees. Taking the 18th of Leviticus for the foundation, relying upon verse six as a general prohibition of marriage with kindred, and assuming that the subsequent verses did not specify all the prohibited cases, but that some were constructively implied and therefore to be supplied, they extended these prohibitions to the seventh degree of the civil law or third cousins, and by introducing the computation of the canon law, added several other degrees. Grievances of this nature produced the statute of 32, Henry VIII., of England, before referred to, in which it is alleged that the Court of Rome had invented these prohibitions "all because they would get money by it," "whereby much discord had arisen between lawful married persons," and it is enacted, that "no prohibition (God's law except) shall impeach any marriage without the Levitical degrees."

The Levitical prohibitions being thus incorporated in the law of England, became the subject of legal adjudication in the courts, and the law in this respect in that country is settled by decisions made in consequence. The manner of proceeding was favorable to an enlarged construction of the prohibitions. The cases originated in the ecclesiastical courts having cognizance of matrimonial causes and incest, and came before the courts of law upon application to restrain the ecclesiastical courts from proceeding, because they were determining a degree to be forbidden, that was not. In every case the court of law came in collision with the ecclesiastical court wielding the power of the church and disposed to establish some questionable prohibition. The power of the church in that age was commanding; and we must suppose, that the prohibited degrees would be carried as far as there was color to justify, and that every doubtful point would be decided for the prohibition. The state of public opinion favored the same inclination. What word more offensive than *incest*? What crime more revolting? All the authority of the church in a superstitious age had been directed to stigmatize as incestuous, marriage within degrees added by implication to the Levitical text. The power of prejudice of this nature is seen in the instance of Martin Luther, whose strong mind filled with holy indignation against the errors of the church of Rome, could never lay aside one of the most absurd tenets arising from those errors, consubstantiation!

We will examine the judicial decisions. In Co. Lit. 235, a book of paramount authority, a work of the most learned judge of his time, and eminent as well for piety and talent as erudition, we have this authority—"A man married the daughter of the sister of his first wife, and was drawn in question in the ecclesiastical court for this marriage, alleging the same to be against the canons; and it was resolved by the Court of Common Pleas upon consideration had of the said Statute (32 Henry VIII., above referred to) that the marriage could not be impeached; for that the same was declared by the same act of Parliament to be good, inasmuch as it was not

prohibited by the Levitical degrees."—(In respect to the application of this authority it is to be remembered, that by the 18th of Lev. the nephew is prohibited from marrying the wife of his father's brother, which raises the identical argument against a man's marrying the daughter of his wife's sister, that is so strongly insisted upon as resulting from the prohibition against a man's marrying his brother's widow to also prohibit him from marrying his wife's sister. Upon the authority of this case, this argument entirely fails.)—Butler in his note on this passage of Co. Lit., says, it "exposed Sir Edward Coke to much censure. It was struck out of the third and every following edition to the ninth. It was restored to its place in that edition"—"that case is said to have been expunged out of the First Institute by order of the King and Council:"—that King was Charles I., his prime minister Archbishop Laud, both of undesirable celebrity for exalting the pretensions of absolute power and ecclesiastical dominion. In the case of *Harrison vs. Burwell*, (Vaughan 206—250, 2 Vent. 9—22,) Lord Chief Justice Vaughan in his judgment of unequalled ability and research, after noticing that the Statute 23 of Henry VIII. contained prohibitions not in the 18th of Leviticus, says, "A man is prohibited by 23 Henry VIII. and by the received interpretation of the Levitical degrees, absolutely to marry his wife's sister; but within the meaning of Leviticus, and the constant practice of the commonwealth of the Jews, a man was prohibited to marry his wife's sister only during her life; after he might." Although this was not the principal point decided in the case, in a judgment so elaborate, it has the force of authority. But it is instructive to look to the conclusion of the report of this case by Ventris, where we are told, "In this case Dr. Stern, the Archbishop of York was very zealous and industrious to set aside the prohibition," (the name of the process to restrain the ecclesiastical Court.) "He made several and distinct applications to the judges about it: he earnestly and particularly debated the matter with them, and gave them papers of his arguments and reasons to prove the marriage incestuous and unlawful." We thus see the influence that was brought to bear upon this subject to produce a construction of the 18th of Leviticus, against the deliberate opinion of the judges. We have a specimen of ecclesiastical reasoning in this matter, 2 Vent. 21. "This law depends upon the original tongues, and tradition, and history; and laymen cannot know the secret of this law by which this matter is to be decided:" thus making these prohibitions, like many other eventful doctrines of those times, to belong to the arcana of the church. Through these arcana liberty and common sense were swept from the earth; men despoiled not only of rights but reason; their very souls debased by a dark and besotting superstition.

The authorities cited were sufficient to settle the principle of construction of the 18th of Leviticus, against extending the prohibitions to cases not specified, and of course that marriage with a wife's sister is not within them: this is the explicit declaration of Chief Justice Vaughan. We see the irregular interference and arbitrary opposition that resisted this construction; and in three years after the last case, we have a decision of Lord Chief Justice Vaughan, that the court of law would not interpose to restrain the ecclesiastical court from dissolving a marriage with a deceased wife's sister. In his opinion sustaining this decision, he says, this marriage is "expressly prohibited within the 18th of Leviticus, and then it must be within the Levitical degrees;" but "that admitting this marriage be without the Levitical degrees, yet it is prohibited by God's law;" for "when an act of Parliament declares a marriage to be against God's law, it must be admitted in all courts and proceedings of this kingdom to be so." Then instead of looking into the Bible to ascertain, whether God's law there written forbids the marriage, he looks into the Statute 25 and 28 of Henry VIII., before noticed, and finding it there said, a marriage with a wife's sister is forbidden, he takes it as conclusive upon him, that it is so. We may suppose his principal reliance to have been on these Statutes; in his

view of them he had no liberty of judgment—the point before him being authoritatively settled; he had intimated the same in the former case; but it is curious to notice his answer to the argument, which in the former case convinced him that the prohibition in Leviticus was against marrying two sisters, as Jacob did. He says, “the words—*Neither shalt thou take a wife to her sister to vex her, to uncover her nakedness beside the other during her life*, may be understood to prohibit the husband his wife’s sister absolutely, as well as to prohibit her during his wife’s life: for the words, *during her life*, may relate either to the words, *thou shalt not take a wife to her sister*, (*viz.* during her life,) and in that sense the meaning will be, that a man is not prohibited to marry his wife’s sister absolutely, but only until his wife’s death, and is consonant to the exposition of that place in Leviticus, by the Scribes and Talmudical Rabbies. Or, the words may read thus, *thou shalt not take a wife to her sister to vex her during her life, or as long as she lives*, that is to cause jealousy and vexation to thy wife during the whole time of her life which sense squares with the doctrine of the Kariats upon Leviticus, and I think may well be defended by the Septuagint translation.” So far Chief Justice Vaughan. This last construction I understand to be, that as the wife would be vexed as long as she lived by the thought that upon her death her husband would marry her sister, and therefore this marriage was prohibited, and such is the interpretation of Leviticus xviii. 18. It could have been no common pressure upon the mind of this great Judge, under which he used this argument. The argument to have any sense must forbid any marriage after the wife’s death: a prohibition that has been contended for, and I believe at one time established. Chief Justice Vaughan associates two canons of the church, as he says of great antiquity. One from the canons styled Canons of the Apostles, declaring that “whoever took two sisters or a sister’s daughter, could not be a clerk,” (clergyman); and the other a canon of an ancient Provincial Council, A. D. 314, providing that “if any one after the death of his wife took her sister he must abstain from the communion five years,” and he lays stress upon the canons. But this is going into the dark and fabulous ages of the church. The canons of the apostles are certain laws insisted on by the church of Rome as transmitted by tradition. They are, no doubt, fictions. The inventions of men, abstruse reasoning, and mistified inductions and analogies early corrupted religion with the notions of ignorance, superstition and philosophy falsely so called. In the times of the apostles this work had began. In relation to prohibitions of marriage there was much of this work. The clergy were forbidden to marry at all: sanctimonious purity would not allow the defilement. The Theodosian code toward the close of the fourth century included within the prohibition cousins german. St. Ambrose declared such marriages contrary to the divine law; and St. Augustine acknowledging that the divine law does not forbid such marriages, justifies the Theodosian prohibition as necessary for the maintenance of public decorum. By 10th Canon of the Council of Arles, (A. D. 538,) and also by 31st of the Council of Autun the prohibition was extended to second cousins.

When Robinson’s little band of persecuted Christians came to the resolution, for conscience sake to abandon their homes, cross the ocean, and plant themselves in a savage wilderness, they solemnly recorded their motives; one of which was, “by separating from all existing establishments in Europe to form the model of a pure church, free from the admixture of human additions.” The survey that has been taken of marriage prohibition, if satisfactory in no other respect, will convince us, that it is important for truth to “free the subject from the admixture of human additions.” Let us examine the law, then, as God gave it. It must be extraordinary, indeed, if in considering a law in which the prohibitions are explicitly specified, we cannot tell whether there is a prohibition against a man and his deceased wife’s sister. The language is not equivocal. If therefore there

is difficulty, it must arise from the introduction of foreign matter, or some prepossession affixing a meaning to terms to suit itself.

Lev. xviii. 6—18, contains the law: Deut. xxv. 5—10, is in *pari materia* with verse 16: Lev. xx. 11, 12, 14, 17, 19, 20, 21, annexes penalties to the breach of some of the prohibitions. It is admitted that the prohibitions extend by implication to marriage. The direct prohibition is of sexual intercourse. Lev. xviii. 6, is a general prohibition made special by the subsequent verses specifying the prohibited cases. The rule of interpretation is unquestionable: the general introductory clause being limited by the subsequent special clauses specifying the particular cases under it.

If the general clause (v. 6,) "*None of you shall approach to any that is near of kin to him to uncover their nakedness*"—stood alone, it would be interpreted according to the signification of the terms and the use of them by the same author. Thus "near of kin" without limitation, would be considered in connexion with Lev. xxi. 2, 3, whereby "kin that is near to him" include mother, father, son, daughter, brother, sister. The terms signify consanguinity or blood relationship: the phrase that might be substituted according to the note of the translators "remainder of his flesh," confirms this. It will be found, that in every case of consanguinity beyond Lev. xxi. 2, 3, and in every case of affinity there is a special clause assigned, so that it does not rest upon "near of kin:"—thus the prohibition against the father's sister, is grounded on her nearness of kin to the father, not to the son. These remarks are made for the sake of guarding against the indefinite use that lately has been intimated, and was formerly made, of this general clause.

As mentioned the 18th of Leviticus specified the particular cases prohibited: twelve verses being taken up with the specifications, which are minute and exact—for example, "the nakedness of thy mother," "the nakedness of thy father's wife," "the nakedness of thy sister, the daughter of thy father or the daughter of thy mother, born at home or born abroad;" specially explicit. It would seem to be conclusive for all purposes of sound interpretation, to add that the case of a deceased wife's sister is not mentioned, that there is no prohibition specifying that relationship. If the like question were made upon any matter of human law, it would not be deemed capable of argument. Under a law making certain specified acts criminal, an act not specified cannot be punished: when a law makes certain specified cases incest, you cannot attach the guilt of incest to a case not specified. It is no matter how strong the analogy between a particular case, and other cases specified by the legislator; if his words do not describe the case, you can not substitute words for him. It is enough that in specifying cases, he has omitted that under consideration. Even in the case of a remedial law, a learned judge has said "its provisions are confined to two particular cases. Then if we were to extend the act to this case, we should be making a law." In the 18th of Leviticus, the legislator has specified particular cases: a deceased wife's sister is not among them: to extend the chapter to it, would be not administering, but making a law. If it were useful to illustrate the fact of this omission, besides pointing to its very existence in the text, I might recur to the superaddition (to the clause in the Confession of Faith explicitly adopting all the prohibitions in the 18th of Leviticus,) of the clause objected to by the article, and refer to all the tables of prohibited degrees under which it has been understood, marriage with a deceased wife's sister is forbidden; in every one of which besides the prohibitions in the 18th of Leviticus, the degree of wife's sister is expressly mentioned: showing general consent, that without adding to this chapter, the wife's deceased sister is not prohibited.

There is a stronger view of this point. In all written instruments of men, courts consider and allow for human infirmity, which may fail to think of every case it would provide for. But even on this ground, when the

legislature mentions particular cases, the courts never feel at liberty to include a case not described. If they suppose a case omitted merely because it did not occur to the mind at the time, their language is "Voluit sed non dixit," *they have willed it but not said it.* But the 18th of Leviticus is not a writing of man. Its authority is expressed in the words, "*I am the LORD.*" Shall we apply the phrase, "Inops consilii" to a law of *JEHOVAH*? Can we say, that *HE* has not clearly expressed what he intended; and that we must supply defect in His work! His instruction upon this point is, "Ye shall not add unto the word which I command you, neither shall ye diminish ought from it, that ye may keep the commandments of the *LORD* your God which I command you." "Add not unto His words lest He reprove thee, and thou be found a liar."

There is one other view. In the 18th of Leviticus 18, there is express provision on the very matter of a man's marrying his wife's sister, and the prohibition is expressly confined to the life of the wife. "Thou shalt not take a wife to her sister to vex her, to uncover her nakedness, besides the other in her life-time." Without this verse, the argument upon all principles of reasoning that I am acquainted with, is conclusive; upon this verse it ceases to be matter of argument; it is an unequivocal allowance to marry the wife's sister after the death of the wife; the prohibition being expressly limited to her life-time.

Let us examine the arguments for including in the 18th of Leviticus, the deceased wife's sister. One is, that "there would be the greatest anomalies unless we should supply by interpretation omissions in that chapter; for otherwise we must maintain the lawfulness of marriage between a father and his own daughter, although that with a step-daughter is forbidden." There are so many answers to this position, that not to extend this tedious article, I must select. The position is utterly destitute of foundation. The language of verse 7 is, "The nakedness of thy father, and the nakedness of thy mother shalt thou not uncover." If this does not prohibit sexual intercourse between parents, *born parents* and children, there is no meaning in words. It is the plainest rule of construction, that we are not to suppose even a significant word has been used without meaning: but here a significant phrase "the nakedness of thy father," coupled with another significant phrase "the nakedness of thy mother," so as to include both parents, and which can serve no purpose, but is altogether expletive, except for its plain, obvious meaning, is to be rejected according to some critical rule in order to raise an argument from the omission—omission of what is expressed. I can not believe black is white upon authority. I might add, that Leviticus xx., annexing punishment to incest, makes no provision in case of parents and children, nor will it be pretended that any can be implied: the specified cases are father's wife or mother-in-law, daughter-in-law, wife and her mother, sister, uncle's wife and brother's wife—evidently implying that there was no need of any provision as to parents and children: as in the twelve tables there was no law against murdering a parent. Another argument is, that the general clause (v. 6.) "near of kin to him" includes relations by affinity, and therefore a sister by affinity must be forbidden. The text does not say so: and it is the same principle on which the Pope indefinitely extended the prohibitions. But the expressions in cases of affinity are cited to prove that these cases come under the phrase "near of kin to him." To my mind they prove the direct contrary. In respect to near of kin as explained in Leviticus xxi. 2, 3, the prohibition alleges no special ground—it is left on the ground already assigned in verse 6: for the son's daughter or daughter's daughter one remove in the direct descending line, the ground alleged is personal to the prohibited person; "it is thine own nakedness." In respect to the mother-in-law, the prohibition does not rest on the nearness of kin of the woman to the person prohibited, but on the injury to the father, "it is thy father's nakedness:" the prohibition of the father's sister is on her nearness

to the father, that of the daughter-in-law is because she is the son's wife, the consideration flowing from the son: that of the brother's wife flows from the brother, "it is thy brother's nakedness:" and that of the wife's daughter, daughter's daughter, and son's daughter is placed on the ground that they are "the near kinswomen" of the wife. These expressions assigning a distinct ground of prohibition, exclude nearness of kin to the person prohibited from being that ground. But here an extraordinary implication is raised. Verse 17 prohibiting a wife's daughter or grand-daughter, assigning as the ground, "they are her near kinswomen: it is wickedness;" it is said, "this passage seems plainly to teach that it is wicked to marry the near kindred of a wife." This is not specious sophistry. It is clear, that taking a woman and her daughter or grand-daughter, is pronounced wicked, and that only; and that there is no pretence, to interpret the verse as asserting it to be wicked to marry the near kindred of the wife. Equally disingenuous is the position, "it is the degree of kindred which the law itself says is to be considered." If this be so, "the marriage of a man with the sister of his deceased wife is as much forbidden as the marriage of a woman with the brother of her deceased husband." But the law says nothing about the degree of kindred. It specifies the particular cases prohibited. The position just quoted, for it is not precise, asserts one of two alternatives—(1st.) that the law in terms prohibits marriage with a sister-in-law; and of course includes equally a wife's sister and a brother's widow; which is without the slightest foundation: or (2d.) that the expression "thy brother's wife," and the expression "thy wife's sister," are of the same signification:—which is preposterous. We have another specimen of these convenient generalities which gain credence because they appear to mean something and are not sufficiently intelligible to manifest their falsehood on their face, in this position—"every precept which expressly names and prohibits a particular degree of relation, must be understood to comprise all relatives within the same degree, as fully as if they had been specifically named." I should like to know what their grave rule means in application to this case. Does it mean, that the verse "thou shalt not uncover the nakedness of thy brother's wife," forbids marriage with your wife's sister? Since the times of the schoolmen we do not allow rules of construction merely for the sake of making language enigmatical. Hear the argument. "The prohibition extends not only to brothers and sisters by consanguinity, but also to brothers and sisters by affinity. Each is particularly recognized." Sisters by blood and sisters by affinity are considered as relations equally near and legal as respects the marriage connexion, and each is equally forbidden." "A sister by affinity is either a brother's wife or a wife's sister. Both are equally sisters." "To prohibit a marriage with one is therefore of course a prohibition with respect to the other sister"—in plain words, the text "Thou shalt not uncover the nakedness of thy brother's wife," has not only a plain meaning which no one can mistake, but also a constructive meaning, "thou shalt not uncover the nakedness of thy wife's sister"—which no one can see. Such reasoning needs no refutation. The statement of this point in legal logic is plain. It is, that "the brother's wife and the wife's sister, although distinct cases of relationship, are in the same affinity; and therefore that the legislator who prohibited the first, by parity of reason, must be supposed to have intended to prohibit the last, and by consequence the last although not within the expression of the law, is within its implication." This is plausible but not sound. All we have to do, is with the legislator's words. We have no right to weigh the reasons which applied to the legislation: the legislator alone was the judge of these reasons, and we have his judgment in the provision he has made. He has not made as the above quotations assert general provisions including particular cases, but he has specifically provided for the particular cases, leaving nothing to construction. When providing for the case of

a sister by blood, he says, "thy sister the daughter of thy father or the daughter of thy mother, born at home or born abroad:" does he follow the analogy in respect to a sister by affinity, and say, thy brother's wife or thy wife's sister?—No: and comparing the manner of expression, can we believe, that if it had been intended to include the wife's sister, it would not have been expressed? But do we know any thing about this parity of reasoning, even if it could be resorted to to make a law instead of interpreting a law already made? Polygamy prevailed among the Jews, and was recognised and regulated by their laws, Deut. xxi. 15. Under polygamy a very different estimate is made of man and woman. A man has two wives as a lawful thing: for a woman to have two husbands would be an abomination. For two brothers to have in succession the same wife, might be gross impurity in common estimation: while no feeling of delicacy would be wounded by a man's marrying two sisters. In confirmation of this suggestion, that we can not judge of parity of reason for prohibition of marriage in states of society of which we have little knowledge, Prideaux in his Connection informs us, that a Jewish uncle might marry his niece, though an aunt was forbidden to marry her nephew. The reason assigned by the Jewish writers is, that the aunt being in the same degree with the father, has a natural superiority, connected with a becoming reverence, that renders the marriage with the nephew indecorous. This makes the expression "she is thy אשת" intelligible. We ought not to set up our refined constructions against the plain testimony of the Jewish writers; besides it is confirmed by John the Baptist, who treats Herodias as the lawful wife of Philip, (Mark vi. 18, "thy brother's wife"); when she was the daughter of Aristobulus the brother of Philip, and of course Philip's niece by consanguinity.

The unanswerable argument from Leviticus xviii. 18, "Neither shalt thou take a wife to her sister to vex her to uncover her nakedness, beside the other in her life-time" is avoided by alleging mis-translation. Being no Hebrew scholar, I cannot meet this allegation directly; but the translators of the Bible were Hebrew scholars of the highest character; their fidelity is unquestionable: they considered the translation proposed, and rejected it; their judgment, in this particular, is sustained by the Jewish doctors and rabbies, good authority upon Jewish law, and assented to by all commentators I am acquainted with. Besides, the proposed translation, "neither shalt thou take one wife to another," makes the verse a positive prohibition of polygamy. Can we believe this, when we read the law expressly recognising and regulating polygamy, Deut. xxi. 15; Exod. xxi. 10, and know that it was customary among the Jews, and practised by the holiest men of the nation, Gideon, David, &c.

This latitude of interpretation where there is no pretext to alter the text, and this *new* translation of a text so long unquestioned and universally received, reminds us of Lord Peter's insisting that Martin and Jack should believe that a brown loaf was a shoulder of mutton. The thing appeared absurd to sense, as Lord Peter himself must admit; but as the brown loaf contained all the principles of nourishment, and the shoulder of mutton did no more, by just interpretation the shoulder of mutton must be included in the brown loaf, and therefore the brown loaf was "as excellent a shoulder of mutton as ever was cut with a knife." Critics notice that Homer not only makes Achilles invulnerable, but gives him a suit of invulnerable armor; and it is said, a man might fight any thing with such advantage. If by interpretation you can make any thing of a text, and by new translation make a text any thing, there is no hope but in implicit submission.

Rather than tear away the relations of Christian life by foisting and glossing the Mosaic municipal law, how much more is it in the spirit of the blessed gospel to imbue these relations with its purity. Look at these relations under the gospel, and under the law. Where do we see polygamy, concubinage, and capricious divorce? Exod. xxi. 10; Deut. xxi. 11, 15; xxiv. 1—3; Judges xix., xx. Where can we find them now? What is

the influence under which they they have vanished?—Yielded as darkness to light? Can we understand habits of thinking and states of morals under a system, in which Sarah gave Hagar to Abraham, Rachel and Leah gave their servant maids to Jacob, the nation of Israel was involved in war through a Levite's concubine, and woman was in the degradation of polygamy, concubinage and capricious divorce? Can we enter into the principles of laws made in such a state of society, and take upon ourselves to correct the Legislator, our Maker, in supplying his defects? Here I will advance an answer which I omitted in its proper place to an argument sustaining the rule of explanation which it is boastfully said cannot be controverted "that every precept that prohibits any particular degree of relation must be understood to comprise all relatives in the same degree." The argument is, "otherwise the law would be greatly defective or tediously prolix." My answer is, that this rule cannot be applied in this case to more than two out of fourteen prohibitions, even upon the latitudinous construction that makes "thy brother's wife" to mean "the sister of thy wife;" and it is only used to add three to upwards of fourteen relationships, which three could be fully expressed by adding two short verses to the twelve now employed. Is there any fairness in such assertions? Such chicanery strangely escapes indignant rebuke, by being received with soft, unthinking deferential acquiescence.

The train of remark connected with the argumentation referred to, is equally liable to just animadversion. "Incest is a detestable crime. The human mind revolts against it as filthy." "Whatever approximates to this accursed sin, is injurious to the morals and character of the community. But marriage with a sister-in-law is not a species of distant or slight incest. It is of the highest grade." "Is it possible that men of understanding and conscience, who fear God, and would not presume to justify the wicked, will dare to patronize such daring incest?" "Will not some who through want of information have heretofore wavered on this subject, tremble at recollecting that they have been in danger of approving an abominable crime?"—What is the intent and effect of such language?—To set passion not reason to work: to drag men by bugbears held up before the eyes when there is too much weakness or indolence in the mind to correct the impression, into obsequious concurrence. Let me inquire, Did God slay Onan for refusal to assent to a "detestable crime?" Were Abraham and Sarah in whose seed all the families of earth were appointed to be, and are blessed, in their marriage guilty of a "filthy, detestable crime?" Were Moses and Aaron the progeny of an "accursed sin?" Were the favored people of God appointed to trace their origin from the "filthy," "accursed sin" of Jacob, the chosen of God, his prevailing prince? Did God by his law solemnly enjoin upon a brother surviving a childless brother, to perpetrate a "filthy," "accursed sin," and annex a badge of infamy to his refusal?—To what has not such language led? Many an innocent, and praiseworthy act has been placed under the ban of detestation, many an innocent person has stood the object of public abhorrence, through this sanctimonious malediction. The whole public mind has been perverted by it, the conscience and the judgment of the benevolent and lovely have been imbued with cruelty in intenseness through the means of it, and atrocious wickedness left its blot upon the fairest lives. It is a means that has always been efficient to introduce interpolations into the law and gospel: its pretence, higher holiness: a spirit of haughty self-righteousness and wanton, acrimonious censoriousness, at once its cause and effect. A very sensible annotator on the New Testament, upon the passage in John relating the mildness of our Saviour in case of the woman taken in adultery, and the objection to it on that account made by some, remarks, "The fabricated stories found in the apocryphal gospels are of quite a different character, and almost always founded on the most severe and ascetic views. And had this paragraph been of *that* character, it would, I will venture to say, never have been

omitted or removed by any." Let me inquire, what has been the effect of this ascetic spirit? The clergy have been forbidden marriage as an impurity, "an accursed sin:"—have they been made purer? Those who use this random talk about purity, will do well to examine cases in their practical existence, and consider whether there is not some meaning and application, true and just, in the sentence, "to the pure all things are pure; but—" I leave them to fill the blank. To the remarks—"One great reason of this prohibition seems obviously to be, the preservation of domestic purity"—"This is not the place to dwell on the evils which would probably result from breaking down the defence erected by God himself around the family circle"—the reply at once suggests itself—we too are for preserving the family circle, throwing into and around it all the principle and power of purity afforded not by the Mosaic municipal law, (weak and beggarly elements,) but by the gospel of Christ: a principle and power not felt alone by the believer, but pervading the whole mass of society, elevating, enlightening, and if not sanctifying, refining, and blessing. But the wife's sister does not belong to the family circle. Her family is that from which the wife is taken away, and is as distinct from the family into which the wife is translated by marriage, as from any other. The reason does not apply to the condition of things. There can be no more impropriety in the husband's entering, after his wife's death, that family circle for a wife, than there was at first. There is no impediment in nature or reason to marriage with the second sister, that did not apply to the first. It is admitted, that by marriage twain are one flesh: but this is only while the marriage continues; it ceases at the death of either party, or there is as much objection to a second marriage, as to marriage with a second sister. St. Paul instructs us, that by death the wife "is loosed from the law of her husband:" and so the husband from the law of his wife.

To the disapprobation with which it is noted, that this nation is an exception among Christian nations to the adoption of the prohibition of marriage with a wife's sister, I remark, that this is not a late exception; but it has existed as long as I can trace legislation on the subject. Its origin is in the principle that founders of this nation took for guidance, "by separating from all existing establishments in Europe, to form the model of a pure church free from the admixture of human additions." Carrying out this principle produced the exception; while the prohibition exists as a rule in our church because it has not formed its own rule in the exercise of its own judgment upon the particular matter, but has adopted bodily the law of Scotland: a law made in the reign of Charles I., a law which the Parliament of England, to which the world is unspeakably indebted for civil and religious liberty, in which Pym, Hollis, Vane, Hotham, Hampden, and other kindred spirits were members, refused to ratify, and which in respect to this prohibition has always been doubted by a great portion, including some of the most eminent ministers, of our denomination. Some consider it no improvement to go back to the period when the church just awaking from the delusious of popery, was indeed a giant hood-winked and in chains.

It is instructive to trace this matter. By the Theodosian and Justinian codes, the first dating toward the close of the fourth century, marriage was the subject of secular authority; and in the Council of Trent in 1545, it was asserted, and not denied, that the cognizance of matrimonial causes came to the ecclesiastics partly by commission, and partly by the negligence of civil magistrates. In the Long Parliament of England just mentioned, in which the Confession of Faith formed by the Westminster Assembly being reported by that Assembly for ratification was very fully discussed, the part which we are noticing on marriage with that on divorce "was referred to the laws of the land:" and in this country in every state of our Union, the entire subject of marriage belongs to the laws:—necessarily belongs to them upon the fundamental principle of our government, the

basis of civil and religious liberty. We discard union of church and state: the church is as earnest in its opposition to this union as the state; of course the church can have no civil power. But what constitutes marriage, what marriages are valid or otherwise, what are the incidents of marriage, and what shall be a dissolution of marriage, all, must be matters of adjudication, must be adjudicated according to law, and this law must be made and administered by the civil power. In the old world, ecclesiastical courts have cognizance of matrimonial causes; determine in respect to marriages their validity and establish them, their invalidity and annul them, and grant divorces from them. There are no such ecclesiastical tribunals in our country; the church can have no such power. In every state of the Union, I believe, the Legislature have made the law of marriage for their people: I can speak from examination of Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Connecticut, Vermont, Maine, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland: in every state of the Union according to the fundamental principle of our republican government, the courts of law and equity must administer the law of marriage according to the laws of that state upon the subject. The laws of the states, I have mentioned, concerning marriage, can be traced to an early day: of Maryland to 1777, of Pennsylvania to 1705, of New Jersey to 1795; and this I presume was a revision of a previous law. Some of them were revised immediately after the Declaration of Independence, and among these, the laws of Massachusetts; the laws of Connecticut soon after, and these laws have been since revived. The legislatures of the states above named have been adorned by members of elevated piety and great moral worth, as well as of great capacity. Many years ago I was pointed to the peculiar excellency as well of matter as composition of some of the laws of Massachusetts made soon after the Declaration of Independence in a revision of the statutes of that state, and was told of the men of distinguished worth, men of piety and learning who stood prominent in the legislature, and whose minds were stamped upon the legislation. In all these states, the law specifies the prohibited degrees of marriage: the prohibitions are full: generally ascending to grand-parents, and descending to grand-children: including uncles and nieces by consanguinity, the father's sister, mother's sister, the wife's mother, daughter and grand-daughter; but in no single one of all these states is the wife's sister prohibited. I say, the prohibitions are full; I can not insert the whole of them: the tables are fairly made, and would satisfy every one not disposed to add by construction to the Levitical degrees upon the principle which we have been resisting in this article, and not taking the qualified prohibition of brother's wife as absolute.

We have then the law of the country, settled by the only legislative power that can take efficient cognizance and make operative law on this subject. The language of that law, by the voice of ten independent states, acting in the exercise of their sovereignty upon this subject, authoritatively pronounces, that it is lawful to marry the sister of a deceased wife, and establishes such a marriage as unexceptionable and valid. Will the church pay no respect to the law of the land? Will a church that sets up its own standard on the ground of its ratification by a foreign Legislature, that of Scotland, in the time of Charles I., insist upon maintaining it in opposition to the laws of these free states, and impugn by its sentence a marriage which the civil power in the unquestionable exercise of its rightful authority enacts to be lawful and binding? Will a church uphold by its sentence, and sanction by its solemn acts the denouncing, on the ground of a foreign law, as "detestable crime," "accursed sin," "filthy" immorality, an act which the laws of our own states hold up as proper and lawful? The attitude is not only ungracious; but there is inextricable difficulty. The church when it passes sentence, can administer no relief. It can not annul the marriage; it can not render repentance practicable, for the law of the state does not allow the marriage to be dissolved, or its obligations to be violated: all the church can do is to stigmatize a

connexion, and destroy the usefulness of those forming it, when the law of the state justified them in forming it, pronounces it proper, and requires of them as good citizens faithfully to observe it. Certainly the facts, that the Westminster Assembly presented the Confession of Faith by them formed to the Parliament of England for ratification, and that the General Assembly of Scotland presented the same to the Parliament of Scotland for ratification, and received and published it with their ratification and sanction, should lead the General Assembly of the Presbyterian church in this country to pay some respect, and show some deference to our legislative power, to whose province this subject, according to the principle of our polity, appertain. To this end, the doctrine of Paley is both pertinent and sound. "Upon this principle, the marriage as well as other cohabitation of brothers and sisters, of lineal kindred, and of all who usually live in the same family, may be said to be forbidden by the law of nature. Restrictions which extend to remoter degrees of kindred than what this reason makes it necessary to prohibit from inter-marriage, are founded in the authority of the positive law which ordains them, and can only be justified by their tendency to diffuse wealth, to connect families, or to promote some political advantage." These considerations properly belong to the state Legislatures.

The only case in the New Testament since the death of Christ, applying to this subject, is that at Corinth of a man having the wife of his father, while living. This case Paul does not place on the Mosaic law, but the law of nature—immoral indecency—"not so much as named among the Gentiles, that one should have his father's wife:" language more conformed to Cicero, "incredible and unheard of wickedness," than Moses. Both the cases in the New Testament, one before, one after the death of Christ, that of Philip and this at Corinth, are having the wife while a wife, the former-husband living. The facility of divorce and custom of polygamy may account for the use of the word wife in Leviticus, as significant of wife—not widow. Verse 17, in the proper use of the words, denotes polygamy, a mother and her daughter. In a work of respectable character, Dr. Dixon in 1674, is quoted concerning the Levitical degrees; "their obligation by Divine Authority ceased, expired, and died at the death of Christ:" so that they are continued now merely by adoption. "The powers that be are ordained of God:" and the only power in our country having right of legislation having omitted prohibition of a wife's sister, in this view upon any construction of Leviticus xviii, this degree is not forbidden to us.

A LAYMAN.

---

A LETTER TO THE RULING ELDERS OF THE PRESBYTERIAN  
CHURCH IN THE UNITED STATES.

BRETHREN, dearly beloved in the Lord, there are three reasons which, as I suppose, will excuse me for addressing you with some emphasis and some personality. The first is, that I am myself a Ruling Elder, solemnly ordained to that office in the church of Horeb, in the Presbytery of West Lexington, in which, according to the measure of grace given to me, I served the Lord and his people, and as such sat in Presbyteries, Synods, Conventions and General Assemblies. The second is, that in this, my case is peculiar amongst our Preaching Elders; so much so, that out of all our fourteen hundred ministers, I know personally, as far as I can remember, but one other (my dear brother after the flesh) who is similarly situated. The third is, that I have for a long

time and with much earnestness advocated, in public and in private, your important, and as I think, indefeasable rights in the house of God; and have on that account, incurred both ridicule and odium.

You know that your office is one of the peculiar and most important distinctions and safeguards of the Presbyterian system, under all its aspects, and in every age and country. It has, indeed, been partially and temporarily engrafted into other systems; but it never flourished except upon its own native and noble stock. It is a fundamental part, as we believe, of the government which God has established for his church; and without it, that government cannot operate with permanence and efficiency. Let us therefore, magnify the office.

Our church courts (above the Session) have not thought it worth while to record your names, or even your numbers; a defect, an injury, and an indignity, for which, as for much else, you have to blame your own indifference to the honour and efficiency of your divine calling, as well as a somewhat exclusive spirit in another quarter. But estimating our churches at somewhat over two thousand, and our elders at four or five to each congregation on an average, your aggregate number must be from eight to ten thousand, not short, I suppose, of the smaller number. Considering your office, your numbers, your duties, your relations to our churches, and to society at large, it will hardly be considered too much, if I say that whatever should permanently degrade your office and reduce your personal and ecclesiastical standing in our communion, would be at once a fatal blow to us, and a daring offence against our Master. You are in danger of such a stroke. I tell you decisively, you are in danger of it.

I have heard, some times with grief, some times with indignation, language in our church courts, which too plainly indicated the estimation in which many ministers hold you and your office. You have often observed it, I doubt not, with deep pain. "Mr. A—, who is *your* elder?" demands the clerk of Presbytery of some youth, it may be, just ordained a minister. "Brother B—, did you bring an elder with you?" "Dr. C—, who comes from *your* Session?" And the answers: "*My* elder thought of coming, but I told him it was hardly worth while." "*My* Session, I believe, deputed some one, but I really am not sure." "The elder appointed to *come with me, &c.*" "*My* elder is present." I have said to myself, is it wonderful that our elders absent themselves from our church courts? Why that young man's Session, as he calls it, has not a man in it, who is not old enough to be his father, and wise enough to teach him till he dies. And that self-conceited body's church, as he calls it, would not keep him half a year, but for the generous and disinterested support of that modest, quiet, excellent man, he calls *his* elder. And so, alas! of how much more—that all of us have too much reason to remember with pain.

And there is a more injurious, though less offensive mode of treating the subject, and that by a more sedate and respectable class of our ministers. Are Boards of Trustees to be appointed? The rule often is, three ministers to one elder. The same of

boards of directors, of theological seminaries and the like. The reverse is rarely if ever true, even in such boards as elders are confessedly most capable of managing. And even where other persons than ministers are appointed, individuals not ordained at all, nay persons not even members of the church are some times appointed in the place of elders; as in the case of the trustees of the Assembly. And no experience, let it be ever so disastrous, seems to shed any light that is available to instruct this fatuity; not even the loss of eighty or ninety thousand dollars—in that case alone—and the eminent risk of a great deal more. So when committees are appointed in our church courts, ministers are almost universally made chairmen, and as commonly the majority on every one. Indeed the very presence of ruling elders in our Presbyteries and Synods, is by many ministers considered a thing rather of expediency than of constitutional necessity; and I have not only heard sensible and aged ministers publicly argue that ruling elders were not necessary to the composition of such courts, but I have known Presbyteries constitute and do business when no elder was present, and have myself incurred no little odium for refusing to partake in such acts or to recognise them as valid under our Constitution.

Now to crown the whole case, there is a systematic plan in operation, to have it settled as the law and practice of the church, that you are not to be henceforth ordained as other Presbyters are ordained, and as all Presbyters were ordained in apostolic and primitive times; and to deprive you of all direct part in all Presbyterian ordinations, even though by the positive declarations of the Confession of Faith, and by the plain letter of God's word, it is your duty to take part in them all. The next step after this will be the practical abolition of your office, which Christ has established, and which the pride of semi-prelacy on one hand and the levelling spirit of Independency on the other, have unitedly reduced in the manner I have described. If, indeed, these obstinate and perverse attacks upon the order of God's house, should not by their fatal success, which may God avert, produce at last an open breach in our church. Is the office of Elder less important than that of Deacon? And do those persons who set themselves to degrade your office, not know, that a like attempt against the office of Deacon, has rent in sunder a collateral branch of the Presbyterian body?

I will hereafter show (by the Help of the Lord) that your rights and duties now brought into jeopardy, are clear, beyond reasonable doubt, both from our Confession and from the word of God.—In the meantime, consider who they are, who would thus deprive you; and consider who they are who are thus assaulted, in a point so near and so important. I beseech you to consider both these points, but especially the last. Who are these *eight thousand elders*, who are to be virtually reduced by a few strokes of the pen, from the rank of Presbyters, to the condition of ecclesiastical hangers-on to the church courts? As a body, do these men merit such treatment, personally considered? On the other hand, can any thing be more certain than that as a body, they are worthy of the

confidence, the affection, the reverence of the church; and are fully as competent to discharge their duties, and fully as much devoted to them, as the body of the ministers are to theirs?

I solemnly declare, that I consider your character and usefulness, as church officers, in a very great degree staked on the determination of these questions. And while I beseech the Lord to incline and enable you to act as becomes you in such circumstances, I shall not fail to do my part for the proper settlement of this business, according as divine grace is bestowed upon

Your fellow Presbyter and brother in the Lord Jesus,

ROBERT J. BRECKINRIDGE.

---

EVANGELICAL CHURCH OF LYONS IN FRANCE.—LETTER FROM THE  
REV'D MR. CORDES.\*

GENEVA, 11 MAY, 1842.

*Rev'd and dear Sir and brother in our Lord:*

THE indisposition with which it has pleased God to visit me, continues to keep me a prisoner here, although I am just beginning to try my voice again in domestic conversation, and am permitted to hope for strength to resume my functions before the end of the present year. In the meantime the work of God is carrying on at Lyons in the new chapel, under the care of Rev. Messrs. Fisch and Laügt, two very active and useful servants of the Lord. The accounts of the building are at length brought to a final close, and show a deficiency (apart from the old mortgage on the premises, against which an independent portion of the building remains) of fr. 9,700, to be provided for. We are feeling embarrassed on account of it, and are the more anxious to submit our distress to the eyes of a few tried and generous friends in America, as *two such nearer to us*, (one in London and one in Geneva) with a view to the preventing any injurious imputations being again thrown out against the gospel of Christ by work-men and trades-men impatient for their money, have expressed their willingness to furnish the greater half of this sum, provided the remainder can be found, and thus the balance be paid off without any additional mortgage debt being contracted. I most sincerely wish I could have been dispensed from the necessity of submitting this statement to you,

---

\*It will give us sincere pleasure to receive and transmit donations for this most excellent and important enterprise; an enterprise, which we can not conceive it possible that any truly enlightened and soundly converted person should understand and not earnestly desire its success. We have several times had the great happiness of transmitting aid from a few Christians of this highly favored country, to our poor but faithful and beloved brethren at Lyons; and hope the present, and perhaps final appeal, will meet with a response not less liberal and prompt, than those which have preceded it. It would be a favor to these dear children of the Lord, and might advance the Master's cause, if the weekly religious press would re-publish this letter of Mr. Cordes, and our brother editors would agree to receive donations for the church at Lyons.—[Ed.]

dear Sir, but all resources nearer, our own included, are I am afraid almost exhausted, having within the last four months furnished no less a sum than fr. 11,200, the above named sum being only the balance of fr. 20,900 to which the original deficiency had been raised by an unexpected but unavoidable increase of cost.

You will be gratified, however, to learn that if on the one hand the pecuniary burden of the undertaking is heavier than had been anticipated, the blessings in which the goodness of God is making it instrumental on the other are great indeed. Mr. Fisch (an excellent minister late of Vevey, who has, *in faith*, resolved on fixing himself at Lyons as second pastor, and has just arrived there to join Mr. Laügt, my present substitute,) writes as follows: "I am now installed in my new sphere of activity, and feel more than ever my insufficiency for the task, as well as my need of prayer. You can scarcely imagine how greatly Mr. L. is beloved and esteemed. His labors have already proved very beneficial; and as to the chapel you will be happy to learn how abundantly the Lord is blessing it, amidst the amazing sacrifices its cost is requiring. I could wish you to see this *delightful* sanctuary, for such it really is as seen full, with its two galleries. The audience has doubled since it was opened. On Sunday mornings there are from 5 to 600 persons, and as a certain proportion of these are continually changing, it may be asserted that a very considerable number of immortal souls at Lyons are by means of this chapel (the only evangelical place of worship in the second city of the French kingdom) brought under the sound of the gospel. Some times fine ladies are seen to take their seats, and at others simple country women from the neighborhood; in one word, the audience is much changed since its removal from Passage Thiaffait. Evidently the Lord intends blessings for Lyons. He shows it in every way. Thus we have just learnt that an *English* minister (sought for some time past, by the aid of a Society in London,) is found in the person of the Rev. Mr. Harding, said to be an excellent Christian labourer, whilst the Rev. Mr. L. of F., is enquiring in what manner a German minister might be installed at Lyons to most advantage, some Christians at Bale being desirous to establish one in our ancient city where the Papists are manifesting some intention to introduce a Romish curate among the numerous German population floating there. Brother Lange, the present German evangelist, continues his labours with much success, and would (with his wife, an excellent, pious woman,) be an almost indispensable aid to the German pastor if they could be maintained.

A committee sitting at Geneva has voted us aid for the work of evangelization in the surrounding country, which is enabling us to proceed regularly to *Vienne* (the ancient sister city of martyrs with Lyons, and where Pilate's tomb is shown) and *Villefranche*, to preach, (either Mr. L. or myself,) every fortnight. At the latter place the cause is in a state of forwardness such as to require, besides our ministry, a resident evangelist.

Amongst the recent conversions there is one I must mention; it is that of a Mrs. B., the wife of a physician, and brought to the knowledge of the gospel through the reading of a Bible lent

to her maid by the R's. Both maid and mistress, seeking their spiritual food in this blessed volume, soon were converted together. Mrs. B. is an humble and faithful disciple; she has applied for admission at the Lord's table, but her husband is so greatly opposed to this, that he came to the chapel one day to fetch his wife away. Thirteen new admissions have taken place since the opening of the chapel, and we are in hopes of twelve more by Whitsuntide; they present some very lively Christian characters, among others a Mrs. R., wife of an advocate whose dreadful treatment has forced her to a separation. She has saved a part of her fortune, and is now at the head of a hotel which she is putting upon a Christian footing. One of the domestics is already grained for the truth; being just raised from a severe illness, with a full assurance of faith. I am receiving information respecting two fresh individuals apparently converted; in short the work is in progress under the Divine blessing, and seems intended to advance more and more, the Lord doing on its behalf that which indicates to us His gracious purpose to do more still for His great cause at Lyons, where the light of the everlasting gospel has never been entirely extinguished since the flames of murderous persecution were first kindled against its faithful professors by their infuriated enemies, *then Pagan Romanists*, in the second century.

May our hopes be abundantly realised.

The building will cost about fr. 140,000, an immense sum to collect by little and little, but the advanced state of the collection shows to demonstration the special favor of God. The whole construction comprehends besides the chapel, the boys' school, the girls' school, the infant asylum, and lodgings for masters and mistresses and the concierge, a concentration of a mass of means of mercy such as had never yet existed within the walls of the ancient city of Lyons although older than Christianity itself! Glory be to God on high.

Believe me, Rev'd and dear Brother,

Most affectionately and gratefully,

Yours in the Lord,

The Rev'd R. J. Breckinridge,  
Pastor of the 2d Presbyterian church,  
Baltimore, U. S. }

C. A. CORDES,  
From Lyons, at Geneva,  
Switzerland.

---

WHO ARE THE "MIGHTY ANGELS" (*αγγελων δυναμεις*) THAT WILL ATTEND THE REDEEMER AT HIS SECOND COMING?

"WHEN the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven," says the Apostle Paul, "in flaming fire, taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ," (2 Thess. i. 7, 8,) he will be revealed along "with his mighty angels—*μετ' αγγελων δυναμεις αυτου*, with the angels of his power"—(verse 7). Who are intended by these words?

There is this remarkable distinction between the shining hosts that will surround the throne of God and praise him forever; one

portion of them are redeemed sinners, while the other portion are pure and sinless spirits. The latter were never in the flesh, according to any ideas we have of *the body*; the former, were not only once in sinful flesh, but will wear spiritual bodies forever. The mere spirits, however much they may owe to Christ the Lord, and doubtless that is more, in many ways, than we can now fully comprehend—never possessed a common nature with him, as all the redeemed do and will forever.

There is in the scriptural mode of speaking of these two classes, something which seems to distinguish them constantly from each other; even when both are evidently intended to be embraced, there is usually a shade in the sense, which will prevent confusion if we are heedful. Thus in Luke xii. 8 and 9, our Saviour, by the phrase "*angels of God,*" τῶν ἀγγέλων θεοῦ, before whom he says he will confess those that confess him before men, and deny those who deny him before men, seems evidently to mean mere spirits. The same is true of Luke xv. 10, where there is said to be "joy in the presence of the *angels of God* over one sinner that repenteth." Also in Heb. i. 6, "let *all the angels of God*—παντες ἀγγελοι θεου—worship him;" which indeed in the place cited (Ps. xcvi. 7) is literally *all God's*, and so rendered in our common version. On the other hand in Matt. xxv. 31, "when the Son of man shall come in his glory and *all the holy angels*—και παντες οι αγιοι ἀγγελοι με' αυτου—with him," the same company seems unquestionably intended, that is spoken of in Jude 14, when "the Lord cometh with *ten thousand of his saints*—μυριασιν αγιας αυτου." And whoever will attentively consider the circumstances connected with that advent of the Saviour spoken of in those two, and many other passages, and then compare them with the advent spoken of in the first chapter of 2d Thessalonians, will see reason to be satisfied that it is the same advent, and therefore that the accompanying angels are the same. If this be well founded, then '*his mighty angels,*' or in other words '*the angels of his power,*' here spoken of, are not pure spirits, but are such of the redeemed as shall be counted worthy to be partakers of the first resurrection. This is the particular point of the present enquiry; and we shall not therefore, push the matter by speaking of that resurrection, nor more particularly, at present, of the advent of our Lord here intended.

This conjecture is strengthened by considering, that the dispensation of the Holy spirit is commonly called a dispensation of the *power* of God; and his gracious work in the soul a work of *power*; and the phraseology used in such cases scarcely ever omits the word here used as descriptive of the angels of his *power*, that will attend the Lord Jesus. And we know that the manner in which the mere spirits can be the subjects of the operation of the Holy Ghost, in the respect intended by such language, is so wholly unlike the operation that regenerates and sanctifies sinful men—that we can see the great propriety and significancy of calling the latter, when become angels, not only emphatically *the angels of Christ*, but the *angels of Christ's power*; or in other words, "his mighty angels," as it is here rendered.

This suggestion may not at first sight appear of much consequence. But the careful student of the scriptures will easily see that it may have a very important bearing in determining the sense of various passages, both doctrinal and practical; to say nothing of its direct relation to certain momentous questions of prophecy, now extensively engaging the attention of the church of God.

[For the Spirit of the XIX. Century.]

#### CRITICAL OBSERVATIONS ON LUKE I. 22.

"AND he remained speechless" (*κωφος*)—Vulgate *mutus*. Light-foot says "Zacharias for not believing the words of the angel is struck deaf and dumb."—(See his Harmony, section 3.) That he was deaf is evident from verse 62, by which we are informed that the neighbours and cousins who came to circumcise the child *made signs to Zacharias*.

The primary meaning of *κωφος*, is *dull, obtuse*, and it is applied to a person deprived of any of his senses, especially of *hearing*. It is used to signify *deaf*, in Luke vii. 22. The deaf (*κωφοι*) hear. In Mark ix. 17, the word *αλαλος*, is used to signify *dumb*, and in verse 25, we find *αλαλος* again used to signify *dumb*, and *κωφος* used to signify *deaf*. I would therefore render the work in the clause in question (Luke i. 22) not *speechless*, but *deaf*. In verse 22, the words of Gabriel are recorded, declaring that he should be (*σιωπηῶν*) keeping silence, (not voluntarily, because it is added) and not able to speak, that is, *dumb*. It was not necessary afterwards in verse 22, to repeat this fact, and for that reason, it may be sufficient to translate the word *κωφος* simply *deaf*. But here a question arises—What was the punishment inflicted on Zacharias? Simply dumbness or inability to speak? It would seem so, from verse 20.—How then came he to be deaf also? A man may be dumb, without being deaf, or deaf without being dumb. Hardoin, the Jesuit, contends that deafness was not a part of Zachariah's punishment, because if it had been, he says, Luke would have mentioned it. He refers to Mark ix. 17, as a proof; but forgets to compare that verse with the 25th. This author had another object in view, viz., to sustain the authority of the vulgate, which renders *κωφος* by *mutus*.

By turning to the original text, (Luke i. 22,) the reader will find that the word *καὶ* (and) is rendered *for*. This is an unusual sense, to say the least of it. But it is suggested that the text is not correctly divided into verses at this place. Would it not be better, in fact does not the sense require that verse 22 should end with the word (*καὶ*) *temple*, and the residue be made a verse, or at least a distinct sentence by itself, and ought not the words (*ἢ διακινῶν*) so to be rendered as not to signify a *single act* of beckoning, but so as to express, the mode by which, from time to time he made his communications to the people, until the days of his ministration were accomplished. Thus: "And when he came out, he could

not speak to them, and they perceived he had seen a vision in the temple. And he was (or continued) beckoning (or kept making signs) to them: (i. e. until his course was finished, see verses 8 and 23.) And he was deaf. And it came to pass that as soon as the days of his ministration (service) had elapsed he departed to his own house."

The last clause of verse 22 (*καὶ . . . κωφός*) seems to have been thrown in by the writer to fill up a chasm in the narrative. It is put down as a substantive fact, omitted in its proper place, (if you please so to consider it,) but necessary to remove an apparent incongruity. It states distinctly and explicitly the fact of his deafness, which inferentially we gather from verse 62. There is something in this incidental or inartificial way of bringing in a fact indispensable to the completeness of the narrative, which tends strongly to confirm the authenticity of the account. If the writing were a forgery, the author of it would have avoided this seeming discrepancy. A man not practised in the style of narration, might easily incur an irregularity of this nature; but such a man would not be likely to attempt the composition of a fictive narration for the purposes of deception. Yet we may be sure, that the most illiterate man writing under the guidance of inspiration, would not be suffered to omit that which is indispensable to consistency, and the defence of the truth of the narrative. It may be added that Luther in his translation has in this place followed the vulgate. Also Tyndale, Wakefield, De Sacy, Diodati, Beausobre, and Lenfant, the Pastors, &c. of Geneva, Montanus, Erasmus, Fabricius, Beza, Tremellius, Deila Lega and Ravizza, and D'Erberg to mention no others. Thompson translates the word *κωφός*, *deaf and dumb*, and Dr. Bloomfield in a note upon the place, gives it that sense. It is obvious, however, that the vulgate has had a very great influence upon modern versions—and in this instance an improper influence. That the vulgate is not infallibly correct, even as revised by the Council of Trent, might be shown by many examples besides the foregoing; but the following may suffice. Heb. xi. 21, contains an error which Erasmus had not the honesty or independence to correct. See also, Rev. i. 3; ii. 9; xi. 13. Arias Montanus corrected these and many similar errors. John xxi. 22, is an example where *sic* (*sō*) is used for *si* (*if*.) In this place the vulgate was correct till it was altered by the popes under the authority of the Council of Trent.

# SPIRIT OF THE XIX. CENTURY.

---

Vol. I.

SEPTEMBER, 1842.

No. 9.

---

A SERMON ON THE ATONEMENT.—PREACHED AT THE OPENING OF THE SYNOD OF CINCINNATI, IN SPRINGFIELD, OHIO, OCTOBER, 1841, BY REV'D SAMUEL STEEL, MODERATOR THEREOF.

“God commendeth his love toward us, in that while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us.”—Rom. v. 8.

THE subject contained in the text is one respecting which nothing new can be said to this audience. It is a theme, however, always grateful to the Christian's heart, as it lays a solid foundation for future hope, and furnishes the strongest motives to holy love and obedience. Our Saviour, when on earth, frequently alluded to his crucifixion, as most important in its results to man: and the Apostle Paul gloried in it as the life of his soul. That Christ died as a vicarious sacrifice for sin, requires no formal proof at our hands to-day; for we presume that no one in this assembly hesitates to admit the fact. Indeed it is written as with a sunbeam on almost every page of the inspired word. Assuming this as a fact, it is our purpose, as we proceed, to confine our remarks chiefly to two points: 1st, To notice briefly some important purposes that are answered in the government of God, by the death of his Son; and 2dly, Endeavor to answer the oft propounded question, for whom did Christ die? In other words; present some thoughts on the extent of the atonement.

I. First inquiry: *What are some of the important purposes which God has accomplished by the death of Christ?*

The entire work of redemption must be considered as without a parallel in the government of God, so far as the information of man extends. And certainly an occurrence of such magnitude must have been designed by the Almighty to produce corresponding effects: and so far as these effects are revealed, they deserve our strictest attention and regard.

1. By the death of Christ, we are furnished with the means by which *God's justice is made to appear in the remission of sin.* Apart from this exhibition, we do not see how the mind of man could have grasped the idea that sin could be pardoned in a just and holy government. In transactions among men, the civil ruler never extends mercy to the criminal except at the expense of justice. Nor can it be otherwise. And in God's treatment of rebel angels, do they not suffer according to their just deserts, without

an overture of mercy in their behalf? Is it not a rational conclusion, then, that just such would have been our condition, had not Christ died, "the just for the unjust, to bring us near to God?" God's character must have suffered in the view of intelligent beings, had any of our race been saved without an ample satisfaction to law and justice. But now, "God hath set forth Christ to be a propitiation—to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins—that he might be just, and the justifier of him who believeth in Jesus." In this plan of God, we see how "mercy and truth meet together, righteousness and peace embrace each other."

2. Christ crucified is set forth as the greatest expression of divine love to a sinful world.

It has pleased God to evince his benevolence to our race in other ways too numerous to mention. The apostle gives a specimen, when he declares that God "left not himself without witness, in that he did good, giving rain from heaven, and fruitful seasons, filling men's hearts with food and gladness." But every thing of the kind falls short when compared with the gift of his Son. "God so loved the world as to give his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish but have everlasting life." And in the text—"God commendeth his love toward us, in that while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us." This is grace abounding to the chief of sinners. Should not every bosom be opened for the reception of this Saviour, as the richest expression of heavenly love?

3. In the death of Christ as an atoning sacrifice, we are presented with the most striking manifestation of God's displeasure against sin.

The wrath of God has been revealed from heaven in various ways, "against the ungodliness and unrighteousness of men." It drove our first parents from the garden of Eden, when they sinned, and appeared in the shape of a flaming sword to keep the way of the tree of life. The wicked inhabitants of the old world felt his vengeance, when the waters swelled over the highest mountains, and only eight souls were saved. So also with the cities of the plain, the people of Egypt, the nations of Canaan, and others. God was pleased to reveal the same feature of his character, likewise, in his dealings with many individuals; such as Cain, and Achan, and Jezebel, and Judas, and Herod. The crucifixion of Christ, however, throws all these into the shade, as a monument and proof of God's opposition to sin. "It pleased the Lord to bruise him!" And why? Because "he was made sin for us." "He bare our sins in his own body on the tree." In him sin was openly and publicly condemned, when he was made a curse for us. Hence, says the apostle—"For what the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh."

4. The atonement of Christ is presented to us, as the only foundation of a sinner's hope.

This is an idea on which we need not dwell. The types and prophecies of the Old Testament abundantly prove the fact; and the New Testament is full as explicit. "Neither," says the

apostle, "is there salvation in any other; for there is no other name under heaven, given among men, whereby we must be saved." "Other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ." Let us rejoice, however, that it is a sure and ample foundation; one on which the chief of sinners may erect a superstructure, lasting as eternity.

II. Second inquiry: *For whom did Christ die?*

The extent of the atonement is a subject about which there has been much controversy among Christians. Some have used such indefinite language respecting it, as would naturally lead to the denial of a true and vicarious sacrifice for sin; while others have expressed themselves in terms so contracted, that it would be manifestly inconsistent with their scheme to make a sincere offer of the gospel to every creature. The truth may be found between these extremes.

1. It may help to solve the difficulty if we inquire, first, did Christ die for men *considered simply as sinners*, yet unreconciled to God; or, did he die for them, viewed as believing sinners, or even as sinners so sensible of their condition that they are desirous of reconciliation?

Our text answers the question by saying that it was while we were *yet sinners* that Christ died for us; and the context alleges that when we were *yet without strength*, Christ died for the ungodly. Has not Christ promised to be eyes to the blind, ears to the deaf, healing to the sick, and life to the dead? Surely the spiritual import of such language cannot be mistaken. If he died, then, for sinners, considered simply as such, does it not follow that the atonement is in its nature and worth, a suitable remedy for the wants of any and every sinner of our race? I know it may be said, that although the scriptures speak of those for whom Christ died as sinners, nevertheless, taking into view God's purpose of election, it was known to him who would believe, and to such the language should be restricted.

We by no means deny the Divine purpose respecting the salvation of believers; for such are declared to have been "chosen in Christ, before the foundation of the world." Those who impugn this doctrine, must content themselves with occupying one of two positions; either that God had formed no definite purpose whatever as to the salvation of sinners, and thus every thing is thrown into a chaos of uncertainty; or else, that he designed the salvation of every creature, and will of course accomplish it, contrary to his express declarations. We cannot now mention the process by which this conclusion is arrived at, but are sure, nevertheless, of its soundness; for we leave out of the question that theory so illogical, and so dishonoring to God, viz.: that he purposed the salvation of all men, and has done all in his power to accomplish it, but has failed in the effort because the arm of man is too strong for God! We cheerfully concede, then, the fact of God's purpose "according to election;" and acknowledge, moreover, that the death of Christ is sometimes spoken of in scripture in reference to believers alone; as, for instance, where Christ says—"I lay down my life for the sheep." And therefore it is unscriptural to assert,

as some have done, that Christ died as much for Judas as Peter. But this is not all, for usually in such passages, or the context, some thing is advanced which shows that the limitation has reference to the *application of atoning blood*, and the effects thereby produced, and not to the intrinsic value, or *sufficiency* of the atonement. Hence, says Paul, "he gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works." And in another place, he states that "Christ gave himself for the church," "that he might present it to himself, a glorious church, not having spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing." Thus the result to be produced is brought to view in these cases. There is another class of passages, in which it is declared that "Christ died for all," that "he gave himself a ransom for all," that "he is the propitiation for our sins, and not for ours only, but for the sins of the whole world." Are we obliged, then, to limit these general expressions by such as assert that he laid down his life for his sheep, and for his church? If so, why is it not said that he died for all, or for the whole world, in order that he might sanctify and cleanse these all, and make them a glorious church? No such language is used on the subject, and yet it might have been appropriately used, if the *all*, mentioned in these passages were only all the elect, or the *whole world* no more than the world of believers.

Again: if these general expressions, "all men," and "every one," and "the whole world," mean only the elect; why does not the Bible tell us that God elected all men, and the whole world? Such as contend for a strictly limited atonement, make election the measure of that atonement. Now if these expressions do not mean literally every human being, but only the elect, it is just as true that God elected them all, as that Christ died for them all. Yet the one is often asserted in scripture, the other never. How remarkable on their hypothesis, that the Holy Spirit should altogether omit the use of general terms in treating of election, while these terms are freely used in treating of the atonement! Is not this fact sufficient of itself to convince a candid mind that the one is more extensive than the other? That the atonement was not merely a plan of infinite wisdom to secure the salvation of believers, but that it has also an important bearing upon the whole family of man.

2. One of the texts alluded to above, presents this matter so clearly, that it deserves special notice: "He is the propitiation for our sins, and not for ours only, but for the whole world."—1 John ii. 2. Some writers have attempted to put a false gloss on this passage, by explaining it to mean nothing more than an assertion that Christ died for believing Gentiles, as well as Jews. Strange, that any one should imagine this to be the antithesis of the text. John addressed himself to little children, or believers. Nothing is said about Jews and Gentiles, in the epistle, by way of contrast; but altogether of those who love God, and the wicked world that love him not. This is very evident from an examination of the fifth chapter, and nineteenth verse, where the phraseology is the same as in the verse already quoted. "We know that we are of

God, and the whole world lieth in wickedness." Here the contrast is manifest: believers on the one hand, and the unconverted world on the other. Would it not be just as evident in the other passage, could we lay aside, while examining it, our theoretical spectacles? Surely the Apostle must have known that men would naturally receive this idea from the language used. The passage is certainly conclusive, in favour of a general or all-sufficient atonement.

Again: The Lord Jesus Christ, in the parable of the supper, teaches the same doctrine. In it he illustrates the goodness of God in making an ample provision, even for those of whom it is declared, "they shall not taste of my supper." Is it unworthy of God to make provision for all, and send an unlimited invitation, because he knows that some will refuse to come? Suppose that some rich and pious man of this assembly should make a feast for all his neighbors; and suppose him to be aware also that some of these were so engrossed with other pursuits, or so prejudiced against him, that he felt assured no invitation, however pressing, could induce them to come. Would it be, therefore unworthy his character to send them a sincere invitation? Would it not, on the other hand, prove his kindness; and certainly every unbiassed mind would say it was right? If our heavenly Father, then, has carried out the same principle, only on a more bountiful scale, by what casuistry is it that some persuade themselves that such conduct is wrong in him? Probably no idea has contributed so much to establish the error which we are endeavoring to confute, as this: why should God, who knows the end from the beginning, make a provision for those that he well knew would reject it? Would not such an expenditure be, at least, useless? In reply to this objection, we ask—Why is it that God acts on precisely the same principle in the works of creation and providence? "He openeth his hand, and supplieth liberally the wants of every living thing." Not, however, by preparing food in mouthfuls—just enough for each inhabitant of the earth, and no more. At times there may be a scarcity; but again, the products of the earth are so bountiful that all have enough, and a large surplus remains to be wasted.

Again: Look at that flourishing plant in your field, its head bent with a crop of seed sufficient to produce thousands of its kind: mark the spot where it stands, and by next summer you may perceive a single plant grow up in its stead: all its seed blasted, or trodden under foot by man and beast. Did not God know that this crop would perish? Why then cause it to grow?

Again: may we not suppose, with almost absolute certainty, that diamonds and other valuable gems are hid in the bosom of earth and ocean, where the eye of man will never penetrate: and that numerous flowers of the richest fragrance, whose delicate hues reflect the glory of God, spring up in deserts where the foot of man has never trod, and there wither and die. Or, as the poet expresses it,

" Full many a gem of purest ray serene,  
The dark unfathomed caves of ocean bear.  
Full many a flower is born to blush unseen,  
And waste its sweetness on the desert air."

Such, then, is God's method in the natural world; and shall we question his wisdom, or charge him with folly? If not, why so slow to believe his assertion that he acts in like manner in spiritual things? Is not the God of providence, also the God of grace? And when we perceive such marks of exuberant bounty, untasted by his creatures in life, though adapted to their wants and circumstances, we might naturally expect an exhibition of the same enlarged character in the gospel of his Son. It should not be wondered at, therefore, that the atonement is represented as abundantly sufficient for all, and sincerely offered for their acceptance; although the Lord knew that numbers would refuse to taste, and perish in their sin. If any one should allege that the analogy is defective, because God may have purposes to answer with the bounties of the natural world unknown to us; we reply to such by asking, may not other purposes, in addition to the salvation of believers, be accomplished also by means of the death of Christ? Some of these have been already mentioned; and others will occur to every mind. Why is it, if not through the mediatorial undertaking of Christ, that sinners of our race, even those that shall not be finally saved, have so many comforts and temporal blessings furnished them in this world? Why are they not already as miserable as their sins deserve? It may perhaps require the light of eternity to reveal to us all that God intends to achieve by the death of his Son.

3. It is an undeniable fact, that Christ commanded the gospel to be preached to every creature. Is not the gospel good news through the offering on the cross, or the atonement? But how can it be good news to every creature, if there be a considerable portion of our race for whom it was not made, and on whom it can have no bearing? That the atonement is the foundation of the gospel offer, cannot justly be denied. And as this is commanded to be made indiscriminately to all, it is no forced inference to say that the foundation is equally ample. Could the voice of a gospel minister reach every inhabitant of the globe, he is authorised to offer salvation to each one, on the ground that Christ has died for sinners. How is it, however, with fallen angels? Can such a proclamation be made to them on the ground of atonement? Certainly not. For "Christ took not on him the nature of angels, but the seed of Abraham," or human nature. Do we not see in this fact the bearing of the atonement on the whole race of Adam? In other words, its relation to every one of them, or its sufficiency for all?

Again: That sinners will be justly condemned for rejecting the atonement is a plain Bible truth. On what principle is it so declared? Certainly on the ground that had it been accepted, it would have sufficed for their salvation. If not, how can a just God condemn them for refusing that which was in no sense made for them—never sincerely offered for their acceptance, and of course never was in reality rejected by them?

It may be satisfactory to some to know that the view now taken accords with that held by the great leaders of the reformation. Calvin and others express themselves decidedly on the subject. The usual phraseology of that day was that Christ suffered sufficiently for all, or for the whole world, but efficaciously for the elect,

or believers. Calvin says, in his Commentary on Romans v. 18, "Although Christ suffered for the sins of the whole world, and is offered indiscriminately to all men, by the goodness of God, yet all do not apprehend him." Some authors of a later date, in their zeal to oppose extravagant representations of errorists, swerved from the use of Bible phraseology on this subject, in part; by dropping all general expressions, or explaining away their force, and confining themselves to that class of texts in which the atonement is spoken of as connected with Christ's sheep, or with his church. While combating one error, we should sedulously guard against embracing its opposite. By neglecting this rule, the truth on this subject has been made to suffer.

On the whole, then, we conclude that the atonement is amply sufficient for Adam and Eve, and all their descendants: and that no more sufferings and no other obedience would have been necessary on the part of Christ, had it accorded with the righteous will of God to make such application of it as would secure the salvation of every creature. While at the same time, it was necessary that Christ should suffer just as he did, in order that God might be just in the salvation even of one sinner of our fallen race.

#### IMPROVEMENT.

1. How important that preachers of the gospel should make the *reality, the fulness and sufficiency of the atonement, prominent in their public ministrations.* This was Paul's method: "God forbid that I should glory save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ." "The love of Christ constraineth us, because we thus judge, that if one died for all, then were all dead." And he calls opposers of righteousness "enemies of the cross of Christ."

Are we desirous that our hearers should "prove their own selves?" Nothing will do it more effectually than the doctrine of the cross. If they have any real love to God, or to his people, Christ crucified will be precious to their souls—sweeter than honey and the honeycomb: but if destitute of this love, no responsive chord will vibrate in their bosom, at the mention of his sufferings. Christ will be "as a root out of dry ground, having no form nor comeliness that we should desire him." How important, also, that we minister consolation to souls in distress for sin! Setting forth Christ is the only effectual method. Awakened sinners are apt to look for some inward qualification, entitling them to divine acceptance: let us press upon their attention the necessity of looking unto Jesus as the only name by which they can be saved. If this doctrine will make us happy, then are we happy indeed; but if not, there is no help for us even in God: for, out of Christ, he is "a consuming fire." Nor will any thing so effectually tend to cherish the Christian graces. It furnishes fresh motives to repentance, by shewing us continually the evil of sin; it increases our faith, strengthens our hope, gives a direct incentive to holy love, and thus leads to activity in every benevolent undertaking. The preaching of Christ crucified, also leaves all unbelievers who hear it without excuse. They cannot plead ignorance; nor say that God has not cared for them; nor allege that his terms of reconciliation are unreasonable. Christ's blood has been shed; he died for sinners; and now, "who-soever will, let him take the water of life freely." Should any reject

this atonement, their mouths will be stopped on the judgment day. The provision is amply sufficient for all, but they "will not come to Christ that they might have life." We should consider, likewise, that if this doctrine be withheld from the people, every form of error will be likely to spring up. The history of the church affords a melancholy lesson on this point. Unitarianism, so dishonoring to the Messiah, has resulted from just such defective ministrations.

2. Finally, brethren, let us ever remember that *redemption is by blood*, and not by truth or moral suasion. Apart from the virtue of Christ's sacrifice, and the Holy Spirit's influences thereby secured, not the tongue of men or angels could move one sinner to repentance, or charm him away from the vain delusions that lead his soul to perdition. And even now, when Christ has died, the success of his truth depends on that Divine aid which he imparts. "Paul may plant and Apollos water, but God giveth the increase." "Being now justified by his blood, we shall be saved from wrath through him." Let our hearts be constantly open to receive this blessed word: for it is by faith that "we have access into this grace wherein we stand, and rejoice in hope of the glory of God." Brethren in the ministry: is this hope as an anchor to each one of our souls, both sure and steadfast? Is Christ precious to us, so that we are desirous of knowing nothing in our churches, in comparison with Jesus Christ and him crucified? Do we preach not ourselves, but Christ Jesus the Lord, and ourselves the servants of the people for Jesus' sake? If so, the blessing of the Lord will attend our labors; and although we may be tried in various ways, and even suppose that God has not heard our prayer, nevertheless our work will prosper by his blessing upon it. Though "weeping may endure for a night, joy cometh in the morning."

To the congregation generally we say, you have a deep interest in the truths to which your attention has been invited to-day. Our object has not been to affect your passions by giving a tragical and moving representation of Christ's sufferings in the garden and on the cross. Had we ability to do so, your tears might have flowed, and yet your souls not be permanently benefited. The Evangelists never attempt a display of this kind, but narrate and establish this truth with great brevity and simplicity—leaving it to make its appropriate impression, by the influence of the Holy Spirit. It is our desire, likewise, to present food for salutary reflection and meditation, as long as you live. What is there better calculated to effect this object, than the death of Christ, taken in connection with its grand results, whether we view them as exhibiting the glorious character of God as a righteous moral governor, or as manifesting his unspeakable love to our sinful race. These things lay hold on eternity; surely we cannot afford to let them slip from our minds with safety. Let us treasure them up in our hearts, that they may influence our practice—leading us in the ways of truth and righteousness. And then, when the world is burnt up, and the light of eternity bursts on our view, we shall have the privilege of bearing our part, with all the ransomed of heaven, in that grand anthem—  
 "Unto him that loved us and washed us from our sins in his own blood; and hath made us kings and priests unto God and his Father; to him be glory and dominion, for ever and ever—Amen."

[For the Spirit of the XIX. Century.]

## THE TEMPTATION AND BETRAYAL OF OUR LORD.—PART I.

AND when the Devil had ended all the temptation, he (*απιστην* stood or kept off or away,) departed from him for a season—(*αχρει καιρου* until the season.)—Luke iv. 13.

A question arises, for or during what season or time did the Devil depart?—Was our Lord afterwards, and during his public ministry, molested by the temptations of the Devil?

Whitby, understands *αχρει καιρου* to signify till the time of his passion, and the word *αχρει* is usually rendered until—(*Usque, ad, see* Matt. xxiv. 33; Luke i. 20; xvii. 27; xxi. 24; Acts i. 12; ii. 29; iii. 21; vii. 18.) Some times it means as far as to, when used in reference to space, Acts xi. 15; xiii. 6. The very phrase *αχρει καιρου* occurs in Acts xiii. 11. Metaphorically it may signify to, e. g. "I persecuted to death," *αχρει θανατου*—See Rom. v. 13; viii. 22; xi. 25. Theophylact also supposes that the Devil departed from our Lord till the time of his passion—(*recessit vero usque ad tempus crucis, tunc illum per adversa ac dura tentaturus.*) Diodati remarks that the expression appears to refer to the severe temptations and open conflict between our Lord and the great adversary, at the time of the passion, and he thinks Luke xxii. 53, confirms this view, inasmuch as the Redeemer himself declared to the chief priests "this is your hour and the power of darkness"—John xiv. 30 is also supposed to confirm this view.—It may be remarked, also, that most of the Latin versions render the phrase *αχρει καιρου*, *usque ad tempus*, "until the time"—(See the vulgate and the versions of Montanus Erasmus Fabricius, Tremellius *ad tempus* Beza.) Mr. Barnes, in his notes on the Gospels, infers from these words, that our Saviour was afterwards subjected to temptations by Satan, although he says that no particular temptations are recorded after this, until his trial in Gethsemane. David Martin says, "We do not read that the devil attacked the Lord Jesus Christ directly on any other occasion, but he did it afterwards indirectly by the persecutions which he raised against him."

If, then, we may assume that the Devil departed (i. e. kept aloof) from our Lord during a certain time, (*καιρος* signifies a season or set time,) or until a certain time, (*usque ad tempus à Deo præfinitum,*) what period can we suppose so probable as that specified by Whitby, Diodati, and Theophylact? Dr. Scott seems to favour this view, and it appears by the *Glossa Ordinaria*, to have been so understood by the early Christian church—(*usque ad tempus ss passionis quando non tamen dolis sed apertiè impugnavit, etc.*)

This first temptation, it should be borne in mind, preceded the entrance of our Lord upon his public ministry, although it was subsequent to his baptism by John in Jordan. The last temptation or rather trial, was after the close of his public ministry to the Jewish nation, Matt. xxiii. 30; xxvi. 36, 46. But during the entire

period of his public ministry, our Lord manifested his power over Satan in the most absolute manner, and in fact appealed to that manifestation of his power as proof of his Messiahship. This is the suggestion.

To refer to only a few instances: When the seventy returned from their mission and reported with joy that even the devils (*δαιμονια*) were subject to them through his name; he replied, I beheld Satan as lightning falling from heaven, Luke x. 17, 18; compare Rev. xii. 7, 9. It is worthy of remark, too, that our Lord, during a season, "gave his disciples a power which if held in perpetuity would confer immortality on its possessor," viz. power over all the power of the enemy, Luke x. 19; Matt. x. 1-8, and the Devil is the enemy which hath the power of death, Heb. ii. 14. Our Lord upon an occasion of exercising his power over unclean spirits, compares himself to one who has entered the house of a strong man for the purpose of binding him and despoiling him of his goods, Matt. xii. 24-29; Luke xi. 14-22. The inference which he would have the Jews derive from such tokens of power, was that the kingdom of God had come to their nation, and that he was king in that kingdom, and was exercising acts in the destruction of the kingdom of Satan, whom he elsewhere expressly calls the prince of this world, John xiv. 30; xii. 31; xvi. 11. See also, 2 Cor. iv. 2; Eph. ii. 2.

In 1 John iii. 8, the purpose for which the Son of God was manifested, is declared to be, that he might destroy the works of the Devil. The accomplishment of this purpose is anticipated and declared in John xii. 31, 32. Now if we may understand the manifestation to have begun at the entrance of our Lord upon his public ministry, when he began to preach the gospel of the kingdom—(see John i. 31, 33,) it would seem to be a proper inference that during his manifestation to Israel in his public character, he would continually exert his kingly power over the usurping prince of darkness, although at the close of his ministry the purposes and the plan of redemption required that he should again submit himself to the direct assaults of Satan: for how else should the scripture be fulfilled, "It (viz. the seed of the woman) shall bruise thy (the serpent's) head, and thou shalt bruise his heel?—Gen. iii. 15. See John xii. 27; Luke xxiv. 26.

The Lord Jesus Christ went to the Jewish nation as their king, and though rejected by the nation in that character, yet he suffered under the title of the king of the Jews. As he claimed to be their king, it was needful that he should furnish the nation with proofs adequate and appropriate to establish his claim to the character and office of Messiah. Hence he says, (John xv. 24,) "If I had not done among them works which none other man did, they had not had sin." The evidence which he furnished was unequivocal, which it would not have been if his works were not of a kind never before known. But Moses and some of the Old Testament prophets had wrought miracles; it was not therefore the mere fact of the miraculous nature of his works which constituted the proof of his Messiahship, so much as the peculiar nature of

the Saviour's miracles.\* Hence the peculiar significancy of the answer of our Lord to John's disciples, recorded in Matt. xi. 2-6; Luke vii. 18, 23. The inquiry was, "Art thou he that should come (*ὁ ερχόμενος*, *the coming one*—the promised Messiah, John iv. 25,) or should we look for another." The works which our Lord appealed to in answer proved him to be the Messiah, because they were, if we may so speak, Messianic miracles. The Jewish nation entertained certain opinions concerning the Messiah, and the consequences of his advent to their nation and the world, which though they might be inaccurate in many particulars, were to a very considerable extent authorized by their scriptures. Had it not been so, they would have been incapable of judging of the proofs which Jesus gave them of his Messiahship. They expected, for example, that when the Messiah should come, he would be a great teacher and revealer of truth, John iv. 25, 29. This was a just expectation, and accordingly we find he spake<sup>e</sup> as never man spake. They expected, also, that he would raise the dead—at least the pious dead of their nation, and accordingly when Jesus raised Lazarus, we find the chief priests and pharisees anticipating as the result, the universal belief of the nation in his character and claim to be the Messiah, unless his course should be arrested, John xi. 48. They also expected that the Messiah would at his advent, renew the face of nature, and restore all things—that the earth would no longer yield its increase reluctantly and in scanty measure, as it does now.† The prophet Elisha, who was a type of Christ, had wrought miracles significative of the change which would come upon the earth at the introduction of the Messianic reign—(See 2 Kings iv.) On the ground of this expectation we may explain the effect on the minds of the people, of the miracle of multiplying five barley loaves and two small fishes into a supply more than sufficient for five thousand persons. John tells us (in ch. vi. 14, 15,) that the men who saw the miracle said of a truth this is *the prophet* (*ὁ προφητῆς*) that should come (*ὁ ερχόμενος*) into the world. It is evident that "the prophet," "the coming one," here intended, is the prophet king or the Messiah, because the evangelist informs us

\* Mr. Barnes remarks upon Matt. viii. 33, (see his Notes on the Gospels,) "that the purpose of the Saviour's miracles was to confirm his divine mission." Upon this we have nothing to say, but he goes on to remark, "and it might have been as fully done by splitting rocks, or removing mountains, or causing water to run up steep hills, as by any other display of power." Such manifestations of power might have proved a divine mission, but they would not have been appropriate to the character which Christ was to exhibit at his advent of meekness.—See Isa. xlii. 1-8; Matt. xii. 18, 20. The proofs which he exhibited of his mission were appointed in the counsels of God, and were just such as were suited to prove him to be the Messiah whom the scriptures foretold and the Jews had reason to expect.

† "The sabbatical year by an extraordinary benediction brought forth its increase spontaneously. It was a blessing on nature, by a suspension of the curse, and has a special typical reference to the great sabbath of rest in the millennial kingdom of regenerated nature." God commanded his blessing also on the sixth year, and the earth brought forth the fruit of three years, and the people ate of it till the ninth year, Lev. xxv. 21, 22. This institution, while it is typical of the *παλιγγενεσία*, bore an extraordinary testimony to the mission of Moses. "The separation of a seventh and the benediction of the sixth year were one continued miracle, and proof of that theocracy.

incidentally that the effect of the persuasion was to determine them to "take Jesus by force and make him a king," verse 15. Now why should this miracle more than any other have the effect of persuading the people that Jesus was the Messiah, unless upon the ground that they expected the Messiah, and him alone, to perform such miracles? His miracles, in fact, were specimens or examples upon a small scale of what they expected their Messiah could do and would do universally upon the establishment of his kingdom, and hence their tendency to convince the people of the truth of his claims. Of the same import was the miraculous exercise of power which he uniformly exhibited over Satan, from the time he began to preach the gospel of the kingdom, till he closed his public ministry, when he for the last time retired from the temple, and pronounced the desolation of Jerusalem till the conversion of her children to the faith of his gospel, Matt. xxiii. 37, 39. Hence our Lord argues from his power over Satan that the kingdom of God had come, Matt. xii. 22, 29; Mark iii. 22, 27; Luke xi. 14, 22. Satan he represents as a strong man armed, and this world as his house. The scriptures taught the Jews that the dominion of Satan would be destroyed by the Messiah who was the promised seed, and that none but the Messiah ever could or would destroy his dominion. Hence the binding of Satan in the name of Jesus was an unequivocal proof that the kingdom of God had come to them, and that he who was endowed with such wonderful energies was the Messiah, and the possessor of that kingdom. May we not conclude, then, that it was a necessary part of the chain of proofs of his Messiahship, that he should continually exercise during all his ministry the most absolute power over the Devil? And if so, can we with any propriety suppose that Satan either could or would, during his public ministry, and while the question whether the nation would receive him or not, was pending, directly approach his person, in the way of temptation or trial without our Lord's permission?

Before we proceed farther, it is important also to say that when our Lord began to preach, the kingdom of God had come in an important sense: the pre-appointed time which must elapse before it could be offered to the nation, had been fulfilled, Mark i. 15, and Nathaniel, whom our Lord distinguished from the mass of his countrymen by the honourable appellation of an "Israelite indeed," acknowledged him as the king of Israel, John i. 47, 49. John the Baptist, had already announced the kingdom of God as come nigh. Our Lord had done the same thing, and towards the close of his ministry he declared that the kingdom of God should be taken from them because they had rejected him, Matt. xxi. 42, 43. Now this kingdom which was taken from the Jewish nation, was not the dispensation of the gospel which we enjoy; for so far from taking away the preaching of the gospel from the Jews, our Lord expressly commanded his disciples to begin at Jerusalem, Luke xxiv. 47; Acts xiii. 46; Rom. i. 16. It was the Messiah's kingdom (or the kingdom which we look forward to as the millennial kingdom) which had come nigh. It was the kingdom which the Jews expected, and of which our Lord's miracles were signifi-

cative, which had come nigh: it had come nigh in the offer of it, —it was ready to be revealed if the nation would receive it; but they would not receive it because their hearts were depraved, and they could not without divine teaching, John vi. 44. It is not important, for the present, to pursue this inquiry farther; all that need be shown is, that from the entrance of our Lord on his public ministry, the kingdom of God had come nigh in an important sense, and in a sense, too, which owing to the rejection of Christ by the Jews, has never yet been realised by an open manifestation of it—that our Lord from the commencement to the conclusion of his public ministry, claimed the character of the promised king of Israel, and exhibited the proofs appropriate to evince his right, and although he did not *compel* the obedience of the nation, but left them free to reject him, (John i. 11,) yet he did exercise his kingly power with irresistible energy over Satan and all unclean spirits, sometimes not allowing them even to speak through the unhappy persons whom they possessed, Mark i. 34.

This class of his miracles as well as the others which he wrought, was calculated to impress the nation forcibly with the conviction that he was their expected Messiah. "The Jewish theologians knew that the ancient theocracy did not realise the elevated destination promised to their nation, Ex. xix. 6. The prophets had pointed to the times of the Messiah and the Messianic kingdom as the epoch of the fulfilment of these promises in all their glory." —See Tholuck on John. In this they were right, and accordingly it was appropriate to the character in which our Lord appeared that he should exhibit a power which, in its developement, should accomplish the expulsion of Satan, the destruction of all his works—the removal of the curse, and the restitution of all things to the beauty and glory which they possessed before the fall.

The fact that God saw fit to allow the nation in despite of such proofs to reject and crucify their King, does not by any means require the further supposition that satan should be allowed to continue his temptations of our Lord during the period of his public ministry—on the contrary, if the foregoing suggestions are well founded, such continued temptations would have taken from the proofs appointed to evince his king-ship. But it may be supposed that Luke xxii. 28, and Heb. iv. 15, are contrary to these suggestions.

The former of these passages runs thus: "Ye who have continued with me in my temptations"—(ἐν τοῖς πειρασμοῖς μου.) It must be conceded that this passage cannot refer to the temptations which preceded his entering on his public ministry, because those were before the calling of the disciples. But the word rendered *temptations*, though frequently used to signify the temptations, or seductive influences of Satan, (*pro insidiosâ exploratione*—Sec I Cor. x. 13; Gal. iv. 14; James i. 13; 1 Pet. i. 6,) yet it has not necessarily that signification. The word often signifies trials or afflictions, Acts xx. 19; Luke viii. 13. Perhaps our Lord here refers to the persecutions of the Jews, instigated no doubt by Satan, and to the manifold evils to which he, though king of Israel, voluntarily submitted as a man of sorrows, that all things written

concerning him in the Law and in the Prophets and in the Psalms, might be fulfilled.

The passage in Heb. iv. 15, is this: "We have not a high priest which cannot be touched with the feeling of our infirmities, but was in all points tempted (or tried) like as we are, yet without sin." This passage may be satisfied by taking into account the temptations by Satan to which our Lord submitted, previously to his entering upon his public ministry, and his trials subsequently to the closing of it:—at least there will not appear to be any difficulty if we add to the direct assaults of Satan during these periods, his afflictions and sorrows during the intermediate time just alluded to, and these latter perhaps are chiefly intended by the apostle.

The plan of redemption, as shadowed forth in the first promise of it in Gen. iii. 15, seems, however, to have required that the humiliation of the Saviour should close in a personal conflict with the great enemy. The result of the Saviour's work is represented by the symbolical action of a man crushing with his heel the head of the serpent—(see Rom. xvi. 20.) The reader has doubtless remarked the trouble of soul which our Lord suffered during the last days of his life, especially when the thought of his betrayal occurred; and also the fact that he uniformly connected his own glorification especially with the events of that period, John xii. 27—33; xiii. 21, 31. But at what time did the conflict commence? Or in other words, when did Satan renew his approaches, which according to the foregoing suggestions were discontinued with the temptations in the wilderness—(Luke iv. 13.) Is there any thing recorded in either of the gospels by which this question may be determined? The hypothesis (if we must so call it,) which has been stated, supposes that our Lord, as king and Messiah, repelled the assaults of Satan during the entire period of his public ministry—that he was during all that time exercising his rightful authority over Satan, the usurping prince of this world—binding him by his word, and even by his name, and despoiling him of his subjects, at his pleasure. If this be so, we should expect that Satan could approach our Lord only when he gave him permission; and this supposition is supported by his declaration, that he laid down his life—that he had power to lay it down and take it again—that no one (*evδεις*) could take it from him—John x. 18.) Satan, therefore, could not accomplish his death either directly or indirectly but by his permission. It was the Divine purpose that our Lord should by a *voluntary* death destroy Satan, who was invested with the power of death, and therefore Satan must be permitted to exercise his power over the human nature of the Redeemer for his own destruction;—in other words—Satan must be permitted to bruise the heel of the woman's seed in order to the crushing of his own head or dominion.

These observations lead us to the suggestion, that the evangelist John (in chap. xiii. 27) records the time and the circumstances under which this permission was given. Perhaps the suggestion may strike the reader as novel and not well founded; but he is desired, nevertheless, to consider the reasons which have led the writer to make it.—They will be given hereafter.

CONTROVERSY WITH THE DOMESTIC CHAPLAINS OF THE ARCH-  
BISHOP OF BALTIMORE.\*

*No. 3, of the Protestants.—The Necessity of the Reformation—  
Continued.*

HAVING exhibited some of the enormous errors in *doctrine* and *worship* which obtained in the church before the Reformation, and which of themselves would render a change necessary, we now proceed to the next general head of corruption, and that will include the deplorable condition of *morals* that disgraced the age. Some of the most distinguished men of the church candidly declared to the world, that either the ruin of the church, or some direful calamity was approaching, unless prevented by a speedy reformation in the public morals. This was the principal design of the celebrated Gerson's *Treatise, on the Signs of the Ruin of the Church*. "And I am bold to say," says the Cardinal of Cambray, in the preface of his book of the Reformation of the Church, "that although they are great evils which we see, yet unless the church be speedily reformed, we shall in a short time see incomparably greater;" and the suffragan of Saltzburg having described the vices of the Roman court, concludes, "'Tis vehemently to be presumed, and cautiously to be feared, that the ruin of the church as to its ecclesiastical dignity, is near."†

It is not strange that considerate men should apprehend the near approach of such terrible calamities, if we reflect that this deplor-

\* The reader, by turning to page 7 of this work, will find a detailed explanation of the origin of the controversy in which these papers were originally published, and an express mention of the paper in which they were first printed. Notwithstanding which, the editor of that paper (Dr. Snodgrass of Baltimore) took occasion to accuse the editor of this periodical, on the issuing of the second number of this series, of having failed to give the proper credit for them; and did this in terms, no doubt intended to be offensive. This is the more remarkable, as Dr. Snodgrass had not only taken such a course as to bring the series to a sudden close, almost immediately on his taking possession of the *Saturday Visitor*, but had spoken of the series itself and of its authors in terms of open disparagement: and, it is hardly possible that under the circumstances he should not know, that the most of these articles were written by the editor of this periodical; and it is quite possible he also knew that those written by the *Rev'd Drs. Morris* and *Kurtz*, the *Rev'd Mr. Cross*, the *Rev. Professor Thornwell*, and *Thomas E. Bond, M. D.*, were so written at our particular request; Mr. Jones having originally desired us to manage the Protestant side of the case, and other gentlemen having been called in at our suggestion. That under these circumstances we should be thus accused by Dr. Snodgrass, is to be accounted for only by the knowledge of the fact, that for some cause or other that individual seldom lets an occasion pass unimproved, in which he can print an ill-natured, or rude thing of us. This explanation is due to ourself—and terminates the matter on our part, with a civil request to Dr. Snodgrass, to erase the name of this periodical from his list of exchanges. If he should return to the bosom of the church we understand he has forsaken, we presume he will see abundant reason to regret much that he has written. While his past and present relations to it continue as they now are, his bitterness towards us is not incomprehensible.—Our readers may expect a more regular publication of this series in future.—[Ed.]

† *Onus Ecclesiæ*, c. 19, fol. 36.

able state of morals was almost universal among all conditions of men, among the clergy, and especially among the popes and cardinals.

1. There was a general corruption of morals both in the state and church. The cardinal mentioned above, having recited the grievous complaints of St. Barnard respecting the wretched condition of the church in his time, adds: "If these things were spoken by blessed Bernard, they may now much more be said; because since his time, the church hath proceeded from bad to worse; and in the whole state as well spiritual as secular, virtue being abandoned, it has fallen into the shame and filthiness of vice."\* Nicholas de Clemangis tells us, "that wicked persons did so much abound in all professions of men, that scarce one among a thousand was to be found, who did sincerely live answerable to their profession; and if there was any one that was honest, chaste and frugal, and did not follow this kind of life, he was made a laughing stock to others, and was presently called, either an insolent madman or an hypocrite."† The description of the corrupt morals that generally prevailed among all orders of men is so black and tragical, that it can hardly be read without horror. The fidelity of these descriptions has never been denied, but on the other hand, their truth has been universally acknowledged by Romanists themselves.‡

2. No wonder that all flesh had corrupted its way, when the lives of the clergy, who should have been the salt of the earth, were more wicked than those of the laity. Cardinal Julian in his letter to Pope Ugenius IV. (A. D. 1400) tells him, "That the people were above measure incensed against the ecclesiastical state, by the dissolute lives of the clergy, for which it is greatly to be feared, unless they mend their manners, the laymen, after the example of the Hussites, will fall foul upon the whole clergy. And in truth, this deformity ministers great boldness to the Bohemians, and gives a fair color, to their errors, who especially inveigh against the filthiness of the clergy."§ The bishop of Saltzburg, before quoted, in the words of Catharine of Sienna, gives this character of the common clergy at the beginning of the Reformation: "The modern and unhappy clergy addict themselves to temporal things, being destitute of divine light; they love themselves, neglect the love of God and their neighbor; they are worse than worldly men, whom they destroy together with themselves. They are addicted to pleasures and infamous practices, and neglect the salvation of Christ's faithful people. By the lives of such wicked clergymen, the senators come to be disobedient and irreverent toward the church; they are seduced by blind guides, and oh! shame, are ignorant idiots, proud, covetous, hypocrites, simoniacal, luxurious, envious, slow to good works, prone to evil, &c. &c. Where at this day can be found that continence in gesture, diet, apparel and laughter, that becomes the clergy? At banquets, taverns, plays,

\*Fasciculus rerum expetend. ac fugiend, p. 203.

†De corrupto statu eccles., c. 25.

‡Hist. Council Trent, l. 7.

§Richer Hist. Con. General, c. 3, c. 2, p. 322, 323.

and theatres, they are more frequently found, than in places dedicated to God; how hugely pernicious in the universal church, the scurrility, ignorance, fornication, simony and other crimes are, with which the whole clergy is infected, there is no man doubts.\* Nicholas de Clemangis, himself an arch-deacon in the church of Rome, represents the clergy of that church in his day, as the scum of mankind, who for the most part adandoned themselves to the most loathsome vices.

Nor were the inferior clergy alone chargeable with these immoralities, but the prelates were as bad or worse than their subordinates. "The bishops," says the same author, "serve their own tables instead of the altar; they are unwise in divine things, while they love the wisdom of the world; they are more employed in the offices of the exchequer, than in the works of Christ; they adorn their bodies with gold; they defile their souls with impurity; they account it a shame to employ themselves in spiritual matters, and their glory is to meddle themselves with those things that are scurrilous. Hence it is said by Catherine de Sienna, they as men that are blinded, reckon that to be their honor, that is truly their shame; contrary to the canons, they keep about themselves, pimps, bawds, flatterers, buffoons; such as give themselves wholly to vanity, instead of men that are learned and of good report." "The bishops neglected due hospitality, by neglecting the poor of Christ, by making themselves fat, by feeding dogs and other beasts, and so one beast feeds another. There are few bishops who are not covetous; they take by violence other men's goods, and wastefully spend the goods of the church; they bestow the revenues of the church not to pious uses, but upon their kindred, upon stage players, flatterers, huntsmen, mistresses, and such like persons," &c. This was the complaint of a popish bishop in 1519. And that a great improvement had not taken place among the Romish clergy more than forty years after, appears from the speech of the Ambassador of the Duke of Bavaria to the Council of Trent, in which he tells the Council, that the cause of the evils that had arisen among them, was the immoral life of the clergy, whose wickedness was so great, that he could not relate it, without offending the chaste ears of the audience.†

3. It will not be thought strange that the people and clergy were so deplorably corrupt, when we consider that the wicked lives of the popes and cardinals were the principal cause of that deluge of corruption in which all orders of society were immersed. We can desire no better proof of this, than the concession of Pope Adrian VI. in his instructions to his legate for the diet of Nuremberg in 1522. "Thou shalt promise," says he, "that we will use our utmost endeavors, first that this court may be reformed, from whence perhaps this evil hath proceeded; that as from thence the corruption flowed to all inferiors, so from thence the health and reformation of all may proceed."—(Sleidan's Comment, l. 4, Hist. Council Trent.) This was an extraordinary confession from a pope,

\*Onus Eccles, c. 21, s. 1.

†Hist. of the Council of Trent, l. 6, p. 527.

but no more than the necessity of the case extorted from him. The cardinals had by degrees arrived to such an excess of pride and luxury, as was odious and intolerable to all but themselves, and those whose vices were supported by them. "If a man would make an image of pride," says Clemangis, "he can no way do it more to the life, than by representing a cardinal to the eyes of the beholders."\* They trampled upon bishops, who were better men than they, nor would they condescend to salute them, when they fell prostrate on the ground to worship them.† One of them, more modest than the rest, when he returned home laden with the spoils of Germany, being asked what the barbarians, for so they called the Germans, thought of Rome, answered: "That the whole world complained of the pride and luxury of the cardinals."‡

We will not be surprised at hearing of such cardinals, when we consider the general character of the popes. We need not go back to ages preceding the Reformation, when, as their own historians tell us, they were *monsters* and *prodigies*. "Such tragical examples, and so devoid of all piety, as neither to regard the person they sustained, nor the place they were in," that "about fifty popes together did utterly degenerate from the piety of their ancestors"||—but passing by these, let us consider the character of the popes about the time of the Reformation, when the world was grown weary of the burden of their vices, and groaned to be delivered from it; and when, if ever, their temporal interests induced them to assume the appearance, however much they abhorred the reality of virtue.

Let us begin with Innocent VIII. in 1485. He led so prolific a life, that at his exaltation to the pontificate, he had sixteen illegitimate children, whom he afterwards took care to settle comfortably. When at his death in 1491, Lionel, Bishop of Concordia, in an oration to the Cardinals,§ pressed them to elect a good man, whose life was without reproach, what was the effect? They elected Alexander VI., a man who was the reproach of human nature; who, before his election was a prodigy of lust and other vices, and continued so to the last, when by the righteous judgment of God, he was poisoned by mistake in drinking the cup himself which he had prepared for others.\*\* "The ecclesiastical records of fifteen centuries, contain no name so loathsome, no crimes so foul as his, and while the voice of every impartial writer is loud in his execration, he is, in one respect, singularly consigned to infamy, since not one among the zealous annalists of the Roman church, has breathed a whisper in his praise.—Thus those who have pursued him with the most unqualified vituperations, are thought to have described him most faithfully; and the mention of his character has excited a sort of rivalry in the expression of indignation and hatred. Neither in his manner, nor in his language, did he affect any regard for morality or decency. By his immoderate ambition and stiferous perfidy, and every manner of frightful cruelty, of

\*De Corrupto Statu Ecclesie, c. 10.

†Richer, l. 2, c. 3.

‡Fasciculus rerum, &c., fol. 203.

||Genebrard. Chronograph, l. 4.

§Raynald, an. 1492.

\*\*Richer. l. 4, part 1, c. 2, s. 1.

monstrous lust and unheard of avarice, trafficking indiscriminately with things mixed and profane, he had imprisoned the world."\* Humanity disowned him, and he is rather to be considered a monster than a man, whose deeds excite horror, and whose enormities place him on a level with the most execrable tyrants of the ancient times. He died in 1503.—(Mosheim, Cent. xvi. 1, ch. 1, s. iv.)

Pius III. succeeded him, but he died twenty six days after his election. Great expectations were excited by his reputed virtues and piety, and his ardently expressed desire for a reformation of the church.

Julius II. who next ascended the papal throne, was guilty of crimes so notorious, as to be a scandal to the whole church. He filled Italy with rapine, blood and war, to which he was so addicted, that contrary to the law of nations, he commanded the procurator of the Duke of Savoy to be tortured, because he endeavored to persuade the pope to peace. So monstrous were his acts, that Richerius says, he must be wholly made of steel who can read them without horror. "To the odious list of vices with which Julius II. dishonored the pontificate, we may add the most savage ferocity, the most audacious arrogance, the most despotical vehemence of temper, and the most extravagant and phrenetic passion for war and bloodshed. He died in 1512."

Leo X., in whose time the reformation began, was a civil, well-bred gentleman; but so little concerned for religion, that he cared not to know what it meant.† When he permitted conversation on that subject, it was for the sake of diversion and profane sport. His soul, he thought, would not survive his body, and therefore he gave himself up to sensual gratification, and it was but reasonable that he who supposed he should die like a beast, should live like an epicure. Leo X., though of a milder disposition than his predecessor, was equally indifferent about the interests of religion and the advancement of true piety. He was a protector of men of learning, and was himself learned, as far as the darkness of the age would admit. He was remarkable for his prodigality, luxury and imprudence, and has even been charged with impiety, if not atheism.

Clement VII. (1524) as he received the popedom by simony,‡ so he administered it by artifice. He was an adept at dissimulation. He regarded neither his word, nor his oath, but violated his engagements, as often as he made them.

"Such was the dismal condition of the church. Its corruption was complete, and the abuses which its rulers permitted, reached the greatest heights of enormity." While the crimes of the Vatican were indeed so various, as to embrace almost every denomination of ungodliness, there was not one among the popes of this period, who made even the slightest pretensions to piety; scarcely one, by whom decency, as well as morality and religion, was not grossly outraged. Much more might be added to show the degen-

\*Waddington, p. 511.

†Hist. Council of Trent, l. 1.

‡Hist. Council of Trent, l. 1.

erate condition of the church, but after the exhibition that has already been made, who will deny the *necessity of a reformation*?

It is to be presumed that this would be observed by many persons of that age, and corresponding efforts be made to produce a change. It was observed and exertions were made.—Many men rose in the church and clamorously demanded a reformation, but their cries were unheeded.

Of the many witnesses to this fact, we must be content to hear only a few, and they shall be such who lived at or about the time of the reformation.

John Gerson, the celebrated chancellor of Paris, in a sermon to the Council of Constance, applies to the modern church of Rome, the words of Ezekiel xvi. 15: "Thou didst trust in thine own beauty, and played the harlot, because of thy renown; and pouredst out thy fornication on every one that passed by; and in all thy abominations thou hast not remembered the days of thy youth. Thou hast built thy brothel-house at every head of the way, and hast made thy beauty to be abhorred. Behold therefore I will deliver thee into the hands of those that hate thee." And after he had admonished them of the symptoms of approaching ruin, he advised an immediate reformation, as the only means of preventing it. "And because," says he, "some may say that the church is founded on a rock, and therefore is in no danger of ruin," he more particularly exhibits the enormities that prevailed in the church and then exhorts the council "either to reform all the estates of the church in General Council, or command them to be reformed in provincial Synods; that by their authority, the church might be repaired, and the house of God purged from all uncleanness, vice and errors." The same author earnestly exhorted Pope Alexander V. to commence the reformation of these corruptions and abuses, which (as he says) were the plague of the church, and without the removal of which, it was vain to expect peace.

Nicholas de Clemangis, (before quoted,) another Parisian doctor, wrote several works on this subject, in which he represents to the world, the deplorable state of the Roman church, and the necessity of reforming it. Add to the testimony of these single witnesses, the solemn appeal of the whole University of Paris, from Pope Leo X. to a general council, in defence of the Pragmatic Sanction, (which was a famous edict issued by Charles VII., of France, in 1438, against the despotic encroachments and pretensions of the Roman pontiffs,) in which appeal they exhibit the corruption of the church, and insist on the necessity of a reformation, and in the year 1517, the very same year in which Luther began to preach against the horrible abuses of indulgences.—If we pass on to the bishops and archbishops, though their interest engaged them more strongly to oppose it, yet we shall find some even among them, who were so sensible of the necessity of a reformation, that they earnestly called for it and endeavored to promote it.

Frederick, Archbishop of Salerno, Jerome, Archbishop of Brunswick, and Gibertus, Bishop of Verona, plainly declared that they were painfully convinced of the corruption of the church, by the

articles of reformation, which (together with the rest of the select council) they delivered to Pope Paul III.

In a book (*Onus Ecclesiæ*) written by the Suffragan Bishop of Saltzburg in 1519, (two years after Luther began the Reformation,) there is a most direful description of the corrupt state of the church.

In the Council of Trent, the Bishop of Conimbria said, "for these 150 years the world has demanded a reformation in the head and members, and hitherto has been deceived—that now it was time they should labor in earnest and not by dissimulation."

Dudithius, an Hungarian bishop, prayed the Hungarians and Poles, "that for God's sake, and for the charity which every Christian owes to the church, they would not abandon so honest, just and profitable a cause, but that every one would put down in writing, what he thought might be constituted for the service of God, without any respect of man, not reforming one part but the whole body of the church, in the head and members."

If from the bishops we ascend to the cardinals, (though to their pride and luxury, nothing could inflict a severer blow than a reformation of the right character,) we shall find that many of them not only acknowledge the necessity of reforming the church, but in some degree contributed their influence in effecting it. Caspar, *Cardinal Contarene*, John Peter, *Cardinal Theatine*, James, *Cardinal Sadolete*, and Reginald Pool, *Cardinal of England*, were of the number of the select council, that presented the articles of reformation to Pope Paul III.

The college of cardinals at the death of Pius III. (A. D. 1503) before they entered the conclave for the election of a new pope, took an oath, that if any of these should be chosen, he should immediately, before the publication of his election, bind himself under pain of perjury and a curse, to call a council within two years for reformation, which oath was taken by Julius II., who was elected pope; and when it afterwards appeared that he did not intend to keep it, (seven years having elapsed without any mention of a council,) in 1511 nine cardinals who had withdrawn from Rome, disgusted by his insolence and profligacy, called the second Council of Piza for that purpose, aided and protected by the Emperor Maximilian and Lewis XII. of France. Petrus de Aliaco, *Cardinal of Cambray* wrote a book in favour of a reformation, and Ludovicus, *Cardinal of Arles*, who presided in the Council of Basle, zealously endeavored to promote it. The cardinals who called the first Pizan Council, to extinguish the schism occasioned by the two anti-popes, Benedict XII. and Gregory XII., vowed that they would exert all their power to influence him who should be elected pope, to reform the church, and that he should not suffer the council to be dissolved, until a proper and sufficient reformation of the universal church was made in the head and members.

A SECOND LETTER TO THE RULING ELDERS OF THE PRESBYTERIAN  
CHURCH IN THE UNITED STATES.

THE first letter which we ventured to address to you, dear brethren, in regard to the rights and dangers of your sacred office, was hardly through the press, before we received the article which follows, and which we substitute for what we should have said in the present number.—It is decisive of two most important points, viz: 1, That the ancient discipline of the kirk of Scotland was precisely analagous to what we contend for as the true order of God's house established by his own word. 2. That although that venerable kirk, misled by an illusory devotion to outward unity, changed her scriptural order to accommodate herself to an erroneous definition on this point;—the founders of our church in America did not follow her in this change, but adhered to her more ancient practice and the true principle of Christ's house. These are important facts, and not only prove that the kirk of Scotland was with us during her earliest and brightest days—to wit, for nearly the first century after her reformation—the successive and glorious eras of her Knox, her Melville, and her Henderson; but that, from the beginning, the fathers of American Presbyterianism, were with us too.

Brethren, there is in this matter a significancy which a casual investigation does not reveal, and which gives to it a vital interest in our eyes. The question at issue, is, in one aspect of it, the key of the argument for the whole Presbyterian system. If Ruling Elders are not, in the true and full sense scriptural *Presbyters*, then, as it seems to me, our whole system of church government falls away from the scriptural foundation; and if it falls away from that foundation, it is a mere human invention for which no man has any right to contend. But if they are *Presbyters*, who will be so bold as to deprive them of the true rank and functions of scriptural *Presbyters*, by refusing them the rights that appertain to that high and sacred dignity?

We feel our hands greatly strengthened by the evidence which the communication now laid before you affords, that some of your body are not only thoroughly aroused to the importance of the question they must exercise so material an influence in deciding; but that they are so capable of vindicating the true grounds on which it rests, and of enlightening the public mind in regard to it. The article is from the pen of a Ruling Elder in a retired country congregation in a distant state, who rejoicing that a public stand is made in several parts of the church for her true order, lifts up his modest but manly voice to plead for Zion. Thanks be to God for giving such office-bearers to his church. Said I not that these men were worthy of her confidence and love, and competent in all respects through Christ strengthening them, to their high duties? That old doctrine of the pharisees, *the fear of the people*, is a sad and foolish doctrine.

Your fellow Presbyter and brother in the hope of the gospel.

R. J. B.

OUGHT RULING ELDERS TO UNITE WITH MINISTERS IN LAYING ON  
HANDS IN THE ORDINATION OF MINISTERS ?

This question has been discussed in some of our church courts and in the papers; and was referred by the last General Assembly to the next. It is important that it be properly understood. The great Head of the church has established the OFFICE of the gospel ministry. Who has the power to appoint the *officer*, or in other words, to authorise men to exercise the functions of that office? Does this power belong to the Presbytery, consisting of ministers and elders, or to ministers alone?

The history of the church of Scotland, from which we mainly derive our origin, may aid us in coming to a correct interpretation of the provisions of our constitution on this subject.—The first book of discipline drawn up by *Knox* and others, and adopted in 1560, says, "Other ceremonies except fasting with prayer, such as the laying on of hands, we judge not necessary in the institution of the ministry"—chap. iv. They did not believe that the ministerial office was conferred by the imposition of hands; and it is reasonable to conclude that for nearly twenty years it was not practised at all. The second book of discipline was drawn up by Andrew Melville and others, and agreed to in 1578, but being so favorable to religious liberty, it was not ratified by the civil power till 1592; it was revived and ratified by the memorable assembly of 1638—and contains these provisions:—chap. ii—"There is threefold sort of officers in the Kirk, to wit: monitors or preachers, elders or governors, and deacons or distributors; and all these may be called by the general word, ministers of the kirk."—"Chapter iii.—How persons that bear ecclesiastical functions, are to be admitted to their office."—"Outward and ordinary calling hath two parts, election and ordination. Election is the choosing out the person or persons most able, to the office that vakes, by the judgment of the eldership, and consent of the congregation, to which the person or persons shall be appointed."—"The ceremonies of ordination are fasting, earnest prayer and imposition of the hands of the eldership."—"Chapter vi.—Of elders and their office."—"We call these elders whom the apostles call presidents or governors."—"The eldership is a spiritual function, as is the ministry."—"Their principal office is to hold assemblies with the pastors and doctors, who are also of their number."—"Chapter vii.—Of elderships, assemblies and discipline."—"Elderships and assemblies are commonly constituted of pastors and doctors, and such as we commonly call elders."—"The power of election of them who bear ecclesiastical charges pertains to this kind of assembly, within their own bounds, being well erected and constituted of many pastors and elders of sufficient ability. By the like reason their deposition pertains to this kind of assembly."—"This was their Presbytery. These extracts show, that both ministers and elders were elected or chosen by "the eldership." That this eldership was "constituted of many pastors and elders," and they were ordained by the "imposition of the hands of the eldership," the same eldership; that "the eldership is a spiritual function as is

the ministry;" that ministers are also of their number; that they may be called ministers of the kirk—and the deposition of both ministers and elders pertains to the same assembly or eldership. It is plain that the election, ordination and deposition of ministers and elders were identical; language could not be more explicit.—This was the cherished formula of the church of Scotland until the Westminster Assembly, a period of sixty five years. Under it they rallied when opposing the tyranny of James the first and his son Charles, in forcing upon them episcopacy, or as they called it, the wicked hierarchy of Roman antichrist.

In the Westminster Assembly there was great diversity of opinion on the subject of ordination. It was before them a whole year, and was frequently and warmly debated. I will give some facts and extracts from Dr. Lightfoot's Journal in the 13th volume of his works. The ministerial members of the Assembly had received episcopal ordination; one of their first acts was to require of ministers examined, an affirmation that "the ministry of the church of England was a true ministry"—(p. 48.) Some of the leading members under their Episcopal prejudices, held that there was no "Ruling Presbyter distinct from a preaching one"—(page 74)—at last it was accommodated and agreed, that "it is agreeable to and warranted by the word of God, that some besides the ministers of the word, be joined with the ministers in the government of the church"—(p. 75.) Some members distinguished between a command and warrant, and others understood the other church governors to be the civil magistracy. One of the Scots Commissions moved that they be called Ruling Elders, but it prevailed not—p. 330.

The proposition that "ordination is only in the hands of the preaching presbyters," was debated very warmly, but in conclusion was laid aside for the present—p. 116.—Afterwards it was voted that "every minister of the word is to be ordained by imposition of hands and prayer, with fasting, by those preaching presbyters to whom it doth belong"—p. 231—also "that the preaching presbyters orderly associated are those to whom the imposition of hands doth appertain"—(1 Tim. iv. 14—p. 231.) This proposition was objected to "as excluding lay elders from imposition."—"At last it was passed over, and the proof of it was fallen upon again, and cost a great deal of time and debate, and at last it was put to the question whether it should pass or no, and it came to a vote so dubitable, that we were put to our votes by standing up, and it was carried affirmatively"—p. 239. It was desired that some reason might be given for these propositions. "As that preaching presbyters are to ordain, for that we find no ordination but by preaching presbyters"—the debate "held long," and after "tugging," it was voted negatively—p. 239. It was also voted "that the power of ordering the whole work of ordination is in the whole Presbytery"—p. 235. There was some question what Presbytery was here meant. It had had been referred to a committee, who reported this proposition, which was adopted: "A Presbytery consisteth of ministers of the word, and such public officers as are agreeable to and warranted by the word of God to be church gov-

ernors, to join with ministers in the government of the church"—p. 243. It was also proposed that "no single congregation which may conveniently join together in an association, may assume to itself all and sole power of ordination." This was debated for five days, and passed by a vote of 27 to 19—p. 262. A committee reported as reasons to support this proposition, "1, They do not find in scripture, that any single congregation, which might conveniently associate, did assume to themselves all and sole power of ordination; nor do they find any rule which will warrant such a practice. 2. We read that a Presbytery over divers congregations associated, did ordain, as in Jerusalem." "At last with extreme tugging, we got it to the question, and it was carried so narrowly that it was thrice put to it, before it could be determined; and there arose a great heat, and at last it was carried affirmatively, by four voices, that the first reason should be brought to prove the proposition" After a long debate, the second reason was voted by some five votes difference—p. 267. A committee also reported that "It is manifest by the word of God, that none is to enter the ministry unless he have a lawful calling, and be set apart with imposition of hands, and prayer with fasting." I among others, says Dr. Lightfoot, objected to the stricture requiring fasting with imposition of hands—which cost some consideration, and so serious as it was fitting, that at last it was left out, and the clause to run thus, "none to be a minister unless he be lawfully ordained"—p. 252. All the above propositions which were adopted are in the Westminster "Form of Government." About two years after, the Assembly in their "Directory for Church Government," which was their last action on the subject, say, "Ordination is an act of a Presbytery, unto which the power of ordering the whole work belongs; yet so as that the preaching presbyters orderly associated, are those to whom the imposition of hands doth appertain"—chap.

The General Assembly of Scotland, to use their own language, "being most desirous and solicitous of uniformity in kirk government betwixt these kingdoms," agreed to the Westminster Form of Church Government, and changed their second book of discipline on the subject of ordination, as well as in other particulars.

The practice of ministers *only* laying on hands in ordination, had its origin in our church in this positive law. But it is now confidently asserted that it has been the uniform practice at all times for ministers alone to impose hands; that the claim for elders to unite is *new*; a thing never heard of before! We have seen what was the constitution of the church of Scotland before the Westminster Assembly, and that elders were excluded from participating, by close voting, after long and warm debating. That the proposition "that preaching presbyters are to ordain, for that we find no ordination but by preaching presbyters," was actually voted negatively—and the proposition that "no single congregation which may conveniently associate, may assume all and sole power of ordination," was adopted by a small majority after a protracted debate. If they *may not conveniently* associate, the fair inference is, that the "congregational eldership" or church session may

ordain. The Westminster Assembly, in their "Directory for Church Government," call the officers of a single congregation "the congregational eldership," and also "a Presbytery," distinguishing it however, from a "classical Presbytery."

The constitution of our church provides, Form of Gov. "Chap. x. Of Presbytery. Sec. 2. A Presbytery consists of all the ministers, and one ruling elder from each congregation in a certain district." In the 8th section, the powers of this Presbytery, consisting of ministers and elders, are enumerated, and it is declared that "the Presbytery has power" "to ordain, instal and judge ministers"—chap. xv. §. 12. When the presiding minister shall by prayer, and with laying on of hands of the Presbytery, according to the apostolic example, solemnly ordain him to the office of the gospel ministry." "The Presbytery" is clearly defined to consist of ministers and elders, and occurs about one hundred and fifty times in our Form of Government and Discipline, and I confidently believe that in no other place can it possibly mean ministers alone; and that practice which is so much relied on in this case is against that meaning. Our book says, with the laying on of the hands of the Presbytery, without any qualification; it is not said of the "preaching presbyters" as in the Westminster Form of Government. If this had been intended it would have been retained, and rejecting the words "preaching presbyters," and adopting "the Presbytery," is conclusive that it was not intended. The first book of discipline declared the ceremonies of ordination to be "fasting with prayer," without the imposition of hands. The second book, "fasting, earnest prayer, and imposition of hands of the eldership," and that ministers and elders constituted this eldership. The Westminster formula changed this, and says "by imposition of hands and prayer, with fasting, by the preaching presbyters." Our own Form of Government changed this again, and says, "by prayer and with laying on of the hands of the Presbytery," and defines the Presbytery to consist of ministers and elders. When any term is clearly defined in a constitution or other writing, it is to be understood according to that definition, unless otherwise explained. And when a tribunal or other body consisting of many members have power to do an act, each member has a right to participate in that act, unless expressly excluded. Hence the Westminster Assembly, after declaring a Presbytery to consist of ministers, teachers, and other church rulers, and that ordination is an act of a Presbytery, added, "*yet so as*" that the preaching presbyters are those to whom the imposition of hands doth appertain. Without this express provision, every member would have had a right to participate. With this before them, the framers of our constitution deliberately changed this provision, by rejecting the words "preaching presbyters," and adopting the words, *the Presbytery*.

But it is now contended that they did not intend to make any change, and that the Presbytery means ministers only!!! It is true that the ministers in our book are called "the members of the Presbytery"—"members belonging to the Presbytery," and perhaps in one place "all the members of the Presbytery." The

reason of this is plain. Ministers are standing members. All the elders do not sit as members at the same time; but those selected by their Sessions are as truly members as ministers. This is by positive arrangement. In other Presbyterian churches the arrangement has been different. In Scotland the Presbytery consists of ministers who have parishes, and an equal number of elders. Ministers who officiate in chapels of ease, and ministers without charge are not members at all. The Presbyteries in England, in the time of the Westminster Assembly, were composed of two elders for one minister. The first General Assemblies of Scotland contained a large majority of elders\*—now there are more ministers than elders; in our General Assembly they are equal. All this is by positive arrangement. And although all the elders do not at the same time sit in Presbytery, they are really and truly presbyters—and ministers alone to the exclusion of elders, are never called the Presbytery in our book.

But after the ordination is over, "the minister who presides shall first, and afterwards all the members of the Presbytery, in their order, take him by the right hand, saying in words to this purpose, "We give you the right hand of fellowship to take part of this ministry with us"—chap. xv. §. 12; and here again the form used in Scotland is changed, and the provision that "all the ministers of the Presbytery" is ejected, and the words "all the members of the Presbytery in their order," adopted in its place.

But still it is contended that "all the members of the Presbytery" means ministers only! What is meant by "in their order" we are not told; but it is said, the words, "take part of this ministry with us" excludes elders, because the term ministry "cannot be applied to them." Melville and his associates thought differently. So far as RULING is concerned, elders may well use this language. If it be possible to confine this clause to ministers as standing members, it is after the ordination is over, and the express provision that the Presbytery consisting of ministers and elders has power to ordain ministers remains in all its force, and if laying on of hands be a presbyterial act belonging to ordination, then elders most clearly have a right to participate in that act.

Again, it is contended that the imposition of hands confers the ministerial office, and elders not having that office cannot take part in conferring it on others—that like begets like. If this be true, they should be excluded from taking any part in the whole matter, and be turned out of Presbytery whenever any thing connected with ordination comes before them. What is signified by the imposition of hands in ordination? Some of our brethren, it

---

\* *Large majority of elders.* The first General Assembly of the kirk of Scotland met at Edinburgh on the 20th of December, 1560; it consisted of *forty members*, of whom *six* only (as Heltherington of Torphichen asserts) were ministers! Indeed there were not at that moment above *twelve* reformed ministers in the whole of Scotland! Two elders, viz., *James Barone* and *Edward Houp*, sat in it, with that mighty man, *John Knox*, for Edinburgh. The remaining five ministers (besides Knox) appear to have been Christopher Guidman of St. Andrews, John Rowe of Perth, David Lindsay of Leith, William Harlaw of St. Cuthburts, and William Chertieson of Dundie.—[ED.]

seems to me, believe that there is in it some mysterious and miraculous virtue; and if their views were carried out, they would result in something very like the popish doctrine of apostolical succession.

A. Hall, a pupil of Fisher, in his *Gospel Church*, p. 46, says, "When we use this form of ordination, we do not intend it as a sign of conveying any extraordinary miraculous gifts; nor as a visible token of invisible saving grace; nor as an actual conveyance of ministerial power; but we use it *only* as a significant sign of the separation of the person ordained to the ministerial function. Hereby the elders who ordain testify that they approve and desire a blessing on those whom they admit to the fellowship of the gospel." If elders are permitted to testify that they approve, by voting for the ordination, why not permit them to do so by laying on their hands? And why should they be excluded from testifying that they desire a blessing on the person ordained?—To be consistent, they should not be permitted to take part in the examination and vote for or against ordination; or to judge ministers, and vote for their deposition. For surely it is as reasonable for them to have power to bestow the office, as to have power to take it away.

But have ministers themselves power to ordain because they have power to preach? Their office is divided into teaching and governing, and ordination belongs to government. It is not a power of order, but of jurisdiction. This was the doctrine of the *Scotts Commissioners* and others in the *Westminster Assembly*. President *Davies*, in his sermon at the ordination of Messrs. *Patillo* and *Richardson*, says, "that ordination is, I think, universally acknowledged to be an act of government, and consequently to belong to those who are invested with the government of the church"—vol. iii. p. 289. Again, at the ordination of *W. Martin*, "ordination is universally acknowledged to belong to them that have the government of the church of Christ committed to them"—vol. iii. p. 299. Hall says, "The ruling elders are joined to teachers, and have the same authority with them, in all acts and duties of church power for her rule and government"—p. 67. If these things be so, and I do not see how any Presbyterian can doubt it, then it clearly follows that they have power to join in "all acts and duties" belonging to ordination of ministers—and so the assertion that they cannot unite because they have no authority to preach, is not warranted; for ministers themselves do not act because they have power to preach, but because they are presbyters or elders and have power to rule.

But the great argument against the right of elders is from practice. When the language of a constitution is clear and explicit, it

\* This argument is by itself conclusive. Let it be pondered. Ordination appertains to government; ruling elders are in special 'governments'—by God's word; (Form of Gov. ch. v.); therefore ordination instead of being denied to them, belongs peculiarly to them, and to ministers, not as preachers but as rulers; that is, as that which they are in common with elders. And a higher or better authority than *President Davies*, we need not, either for the fact or the argument.—[Ed.]

is conclusive of its meaning; and practice is only resorted to where the language is ambiguous, and then it is only presumptive evidence to aid our conjectures as to the true meaning of the words. In this case the change in the language of the Westminster Form of Government in the manner before stated, is to my mind much stronger evidence than mere acquiescence, or practice. Even adjudications by the proper tribunals have been often overruled when opposed to the plain meaning of the words used. There are cases of laws acquiesced in and obeyed for many years, and then decided to be unconstitutional and void. The great contest in the church of Scotland at this time, is a striking example. For more than one hundred years, ministers presented by patrons, have been intruded on the congregations against their consent, in violation of one of the fundamental principles of their constitution!—And surely there is no Presbyterian in this country who does not ardently desire that in this contest between practice and the constitution, the constitution may prevail. The *plan of union* is familiar to us all; it was adopted when many of the framers of our constitution were living, and sanctioned by practice for many years. The practice in ordination under our constitution cannot be more than thirteen years older than that plan—and the argument from practice will apply with as much force in one case as the other. In my judgment not one provision of that plan was more repugnant to our constitution than excluding elders when members of Presbytery, from joining in the ordination of ministers. It is as unconstitutional to exclude elders from acting as members of Presbytery, as it was to admit committee men to act as members.

We are charged with advocating *new measures*, contemptuously called reformers, &c. We occupy the same ground now that we did in the New School controversy.\* We are for sustaining our constitution in opposition to every unconstitutional practice, whether new or old.

---

\* *The same ground, &c.* This is a most pregnant truth. It is the same ground; and to a great extent, the same people are on it. We are resisted on the same ground that was assumed in resisting us up to 1837; and speaking in general terms, the same people are resisting us. We do not mean the New School, but that section of the orthodox which resisted the reform of the church, and every leading measure necessary to effect it, up to the grand crisis. There are, no doubt, some exceptions both ways; but there can be no question of the main facts. And it is greatly to be deplored that any of those who were valiant for the truth in years past, should now be found opposed to the principles on which they stood then, and fighting against the precious rights of those who so materially contributed to the success in which they rejoice. Is there any reasonable doubt that the ruling elders of our church did more than half the work of saving it? And shall the reformation they so essentially aided, change its grand and fundamental principle in order to degrade their office, which Christ has established? Or shall we carry out our principles, and restore the ancient, the primitive, the scriptural, the undoubted order and discipline of true Presbyterianism? It is a great question: and great issues depend upon its proper settlement.—[ED.

## INTERCOURSE BETWEEN THE GENERAL ASSOCIATION OF MASSACHUSETTS AND THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH.—RECENT TROUBLES.

It cannot be unknown to any of the readers of this periodical, that the friendly intercourse which existed for many years between the Presbyterian church in the United States, and the Congregational churches of New England, was for a time interrupted, and its continuance seriously threatened by the course which was generally adopted by the latter in regard to the troubles and final division of the former. It is well understood, that the great mass of the Congregational churches openly held to the cause of the New School party in the Presbyterian church; and to that of the Home Missionary and Education Societies:—and we presume there are few amongst our ministers or people, who do not feel that we have much to forgive and much to overlook in the conduct of those churches towards us, and towards the vital interests of Christ's kingdom, in the troublous times through which we have come. Nor can it be denied by any one at all conversant with the state of general opinion in the Presbyterian church, that the renewal of this intercourse, though not opposed, was rather a matter of toleration than of cordial feeling on its part. The truth is, the church to a very great extent, has lost confidence in the ecclesiastical bodies of New England; and while the abounding heresies of their ministers are undisguisedly repudiated along with those who hold them; both the numbers of the orthodox and their zeal for truth are questions of painful doubt. We say all this with regret; but we believe every syllable of it and a great deal more, to be true, and that it is our duty, at the present moment, to say thus much.

During the last General Assembly, a very painful scene was enacted—which has since made some figure in the religious press—which was in close connexion with the state of fact and feeling we have alluded to above; and in regard to which, it is our present purpose to gather together and record the principal matters that have fallen under our eye.

It is extremely remarkable that the whole matter in its present shape, grew out of a naked and absolute falsehood published by some of the Philadelphia papers, and amongst the rest by the *Christian Observer*. In the number of that unscrupulous journal for June 3, under the caption, "*the Committee ad Interim*," the account of the proceedings of Dr. Cox, Dr. Gilbert, Mr. Barnes, and the like, on "*Friday, May 20th, 9 o'clock, A. M.*," contains the following sentence—"The Rev. Morris E. White appeared as a delegate from the General Association of Massachusetts, and was invited to sit as a corresponding member." The main fact in this case turned out, as the reader will see, to be *false*. Mr. White did not appear in the '*Committee ad Interim*,' nor did he sit there "*as a delegate from the General Association of Massachusetts.*" At least that he did neither, the public has his own assertion made on the floor of the General Assembly. We do not pretend to say

that this falsehood was published knowingly and intentionally by any body, not even by the *Christian Observer*; the more especially as the article is headed by it in brackets—thus [Reported for the *Christian Observer*,] and is, as we now observe for the first time, reported substantially in the same way, in the *New York Observer*, for May 28. Nor do we know what paper was used by the member who brought the subject before the Assembly. But however that may have been, the effect was precisely the same in all respects, except as to the characters of the papers publishing the statement, in regard to which they are all positively contradicted by Mr. White, who is surely to be believed in the premises.

We may as well say here, that the remark made by us on a subsequent day of the sessions of the Assembly, in regard to the general character of the *Christian Observer*, for fairness and veracity, especially in its controversial articles, and reported in the *New York Observer*, in more offensive and decided terms than those used by us, (though the *Observer* uses inverted commas, as if the report were verbally accurate;) and more particularly the characteristic comments of *Mr. Converse*, upon other matters under the pretext of defending himself from those remarks; may claim our future notice. For the present, we will not depart from the current of our thoughts to discuss those subjects, which, amply as we are prepared to meet them whenever the occasion requires it, have no particular connexion with the matter in hand. We may indeed yet be compelled to do and say things which we desire to avoid if possible. But we waive these questions now.

The *New York Observer* for May 28, gives the following account of what took place in the Assembly.

Rev. Mr. Maclin called the attention of the Assembly to the fact that the Rev. Morris E. White, the delegate from the General Association of Massachusetts in this body had also taken his seat in another body, meeting in this city, and styled the "*Committee ad Interim*;" he thought the subject required some consideration.

Rev. Dr. Breckinridge thought the Assembly should take up the matter at once, and if the facts were as they appeared, he was prepared to move that the name of the delegate from Massachusetts should be stricken from the roll.

Rev. Dr. Krebs thought that the right of the delegate could not be questioned, and he hoped the course proposed by Dr. B. would not be adopted. He was quite sure that in this case he could quote Breckinridge against Breckinridge. (Dr. B. said that the brother could not cite an authority in the universe that would have less weight with him.)

Rev. Mr. McClusky moved the appointment of a committee to investigate the subject and report the facts in the case to the Assembly.

Rev. Dr. Hodge could not see that the honor of this house was interested in the course pursued by the delegate; he did not believe that any disrespect was done to the Assembly, and it was not worth while to be so sensitive on a subject that was quite unworthy of notice, and ought not to be made a matter of so much consequence as to require a committee of investigation. Several members concurred in the views expressed by Dr. Hodge.

Rev. M. E. White, the delegate alluded to, said he had no desire to make any explanation, but if any one wished to hear him he could do so. A desire being manifested to hear him, Mr. White said that he came as a delegate to this body only; he met with an old class-mate in the city, and in company with him dropped into the meeting of the "*Committee ad Interim*," and without presenting any credentials or request, he was invited to sit as a corresponding member.

Rev. Dr. Breckinridge said that the house had evidently too low an opinion of

what is due to its dignity. He felt a disposition to treat the brother with all possible courtesy, but it was in vain to mince the matter. The New England ecclesiastical bodies profess not to know which body is the Presbyterian church, and therefore they send delegates to both. This course he regarded as insulting. Holland, in Cromwell's time sent word that she did'nt know which the English government was, and Cromwell sent back that he would *show them* which it was. Something of this spirit, sanctified indeed, we owe to ourselves. People who don't know who we are have no business with us, and he had never been satisfied to let this thing stand as it now does. Last year, instead of appointing delegates, he would have written a letter to the orthodox in Massachusetts, asking them to tell us *where they are*. Here is a brother who comes as a delegate to our body, and goes and takes a seat with a body of men whom we do not recognize as Presbyterian ministers; if one of our own number should do the same, we would regard it a great indignity and should call him to account; and, according to its rank and grade it is an offence on the part of the brother. If that "Committee" sat as a sect by themselves, it would be another matter, but *claiming to be ourselves*, and sitting here at the same time to keep up the impression that they are the General Assembly, it certainly would be a gross indignity on the part of one of our own members to take a seat with them.

Rev. Mr. White, the delegate, said that he had of course intended no disrespect to the Assembly, and if he had been guilty of any *indiscretion* or any *wrong*, he had yet to see it. When he did see it, he would acknowledge it.

The motion to appoint the committee was, by *unanimous* consent, *withdrawn*. Mr. White stated that he had just received intelligence which made it necessary for him to leave, and accordingly retired. So far as we are able to judge, a general regret prevailed that the subject had been agitated at all. Rev. Mr. Platt said, (before the delegate left,) that he hoped he would retire with the assurance that none other than the kindest feelings are entertained toward him, and in this sentiment the whole body appeared to concur.

We will not be understood as endorsing the exact accuracy of this report. But it is clear enough from our own remarks as here given, that there were two things *reported* in relation to Mr. White, that struck us, and we respectfully submit, ought to strike every man, as highly offensive if they had been true, viz., 1, that being delegated to the General Assembly, he should at the same time be delegated to another body that was in open schism and rebellion against the Assembly; 2, that he was delegated to it, as being as much *the* Assembly, as our own body to which he was specially delegated, was. Mr. White at first declared these facts were incorrectly printed; subsequently he added that in what he had actually done he had intended no disrespect to the Assembly, and was unconscious of any wrong; and here the matter dropped, by general consent. The General Association of Massachusetts had not done, what divers newspapers published it as having done; and Mr. White made the *amende honorable*, for what he had done personally. The thing was finished. What would have been done in an opposite state of facts it is not possible to say, nor profitable to enquire.

We have not the room to spare, even if it would be useful to our readers, to print somewhere about a column and a half of small type, in regard to this matter, from the *New York Evangelist* of June 30th. It is headed "*The late General Assembly of the Extincting Presbyterian church, No. II.*" and is signed "*A New Englander.*" The author berates us roundly, scolds mightily at our church, talks very big about matters and things 'down east,' and is, we trust, sensibly relieved by getting so much bitter trash off his stomach.

The letter which follows will explain the out-door action on this case still further. It is copied from the *New England Puritan* (published at Boston) for June 30th.

Baltimore, June 17th, 1842.

To the Editors of the N. E. Puritan:—

Gentlemen. I will be a debtor to your Christian courtesy, if you will permit me to say a word through your columns, in reply to a very rude attack which seems to have been made upon me, by name, in your neighborhood. At least, I find an article in the (Philadelphia) *Christian Observer* of this date, copied, as it says, from the *Boston Recorder*, and by the Recorder, (as the *Observer* says,) from the *Hampshire Gazette*; making the attack in question. You perhaps know the character of the *Observer*, and therefore know how useless it would be for me to apply to it. The other two papers I know nothing of; but suppose I shall be more likely to get justice at the hands of a new party, than from those who with full means of knowing the truth, have printed injurious errors about me. I therefore apply to you.

Under the title "*High Church Tyranny*," the article in question says that Rev. Mr. White, the delegate from your General Association to our General Assembly, "by invitation of an old class-mate, went into the Committee room" (of the Committee *ad Interim* of the New School Assembly) "as a spectator, and while there was invited to take a seat with the Committee. For this atrocious offence, Dr. Breckinridge called him to account before the General Assembly, and moved for the appointment of a Committee to consider what should be done for this insult to the dignity of the General Assembly. The Doctor's wrath, however, did not meet a response in the majority of the Assembly, and all action upon the subject ended in words."

The facts of the case, are these:—Mr. Macklin, of Philadelphia, brought to the notice of the Assembly, a publication in a Philadelphia newspaper, stating that Mr. White, a delegate as before observed, to our Assembly, had taken his seat in the Committee *ad Interim*, as a delegate also to it; and said he thought the subject should be looked into. Mr. McCluskey, (if my memory is correct,) moved the appointment of a Committee to ascertain the facts of the case. Several members expressed their opinions; some saying the matter was of small moment, &c.; others that it should be inquired into. Amongst the rest, I, knowing nothing of the matter and never having heard of it till it was then publicly introduced, took occasion to say several things of a general character, which I have long thought it important to the preservation of harmony between our New England friends and ourselves, to have better understood; and it is, in part, to call attention to some of these matters, that I trouble you, gentlemen, with this communication.

1. It is a source of constant offence to many in our communion, and has tended very much to alienate the hearts of our people from the orthodox in New England, to find such constant evidences of their sympathy with New School, rather than Orthodox Presbyterianism.

2. It is a ground of special alienation, that the New England churches should really not be able to discover, which is the *Presbyterian church*, and should apparently take so much pains, to let us know, that they do not know who we are.

3. That they should, in all their public acts relating to us, studiously place our church on the same footing with one which differs from us so entirely, that we hold no fellowship with it.

Now, gentlemen, you must be aware that the Presbyterian church has no desire to break with our New-England brethren, who are really evangelical; but would much prefer drawing the bonds of fellowship with them still closer than they are. On the other hand, there can be no impropriety in saying, that having repudiated utterly, New School Presbyterianism, we can hardly be expected to desire fellowship with New School Congregationalism. What we are embarrassed by constantly is the difficulty of knowing who is who, and what is what—up north. And what would put the whole matter to rest, would be some decided action, one way or the other, by the churches of New England. If they are all New School, why should we or they, any longer keep up a hollow intercourse, which must be unprofitable to all parties? If any of them really have fellowship with our doc-

trines, why do such desire to wound us, and alienate us, by a line of conduct such as I have described? Or if they prefer to hold intercourse with both parties, is it not possible to fall on some way of doing it, that will not confound things so singularly unlike as orthodox Presbyterianism and Semi-Pelagianism?

I am sure I speak, in these things, the sentiments of very many,—I believe, of by far the larger part of our ministers and people. And these sentiments are not lately sprung up in our minds, but have been maturing for some years. The *apparent* connexion of the case of Mr. White, when it was brought up in the Assembly, with the aspect of the subject I have now presented, was the reason of the interest which the body evidently took in it. When Mr. White explained the real state of the facts, nothing more was said.\* Nor was there any intention in any quarter, to treat him otherwise than with consideration and respect.

For the rest, if persons think they can serve their cause, whatever that may be, by holding me up to public odium, I suppose they will continue to do it.

Respectfully yours,

ROBERT J. BRECKINRIDGE.

NOTE BY THE EDITORS OF THE PURITAN. Dr. Breckinridge, in the above letter, seems to convey the desire, that the New-England churches will repudiate the New School General Assembly, and give in their adhesion exclusively to the Old School General Assembly. Now, with all due respect it seems to us that this desire is wholly unreasonable. As Congregationalists, we are no judges of such matters. Consistently with our principles we can correspond with both bodies, if they can with us, while there are views entertained by both, which we do not approve. We do not know what the ecclesiastical bodies of New England will do, but we cannot entertain the idea that they will take any action which will constructively make them umpires in Presbyterian controversies.

The reader will perceive at a glance, how studiously the facts of the case, and our own conduct are misrepresented, by the enemies of truth and of our church. For example, Mr. Converse publishes in his paper for June 3, (and others do the same,) that Mr. White was *delegated* to the New School Committee *ad Interim*; and when members of the Assembly find fault, they are held up to public execration by the *New York Evangelist* and others. Presently, Mr. Converse publishes, (in his paper of June 17,) and others do the same, that Mr. White was *not delegated*, but only, as it were, by accident, sat with the Committee *ad Interim*; and then Mr. Converse publishes still more flagitious abuse of us, for questioning Mr. White's liberty *thus* to sit! And these editors think it strange that honest men distrust them!

But it grieves us to hear the respectable editors of the Puritan talk as they do, in their note appended to our letter. "*Umpires in Presbyterian controversies*," "*the ecclesiastical bodies of New England*," never, we presume, will desire to become, nor be asked,

\* There is an editorial in the *Hampshire Gazette* of July 12, which calls in question this statement. But the reader will at once perceive, on reading the extract from the *New York Observer*, printed on a previous page, that our statement is precisely correct. Mr. White made *two* explanations; the first touching his official position; the *second* regarding the personal aspect of his conduct. As to his *official* conduct, if any action had been taken, it must have been with the body sending him; as to his *personal* and unauthorised acts, the case might have been otherwise. Before and after his first or official explanation, there was debate and sensation in the Assembly; after his second and personal one, there was neither. And so was our assertion.

In the same article, the editor defends himself by saying he "*judged of the case from the report of it in the New York Observer*." But if the reader will compare that report (see preceding page,) with the case as originally given by the *Hampshire Gazette*, (see the above letter of the editor of this magazine,)—he will perceive the greatest discrepancy between the facts and the tone of the two statements. It is no unusual thing, however, for men to pervert the truth in order to accomplish their vile ends, and then pervert it over again to screen themselves.—[Ed.]

nor be fit. But have they no interest in the fundamental doctrines of Christ's gospel? Is there no essential difference, to them, between Pelagianism and Calvinism? Is there no party in New England that holds the glorious doctrines of the old Puritans? If there is such a party, how can they bear to stand neutral in a day and controversy like this? If there is no such party, in the name of the Lord say so, and let us have done with trickery and deceitful handling of God's truth. If indeed the evangelic doctrine is so reduced, that to uphold it, is become a brand of "*Presbyterian Controversy*," the world is far worse off, and our church far better, than we had supposed. We warn the orthodox of New England, that God will surely exact from them a strict account in this thing. Their carnal policy will bring them to ruin if they persist in it.

We find in the *New York evangelist* of July 7th, and in the *New England Puritan* of the same date, some account of the doings of the *General Association of Massachusetts*, in regard to our present subject. The extract, which follows is from the latter paper, and represents the affair as occurring on the evening of June 29.

Rev. Mr. Mitchell moved that no delegation be appointed this year to the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church. In support of this motion, Mr. Mitchell adverted to the "Plan of Union," originally proposed by Presbyterians, and cordially responded to by the Congregationalists of New England; but which, he said, has been most unfraternally cut asunder by the exciding acts of the General Assembly, and to the treatment received by the Rev. M. E. White, the delegate of this body to the General Assembly, during his recent visit to Philadelphia, as reasons for declining the continuance of the intercourse.

Rev. Mr. Sessions read an extract from a letter published in the *N. E. Puritan*, from Rev. Dr. Breckinridge, in regard to the relations of the General Assembly to the Churches in New England, and the desire of himself, and of many, as he alleges, of the ministers and churches connected with the General Assembly, that the ecclesiastical bodies in this part of the country will break off all connexion with the New School portion of the Presbyterian Church, on account of their alleged heresy.

Rev. Mr. Allen said that he was in favor of continuing the correspondence; that to decline to do so, would be just what Dr. Breckinridge desires, and would be giving too much importance to the opinions of that gentleman, that an interchange of delegates is what both bodies have agreed upon, is still desired by both. He had no idea that Dr. Breckinridge represents the views of the majority of the ministers and churches of the Old School General Assembly.

Rev. Dr. Codman offered an amendment to the motion of Rev. Mr. Mitchell, regretting the occurrence of the circumstances in the case of Rev. Mr. White, but proposing to continue the correspondence.

Rev. Mr. Bement commented upon the relations which have existed for the last few years between this Association and the General Assembly, and urged the impropriety of continuing an interchange with that body for the present, till the affair referred to is explained.

Rev. Mr. Lord was opposed both to the motion of Mr. Mitchell, and to the amendment proposed by Dr. Codman, and thought the indignity offered to this body ought to be overlooked.

The Moderator said that twenty-six years ago he represented this body in the General Assembly, and found there piety and talents and fraternal kindness, and that our interchange with the Assembly ought to be continued.

Rev. Dr. Alden said that he believed that the object of Dr. Breckinridge in writing the letter referred to, is to effect a dissolution of this intercourse between the two bodies, and that his object ought to be defeated.

Rev. Mr. Boardman then reviewed the history of the connexion between the two bodies, and said that the General Assembly *did right* in abrogating the Plan of Union, and that all the ecclesiastical bodies in the land, which understand the

subject, think so too. He respectfully submitted whether ecclesiastical bodies ought to be held responsible for the doings of individual members of those bodies. Louis XIV., of France, said, "I am the State;" but the sayings or doings of individuals cannot be understood as the sayings or doings of the ecclesiastical bodies to which they belong. Such bodies should be judged only by their *own* acts. He was highly gratified to find such evidences in New England, of interest in the Presbyterian Church, and such proof of the theological soundness of the great mass of the ministers and churches in this part of the country. If New England has, in some measure, swung away from her moorings in the great principles of Calvinism, it was with peculiar pleasure that he found, that she is returning to her ancient, venerable position. He hoped that the intercourse between the two bodies would be perpetuated.

The discussion was conducted in the spirit of the utmost Christian frankness and kindness, and was listened to with deeply interested attention, by a large congregation of spectators. The explanations which were made being satisfactory, Rev. Mr. Mitchell withdrew his motion.

It is quite useless for us to take up our time in replying to the frivolous and uncandid statements of some of these persons, implicating our conduct and motives, in this matter of Mr. White. We believe it is not usual for the opinions of a private person to be thus discussed by a grave Assembly, as an important element in deciding on its own duty; and certainly we had no idea of our consequence in New England. It is true, the New School party has long denounced us as a sort of dictator in the Presbyterian church; and even better men have been found who have used such arguments, when they could find none better, to oppose measures which we have felt it to be our duty to propose. Any serious reply to such statements would be at once insulting to our beloved brethren and friends, and convincing evidence of great folly and vanity on our part. Whatever influence God may have been pleased to give us in his church, was the result of a simple, honest, consistent adherence to the principles we professed; and has its chief value in our eyes, as it may be used to promote those principles. And we faithfully promise those worthy persons, whom that influence, such as it is, so much offends, that the whole of it will be always unhesitatingly and frankly periled, to maintain those great interests, which the most of them so cordially hate, and the rest so reluctantly and tardily embraced.

It was certainly extremely lucky that Mr. Boardman (Rev'd Henry A. Boardman of Philadelphia, delegate from our General Assembly,) succeeded in convincing the Association, that the poor pastor of the Second Presbyterian church in Baltimore, does not bear *precisely* the same relation to the Presbyterian church in this country, that Louis XIV. did to the French monarchy. And it is a manifest mercy to our naughty church, that upon "The explanations which were made being satisfactory, Rev'd Mr. Mitchell withdrew his motion." We therefore understand distinctly, that Rev'd Parsons Cook, and Rev'd Francis Norwood, will come next year, God willing, to the General Assembly in its united capacity, and not to us as an individual. This is a great revolution, and it is unprecedented that it should have been accomplished without arms or blood-shed.

We notice, not without interest, that the whole matter has so worked, that the Association was able at last, to distinguish between

our Assembly and the schismatical body which has for four years usurped its name and been countenanced in that audacious fraud by the churches of New England. The gentlemen sent to our body are delegated to "*The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church.*" The other body is called "*The Constitutional General Assembly.*"

We are glad to see that Mr. Boardman boldly vindicated the conduct and action of the Assemblies of 1837 and '8. Perhaps that was the explanation, that was so fully and suddenly satisfactory to Mr. Mitchell? We fear he (Mr. B.) was premature in congratulating New England upon her return to the "ancient, venerable position" on "the great principles of Calvinism." At least, in the following observations, which are editorial in the Presbyterian of July 9th, Dr. Engles gives a different, and we fear, a truer account of the matter.

**THE CHURCH IN CONNECTICUT.**—In the report of proceedings of the General Association of Connecticut at its recent meeting, which we find in the New York Observer, a deplorable evidence of the low state of doctrinal religion in the Congregational Church of Connecticut is afforded. The Association at its previous meeting directed the re-publication of the *Saybrook Platform*, which our readers must remember comprises a system of sound truth, and is the beautiful index of what the churches in Connecticut once were, but are no longer! Dr. Hawes presented the report of the committee on the subject, in which the publication of the Platform was objected to, as a Confession of Faith of the churches, because it teaches "moral inability and limited atonement," and "where," said he, "is the minister who believes them?" Mr. Bacon of New Haven, proposed that an advertisement should be appended in which there should be a distinct disavowal of the Platform as a rule of faith for Congregational ministers and churches. This caused a most extraordinary debate in which with a few honorable exceptions, the speakers disclaimed being tainted with the orthodoxy of that noble confession; some asserted that no-body believed it; that no-body read it, and that no-body cared about it. One Mr. Bushnell put it to the consciences of the members present whether they believed in it as a rule of faith, and affirmed that it was in the face of and contrary to the Bible; and then to give force to his remarks, added that he knew very little about it himself! A very Solomon. Mr. Bacon, another of the wise men of the East, said, "he did not believe there was a man in the body who was willing to adopt the Platform as his belief; and that if there was, he would like to see him!" as a kind of monster no doubt, which would be a very curious spectacle to the scientific theologians of Connecticut. One after another seemed afraid and ashamed at the very possibility that the Association should give any countenance to the antiquated relic; and Professor Thompson by an admirable side blow directed at these glories in a false theology, remarked "that they had better deliver it over to the antiquarian or historical society." Mr. Bingham of the Sandwich Island Mission suggested that the Platform might with advantage be sent to the members of the mission, who were at this time considering the subject of a confession; but Mr. Bacon, with a kind of spasmodic horror deprecated the suggestion, and said that if they wanted to introduce controversy into the mission, they should send their creeds and confessions—he ought to have added the Bible, for it is notorious that Mr. B. understands the Bible very differently from many of his brethren in Connecticut. The debate has given us a sad insight into the depreciated theology of Connecticut, and the loose and disjointed state of their church government, and we are disposed to adopt, with the change of a word, the language of the Boston Recorder, in expressing our joy, "that our lot has been cast among the pleasant things of Presbyterianism."

Now we take it to be true that the great majority of the Presbyterian church desire to have Christian fellowship and intercourse with every orthodox and evangelical body of Christians, and amongst

the rest, with Congregationalists of that kind ; but that they do not desire to have any Christian intercourse with any other sort, and therefore not with Congregationalists who agree in doctrine with the New School Presbyterians; and especially not with such as not only agree with them in doctrine, but sympathise with them and aid them in their plans and operations against our church, both directly by furnishing them with men and money to divide our congregations and occupy our territory, and indirectly by giving them character and standing in the country at our expense and at the expense of God's truth. In the end, this is the shape this business must take. Sound policy, fidelity and consistency all require it. Its management may be difficult and painful; but it must come to this, unless we intend to return to the condition from which we were delivered in 1737 and '8. The present matter may cause things to tend in that direction; in which case we shall not regret having been made, for the thousandth time, an object of public obloquy for vindicating the interests and honor of the church of our fathers and our Redeemer.

---

SECOND CENTENNIAL PERIOD OF THE WESTMINSTER ASSEMBLY.

THE readers of this periodical may have observed that towards the close of the discourse pronounced at the opening of the last General Assembly of the Presbyterian church, (published in a former number of this periodical,) we took occasion to direct the attention of that venerable body to the approaching bi-centennial anniversary of the illustrious Synod whose name stands at the head of this article, and to urge its celebration in some form appropriate to an occasion so imposing.

The following minute is extracted from the 17th page of the "*Minutes of the General Assembly, &c.*" for 1842.

"Dr. Breckinridge offered the following minute, which was adopted, viz.:

"This General Assembly looking forward to the approaching second centennial period of the Westminster Assembly, as an era full of interest to the churches under its care, and to all other churches which adopt the standards of faith, church order, and discipline, prepared by that venerable body; and believing that the occasion can be so used, as by the Divine blessing, greatly to promote the interests of truth: it is

"*Resolved*, That a Standing Committee of ten members of this body shall be appointed, whose duty it shall be to mature a plan for a suitable commemoration of the aforesaid anniversary, on the first day of July, 1843; to take such measures by correspondence with other denominations, whether at home or abroad, which adopt these standards, as may, as far as possible secure their co-operation in such a commemoration; to invite the co-operation of all other denominations which are evangelical in doctrine and presbyterian in order; and to report their proceedings herein to the next General Assembly."

On a subsequent day of the sessions, (page 24, Minutes,) the Moderator appointed the following Standing Committee on the Commemoration of the Westminster Assembly, viz.:—Messrs. Robert J. Breckinridge, of Md., John M. Krebs, of N. Y., Charles Hodge, of N. J., Drury Lacy, of N. C., William W. Philips, of N. Y., Alexander Macklin, of Pa., George Howe, of S. C., Robert Stuart, of Ky., Benjamin M. Smith, of Va., and William Chester, of N. J.

We have the impression that several of the Congregational Associations of New England have taken some favorable notice of the same great event; and we have observed, in two or three religious newspapers, articles directing public attention to the subject.

The effect produced in Scotland by the action of our Assembly in relation to this matter, as well as by a most important series of resolutions offered by Dr. Krebs, and transmitted to that country by order of the Assembly along with the one now more immediately under consideration, seems to have been most decided and most salutary. The *Presbyterian* newspaper of Aug. 6 and 13, contains extracts from Scottish papers, which we doubt not our readers have generally read with intense interest, in regard to both subjects.

The time of the members of the Standing Committee mentioned above, was so much engrossed by the important business of one of the most laborious and useful Assemblies that ever met in this country, (an Assembly worthy of the church that delegated it, and well entitled to its gratitude, whatever a few disappointed and evil minded persons may say or print to the contrary;) that they had no meeting on the important subject referred to them. Occupying the very responsible position we do towards that committee and towards the subject referred to it, we have naturally been led to ponder the subject with great interest; the more so, as public reference to us has been several times made in a manner which seems to indicate that more is expected of us than we had any idea of attempting.

It is therefore with great pleasure that we have received the following letter; which we print without the knowledge of its excellent author, (and therefore without his name,) in order to bring his views to the knowledge of the other members of the committee. It will be a singular favor to us, and an important service to the general cause, if each member of the committee will favor us with his views in the form of a minute, or statement; and doubly so, if we are permitted to print them with the names attached. In this, however, we shall not go beyond the wishes of the brethren, when they are made known to us.

The whole subject is one of very great interest, and some difficulty, and ought to be kept before the mind of the church and of society. It has occurred to us, that a general movement in regard to it, might be easily secured at the approaching meetings of our Synods; and that in this way the public sentiment of the church might be developed in a way extremely useful as it regards final and efficient action when the bi-centennial period itself arrives.

That something ought to be done seems generally admitted. The difficult questions are, what shall it be? And how shall it be

accomplished? God gives to some men, what old Cotton Matthew used to call a *leading spirit*. Here is an occasion for such men to show themselves.

The letter we have spoken of follows.

JULY 27th, 1842.

*Rev. and dear Sir:*—Since my return home—which, however, was very much delayed by reason of sickness in my family on the road—I have considered with deep interest the important subject committed to my attention in common with that of yourself and eight others by the late Assembly. I mean, of course the 2d centenary of the Westminster Assembly.

My mind has been exercised on three items of interest, connected with the general topic, on which I proceed to present you the result of my reflections.

I. In what manner can the committee now act, dispersed as the members are?

I presume there is scarcely a member of that committee, who would hesitate to commit the management of the affair to our chairman, in connexion with such others of the body, as he may find it convenient to consult, either by reason of proximity or from opportunities of personal conference afforded by other engagements.

Meanwhile, might you not invite an expression of their opinions, either by private circular or by your Magazine? Fix some period to which you limit the answer to your invitation. Then digest the views presented and publish some general outline of the result as the projet of the report. To this the committee could communicate their assent or objections in time for a presentation to the next Assembly. The publication, meanwhile, would afford to the members of the next Assembly an opportunity for such an examination of the subject, as its importance demands.

II. The one great object of this centenary celebration must, of course, be marked out by the nature of the subject. It must then be the instruction of the people in the History of opinions, productive of that Assembly, developed by its discussions, and resulting from its action. Discourses of this nature would at once throw light on those peculiarities of doctrine and government which distinguish the churches of Calvinistic faith and Presbyterian order. An incidental, but by no means unimportant item would be the illustration of the position of such churches in view of the great error of papacy and the fundamental truths of the reformation—presenting in prominent view, two truths; 1, that modern errors in doctrine, as Pelagianism, (semi and total,) Arminianism, pure or Wesleyan; prelacy, Oxonian or Lambethian; so far from being, as charged by infidels, natural or papal, the fruits of the reformation, are of a truth the fragments of scholastic theology and the papal hierarchy—inherited by us, not in their entire state, but divided among various classes of errorists. Their re-union would result in a people such as Luther found the Catholic church—merely abstracting the pope:—2, and consequently that so far from being a sect of the reformation in common with

Prelatical Pelagian and Armenian Protestants—Calvinistic Presbyterian churches, (including Lutheran, so far as identified in doctrine and order,) constitute the one great reformed church—primitive, apostolic, and *jure divino*, in any sense of the phrase which does not imply (what no man can believe, and receive the scriptures,) that God has expressly revealed every jot and tittle of our form of government—yet *jure divino*, so far as a warrant for our principles of government is found in sacred scripture, and our doctrines are the *ipsissima* of inspiration. To these ideas by way of appendix, I add—the importance and duty of speedily consummating some visible union of all such churches—not under one great visible bond as an assembly of defined powers; for diversities of national government, language, and location forbid it, but by drawing closer our present system of correspondence, and placing each other on a substantially peculiar platform in the matter of ministerial communion from that which we occupy with respect to Baptists, Congregationalists, Methodists, and Episcopalians.

I have barely room for my third idea.

III. The object to which pecuniary *free-will offerings* should be appropriated, should be the establishment of a capital for our Foreign Missionary Board, to publish the Catechisms and Confessions for our missionary stations. No better tracts could be sent to the heathen. No better commentary. If more money than suffices be raised, expend it on objects similar, such as brief summaries of Christian doctrine, &c., for the heathen, or Catholic, or Mahomedan objects of missionary enterprises. I am forced to omit enlarging on this. If this letter and its plans please you, and you issue your circular—you may hear from me more fully on each of the topics, (2d and 3d) meanwhile.—Farewell.

---

SOME ACCOUNT OF THE LATE REV. JOHN H. REDINGTON, WITH PARTS OF HIS CORRESPONDENCE AND ILLUSTRATIVE NOTES THEREON.

*Article Fourth.—Letter written in 1839.*

Moscow, Livingston Co., N. Y., Aug't 12th, 1839.

*My dear brother:*—It is a long time since a letter has passed between us, but I trust we have not forgotten each other. Your Magazine indeed keeps yourself and work before my mind, besides which I see occasional notices of you in the papers, showing that you are not idle in the Master's service. And be assured, dear brother, my heart is with you in every good work. I some times wonder how you are sustained under the weight of your trials and labours, but this wonder ceases when I consider the sufficiency of the grace of Christ, in whom I am persuaded you believe and trust. God has been pleased to bring you forward and place you as it were in a breach, in the troublesome times in which we live, so that your position is one of peculiar trial and responsibility. I allude to the part you have been called to act in the great reform in our church, and also to the stand you take in regard to the

slavery question.\* I have been made to rejoice and to thank the Lord at the degree of confidence you have at times expressed in him, and for the good confession which you have made before many witnesses. The Lord Jesus never will leave those who stand up for him and his truth, but will in due time show himself strong on their behalf. Let us not then be ashamed of him nor of his word in the midst of an adulterous and sinful generation, but always keep in view the glory of his second coming. This will fortify our minds to endure any present hardship or affliction. I have frequently thought of writing to you since I received your last, (of date, 2d Oct., 1833,) but have deferred it hitherto. In this, perhaps I have erred; not that I have the vanity to suppose that a letter from me, *as such*, would be either very interesting or profitable to you, but I should have remembered that you have the true interests of the whole Presbyterian church much at heart, and would receive with gladness any information concerning it from any quarter, especially from the region in which my lot is cast.

And here let me notice what you say in regard to my supposed want of interest, (as expressed in your last) concerning handing down to our posterity a true history of the great controversy in our church.

You may rest assured, dear brother, if I have not furnished you with that part of the history which pertains to Western N. Y., it has not been through a want of interest or inclination. There are other very substantial reasons why I have not done this, as hinted in former letters. I have made frequent inquiries and applications to others, to furnish you with the numbers you desired, but without success. I hope some one may yet be found to do it.†

\* *Slavery question.* The reader who has taken any interest in the controversies of the last ten years, knows that three parties have divided the public mind in regard to this important question. The *first*, in point of violence and perhaps folly too, were the abolitionists, who arose about 1832, and are now, as a party, nearly extinct. They contended for the immediate and universal extinction of slavery, for the instant rejection of all distinctions founded on color or cast, and vehemently opposed all schemes of colonization. The *second* party, hardly less unreasonable or violent, contended for the justice and propriety of slavery in itself, yea for its full accordance with the spirit of our political institutions, and that of our divine religion, and desired to make it perpetual. The *third*, held slavery to be in itself a great evil, morally, politically, and physically, and earnestly desired and laboured for its termination, as soon as that could be done consistently with the true and great interests of all the parties to it; that is, of the slaves, the masters, and the country itself. But they did not believe it to be the only or even the greatest of all possible evils, and shaped their conduct and opinions accordingly. To this party, it is well known, the editor of this journal has always adhered; and has on that account, been much traduced by members of both the others; Mr. Wickliffe and Mr. Garrison, the greatest bigots of their respective factions, rivalling each other in their coarse and malignant calumnies, and their respective satellites who revolved in inferior orbits around these glorious luminaries, reflecting in their degree, their baleful influence. We can scarcely imagine a higher proof of the justice of our sentiments, than the hatred of such wretches; unless it be the love of such men as Redington.—[Ed.]

† This matter has been fully explained in previous notes, to which the reader's attention is directed. A clear and faithful narrative on this subject is a desideratum, which the orthodox cannot, in fidelity to themselves or to the truth, fail to secure. These letters and these notes, are a portion of our contribution to that general object.—[Ed.]

I did not avail myself of your kind encouragement to visit Baltimore last fall, to seek pecuniary assistance in the erection of a small house of worship for us in Moscow. I visited New York and Philadelphia, and through the goodness of God, met with such encouragement, that I went no further. Our house went up spiritedly, in the midst of much opposition, and was dedicated to the service of God on the 21st of July last. Our prospects, we thank the Lord, are as good as we anticipated, and as could reasonably be expected.

We have to encounter the combined opposing influence, not of New School Presbyterians only, but of almost all other denominations, who on some account or other, are displeased with our strict way, and exhibit their enmity against our standards.\* But this is nothing strange. A multitude of enemies combined against Israel of old, (see Ps. 83,) and it is even so in our day. But the more they oppose and speak against the truth, the more (I thank God) I am confirmed in it, and the more precious it is in my estimation. Do you not find it so? Are you not a better Presbyterian? More thoroughly orthodox? And by the grace of God more determined to endure hardness as a good soldier of Jesus Christ, than when you first buckled on your armor in defence of our church? Does not the subject of the great reform in our church, open more and more to you in the length and breadth of its consequences, till you cry out, in grateful wonder, "what hath God wrought!" "This is the Lord's doing, and it is marvellous in our eyes!"

I profess, dear brother, that my heart's desire and prayer to God continually, are that he may with a mighty hand and an out-stretched arm, carry on and complete to the glory of his name, the great work which he has so well begun. O, let us not be deluded with the idea that the work is *finished!* It is only well begun, and it remains for us, under God, to follow it up, till our church is fully brought back to our standards in form and spirit.† No one in

\* This fact, so peculiar and so characteristic, will perhaps be more difficult of belief by our children, than any other connected with our late troubles and deliverance. It will be indeed hard of belief that in a controversy for the fundamental principles of all true religion in the soul, every denomination of professing Christians in America, stood aloof from us; and with a single exception, every one seemed to manifest a decided sympathy for the New School party. The Methodist Episcopal church, it is due to them and to truth to say, seems to have openly and utterly repudiated the new theology, and to have taken a firm stand against those who hold it; but all the rest, even the various bodies of Presbyterians, were silent or against us. The Presbyterian Synod of the Canadas, the Synod of Ulster in Ireland, and the General Assembly of the Kirk of Scotland, pursued a course worthy of them and of the great occasion.—[Ed.]

† This work is far more extensive and difficult than even the zealous man who thus spoke three years ago, then supposed; and is much farther from being yet accomplished than many seem to imagine. It is a terrible work to extirpate the roots of a cancer; which, however, if it be not done thoroughly, leaves the patient exposed to perpetual and dangerous relapses. It is, blessed be God, true, that New Schoolism is in a great degree (not thoroughly, as is painfully and continually manifest,) eradicated from our church. But is Presbyterianism in its fulness and its simplicity restored? How many questions remain open, which, if we take the Bible and our Confession in our hands, seem to admit of no doubt? How many influences and how great, are stubbornly upholding things that grieve many of our soundest ministers and members? How many indispensable reforms are obstinately resisted? How many new and evil schemes are taking root amongst us? Much, very much has been done; but much remains to be done, which if it be omitted or done amiss, may expose us anew to dreadful trials.—[Ed.]

yet fully aware of our vast departures from the Lord in many respects. None but his own almighty arm can fully bring us back, shall I say from our wanderings? Alas! multitudes of our people never were what the name Presbyterian properly implies, and so cannot so truly be called *wanderers*: for he that never was in the right way, cannot be said to *wander* from it. We must hold fast whereunto we have attained, dear brother, in the work of reformation, and urge it on by all proper means; especially in *practical* respects. In *doctrines* much has been done, but our *practice* lags far behind. I have recently closed a course of lectures on *infant church membership*, and I cannot express how important the subject at times, appears in my view—especially, when I consider the amazing neglect in regard to this matter which so extensively prevails in our church. I must say, I am not acquainted with a single church, which in any good degree, lives up to its obligations in regard to the seed of the covenant. O, that this thing might receive due attention!

I fear great loss will ensue to the cause of true Presbyterianism in this region, because some missionaries of a right stamp were not sent here soon after the disowning act of 1837.\* The feeble few on the ground could not do much, and the consequence has been that the New School and others, have had the ground to themselves for two years—and they have not been idle to do what they could against true Presbyterianism. A *third party*, headed by Rev. Norris Bull, (of whom better things might have been expected,) has been in a train of formation for a long time, in this quarter, and is now coming to more maturity. They profess *independency*, for the present at least, and will be composed of those who are not prepared to go either with the Old or New School Presbyterians. This course is likely to be *popular*, and will, for a time at least, hinder the true cause among us. I am utterly opposed to this third course, and if any of them think in this way to get into our church again, through a sort of *back door*, I say in reference to it, as you said in another case, “*I will contend against it to my latest breath.*” Nay, nay, let us admit no more wooden horses into our city. We have too many milk and water Presbyterians already among us for our good.†—I beg your prayers, that

\* This matter also has been explained in previous notes, as fully as it is necessary, under present circumstances to go into it. One of the most serious misfortunes which can befall any sound organization, is for its regular functions to be transferred to temporary and uncongenial agencies. Even when these agents are competent, and act in the general spirit of the body politic, the debility of that body and the monstrous development of its parts necessarily follow. But when, from any cause, the substituted function is not only unlike, but is opposite to the regular and natural one; the case of the poor patient is bad enough. Nor the less so, that his spasmodic efforts are considered the natural evidences of health, and the friends who mourn over his case and would relieve him, are denounced as quacks. The Presbyterian church has a very vigorous constitution, it is true; but diseases, when they become chronic, eat very deeply.—[Ed.]

† The *third party* in Western New York, we believe, finally took the very modest ground that they were the remaining faithful of the ancient Presbyterian church, and that the best hope of settling all difficulties was for both New School and Old, to repent, reform, re-unite, and cleave unto them; they being about forty ministers, more or less. We have not yet heard that the offer has been so eagerly or extensively embraced, as might have been expected. But it is hardly to be questioned that a proposition so reasonable, so consistent, so timely, so becoming

I may be faithful—and may the Lord Jesus Christ be with you and yours.

Affectionately yours in Christ.

Rev. R. J. Breckinridge, D. D., }  
Baltimore. }

JOHN H. REDINGTON.

P. S. Cannot *one* missionary or more, now be sent to Western N. Y.? If even *one* sound, active, prudent man, of ready utterance, a bold, lively preacher—zealous for good old Presbyterianism, could be sent among us, he might, with God's blessing, do much good. Do not wonder, dear brother, that more is not done in this region for the truth. There is scarcely any body to stand up for it, and the true Israel are scattered. Cannot something be done for us?

[For the Spirit of the XIX. Century.]

CRITICAL OBSERVATIONS ON ACTS III. 12.

Why look ye so intently on us as; though by our own power or holiness (*ως ιδια δυναμις η ιωσιβια*), we had made this man to walk.

Instead of (*ιωσιβια pietas*) holiness; the vulgate and Syriac have (*postestate vel εξουσια*—quasi nostra virtute aut potestate) ability or authority, which reading Wakefield prefers. Mill (Proleg. Nov. Test. 438,) conjectures that *εξουσια* was put in the margin of some ancient manuscript, as exegitical of *δυναμις*, and from the margin passed into the text—(*εξουσια* exegiticum του δυναμις, ex ora libri transiit in contextum.) The received text, however, gives an excellent sense, and doubtless is the true reading. Holiness or piety (*ιωσιβια*) is by the constitution or appointment of God, a power. He has imparted to it an energy of a moral nature, as any man may see, even in the imperfect exhibitions which are made of it in this world, in the lives of pious men. But if Christians were made perfect in holiness in this life, the power of their holiness would no doubt be wonderfully increased. Our Lord Jesus Christ was perfectly holy, and the impression which he made upon the wicked and profane, was wonderful indeed. It is scarcely necessary to refer to examples; but the reader may be reminded of two passages in the gospel history illustrative of the power of his holiness. The first is John ii. 14; 16, and the other in John vii. 45, 46. It must be remembered, however, that Christ came to suffer. It was predicted of him that he should be despised, spit upon, and mocked. It was needful, therefore, that he should temper and restrain the power of his holiness, so that it should not completely overawe and restrain the sinful propensities of those to whom he went. Evil spirits, however, felt the power of his holiness more fully than the wicked Jews. "Ah! what to us and thee? Jesus, Nazarene; art thou come to destroy us, I know thee, who thou art, the holy one of God? But Jesus rebuked him. Be silent and

in all respects, and holding out such inducements to all parties, can possibly be resisted long. It is said the most precious of all jewels is some times found in the head of a toad; and if so, the analogy is very close, to the finding of the true Presbyterian church, in the heart of the "three Synods."—[Ed.]

come out of him"—Mark i. 24, 55; Luke iv. 34, 35. Leigh remarks on the word here translated *rebuked*, that "it signifies to reprehend, chide, charge, yea, charge strictly, &c., which majestical threatening intendeth three things, viz., authority to command, power to punish if he be not obeyed, and an acknowledgment of that power." Another example, perhaps, of the power of his holiness, is recorded in John xviii. 6, when the whole hostile band who went out to apprehend him fell prostrate as he said "I am he." But the idea which the reader is desired to consider, is this—that God by a natural constitution, or by an appointment in the nature of a law, has imparted to *holiness* a power to control that which is sinful, and this law, though modified, interrupted, and but partially felt in this world, during this economy, will hereafter be as obvious and as uniform, and as controlling in its operation as any law of the physical universe,—that is to say, a holy being of any order, whether man or angel, will be mightier in strength, than a sinful being of any order, whether man or devil—and this result will come through the power or energy of holiness. The saying of Lord Bacon is often repeated, "knowledge is power," but this is true in a figurative sense only: holiness, however, is power in the *literal* sense; for it is an attribute or quality which by the appointment of God is designed in the future economy or state, uniformly and with unerring certainty to overcome evil of every form, by its inherent energy. As fire has the energy to remove or destroy every combustible barrier in its course, so holiness will have the power to overcome and remove the powers of evil in its way. The holiness of God, it is true, will consume out of his kingdom every thing that is evil and offensive, Matt. xiii. 41–43; Rev. xxi. 27, and in this way the saints being made perfect in holiness, may not be offended with the presence of any impure or wicked being. Yet as Peter teaches, the saints will be made partakers of the Divine nature, and thereby possess in their proper measure, a power which would make them superior in energy and might to all sinful beings. In confirmation of this opinion, it may be said that something of this kind was promised to Israel, if they would render to God the obedience he required—"Oh that they were wise," &c. "How should one chase a thousand, and two put ten thousand to flight, except their Rock had sold them," &c.; Deut. xxxii. 29, 30.

And why should not holiness possess an intrinsic energy? All power is of God. He gives it to whom he will, and to what should we expect he would impart or annex it if not to holiness? "My name is holy," saith the Lord. "Holy, holy, holy, is the Lord God of Hosts—the whole earth is full of his glory"—Isaiah vi. 3. "Who shall not *fear* thee O, Lord, and glorify thy name? for thou art holy." This attribute is of supreme excellence, and can there be a doubt that (irrespective of the power of God considered as a distinct attribute,) it would repel and destroy from the universe every thing opposed to it or unholy? Or if this supposition be inadmissible, we may say that the power and holiness of God are inseparable, so that his power will destroy that which his holiness disapproves. And if men should be made partakers of his holiness, is it too much to believe that in the proper measure of its finite possessor, the holiness of each saint will partake of the like nature, or have connected with it a predominating power over the might-

iest of sinful creatures? Satan and the fallen angels have no energy except as creatures dependent on God. The attributes which they possess were conferred upon them before they fell; and although God, for mysterious purposes, has allowed them to retain in a great measure, their original powers, notwithstanding their perversion, yet if it be his gracious purpose to make the redeemed from among men, partakers of this holiness, is it too much to believe that he will give them energies superior to these apostate spirits? In fact the Lord Jesus Christ conferred upon his disciples for a time, power to overcome all the power of the enemy.

In the passage under consideration, (Acts iii. 12,) Peter connects the cure of the lame man with power or holiness, though he denies that the power or holiness by which it was effected, was their own. He ascribes it to Jesus, *the holy one* and the just, (*ὁ ἅγιος*, Acts iii. 14,) whom they had crucified.

There is another idea which should be mentioned in this connection. God has in this world connected misery, weakness, sickness, frailty, death, with sin. All our infirmities are connected with that as a cause. The restoration of man to perfection in holiness is also connected with his deliverance from this bondage of his corruption. Now think, what *one body* exempt from mortality, pain, corruptibility, and destructibility, might accomplish. It might subdue the whole race of mortal man, if allowed to do so—and when we think of the wonderful endowments with which God will clothe his glorified church by making each risen saint like the glorious Redeemer, it does appear not merely probable but quite certain, that the holiness of the saints will be as really and truly a power, as the vital principle is, in the present state of the human body. Then will the saints exhibit in literal and exact accomplishment, those wonderful works which our Lord promised his disciples the power to accomplish, when their faith should be made perfect, Matt. xxi. 21, 22; Mark xi. 22, 24.

The reader may observe, too, a marked difference between the Apostle Peter, and those ecclesiastics, who claim exclusively to be his successors. While the popes claim the title, "Holy Father"—the name by which our Lord Jesus Christ addressed God the Father, John xvii. 11—while they claim and receive in succession, the title, "His Holiness," as though they were fathers of the faithful, and holy—yea holiness itself; Peter, anxious to be considered as nothing in himself, and to give all glory to his blessed Lord, who indeed was the holy one, begins his discourse by guarding the people against the possibility of a mistake on this head—"Men and brethren, why look ye intently on us as upon persons who had made this man to walk by their own power or holiness?" The diplomatic use, which the nations of Europe make of the terms, *holy, holiness*, in their intercourse with the popes, calling the see of the bishop of Rome "the Holy See," and the bishop, "His Holiness," serves to identify them with those kingdoms which Daniel foresaw would arise with Antichrist out of the fourth empire. It is anti-Christian profanation, both in those who give and in those who receive such honors. And when it is considered that most of the popes during the last twelve centuries have been am-

bitious and worldly men, without personal holiness, and not a few of them desperately wicked men, we can hardly fail to perceive the conformity of such an assumption with the conduct which the Apostle Paul predicted of the man of sin, that he would sit in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God.

### NOTICES, ACCOUNTS, ANSWERS TO LETTERS, &c.

**Payments.** Levi Dickson, Esq., of Phila., \$5, for 1842 and '3.—P. M., Oak Grove, S. C., \$5, of which \$2,50 for Rev. J. H. Sayre, of Jonesville, for 1842, and the remainder for Rev. H. A. Monroe, of Union, for '41, (apparently).—Mr. J. T. Paine, Concord, N. C., \$5, which pays to April (inclusive,) '42; Nos. 9, 10, and 12, of Vol. vi. (for 1840,) sent to him.—P. M., Columbia, S. C., for the Society of Inquiry, &c., in the Theological Seminary, \$3, in full to the end of this year; and the Nos. for Aug. '40, and Feb. '41, sent to it.—Dr. McClung, of Rockbridge Co., Va., \$5 for '41 and '2.—Mr. A. G. McIlvain, of Petersburg, Va., \$5 for self and H. A. Garland, Esq., for '42; the name of the latter substituted for that of the late Mr. John Dunn.

**New Subscribers.** Isaac Baldwin, Esq., city of New York, from June.—Rev. Dr. Samuel B. Wylie, Phila., back Nos. sent by private hand to care of Mr. Wm. B. Martien, corner of Seventh and George streets Phila.: [ ] to whom also a set of the back Nos. sent for Mr. Hugh Stinson. [ ]—Wm. A. P.—(cannot make out the name, No. 100, Walnut street, Phila., from July, and \$3 paid.

**Changes, &c.** The P. M. of St. Louis, Md., informs us that the copy sent to St. Onovis, for Mr. Robert A. Cummins, is "not called for;" we change the direction from St. Charles to St. Louis, supposing there may be some mistake, as Mr. C. has been a subscriber since April, 1840, making our bill \$6,87; to the end of 1842.—Rev. W. J. Gibson's direction changed to Williamsburg, Huntingdon Co., Pa.

**Discontinuances, &c.** Mr. Samuel Doyle, Plymouth, Illinois, discontinued by order of P. M., owes us \$7.—Mr. J. B. Walton, New Orleans, discontinued by order of P. M., owes us \$5.—J. B. Drouillard of New Orleans, refused, by P. M.; due us, \$5.

**Answers, Corrections, &c.** The Nos. for June, July, and August, sent to Rev. Mr. Smyth of Charleston; the apparent cause of the irregularity in the transmission of these Nos. is discovered and remedied as we hope.—In reply to the letter of Mr. John A. Merritt, of New Orleans, dated August 8th, we have to say that he is charged with subscription for 1840 and '41, to our former work, and for the current year for this, viz., 3 years, at \$2,50—\$7,50, and credited with \$2,50, paid in April, 1840; balance due us to the end of this year, \$5,00.—The No. of our periodical sent to Rev. J. J. Henderson, Galveston, Texas, care of Walton and Kemp, New Orleans, returned from N. O. "for inland postage."—To our esteemed friend in Ohio, who promised our readers an original series of Nos. on the *Latter Day Glory*, we say in reply to his letter on the subject, that having committed himself and us, all he has to do, is to go to work; redeem the time, and, as a general rule, we may do twice or three times as much as we think we can.

[ ] Such of our old subscribers as are in arrears for two or more years (including 1842,) will oblige us, by remitting their respective dues, by mail, at our risk; post masters will frank their letters.

[ ] It will be a favorable opportunity to send the names of two or three new subscribers, with the arrears of subscription.

[ ] A periodical that employs neither paid agents, nor regular collectors, and which is too poor to pay for newspaper puffs, and too proud to beg for them, must rely on the punctuality of its subscribers for support, and the active influence of its friends for extension.

# SPIRIT OF THE XIX. CENTURY.

VOL. I.

OCTOBER, 1842.

No. 10.

HINTS ON SLAVERY.—FOUNDED ON THE STATE OF THE CONSTITUTION, LAWS, AND POLITICS OF KENTUCKY, THIRTEEN YEARS AGO.

[H] This article was printed first in the *Kentucky Reporter*, at Lexington, Ky., in weekly Nos., in the months of April, May, and June, 1830. Though the interest which may have once attached to them, was purely local, and the influence they may have exerted in forming public sentiment long ago, must have been confined to the comparatively narrow circulation of the several inland newspapers which printed them; yet the transcendent importance of the subject they discuss, and the constant and increasing agitation of the public mind throughout this country, and indeed throughout the whole world in regard to it, might possibly excite and even more excite—if such a one there be—than the editor of this periodical, in regard to the fate of his literary labors, for recalling from the silence of the past, productions which the hatred, and malice, and folly of relentless public persecution and private revenge would not allow to expire. It is hoped and believed that men of candid and moderate views—(and what other views were ever either just in themselves or capable of being permanently established?)—will find here little to condemn, if they find nothing worthy of being brought, a second time, before the public.

It is somewhat in the nature of a personal duty to his own character, that the editor of this Magazine re-publishes this portion of his labors, when acting on a theatre very different from that on which he has been for many years engaged. Legal and political studies have long ceased to engage his particular attention, and have lost some of their special interest in his eyes. They are noble and useful studies; but there are others still more so. These publications, however, occupy so important a place in the infamous accusations of that most atrocious of all slanderers—*Robert Wickliffe, Sen.*—that it has been judged proper and becoming to precede any reply to his *third* published attack, by a re-print of that about which he has printed so much malignant falsehood. It may be that God would thus oblige us to vindicate again opinions, which if they are founded in clear reason, and sustained by public necessity, must have a decided interest in the eyes of good and wise men; and, seeing the constitutional and legal questions are nearly the same in all the slave states as in Ky., they present the case of slavery in a light which, though it is much overlooked, is yet extremely important, if not decisive.

The Nos. are now re-printed exactly as they were originally published, preserving even the signature, and the lateral enumeration; minute facts, it is true, but yet important enough to be the basis of several falsehoods by Mr. Wickliffe. Years of subsequent observation and study would have induced us to modify some expressions, perhaps to qualify some opinions. But we have preferred the other course; and here, without shame, perhaps it may be allowed to us to say, with some emotions of honest satisfaction, presents the naked, original, and undisguised, leveller, *sans culotte*, pettifogger, demagogue, and traitor, which our wise, learned, polite, honest, and truthful accuser, *Robert Wickliffe, Sen.*, represents us to have been, in our first estate—to the scrutiny of all who choose to gaze upon him.

One thing is at least remarkable; amid all the abuse heaped upon these Nos. by Mr. Wickliffe and his handful of followers, during thirteen years nearly, not even a pretence has been made of answering the argument they contain, and the moral

they assert. It is comparatively an easy thing to make truth ignominious; it is another work entirely, to make it false. It is very easy to pollute a file; it is very hard to eat it. (—)

NO. I.—WHAT are the advantages of domestic slavery? Such an inquiry naturally suggests itself when we consider that in the circular address of our Senator in the General Assembly from this county, one part of four is taken up in exhibiting the evils which must necessarily result from permitting those who own no slaves to express an authoritative opinion on that subject.

If I understand the argument of Mr. Wickliffe, it is in substance this. After expressing his decided hostility to every effort for calling a convention to amend the constitution of this state, he proceeds to give the reasons of those who favor that measure; which he reduces to three—first, that all officers, judicial and ministerial, shall be elective by the people; second, that judges shall hold their offices only for a limited period; third, “to effect emancipation of slaves.” The first two are dealt with in a very few lines, brief and bitter. The third project is argued at some length. He opposes it on the score of inhumanity to the slaves, by reason of the condition into which experience and reason also justify us in saying they must fall, as freed men, whether they remain among us or go to other states. He objects to it also, because the attempt to emancipate our slaves would not in fact succeed, but would only drive the slave owners with their slaves to the southern states of this Union, where he supposes slavery must continue “for centuries yet to come.” He considers the consequences of such a migration terrible “to the wealth and capital of the state;” and again adduces the argument from inhumanity to the slaves, as they would be removed to “countries where their slavery would be more intolerant than it is at present.” The general diffusion of slaves over extensive portions of the nation, is looked upon as tending more to the final emancipation of the race, than gathering them in large masses; inasmuch as such a policy would “in time efface the distinctive marks of color”—and wear out, rather than break the chain of slavery. The wish is expressed that slavery should not be perpetual: and the conviction, that Providence will point out the means of effecting its extinction. But the opinion is stated, that it is better to retain the blacks in slavery than to turn them loose among us as freemen: and that any scheme “to be effectual, must be general in all the states.” Mr. W. then pledges himself “at all times to aid in whatever will tend to effect the emancipation of the whole slave population gradually.” In the preceding argument he takes it as unquestionably true, that in any constitution which would now be formed, slavery would be abolished; and again warns slave-owners throughout the state, “of the danger to the tenure by which they hold their slaves” which would result “from a convention.” He refers to the yearly returns of the commissioners of tax, and states as his opinion that not “one voter in ten, in the state is a slave-holder.” “In this state of the polls” he asks “what chance can the slave-holder have to retain his slaves, if by a new constitution he is left at the mercy of the annual Legislature of the state?” Again, he argues “that while

"the constitution secures the rights of the masters to their slaves, "the religious societies that abhor the principle of slavery, feel themselves restrained to be silent as to its evils: but so soon as it becomes a question to be settled in a new constitution, all such feel themselves called on by the principles of their religion, to act, and will act, as their consciences dictate." In this contest, already so unequal, he supposes that for three hundred miles along our northern border, the non-slave holding states and their presses will exert their influence against the slave holder. Amid these multiplied evils, it will be too late to repent "that he has from prejudice, passion, or whim and caprice given up a constitution under which he was happy as well as secure in the possession of his property." An appeal "to every sober-minded man of every party"—and a serious admonition to the slave-holders in particular, to have this subject settled and their final determination known before the next session of the General Assembly, closes the argument. The paper from which the foregoing analysis is taken, is addressed "to the freemen of the county of Fayette," and published in the Reporter of February 17th, signed R. Wickliffe. It has been my object to give a fair, indeed an ample abstract of the argument, and that, as far as my limits would permit, in the words of the author. I think he will not complain of injustice on that score; or if any has been inadvertently done him, he has some reason to know that there are very few persons who would deal with his errors more lightly, or receive the truths he would utter, with the increased favor derived from high personal consideration, more readily than myself.

I have been myself opposed to the project of calling a convention to amend our state constitution; and have manifested that opposition in a public manner. I now see no reason to think, that I was then in error. No state that is deeply involved in difficulties, of whatever kind, can live quietly under any regularly administered government. Nor could it form any scheme of fundamental law, which would be the most acceptable to itself in the ordinary condition of its affairs. Hence it has grown into a maxim, that a period of great public excitement is not the best time for amending the constitutions of states. Perhaps for fifteen years back in this state, it would not have been wise to call a convention.

Mr. Jefferson has said, he was convinced it would be to the advantage of mankind if all nations could call conventions to examine into the state of their civil constitutions three or four times in a century. Though there may be some eccentricity, there is also much wisdom in this reflection. I think no assemblage of persons in any nation, who represented the body of the people, has at any time met, without producing a salutary effect on the institutions of their country. No revolution has ever been brought about by the desire of the mass of the people, that did not give them ultimately a better condition of government. Every attempt to give dignity to the common people, the bulk of mankind, by an increased participation in the ordering of public affairs—from the secession of the Roman tribes to the sacred mount, and as much farther back as history will carry us, down to the late convention in Vir-

ginia, has added more or less to the progress of free opinions. To avoid the force of this reasoning as applied to ourselves, it must be shown, that by a fortunate application of all the knowledge of mankind in relation to government, and by the most happy concurrence of every necessary circumstance, we at last succeeded in establishing a perfect constitution. Yet "that the present constitution is imperfect all admit," Mr. Wickliffe himself being judge; who adds to that admission, the declaration "I would myself make alterations in the constitution, *were it left alone to me.*" As this precedent condition is not likely to be acceded to, that part of the subject need be pressed no farther.

Our constitution is an excellent one. In addition to the veneration which I feel for it as the organic law of my state, under which I have lived and was born; and the hardly inferior regard which it challenges as a very high effort of intellectual power, for the time in which it was formed, and the opportunities of those who gave it birth; there are personal recollections which commend it in a peculiar manner to my admiration. That the lapse of more than thirty years, during which the human race has made very great advances, should have exhibited some considerable errors of theory, and some practical inconveniences in our system, is no disparagement to those who formed it under a state of things somewhat different from the present. In the declaration of our national independence (an authority we all bow to) it is asserted "that mankind are more disposed to suffer, while evils are sufferable, than to right themselves by abolishing forms to which they are accustomed." Acting upon this principle, and clinging with parental fondness to the instrument they had produced, the gentlemen who formed our present constitution, while they recognized the right in every community to alter or even to abolish its government, interposed the most intricate machinery for the execution of any such projects; and by the provision for its amendment have provided effectually against any alteration. Let any one consult article 9th, and he will see no reason why the most nervous admirer of that instrument should dread its fate. If the whole commonwealth with one accord were to demand its alteration, it could not be effected in much less than three years (a period as long as the cycle of some politicians,) from the meeting of that General Assembly which should set vigorously and successfully about its accomplishment. If to this we add the repeated votes of the people and the Legislature, twice of one, three times of the other, a majority of all who are entitled to vote being required at every step, and those who do not vote counted in the negative, and other obstacles that interfere, it may be safely said there is no probability that a convention will be speedily called to amend the constitution of Kentucky.

With this view of the subject, it is not necessary that I should point out any portion of that instrument which I might consider defective; the more especially as the propriety of calling a convention was not the subject I wished to consider. It may be proper to observe that the reasoning of Mr. W. on that matter seems to me to be destitute of his usual ability, and his array of the opinions of his adversaries incorrect. I except of course the question of

slavery, which I design more particularly to examine. While I admit therefore that our affairs are tolerably well conducted under the existing constitution, and believe that it is nearly hopeless to attempt its amendment, I have made these general observations, to show, that in a period like the present, no danger is to be apprehended from the calling of a convention, and therefore that no attention is due to that view of the subject which attempts to make the questions of slavery and old constitution, or convention and emancipation, reciprocally operate on each other. Indeed it appears extraordinary to me that those who hold the opinions avowed in the circular should not have considered any such mingling of debated questions highly injurious to the success of their cause: for in that paper itself, it is in substance admitted, that nine tenths of this community favor opinions, whose probable success is urged as a reason why another set of opinions about which the same community is more nearly divided should not succeed. If nine tenths of the voters of this state favor emancipation, it seems curious to urge them to oppose a convention for the reason that a convention would also favor emancipation. I have taken a different view of this subject, and been led to different conclusions. By making Mr. Wickliffe's argument the foundation of what I intend to say, it will afford me an opportunity of remarking on certain principles of great importance to us all, in regard to which doctrines are inculcated from which I dissent. B.

No. II.—I had not thought that any individual could be found in this community who would give it as his opinion, that if a convention were called to amend the constitution of this state, as soon as by the present constitution it could be called, that convention would recommend the immediate abolition of slavery in the commonwealth. Nor did I suppose that any individual could be found, who would give it as his opinion, that any reasonable portion of those who favor the call of a convention, are favorable to immediate emancipation. No one that I have heard of, ever advocated such a plan of abolition as that denounced in the circular, whereby the slaves are to be freed and turned loose at once among us. Such an idea was never pressed for one moment by any person whatever within my knowledge. But, on the other hand, the most ardent friends of the American Colonization Society have avowed the opinion so clung to and reiterated by Mr. W., that slavery itself was preferable to the general residence among us of manumitted slaves. This idea, whether true or false, may be said to be almost universal. It could not therefore be just reasoning, to suppose that opinions are held which all men renounce, and then infer from them the magnitude of evils which must be absolutely imaginary.

It cannot be supposed that the abolition intended to be denounced was a gradual abolition; because Mr. W. in the very argument expressly declares himself no friend to the perpetuity of slavery; expresses his belief that Heaven will put an end to its inflictions, and in terms, pledges himself "at all times to aid in whatever shall tend to emancipate the whole slave population gradually." What scheme different from that, as applied to Ken-

tucky, did any one ever advocate? To emancipate "the whole slave population gradually" has been the uniform plan, when any thing has been urged on the public attention in this state, and which has been achieved in those states, to whose example an appeal is made to deter others, by its inhumanity to the blacks, from following their career. I confess I do not perceive the value of that advocacy, which finds even in the partial success of cherished plans, enough of evil to deter all others from similar attempts.

As to any arguments drawn from the fine theories of persons of sensibility, regarding the cruelty of freeing persons who are only sufficiently informed to be slaves, I confess I could never see their force. A very small portion of acquired knowledge is necessary to enable men to sustain the relations of independent communities; or, as we have some reason to know, to govern them. Still less is required to fit a man to become a peaceable and industrious citizen. In relation to this particular race we are not without experience. The mulattoes of Hayti under Petion and the blacks under Christophe have exhibited more knowledge of the principles of free government, than most white nations who have peopled the earth. The blacks had sense enough to know when Christophe tyrannised over them; and though he was a wise and firm prince, they overthrew his government and established one much better. Since the union of the Island in a republic under President Boyer (whose mother was a Congo negress, and his father a French tailor, an odd compound for a wise man,) few governments are better or more quietly administered. The colony at Liberia is a model of good order. Nor is there any reason to believe that any of the South American states have regretted the decrees emancipating their slaves en masse, by which their revolutions have been attended. However a sense of duty to ourselves may deter us from attempting a sudden and general emancipation while other and better hopes remain, it is little better than mockery to place our conduct on the footing of humanity to those from whom we withhold the highest enjoyments of nature. He who has lost his liberty has little else to lose over which humanity can weep.

Free negroes are very seldom good citizens; and for a reason sufficiently evident; they are not citizens at all. The law views them with constant jealousy, and barely tolerates their existence in the country. It can never be otherwise with any degraded caste. The argument proves nothing beyond the admission I have made; least of all does it prove that because the blacks are bad citizens when free, therefore they are good citizens when slaves. The end proposed should be to get rid of both classes, or if that is not practicable, then of the worst. For it is not the part of a wise man to make no effort to amend his condition, lest perchance, he may not succeed at every point.

It seems to have been perceived that all arguments drawn from the sources I have hitherto touched, were without any solid foundation; and hence the whole ground is varied, and another and incompatible aspect of the case presented. The present argument is, that slave-owners will not wait to come under the operation of any system of abolition; but will remove from the commonwealth

with their slaves; thus, as it is added, producing consequences "upon the wealth and capital of the state (which) are to my mind terrible, in driving a large portion of the industry, talents and capital from the state." But even here we are met again by the argument of inhumanity, that our slaves will be carried by their masters to a region where their servitude will be more rigorous than here. This is really taxing us too far. For the self-same act we become responsible in two opposite and irreconcilable ways: first for the cruelty of degrading our slaves by freeing them at home, and second for the cruelty of sending the same slaves into a distant and more aggravated bondage. This argument about inhumanity is a garment thread-bare and utterly past service.

The address estimates the slave population of this state at two hundred thousand souls; which I suppose not far from correct. If there is any error, it may be a little too high. The voters of the state are estimated, by it, to be more than nine tenths non slave-holders. Taking that estimate, there are about eight thousand voters who own the whole slaves of the commonwealth. Allowing five persons to the family of each voter, as an average, and the aggregate of the population we should lose, by an effort at gradual emancipation, including all ages and complexions, would, according to the circular address, be about two hundred and forty thousand souls, I suppose our whole population now exceeds seven hundred thousand souls; from which the proposed emigration would take off about one third, embracing therein all the blacks and some thousands of the whites. This statement is merely carried out for the sake of distinctness, for a more chimerical notion could not readily be propagated.

The truth is that those who own no slaves have remained quiet on this subject. So far as they have been compelled to act, they have exercised an astonishing liberality and forbearance towards slave owners. If my slave is hanged for burning the mansion of my father, who is a slave-holder, then my neighbour who owns no slaves is taxed to aid in paying me for the one executed. If my slave is hung for killing the son of my neighbour, who owns no slaves, his land and other property are taxed to aid in paying me for the executed negro. Yet these laws are enacted by a community, in which nine out of every ten persons who had a vote in passing them, own no slaves; and who could not on that account be safely trusted to re-model the forms of the government, lest they should emancipate the slaves in a body—with which design I understand them to be substantially charged in the paper under consideration. It has been by the owners of slaves that the question of slavery has been most maturely considered. And as they have examined it, a great change has been wrought in their sentiments. For example—Mr. Wickliffe is a slave-holder and resists the idea of a gradual abolition of slavery in Kentucky, among other reasons, because it would diminish the wealth of the state, and drive industry and capital from it: I also am a slave-holder—as much below Mr. Wickliffe in wealth, as in consequence and influence—but a slave-holder to the extent of my estate, in as large a ratio perhaps as himself, and I am as thoroughly convinced as I

can be by facts and reason, that no reasonable plan—nay no plan I ever heard advocated for the gradual eradication of slavery, would make this state one dollar poorer during its progress or at its completion; but on the other hand, that all the elements of great national wealth and power would strengthen and advance, in proportion as slaves and slavery were banished from our land.—I need not now argue this wide difference of opinion, but I will illustrate by the statement of a proposition. Suppose it to be just for one race of men to hold another in perpetual and involuntary slavery, which all our public acts and principles deny. Suppose it to be consistent with the clear and upright spirit of Christianity, which I observe is held to be the fact, by a gentleman, who, to the honor of being a Senator of the United States, adds the claim of membership in the church of God. Is such a condition of things advantageous to a state? Does it add any thing to its strength or riches? Whether is it better to have within our bosom, two hundred thousand free citizens attached to our political institutions, and ready to contend unto death in their defence; or an equal number of domestic foes—foes by birth, by injuries, by colour, by caste, by every circumstance of life, ready to take advantage of every emergency of the state to work our injury? Whether is it better to have two hundred thousand labourers, in the most abject condition of ignorance, with no motive for toil but the rod, and no rule of conduct but the caprice of a master, sometimes indeed humane and just, but sometimes also hardly more refined than themselves; or an equal number of hardy, happy, and laborious yeomanry, such as the heart of a patriot would yearn over in the day of his country's prosperity, and repose on as upon a rock in the hour of her need? Vain is the philosophy which will allow a man to doubt in choosing between such alternatives.

B.

No. III.—In a greater degree than most other evils, this of slavery feeds upon itself and results in multiplied forms of ill. The care which in other countries would be bestowed, in better living and more bountiful support, on the whites, is in slave countries lavished on them; and they increase faster in proportion. Their increase again encourages the emigration from among us of the labouring classes of the whites, whose small places are bought up to add to the extensive farms cultivated by slaves. Then our laws of descent reduce the children of the rich to moderate circumstances, who, rather than lose ideal rank, sell out and remove to some new country, where in the gradual improvement of affairs, they hope to attain their former condition. While by these operations we lose the bone and sinew of the state, the slaves remain and increase to fill up the space thus created. While this process, so destructive to the state, is accomplishing, the slave-owners themselves are only procrastinating a little the day of their own trial. As the number of slaves increases, their value must diminish with the diminishing value of the products of their labor, in an increasing ratio. Then comes the competition with free labor from the adjacent states. Lexington is now partly, perhaps chiefly, supplied with Ohio flour, and to a great extent, with eastern hats, bridles,

horse harness, boots, shoes, and various other articles of the first necessity, which we ought to produce as cheap as any other people. Horses have been the favorite production and one of the greatest staples of Kentucky; yet Ohio horses are sold at a profit by auction, in the streets of our villages. All this operates a gradual decline in the value of slaves, which will fall lower and lower as they come nearer to the number of the whites, until they become themselves the chief article of export. Such is now the case with Delaware, and part of Maryland and Virginia. The value of the staples of the southern states would for some years keep up the value of slaves. But when the progress of events shall produce the same state of public sentiment, I ought rather to say of public necessity, there, that is steadily advancing here, and they will no longer receive our slaves as merchandise, where would be "the wealth and capital," and where "the industry and talents" of our commonwealth? Never was there a more fallacious idea than that slavery contributed any thing towards the permanent resources of a state. It is an ulcer eating its way into the very heart of the state, and which while it remains, cannot be affected by any change of constitution, but would work its effects with unerring certainty under every possible form of government.

Mr. Wickliffe thinks "that while slavery exists at all in the United States, it is better that we tolerate it in Kentucky, where the condition of the slave is as good as is consistent with a state of slavery; than to crowd the slaves into the southern states." Again he says that any plan for "effecting the liberation of the slaves, to be effectual must be general in all the states." These opinions are singularly erroneous and illogical. That a plan to be effectual in all the states must be general in all the states, is obvious enough. But that a plan to be effectual in Kentucky must be general in all the states, is not very apparent. On the other hand, that a state which foresees impending calamities, which it is in her power and in the power of no other to avert, should yet decline providing for her safety because distant and independent states choose to deny the existence of the miseries we foresee, and madly elect to brave all their horrors, is a course of policy whose wisdom may well be questioned. This Union now embraces twenty-four states and three organised territories. Out of these, twelve states and two territories tolerate negro slavery. It is admitted by all men that the national government has not the smallest power over the subject of slavery within the limits of any state. The opinion is also prevalent, that in those states whose staple is sugar, cotton or rice, being not less than six or seven states, slave labor cannot be dispensed with for a long time to come, if it can ever be done. In this circular, Mr. W. states that slavery will exist in the southern states for "centuries yet to come." And does a gentleman avowedly hostile to the perpetuity of slavery—openly expressing his reliance on Providence for the means of its extinguishment—and directly pledging himself to co-operate at all times in favor of any plan which will even *tend* to "effect the emancipation of the whole slave population gradually"—seriously recommend the postponement of every effort on this subject until after the lapse "of

centuries yet to come"—twelve scattered sovereignties, (with as many added thereto as our whole unsettled territory south of latitude 40 degrees and 30 minutes north, can make up) shall by a grand simultaneous impulse achieve so extensive a revolution in society? In waiting for these events and the efflux of these indefinite centuries, I do not see that even the valuable co-operation of Mr. W. could be of any material advantage. Alas! into what errors are wise men betrayed.

Kentucky and no other earthly authority must control this interest within her limits. Two out of every seven of her population are estimated to be slaves. One out of every 13 of her white population is estimated to be a slave-owner. It may be conjectured that one out of every two among slave-owners will be favorable to the principle of gradual abolition. Twelve out of every thirteen whites own no slaves, and are therefore in every way interested in getting rid of them. It follows then, that not more than one in every twenty-six whites, upon a full presentation of the question, could upon any reasonable calculation be supposed favorable to the indefinite continuance of slavery in this state, or in other words, to the principles of the circular; for a period designated by "centuries yet to come" does in every political view amount to perpetuity. Our white population may now be estimated at a little over half a million; out of whom if the preceding calculations are nearly correct, not much more than twenty thousand can be presumed to consider themselves interested in maintaining the principles against which I contend. In a free government, so small a minority should be very cautious in trusting to their own impartiality and justice, in a case where they consider their property involved, when the great mass of their fellow men differ from them in their views of the welfare and grandeur of the commonwealth.

Connected with this part of the subject, the circular advocates the extension of the slave population, for the particular reason that it would encourage the amalgamation of the white and black races, and thus in the progress of time obliterate slavery, by effacing "the distinctive marks of color." The diffusion of slaves would certainly tend to augment their value, and by consequence, to add an increased ratio to their productiveness; thus magnifying their numbers, and in an equal degree the difficulties of ultimately getting rid of them. But that it would have any tendency to encourage the mixture of the two races, there is great room to doubt. I do not know that such a mixture would be desirable, to the white race at least, even if it could be achieved: and among the blacks, its progress wherever it has hitherto operated has been attended with the most pernicious effects. From the tendency to this mixture by an illicit commerce of the sexes (and no other is ever thought of by the whites) the argument against the private morality of slavery which has appeared to me most cogent, has always flowed. It may be said that in slave countries, the prostitution of the female slaves, at some period of their lives, is universal. And what is frightful to add, it is not absolutely certain that their condition of abject abandonment is always voluntary. A large family of negro children having the same mother rarely have the same father. The rights of

marriage and even its ceremonies are not allowed them by the laws. If, surmounting all the ills of their condition and escaping all their miserable fortune, a few of them arrive at the possession of social enjoyments, their success should hardly be considered a cause of congratulation. For the necessities, the vices, and what is sometimes not less fatal, even the good intentions of their owners, may at any moment make them their victims. Yet men of sense and virtue are not wanting, who will insist that we may by some unadvised step bring them into a condition so much worse than this, that we should subject ourselves to the charge of inhumanity. Earth holds no such condition.

As it is my wish to consider this subject rather in a political than a moral point of view, I will pass over what is said about religious societies, and their efforts and principles touching the question of slavery; which I do the more readily as if the view I take of the constitutional question be correct, such arguments would be admitted by those who use them to be without any force, as the whole subject would be fully open. Nor do I see that what is said about the non-slave-holding states and their presses, requires any reply, for the same reason. Such appeals as that made in the conclusion of the argument appear to be natural to all politicians. I only regret that it should have been considered necessary to group in such a manner the security of property under the existing constitution, with the strong implication from the whole course of the observations, of its entire insecurity in the hands of those who think (in common with Mr. Wickliffe) that the constitution is not perfect—or who say (and can avouch Mr. Wickliffe for authority) that slavery ought not to be perpetual in this state.

I shall not make any apology for having so particularly examined a part of the circular address of Mr. W. His arguments, while they seemed to me to contradict his avowed opinions, went to the length of entailing an intolerable national burden on us and our posterity to remote ages, by exhibiting the supposed dangers, inhumanity, and difficulty of every plan for its alleviation, except one so remote and intricate as to be merely fanciful. I think I have shown that his view of the subject cannot be relied on. It is but just that I should now present my own. B.

No. IV.—The plan of African colonization, as exhibited by the national society for that purpose, is a very noble conception. Even without the aid of the general or state governments, there is no reason to doubt but that enough will be done to give civilization with all its train of blessings to the Western shore of Africa. As a grand missionary operation, it commends itself in a peculiar manner to the Christian community, who fail not to discover in it the hand of that presiding Providence, which, having permitted the wretched African to be enslaved and Christianised, now demands his restoration that he may Christianise his brethren. But that as a mere individual enterprise of benevolence, it can ever materially diminish the number of our free negroes, is no longer asserted by its most enlightened advocates. If such a condition of things were brought about that the energies of the Federal

Government could act effectually on the subject, it has been sufficiently shown on several occasions, that in a reasonable time and at a moderate cost, every colored person in the United States could be comfortably planted in Africa. But no one has shown a reasonable prospect of arriving at that condition. The first step is to have negroes free, before they can be transported. And in taking that first step, the general government has not, nor can it ever have any power. Several states (our own among them) have recommended the Colonization Society in the most urgent manner to the protection of Congress; and the executive of the nation has uniformly manifested a favorable disposition towards it. Even if such petitions should be successful in their object, and the government were to remove by universal consent every free negro now in the United States, and were to continue removing them as fast as they became free, only by the exercise of private benevolence or other individual feelings, or private operations; there is not the least reason to suppose, that at the end of any period of years, the number of slaves would be at all diminished. The whole resources of the nation could avail us in that way, only in connexion with state efforts by state authority, and not without or in opposition to them. If Kentucky should resolve on a gradual emancipation of her black population, the general government could do her much service by aiding in their removal when freed. If Kentucky is resolved never to emancipate them, the removal of every free negro will only in the supposed condition of society, make room for an equal or greater number of slaves. The political moral of the Colonization Society is strikingly plain. It has taught us how we may be relieved of the curse of slavery in a manner cheap, certain and advantageous to both the parties. It now remains for those who say they are its friends to go whither the light of its example points them.

What I have said recurs with accumulated force. Kentucky must achieve her own deliverance, or it will never come to her. From the tenor of Mr. Wickliffe's remarks, he seems to think that the people of this commonwealth under the present constitution, possess no power to regulate the tenure by which slaves are, or their descendants ever shall be held to bondage during its continuance. Such he seems also to infer are the opinions of those who advocate the call of a convention. These opinions as to the meaning and intent of the constitution have extensively prevailed, and are in part correct. But I think an attentive investigation will satisfy mankind that we do really now possess all the power over this subject, which any moderate party would desire to confer—which is needful for any useful purpose—or which could be safely reposed in any government. A contrary opinion has resulted from general inattention to the subject by one portion of our citizens, and the continual reiteration of the undoubted correctness of a particular construction put on the constitution by another portion, who seem to have considered themselves interested in maintaining that gloss.

Our constitution, though it recognises, does not define slavery. For any thing contained in it, a white man "without a cross" may

be a slave in this state, just as well as a negro, or Indian, or mulatto; although if free he enjoys rights which neither of the others can if free. Hereditary slavery is at war with the principles of every species of social system. Even the fierce and intolerable rule of a military despotism has this to alleviate its sway, that it tolerates no subsidiary tyranny. It is at war also with every law of nature, except the first and greatest of them all, the law of self-preservation. In its inception it cannot be right, though in its progress it may become so, by becoming indispensable to the safety of the parties. So our constitution appears to have viewed it, and made all its provisions regulating it in unison with that sentiment.

The 7th article, headed "concerning slaves," is devoted to this subject. In one of its provisions the Legislature is directed to pass laws permitting the owners of slaves to emancipate them, saving the rights of creditors, and guarding against pauperism. The act of 1798 relating to slaves, that of 1800 to wills, and other enactments have well obeyed this command. I will not stop to enquire whether any further regulations on this head are necessary, as I do not consider that the best mode of eradicating slaves from the state.

Again it is provided that the general Assembly "shall have full power to prevent any slaves being brought into this state as merchandise." Accordingly several provisions have been made by law on this subject. The act of 1801 enacts that slaves brought into this state for merchandise, or even passing through it, who may commit any capital felony and be executed, should not, as in other cases of slaves, be paid for out of the public treasury. The act of 1815 is strict in the highest degree. I refer to it at large, 2d digest, page 1162. It prohibits the importation of slaves into this commonwealth for merchandise—and imposes a fine of \$600 on the importer, and one of \$200 on every seller or buyer of a slave so brought into this state, making other apt and proper regulations for the due enforcement of its provisions. It is greatly to be deplored that the negligence of our judges, grand juries, and commonwealth's attorneys should have suffered this act to remain a dead letter on the statute book, when the shocking and disgraceful traffic which it was designed to put an end to, is regularly and openly carried on. Many thousands of offences have been committed under this law—and not one conviction has taken place under it. Nor is it less a subject of astonishment that the Legislature of the state, acknowledging the utter depravity of the trade, should have been unable, in several years' attention to this subject, to give such a shape to the law as would make it effective in practice. Nor can this county in particular, find any cause for self-gratulation, in the course taken for several years by the majority of her representatives on this most important, and I will add, singularly clear question. One thing at least is certain; even if I am fastidious in supposing that public decency is outraged by allowing droves of manacled slaves to be openly imported and driven as merchandise along our highways; if I err in supposing that our laws are disregarded at every step of the procedure—in some cases to the extent of depositing the slaves in the public prisons for safe keeping and delivery; whatever else is doubtful, it cannot be

denied, that while gangs of slaves are yearly, and many times a year brought hither and dispersed through the state by sale, it is absolutely hopeless to reason about plans for the bettering of our condition. That a stop should be put to that branch of this domestic slave-trade, which brings slaves into this state as merchandise, is the first and indispensable step towards the removal of those already here.

Power is also given to the General Assembly to prevent slaves being brought into this from any foreign country, or such as have been or may be imported into the United States from any foreign country, subsequent to the 1st day of January, 1789. Which provision was enforced by the act of 1798 then in force, under a penalty of three hundred dollars for each slave so imported.

By another clause, the Legislature is delegated with the power to make owners of slaves treat them with humanity in all respects; its authority going even so far as a forcible taking and selling of the slave for the benefit of the owner who should violate the law. For what has been done on this branch of the subject I refer to 2d Digest, pages 1163-4, and to the law passed at the session of 1829. To say that in all these respects the wise intentions of those who formed our constitution have in general been faithfully executed, is a well deserved commendation of the enlightened policy of the state for a period of more than thirty years.

The first clause of the article under consideration is in these words: "The General Assembly shall have no power to pass laws for the emancipation of slaves without the consent of their owners, or without paying their owners previous to such emancipation, a full equivalent in money for the slaves so emancipated."

By this clause it is obvious that without a gross violation of the constitution, the Legislature cannot emancipate "slaves" without their owner's consent, or without first paying for them. A reflection arises out of this phraseology which exhibits in a very striking manner the injustice which is done to the non-slave-owners of the state, in charging them with a desire to turn free the whole slave population in a body. The language is in the alternative. The power is therefore given, not where both events concur, but where either exists separately. Either consent of the owner, or payment of an equivalent without his consent, places the liberty of the slave at the disposal of the government. Has any principle in legislation been more uniformly revered as true, than that revenue should be raised by a tax levied on the luxuries rather than the necessities of life? Are not slaves luxuries in the most unhappy sense of that term? What then either in constitutional law or in the received wisdom of ordinary legislation, ever existed to prevent the Legislature of Kentucky from collecting a sufficient revenue by taxing slaves, to pay for, manumit and transport a certain proportion of young slaves of one or both sexes annually? A tax on slaves not larger than is now levied in Ohio on land, applied judiciously in that way, would in a few generations put an end to slavery in this commonwealth. Who will assert that such an achievement would benefit Kentucky less than her canals will Ohio? But it may be thought it is not constitutional to tax slave property more

than other estate. It has been done from the foundation of the government. They are taxed as property; and they are assessed as tithables. They are valued like a horse: but they are made to work the highways in the capacity of men. So it is of other things; my cart is not taxed—my friend's chariot is; my mules and horses are taxed—my neighbor's fat cattle and drove of hogs are exempt. The power is complete and the right to exercise it perfect. That it has remained undisturbed is another obligation those who own slaves owe to those who own none. Now that it is brought to notice, the non-slave-holders have a choice of being re-paid as heretofore, in similar cases.

But a slave shall not be emancipated except in two ways. Who is a slave? The law has said: "No person shall hereafter be slaves within this commonwealth, except such as were so on the 17th day of October in the year 1785, and the descendants of the females of them." 2d Littell, p. 113. It might be difficult to point out any particular clause of the constitution authorising the foregoing enactment. Yet I do not doubt its constitutionality—nor has it been at all questioned, that I know of for thirty years. Who, however, were slaves in 1785? Our laws and constitution say nothing on the subject. The constitution of Virginia is profoundly silent. Could the ordinary powers of government suffice to inflict hereditary slavery on any class of its people? Did any state ever attempt such an outrage? In the general statutes of England at any time in force here, do we find this question solved? In the common law of that realm, which abhorred slavery, shall we find the recorded doom of involuntary and endless bondage? Let me vary the question. Suppose the passage I have quoted from the act of 1798, had read thus: "No persons shall hereafter be slaves in this commonwealth, except such as are so on the 17th day of October 1805," what provision of our constitution would have conflicted with it? Would it have been binding or would it have been void?  
B.

No. V.—A man cannot by a covenant bind himself to slavery; because no compensation can be equivalent to that with which he has parted, his liberty; and because, whatever was the consideration pretended to be given, whether small, or great, it would pass through the slave to his master, who would thus enjoy both the thing bought and the price paid for it. This is an absurdity too gross to be entertained by any one with whom it would be worth the trouble of reasoning. Far less can a man barter away the rights of his unborn offspring, except in a manner subject to their confirmation or rejection at the years of maturity. In this case every reason applies that does in the other, and these in addition, that there could be no pretence of necessity over a being not created, and in any case the parent could part with no greater right to control his child than he himself enjoyed, that is, till the child was capable in mind and body of controlling itself. Such is the doctrine of the American constitutions on the subjects of citizenship and naturalization; and our own expressly provides for the voluntary expatriation of its citizens, and guarantees that right as

one of the "general, great and essential principles of liberty." But if it were otherwise, in stating the original principles of all rational law, we have a right to look beyond all human governments, and instead of being impeded by their dicta, to bring them to the same standard of judgment by which all things else should be measured. The law is to be obeyed because it is the law; but it is to be commended only because it is wise and just.

It can be no less incorrect to apply any arguments drawn from the right of conquest, or the lapse of time, as against the offspring of persons who may be themselves slaves. For neither force nor time has any meaning when applied to a nonentity. He cannot be said to be conquered who never had the opportunity or means of resistance, nor can time run against one un-born. Those who lean to a contrary doctrine, should well consider to what it leads them. No rule of reason is better received or clearer, than that force may be resisted by force, and whatever is thus established may be at any time lawfully overthrown. On the other hand, if error is made sacred by its antiquity, there is no absurdity or crime which may not be dug up from its dishonored tomb, and erected into an idol, around which its scattered votaries may re-assemble.

I think it is clear that one unborn can in no sense be a slave. And such, I do not doubt, is the doctrine of our constitution. The laws of man do oft times pervert the best gifts of nature, and wage a warfare, idle and impious, against her decrees. But in all such cases you may discover what is of the earth and what is from above. You may take man at his birth, and by an adequate system make him a slave—a brute—a demon. This is man's work. The light of reason, history and philosophy—the voice of nature and religion—the spirit of God himself proclaims that the being he created in his own image he must have created free.

The General Assembly is invested with power to pay for and liberate slaves. Suppose a plan on this conception of our constitution should be matured which would be fair and lawful. Commissioners are appointed to have slaves valued and paid for. The least costly method, and the most effectual at the same time, would be to take and pay for *none but unborn slaves*. Pay in advance for all the slaves a young female might give birth to, during her whole life. Why not? If the chance or probability of a female having children and grand-children be such an interest vested in her owner that it can be called "slaves;" then it is such an interest as by our constitution the state has the express power and right to take, pay for and liberate; nay it is such an interest, separable from the slave herself, that the General Assembly may under certain circumstances, prohibit from being imported into the state along with the female slave. On the other hand, if it be not such an interest, there is no shadow of pretence for saying that the constitution ever meant to guarantee to slave-holders that they should hold in servitude the descendants of their slaves.

There is no guarantee in the constitution of Kentucky that slavery shall be perpetual in this commonwealth; on the contrary the right is reserved to free those whom the laws shall have previously recognized as slaves in two kinds of cases. If such a guarantee be not

expressly stated, or clearly inferable, the received theory on the subject of state authority makes the idea of its existence futile. For it would put an absolute limit to its power over a third or fourth part of its population, upon a government which knows of no limitation to its comprehensive authority, except such as is exhibited by the instrument which gave it existence, and the limited but paramount authority of the general government.

All the powers of society reduce themselves to three general heads: the power to make laws—that to determine their meaning in each case that may arise under them—and that to enforce the public will when properly ascertained. We call these legislative, judicial, and executive powers; and they are by our constitution, vested in the government of the state, in separate departments, in as full and complete a manner as they existed in the people themselves. The same instrument excepted certain subjects out of the general grant thus made. Over these, no control can be exercised. The power to liberate persons in slavery being restricted in part, cannot be exercised over the excepted cases. But the power to confirm and enforce the laws of nature, anterior to the birth of the children of slaves is not excepted. Having passed under the full grant, it must now reside in the government in as perfect a manner as it could do in the people in a state of nature. Now it is a principle of common sense, sanctioned also by long usage, that whatever operates in derogation of common right shall be strictly interpreted. And if freedom be not as of common right in this country, it might be difficult to say what is. If the word 'slaves' is allowed to mean all the descendants of a slave, not only by permission of the supreme power, but from the necessity of the term according to its strict interpretation, it would be curious to enquire who would be embraced by a construction that might be called liberal. Those who administer the laws regard this principle as sacred, even when its particular effect may chance to be hurtful to society. And shall it be denied to those who make and may un-make both the laws and the rule, when its application is clear and of the last importance to us?

There is another rule not less just, and even more ancient; that every law shall be so constituted as to favor the liberty of the subject. I will not quibble about the words, law and subject. I care very little about the subtleties of verbal criticism. I ask for the application of the rule not more as a maxim of municipal law, than as embodying a just, clear, and noble precept. And let any one ask himself if it favors liberty to interpret the word 'slaves' in the clause I am discussing, to mean the distant posterity of a slave? What meaning could be given to it more unfavorable to liberty, or more variant from the general tone of the article itself, which is throughout strikingly humane?

Hence arises another rule of common sense; that one part of the instrument, when at all doubtful, may justly derive from the remainder of it the clue to its general meaning. The general tendency of this article is in an eminent degree to mitigate the evils, whether personal or national, which belong to slavery. It is filled with details for effecting the emancipation of slaves—for insuring

humanity of treatment towards them from their owners—for discouraging the traffic in them, both foreign and domestic. And is it conceivable that there should be added to provisions breathing a spirit of such wise forecast and vigilant humanity, one that must needs be so interpreted as to make the captivity our fathers were so exact in mitigating, endless and hopeless, and to doom this beautiful region, for whose glory they were laying a deep foundation, to be a prison house forever, and us their children, to be its wretched keepers?

If any thing were wanting to place beyond a doubt the construction for which I contend, it is found in the very next succeeding clause of the same article. It is in these words:

"They (the General Assembly,) shall have no power to prevent emigrants to this state from bringing with them such persons as are deemed slaves by the laws of any one of the United States, *so long as any person of the same age or description shall be continued in slavery by the laws of this state.*"

There has never been any contrariety in the different states of this union, as to who might be slaves. If the first part only of the above clause had existed, it would have made the sense complete, and would have favored very much the opinions of those who say that the General Assembly of Kentucky has no power over this subject. By adding the latter part of the clause (that in Italics) it is intimated as clearly as it can be done, that the time will come when those who may be slaves in other states, will no longer be slaves here. Observe the striking phraseology, "*continued in slavery by the laws of this state.*" And where does the power reside to make "the laws of this state" which shall no longer allow those of a certain "age or description" to continue in slavery? Beyond all doubt, in the Legislature of this state. As long as we have slaves, emigrants may bring slaves here; the Legislature being denied the power to make one set of laws for citizens, and a different set for emigrants. When, however, the General Assembly shall discontinue slavery wholly or in part, emigrants must conform to our laws and not be allowed to bring even those who are slaves in other states, into this.

My ideas on this subject are supported by the cotemporaneous interpretation of the constitution, and constant acquiescence therein, in a point which I think settles this question. The act of Feb. 8th, 1798, in the first section, which has been already quoted, restricted slavery in this state, to those who were slaves in 1785, *and the descendants of the females of them.* This act was passed before the adoption of our present constitution, which was formed in 1799, and went into complete operation in 1800. But in the first paragraph of the schedule of the constitution, it is provided: "that all laws of this commonwealth, in force at the time of making the said alterations and amendments. (to the old constitution) and not inconsistent therewith, and all rights, actions, prosecutions, claims and contracts, as well of individuals as of bodies corporate, shall continue as if said alterations and amendments had not been made." The act of 1798 has not been considered "inconsistent" with the "alterations and amendments" in the constitution made subsequent

to its enactment; but is, and as far as I can learn, has ever been considered and acted on as the law of the land. *Yet by that act the Legislature set free the offspring of all male slaves to the end of time, unless they should also be the offspring of female slaves.*

There was indeed a maxim of the common law (of which there were enough, bad and good a century ago, to form a thick folio,) that the child should remain in the condition of the mother—or, as its jargon has it, *partus sequitur ventrem*. But it is clear that such a rule, so far as it distinguishes between the parents, is artificial; being founded merely in the greater convenience with which a mother can be identified than a father, and had not the least binding obligation in any way on the Legislature, whose law might sanction the rule, or reverse it, or abrogate it; just as was thought best. That the General Assembly of 1798 may have availed itself of the existence of such a rule in the courts of another people, which might also have obtained some currency in its own, to interpose its authority for the full establishment of a principle which would check in some degree the growth of slavery, is highly likely; and is an additional reason for bestowing commendation on a body and an era which our citizens delight to contemplate, as among the most illustrious in our annals. If the law had been precisely reversed, and had restricted slavery to the children of male slaves only, whatever difference in effect might have been produced, it would assuredly have been as constitutional then as now. The son of a male slave by a free woman, is just the same mixture of bond and free, that the son of a free man by a slave woman is. The inference from hence is irresistible, that the Legislature of Kentucky has power to make provision for the prospective emancipation of all mixed races. But in the constitution, the mixed races—the blacks—the mulattoes—all, are alike provided for under the term 'slaves.' Whence it follows that the term 'slaves,' when used in that instrument, is to be understood as meaning those persons held to involuntary bondage, who are in existence at any particular time being, and none others.

If it had been the intention of the convention to put an absolute instead of a limited restraint on the power of the government—to prevent forever the extinguishment of slavery, instead of guarding the interests of owners to a certain extent, a very different phraseology would have naturally suggested itself, and must have been used. Thus; the General Assembly shall have no power to pass laws for the extinguishment of slavery. If such had been the provision, there had been an end of all dispute. And if such had been the design of the constitution, some such sentiment would have found a place in it. "Emigration from this state shall not be prohibited." Such a provision we find; and it is clear and distinct. "Slavery in this state shall not be prohibited." This would have been a similar and parallel provision on a subject fully as important. But nothing like it exists. After forming the constitution and investing the government with those powers residing naturally in the people, the convention, acting on a wise and true theory, supposed that some of those powers were too large and delicate to be entrusted with safety to any government, and that others were not

necessary to the safe conduct of public affairs. Accordingly the 10th article of the constitution, embracing 28 sections of precise and explicit limitations, profound and comprehensive definitions, and most wise and noble principles of freedom, was expressly designed to curtail the powers of the government. Yet neither here nor elsewhere in the whole instrument is a word said which puts the least limitation to the power for whose existence I am now contending.

I cannot doubt, then, that I am authorised to give the following interpretation to the debated clause of the constitution, as embracing its plain meaning and fulfilling its intent :

1. The General Assembly of Kentucky can never emancipate any slaves, gradually, contingently, or in any case whatever, except, first, with the owner's consent ; or, secondly, having previously paid for them a fair price in money.

2. The General Assembly is bound to pass laws for the emancipation of slaves with the consent of their owners ; and has full power to pass laws for their emancipation without that consent, by first paying for them ; having power also to collect the necessary funds to pay for them, by general taxation on all things subject thereto, or by special taxation of slaves only.

3. The General Assembly has full power before the birth of those persons who by our constitution and laws can be held in slavery, so to modify existing laws as to allow them to remain as they are born—free.

4. It follows, that the General Assembly has full power so to modify existing laws, as to allow the condition of slavery to attach at birth to those who can be slaves, only in a qualified or limited manner ; that is, to provide for the gradual prospective emancipation of the descendants of female slaves. B.

No. VI.—I am not putting forward any novel or extravagant opinions. If it is admitted that *a man cannot by any possibility be born a slave* ; if it is allowed that *all men are by nature free*—all I have argued for follows of necessity. Who will deny that principle ? It is asserted as the very first self-evident principle in the Declaration of our Independence, and is the foundation principle of that immortal argument. It is reiterated in express terms in nine of the American constitutions. It is a sentiment consecrated to our country, coeval with its national existence, and illustrated and enforced by the proudest monuments in its history. Has any American constitution denied it ? When truly interpreted, I deny that any has. That our own has not, it has been my effort in these papers to show. If any one will prove that I have misinterpreted the constitution of Kentucky, he will establish at the same moment that that instrument has asserted what is not true in fact—that it has upheld what is indefensible in reasoning—that it has established what is fatal in practice—that it is inadequate to the exigencies of society—and should on these accounts be amended with all convenient despatch. Let those who oppose a convention reflect before they drive from them, those who have held many opinions in common with them.

The time and manner of exercising the power which I think I have clearly shown to reside in our state Legislature, is certainly a very delicate question. The *extent* of its exercise will probably present only a single, and that a very plain question. If any thing is ever done, it will be undertaken with the direct intent, and as part of a plan for eradicating slavery from the state altogether. It would be useless to set out with any other object: and the warmest supporters of such a measure would scarcely find any sufficient reason to lend their aid to measures which should propose partial or temporary expedients. When the work is begun, it will begin at the root, and make root and branch work of the whole matter. When to begin and how to begin are the questions of difficulty, which require wisdom and experience in our rulers, and a general acquaintance with the subject, and great mutual forbearance among our people. I will not at this time discuss these questions. They may no doubt be safely left to the disposal of those whose particular duty and interest it will finally become to settle them. Nor will they be without the light of more than one example, in the history of our sister republics, of a people successfully and peacefully achieving just such an amelioration in the condition of society, as they would aim at. To the practical good sense of my fellow citizens, I freely submit them for decision.

There are however one or two points slightly touched or only hinted at in what I have said, which may have an influence on the opinions of some persons, to which I wish more particularly to direct attention. Some are of opinion that an attempt to devise a plan for the future gradual extinguishment of slavery, would greatly diminish the wealth and resources of the commonwealth; others fear the serious depopulation of the state; while others predict still greater evils from the vast accumulation of liberated negroes. It must be apparent that all these forebodings have no better foundation than this assumption—that whatever scheme shall be ultimately adopted will be wholly ineffectual to compass its own ends. Such an assumption is contradicted by the known character of our people, and by the experience of others on this subject. Such fears are moreover in opposition to well established facts, and to all just reasoning.

It may be safely asserted that if a fair and reasonable plan was adopted on this subject, when the period should arrive for its final accomplishment, there would be more free white persons in this state, than the united black and white races would have amounted to at the same time if nothing had been done in the matter. Emigration from a state has rarely produced any sensible diminution in its population. Could any man tell by statistical tables, out of what European nations the thirty or forty millions of Europeans and their progeny now on these American continents, emigrated in the last three centuries? Their population has augmented in defiance of the most bloody wars, as rapidly as in former periods, and yet here are perhaps forty millions of their race withdrawn in three centuries! Can any man take our national census and tell where the million of whites who now people Ohio came from in the last forty years? Almost the whole population of the valley of

the Mississippi has been withdrawn in fifty years from the other portions of this Union, and yet those other portions have continued to augment rapidly and steadily. Indeed it is a very singular fact, and one that shows in a strong point of view, the utter groundlessness of the opinions I am now combatting, that those states along the Atlantic from which the fewest emigrants have gone, have added the smallest ratio of increase to their former numbers. There are those who scatter and yet increase, as we know from holy writ; and here may be found an illustration of taking from those who have not, even that they seem to have, and emptying it into the lap of those already overflowing with abundance. So singularly clear is the principle I am stating, that hardly one example can be found of a nation locating the permanent seat of its empire in the native land of its inhabitants. Every people of which we have any account, has been a nation of emigrants: some by peaceful acquisition of unoccupied regions—some by purchase—most by the power of their victorious bands. Driven out by the wants of too dense a population—fleeing from the various calamities by which every region has at some period been visited—persecuted children of God—oppressed disciples of liberty—the love of gold and the still more unappeasable lust of conquest—every feeling in short has operated to make men wanderers, and all nations colonisers.

Withdraw any reasonable amount of population from a settled country, and in an astonishingly short period, the increased vigor of production stimulated by the greater facilities of subsistence and increased comfort, will fill up the space. Nor does it stop here. A vessel launched into the ocean will make its shock be felt in the agitations of the waves to a long distance from the shore. A heavy body in its descent along an inclined plane acquires a velocity so continually augmented that it will ascend to a great height the adjacent hill. And so it is with nature in all her operations. The principle of production once set in operation with a vigor beyond its common energy will not suddenly be arrested when it has reached the former boundary; but by violent contests with the barriers which surround and depress it, must gradually find its impassable limits. The population of the United States increases about double as fast as that of most European nations, and more than three times as fast as the Asiatic nations with whose condition we are acquainted.

Nor on the other hand is any thing to be apprehended from a source which is made the ground of a contrary objection. If the white race will so speedily supply any vacancy created by the transportation of slaves by their owners, or the voluntary removal of free negroes—why may we not dread the equally rapid increase of free negroes themselves? This depends on other principles, and is equally clear. It would not be possible to adopt any gradual system of emancipation of the blacks, which at its completion would leave as many free negroes as there were slaves when it began. Nay I doubt not the longer the system would be in operation the greater would be the difference between the number of slaves at its origin and free negroes at its close; the free negroes being found perpetually to decrease in number. The direct tendency of any system on this subject, is to diminish the black race, whether

bond or free, and substitute it with a free white race, superior in all respects. That has been the uniform result wherever the experiment has been made on a race with which the prejudices of society prevented it from amalgamating; as is clearly established by the examples of several of the most prosperous states of this Union. Let me illustrate: Say that a law were passed, providing that all the children of female slaves who shall be born in this commonwealth after the year 1835 should be free at 21 years of age; all so born after 1840, should be free at 16 years of age; and all so born after 1856 should be free at birth. Let us see how it would operate. All slaves now alive would continue slaves for life; in regard to all born after that period and before 1856, there would be a qualified and limited slavery. The effect would be, that all negro children born after 1835 would be less valuable to those who owned their mothers. Therefore much fewer would be born, and of those born much fewer would be raised than now. In consequence of the value attached to slaves now, they are well fed and clothed, carefully attended in sickness, well provided for in infancy, and though roughly yet bountifully nurtured. In consequence, a healthy negro woman will have twelve or fifteen children, the most of whom will grow up, and many live in health and vigor to seventy years and upwards. This all happens of course out of pure humanity; which, however, rarely extends itself to the suffering families of whites in the neighborhood of the better fed and better clad slaves. But let that pass. Let slaves be no longer considered valuable as hereditary estate, and such a change in the whole theory and practice of owners will take place, that the female will give birth to only three or four puny children, not half of whom will be raised: and exposure, casualty, and feebler constitutions will cut off the survivors at half their former age. If we add to these the number that would be sold out of the state by owners who would not choose to retain them and abide the system, and the increased number that would probably be emancipated before the time; it is hardly saying too much to assert, that those who would actually go free under any plan that might be adopted, would constitute a very small fraction (perhaps not a twentieth part) of the number of slaves at its origin.

During this process, the race of poor and laboring whites, receiving that just protection, aid and encouragement of which they have been so long deprived, *and which our humanity has so long lavished on the blacks*, and no longer forced to emigrate to avoid the hardships and mortifications incident to their condition in a land of slaves, would find in the increased employment, more comfortable living and greater respectability of their condition, (each operating as a bounty on production) every indispensable ingredient in individual prosperity. Let us suppose that these changes are taking place in a gradually improving state of society, and there could no longer be any doubt that our state must under such auspices, reach a very high degree of wealth, power and cultivation. B.

No. VII.—It is useless to argue *a priori* when experience has placed a proposition beyond dispute.—Such is unquestionably the

case in relation to the increase of free negroes by ordinary generation. They are less prolific than the whites, and less so than the slaves of their own race. It needs must be so. A very corrupt population cannot possibly be a prolific one. To say that free negroes are the most abandoned of our population, is equivalent to saying that they increase more tardily than any other. Such is the uniform fact in all the states. Although twelve states have liberated their slaves, or never tolerated slavery, the free negroes now in the United States amount to only about one in sixty of the whole population; while the slaves are as one in eight of our whole population, although only twelve states tolerate slavery. Nature will not allow us to be tormented by the vices, and afflicted at the same time by the rapid accumulation of a race so worthless. It is always the case with a degraded caste if left to its own efforts. It seems to hang on society in a sort of loose and disconnected way, which a steady effort will always throw off. History is full of curious facts illustrative of this subject, the most extraordinary of which perhaps, relate to the race of beings called Bohemians, Egyptians, Gypsies, and by various other appellations, who inundated Europe like a flight of locusts, and disappeared, leaving to this hour no certain knowledge of the country whence they migrated, or the end to which they came.

In the 1st vol. of the *Memoirs of the French Royal Academy of Medicine*, there is a paper contributed by M. Villermé, from which the following facts are drawn. In the 1st arrondissement of Paris, with a population of 50,000 souls, and paying taxes on property to the amount of six millions of francs, the entire mortality, as appears from official returns, was in a given year, 1 in every 41 of the inhabitants. In the 12th arrondissement of the same city, with a population of seventy thousand souls, and paying taxes on property to the amount of two millions and a half of francs, the entire mortality in the same year was one in every twenty-four of the inhabitants. In some of the wealthy departments, such as Calvados, Orne and Sarthe, the deaths are only one out of fifty of the inhabitants in ordinary years. In the wealthy departments, only one infant in five dies under one year old: in the poorest, one in three. In one year there were taken into the hospitals of Paris—about 1600 seamstresses sick, of whom two in sixteen died; about 800 journeymen shoemakers, of whom two in fifteen died; about 1300 dog-shearers, boot-blacks, door-keepers, beggars, &c., of whom one in four died. From which it appears, that by greater mortality among the children—by worse tending in sickness—by more numerous and violent diseases—and by greater average mortality, the poor increase much more slowly than those who are better provided for; and this even among persons of the same race, and under the same government and laws. Let them be of different races, one degraded and the other cherished—under different conditions of society, and with different hopes and motives, and we can well imagine the rapidity with which one will grow upon the other.

We must take man as we find him. Though we have neither the right nor the disposition to exterminate any race that God has created—neither are we called on, by any artificial condition of

things to stimulate the productiveness of one that is degraded, in an unusual degree. The lessons of experience may be sometimes painful, though full of instruction.

It may be said that the slave-holder would not partake in the prosperity which most persons admit would be augmented by the removal of our slaves; and that he would find in the general welfare no adequate compensation for his own ruin. I am not able to see the injury to the slave-owner likely to arise out of any reasonable project for abolishing slavery in this state. Say some such plan were adopted as that I have heretofore alluded to. Every slave we own would be secured to us as we now enjoy them, for the same period—their lives. That will, no doubt, be as long as we could enjoy any thing in this world; for scarcely any owner outlives the average lifetime of his slaves. Even beyond this, a period of some years in advance would be given, during which all who are born would be slaves also for life. Thus far then, or during our lives and their's, no difference would be produced in our situations. We might still retain them and enjoy their labor; or sell them and enjoy their value; or liberate them, at our pleasure. Slave labor is even now so little valuable in this state, that many persons whose interests or attachments retain them here, locate their slaves in the lower country, and employ them in the culture of more valuable staples. We should have 20 or 30 years to look about us before any injury could accrue to us; and if we should finally resolve to remove, we should have half of this large and beautiful empire, out of which to select a resting place, amid a people like ourselves in their language, religion, laws and institutions of society. Added to all this we should have this consolation, and it must be a lofty one, that our brethren who differed from us in this great plan of operations, are honestly laboring after the grandeur of a commonwealth dear to us all, and that their labors are of a character, which, whether practicable or not, needs must command our fervent benedictions.

That estate which for a period of twenty or thirty years a man may enjoy without stint of waste, or any after accountability, is, for all practical purposes, equal to an estate forever. If we add to this the right during those twenty or thirty years to dispose of the estate and retain the proceeds forever, it is idle to talk about a larger or more entire interest. There can be no force therefore, in those arguments which would bring the children, born or expected, of slave-owners, into this discussion as classes of persons to be impoverished in the progress of such plans. I suppose that slaves are not the kind of property by which even those who own them would prefer to enrich their children. And surely twenty years are amply sufficient to enable us to commute one estate for another. Our laws of descent give a different turn to all such reflections. Few persons own slaves whose ancestors belonged to their's. Wealth rarely remains three generations in a right line of descent. This fact should cut up at once all selfish interests from our hearts, and make us look, in the settlement of all general questions, only to the common interests of mankind, amid the great mass of whom, our children, or at the farthest, our grand-children, must take the denun-

eciation against our first parent, which has been perpetuated upon nine-tenths of his race, "in the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread."

There is an idea which has pressed most heavily on my mind, that I will suggest, before closing a discussion which has grown to such an unexpected length.—Men will not always remain slaves. No kindness can soothe the spirit of a slave. No ignorance, however abject, can obliterate the indelible stamp of nature, whereby she decreed man free. No cruelty of bondage, however rigorous, can suppress forever the deep yearnings after freedom. No blighting of deferred and crushed hopes will so root them from the heart, that when the sun shines and the showers fall, they will not rise up from their resting place and flourish. The stern Spartan took the dagger and the cord. With what avail? The wiser Roman, as he freed his slave, against whom no barrier was raised in the difference of complexion, allowed him to aspire to most of the rights and dignities of citizenship, and all the privileges of private friendship. Yet the annals of the empire show that this was hardly an alleviation of the calamity. The slaves of the Jews, the remnant of the conquered nations of the land, for a long course of ages were by turns their victorious master, and menial servants. Here is no doubtful experience. History sheds on this subject a broad and steady light, and sheds it on one unchanging lesson. Domestic slavery cannot exist forever. It cannot exist long quiet and unbroken, in any condition of society, or under any form of government. It may terminate in various ways; but terminate it must. It may end in revolution; bear witness San Domingo. The Greek and the Egyptian took other methods, effective each if fully acted out, and differing only in the manner of atrocity. It may end in amalgamation—a base, spurious, degraded mixture, hardly the least revolting method of the three. Or it may be brought to a close by gradually supplanting the slaves with a free and more congenial race, in some such manner as I have attempted to illustrate. It is an American scheme, matured and fully executed in several of our most prosperous states. That it is effectual, let their examples tell: that it is wise, let the relative conditions of New York and Virginia answer; that it is humane, if by humane we mean that which augments the sum of human happiness, let him declare, who living among freemen, owns and governs slaves.

I have endeavored to look at this subject merely as a political speculation, relinquishing every advantage which might have been derived from other and most cogent aspects. If those who agree with me, think that in doing this I have failed of doing justice to our cause, I appeal to their candor when I say, that if failing in every point, I shall have pointed the way in which some abler hand may vindicate the constitutional power for which I contend, I shall have achieved more for this cause, which I contend is that of my country's glory, than many who have preceded me. To those who differ with me, on the other hand, I have given the best pledge of the depth of my convictions of our common interest and duty, by presenting such views only as they will admit are legitimate, and canvassing the matter in that aspect only, on which they have been taught to repose as impregnable.

B.

A THIRD LETTER TO THE RULING ELDERS OF THE PRESBYTERIAN  
CHURCH IN THE UNITED STATES.

It is my purpose, beloved brethren, to consider briefly and plainly, in this letter, the doctrine of our own "Form of Government" in regard to the question we are discussing. Does it teach that you are really and truly *Presbyters*, and so as to *order* equal to all other Presbyters, or not?

The 1st ch. of the "Form of Government," sec. 6, asserts not only that "the character, qualifications, and authority of church officers" but also "the proper method of their investiture and institution"—"are laid down in the holy scriptures." To the scriptures therefore we ought to go, and so we shall before we close. But at present, let us see what is the doctrine thus professedly brought from the scriptures by the fathers of our church.

"The ordinary and perpetual officers in the church, are Bishops or Pastors; the representatives of the people usually styled Ruling Elders; and Deacons."—(Chap. iii. sec. 2.) Upon this, it is to be noted, that to disfranchise the Elder is to degrade the body of God's people, for he is emphatically their representative; the representation of a "royal priesthood." Again, one of the proof texts cited to establish the pastoral office, (Eph. iv. 11, 12,) confessedly relates equally to that of Ruling Elder. And again, the very words used in the proof text cited for the Ruling Elder (1 Tim. v. 17,) and from which his very name comes—import an officer who has *pre-eminence*—such as a president, a prefect; the chief person in a state,—the very fountain of authority; the chief amongst the Presbyters,—the Ruling Presbyters. And therefore, shall we say, unfit to confer authority on others?

"We hold it to be expedient, and agreeable to scripture and the practice of the primitive Christians, that the church be governed by Congregational, Presbyterial, and Synodical assemblies"—(ch. viii. sec. 1.) Just so: the church is not a democracy to be governed by the brotherhood; nor an oligarchy to be ruled by prelates; but a republic to be guided by delegated assemblies of ordained men. Just so was the primitive church governed; as we shall prove before we are done with this subject. And for the present will content ourself with saying that if any scholar will find in the writings of the fathers of the first three centuries, the word *Presbytery* used one single time to mean any thing else than the Pastor and Elders of a particular church, he will do what no one else ever could. Therefore, by the force of the indisputable first principle quoted above, Ruling Elders must aid in the ordination of Pastors; or else Pastors were not ordained at all for three hundred years after Christ; or if they were, it was either on prelatical or congregational principles, which cuts the throat of Presbyterianism.

"The Church Session consists of the Pastor or Pastors and Ruling Elders of a particular congregation"—(ch. ix. 1.) To this Session, amongst other important duties, it belongs "to appoint delegates to the higher judicatories of the church" (sec. 6.)—viz. those "representatives of the people" before spoken of. The proof

text here is Acts xv. 2-6. From which it appears that the authority in the church at Antioch was a parochial Presbytery; that this body not only deputed Paul and Barnabas to a great mission—but “laid their hands on them” before they sent them on it; that these apostles gave account of themselves when they returned; that afterwards the question of gentile circumcision arising in this parochial Presbytery or church session, after “no small dissention and disputation,” the same apostles “with certain other of them” were deputed by it to Jerusalem, where “*the Apostles and Elders* came together” and considered and settled the matter. All this, we say, is manifest; or else the proof reference is absurd and proves nothing it was cited to prove. But it was cited by the Westminster Assembly itself, as Lightfoot shows in regard to all these proof texts; and they were all cited after grave examination. But if our standard definitions and proofs involve these things, how unutterably ridiculous it is to say that men who might of right act thus towards Paul and Barnabas, are, from their very rank and office, unfit and disqualified to do the like, or less things, towards ministers and evangelists of our day?

“A Presbytery consists of all the ministers, and one ruling elder from each congregation, within a certain district”—(chap. x. sec. 2.) To justify this definition and the existence of the body thus defined, texts are cited, which prove, if they prove any thing to the point, that ruling elders like ours, sat and acted with full powers, in the primitive Presbyteries of Jerusalem and Ephesus; in that which ordained Timothy; in that which decided the question of gentile circumcision, &c. &c. Few better ministers than Timothy are, we fear, ordained now-a-days; none, we presume, with more authority, or to a higher rank, in our church. It follows, therefore, that these proof texts are falsely cited, that Presbyterianism is not of scriptural authority, and that ruling elders did not aid in ordaining Timothy; or else that ruling elders now, may and should sit in Presbytery with all the inherent powers they did at first, and partake in ordaining all ministers that are not higher than Timothy—in *office* we mean—not in merit or pretensions.

“The Presbytery has power . . . to *ordain*, install, remove, and judge *ministers*”—(chap. x., sec. 8.) The proof texts here are as full and explicit for the presence and power of one sort of Presbyters as another; that is for those “*that rule well*” as for those that “*labor in the word and doctrine*.” By the previous definition, the Presbytery consists of both sorts; that is of ministers and ruling elders—(chap. x., sec. 2.) Therefore, by the very force of the terms, which terms are carefully chosen, based on scripture, and in themselves technical—both sorts have unitedly the power “*to ordain ministers*”—(chap. x., sec. 8.) *Quod erat demonstrandum*. If there is any sense in precise constitutional definitions, these settle this question.—Suppose a rule said a church consists of men and women who love God; and another said the church ought to commune once a month; who would venture to say the meaning was, that only the women should commune? Suppose a definition set forth that a school consists of boys and girls; and another that that the school should attend prayers every morning; who

would pretend that only the boys should pray? Well, here the definition is, the Presbytery consists of ministers and elders; another is that the Presbytery shall ordain; and wise men and able divines, say this means that only ministers can ordain! And people call this sense and logic; biblical literature; exegesis; and other fine, big names!

There is a particular chapter (the 15th) "Of the Election and Ordination of Bishops or Pastors and Evangelists." When a call is made out, it is to be presented to "*the Presbytery*," (sec. 8,) that is, to a body made up of ministers and elders—and no call can be lawfully received, except "through the hands of the Presbytery" thus composed—(sec. 9.) Every act indispensable to ordination subsequent to the call, passes under the eye and authority of "the Presbytery"—(sec. 10, 11, 12, 13.) When all is fully accomplished, "the presiding minister shall, by prayer, and with the *laying on of the hands of the Presbytery*, according to the apostolic example, solemnly ordain him to the holy office of the gospel ministry"—(sec. 14.) Who ordains? The presiding minister; such are the words; he "shall solemnly ordain," &c. He does this by previous appointment of the Presbytery, (sec. 12,) and as its organ. Who concur? "The Presbytery"—(sec. 14;) that body composed of ministers and elders. How? By "laying on of the hands of the Presbytery"—(sec. 14.) Was any thing ever plainer? Could words more precisely convey a particular sense?

There is a subsequent clause of this same emphatic section which is often quoted to defeat all the provisions heretofore cited. It is in these words; "Prayer being ended, . . . the minister who presides shall first, and afterwards all the members of the Presbytery in their order, take him by the right hand, saying in words to this purpose, "We give you the right hand of fellowship to take part of this ministry with us"—(chap. xv., sec. 14.) Therefore, it is urged, elders cannot take part in ordinations because they cannot with propriety use the words quoted, to a minister. To this, various answers may be given. First, the man is already ordained, and this ceremony forms no part of the act. Secondly, if elders could not use the very words, they might use words very similar; and the ceremony only requires "*words to this purpose*;" for example, suppose they should say "We give you the right hand of fellowship as a fellow labourer and brother Presbyter;" what then? Thirdly, is not the language express—"all the members of the Presbytery"—shall do this thing; and are not elders members; and shall fastidious, verbal criticisms upset a positive law, previously laid down, and here again repeated. Fourthly, there is not the least impropriety in the identical form of words used; the office of a Presbyter is a "*ministry*;" though there be two kinds of Presbyters, viz., those who "rule well," and those who "labour in the word and doctrine"—still both sorts are really Presbyters, and Presbyters only; and in that regard, "*the ministry*" unto the fellowship of which the newly ordained is welcomed, is one as to both classes of the same general order. Fifthly, the matter of ordination appertains essentially to the function of government, not to that of teaching; therefore the form of welcome is not only

proper to be used by elders who are expressly 'governments'—but is properly used by ministers themselves as partaking this authority, rather than as being labourers in the word and doctrine; and so all the reformed churches held, and most excluded mere teachers from the Presbytery entirely. Sixthly, the proof texts cited (Acts i. 25, and Gal. ii. 9.) contain nothing whatever to bear out the exclusive views of those who would thus pervert our standards; but the contrary: for in the former case there is no evidence in the sacred record that Mathias was formally ordained at all, or any body's hands laid on him; and in the second case, Paul had been an apostle fourteen years before Peter, James and John gave him the right hand of fellowship.

Ponder the argument drawn from the plain words and obvious sense of our Form of Government; and then consider the objections commonly urged against the exercise of the rights and duties growing out of them. You will find, unless I greatly deceive myself, that our standards, whether right or wrong, are so plain that even a tolerable gloss cannot be put on them so as to make them deny your scriptural functions. And you will also find, that the arguments which go to show the contrary, are essentially attacks upon your office rather than interpretations of your constitution. They who doubted the scripturalness of your office, originally deprived you of the functions in dispute. They who would deprive you again, will probably follow their opinions to the original and legitimate source of their error.

I tell you, therefore, again and again, that the true nature of your office turns on the question at issue; and thus, in some sense, the whole Presbyterian system of church order.

In the bonds of the gospel, your fellow labourer.

R. J. B.

---

ALLOCATION OF HIS HOLINESS, POPE GREGORY XVI., IN THE SECRET CONSISTORY OF THE 19TH OF THE CALEND OF DECEMBER, (22nd NOVEMBER,) 1839, UPON THE SCHISM IN RUSSIA.

"VENERABLE BROTHERS.—Since the commencement of our apostolic functions we have been compelled, by the many misfortunes of the times, to announce to you, from this very place, a great many grievous and lamentable events; but that which we have to communicate to you in our present assembly, in the midst of the afflictions and of the mourning of the church, is of such a nature that it surpasses by far the bitterness of the evils for which we have hitherto lamented.

"No one of you is ignorant of the fact that the Russian bishops, and the entire of that illustrious nation who, after having received the Catholic unity with the Christian faith had unhappily abandoned it, and followed the deplorable schism of the Greeks, retaining the use of its ordinary language, and the Greek rites; that this nation, I say, had more than once meditated, with the assistance of the Divine Grace, to return with sincerity and constancy to the Roman church. Thus first in the general council of Florence, the Archbishop of Kiow, metropolitan of all the Russians subscribed with the Greeks to the celebrated decree of union, and although the thing had soon after fallen to the ground on account of the troubles.

which arose and by the hostile efforts of those who, rebels to the light, adhered most obstinately to the schism, nevertheless, the bishops never ceased to keep the same object in view, and at length the happy day appeared when God displayed his mercy to them, and when it was allowed to the Russian nation again to enter the bosom of the mother, which it had abandoned, and to return to that holy city founded by the Most High, and in which alone salvation can be obtained.

“For, about the end of the sixteenth century the Russian Bishops who were under the civil dominion of the pious Sigismund III., King of Poland, and Grand Duke of Lithuania, recollecting the concord and tranquility which had formerly existed between the churches of the east and west—concord which their ancestors had maintained with care, under the government of the Holy See, without being constrained by violence or deceived by artifice—without suffering themselves to be led away by inconsideration, or seduced by temporal advantages, but solely illuminated by light from above, and yielding to the only knowledge of the truth—excited, in a word, by the sole desire of their own salvation, and of that of the flocks intrusted to them, after having deliberated on this affair in a general assembly, sent two of their colleagues to this chair of St. Peter; and after having abjured their schismatical errors, demanded to be admitted once more into society with the Roman Church, and be re-established in the ancient unity with her.

“Many apostolic constitutions attest with what charity our predecessor Clement VIII., of holy memory, received them in the midst of the applause of the Catholic universe; what solicitude the Holy See showed for them, with what wise indulgence it treated them, and how it aided them in every manner. By these constitutions, particular graces and great benefits were granted to this nation; the clergy were permitted to follow the sacred rites which they held from their relations with the Eastern church, and colleges were erected in many places, but particularly in Wilna, or else were supported by annual incomes, to educate the clergy of the Russian nation in holiness of faith and morals. Unfortunately, this union so happily re-established between the Russian and Roman church, was exposed, in the course of time, to painful alternations; but it was always a matter of joy that the greater portion of them guided particularly by the constancy of their bishops, continued to show themselves strongly devoted to the Holy See, and so attached to the centre of unity that, notwithstanding the errors of a vain system of philosophy which insinuated themselves in these countries during the last century, and notwithstanding false and perverse opinions, they did not deviate from the integrity of the doctrine of the Catholic faith.

“But oh, unhappy change!—Oh, calamity which never can be sufficiently deplored for the Russians!—those who had been given to them as fathers and pastors—those who ought to have been their masters and their guides to cling more closely to the body of Jesus Christ, which is the church; those very men have been, to the misfortune of the nation, the authors of the new defection. Behold, venerable brothers, that which troubles and afflicts us!—behold that which adds to the bitterness and pains that come to us from all sides, and that which calls for tears rather than words! We avow that we could not at first prevail on ourselves to give credit to all that the public rumours related of this melancholy event. We reflected on the great distance of the places, and on the extreme difficulty which we experience in communicating with the Catholics of those countries. It is on that account that we have deferred giving public expression to our lament on the greatness of the evil.

“But certain accounts having since arrived, and the circumstances having been expressly announced by the journals, it is a fact unhappily, as incontestable as it is painful, that many of the bishops of the United Russians in Lithuania and White Russia, with a portion of the clergy, and of

the people who are confided to them, have abandoned the communion of the Roman Church, whence is derived the unity of the priesthood, and have passed into the camp of the schismatics. Such has been their conduct in this iniquitous design, that they first introduced by fraud into the celebration of the offices, the books which they got from the Russo-Greeks, and that they rendered nearly the whole form of worship conformable to the usage of the latter, so that the ignorant people were drawn, as it were, involuntarily into schism, by the similarity of the rites which were thus insensibly established. At length, by their orders, the parochial clergy were convoked together several times, and circulars were addressed to them, in which in the midst of impudent falsehoods, each of them were ordered to profess his adhesion to the Russo-Greek Church, according to the formula which was then presented to them, in the mean time reminding those who refused, that they forfeited that moment their place as pastors, and that accusations would be carried before a superior authority against them, and against the other priests who refused after their example.

"At length, after having employed other machinations, they arrived at such a degree of perversity, that they did not blush to declare in public their intention of adhering to the Russo-Greek church, and to unite their prayers, in the name of their flocks, in order to obtain the permission of the emperor for that purpose. The result has answered their wishes; for all being prepared and sanctioned by the schismatic synod sitting at Petersburg, the uniting to the Russo-Greek church, of the Bishops, of the clergy, and of the people of Russia, which had been, up to that time, united to the Church of Rome, has been decreed and celebrated with solemnity. It would be too painful for us to relate in this place all that made us foresee this result for a long time, and by what suggestions these degenerate pastors have been precipitated into the abyss of malice and perdition. Beholding their miserable fall we can only exclaim in the words of the sacred Scripture, "The judgments of God, are a profound abyss!

"You see, venerable brothers, by this cruel wound inflicted on the Catholic church, what is the situation of our mind, and what is our inmost and most bitter sorrow. After that, venerable brothers, we cannot dissemble that the cause of our sorrow on the situation of Catholic affairs in the vast empire of Russia, extends itself much further. We know how much our holy religion has been there, for a long time overwhelmed with persecutions. We have not, surely, neglected to apply all the cares of our pastoral solicitude to assuage them, and for the future we shall not spare any exertion with the powerful emperor, hoping still that in his justice, and in his elevated mind, he will receive with kindness, our prayers and entreaties.—To arrive at this termination, let us approach with confidence to a throne of grace, praying, all of us together, the Father of mercies and the God of all consolation, that he may look down with goodness on his inheritance, that he may console by his timely assistance the Church his spouse, who weeps bitterly for the loss of her children, and that he may grant in his clemency a tranquillity so long desired in the midst of so many adversities."

---

THE DOCTRINE OF THE CHURCH OF ROME, THAT NO FAITH IS TO BE HELD WITH HERETICS.

PROTESTANT writers have not scrupled to assert, that it is a doctrine of the church of Rome that no faith, however pledged, is to be kept with heretics. In the year 1768, Mr. Pitt employed Mr. Charles Butler, the eminent Roman Catholic barrister, to draw up a case, and submit this, with other queries, to the Roman Catholic Universities abroad.

These questions were regularly transmitted in the same year to the Universities of Louvain, Douay, Paris, Alcalá, Valladolid, and Salamanca; and from all of them in that and the following year, answers were received all in the strongest negative form.

The University of Louvain was overwhelmed with astonishment that such a question should be proposed to her, and replies thus:

"Proceeding to the third question, the said Faculty, in perfect wonder (*germinato stupore!*) that such a question should be proposed to her, most positively and unequivocally answers, that there is not, and that there never has been, among Catholics, or in the doctrines of the church of Rome, any law or principle which makes it lawful for Catholics to break their faith with heretics or others of a different persuasion from themselves in matters of religion, either in public or private concerns. The said Faculty strongly protests against the imputation that the Catholic Church has at any time held a contrary doctrine. This he asserts, is a calumny, invented and endeavored to be forced upon Catholics by the worst of men (*a pessimis hominibus,*) who, knowing their charges against Catholics were destitute of truth, determined to make falsehood supply its place, and thereby render the Catholics odious to princes and states."

Equally decisive, if not so indignant, was the reply of the University of Paris:

"The tenet, that it is lawful to break faith with heretics, is so repugnant to common honesty and the opinions of Catholics, that there is nothing of which those who have defended the Catholic faith against Protestants have complained more heavily than the malice and calumny of their adversaries in imputing this tenet to them."

We shall brave the wrath of these angry doctors, and present them with a comment on their veracious statements, derived (through Dr. Adam Clark's research) from those spiteful and calumnious adversaries, the close rolls in the Tower of London.

A. D. 1382, an 5, Richard II., Urban VI., publishes a declaratory bull for the guidance of future ages, "ad futuram rei memoriam," the very title of which is sufficient for our purpose. "Leagues made with heretics are null and void." ("*Ligas cum hæreticis, quacunq̄ firmitate roboratas esse nullas.*") As usual, his holiness, in resorting to such extremes, is only concerned for the souls' health of good Catholics, "lest by any kind of agreement with heretics and schismatics the faithful should be exposed to danger." By this bull (which may be seen in Rymer vii., page 352) he absolves all kings, princes, dukes, &c., and all others, from all leagues, agreements, &c., of whatsoever extent, or howsoever made, with any heretics, whether those confederations were made before the persons or states became heretical or since, and even though they had been confirmed by an oath, "*etiam si forent juramento vel fide data fir, matæ!*"

This was followed the next year by a second bull, of which a copy remains in the Tower, which differs from its predecessor by the additional clause, that had these confederations been confirmed by oath, by fealty pledged, or by the Pope himself (aut confirma-

tione apostolica) still, as made with heretics or schismatics, they were null and void, "for," says the pope, "there should be no communion between darkness and light, and no concord between Christ and Belial."

The alleged infallibility of the see of Rome binds these decisions as a mill-stone round the neck of Popery. Indeed, however angry she may be when charged with them, however unwilling to have it supposed that she still clings to them, there is, in truth, no ground for the charitable hope that she would be rid of them even if she could. The notes to the Douay Bible, printed in Ireland in the course of the present century, under the sanction of the Romish bishops, repeat these infamous doctrines.

[For the Spirit of the XIX. Century.]

THE TEMPTATION AND BETRAYAL OF OUR LORD.—PART II.

*And when the Devil had ended all the temptation, he (απειστη stood or kept off or away,) departed from him for a season—(αχρη καιρου until the season.—(Luke iv. 13.)*

THE twelfth chapter closes the record which the evangelist makes of the public ministrations of our Lord. In fact he says nothing of them after verse 36th of that chapter. In the 13th chapter, he conducts us to the little circle composed of the Redeemer and his disciples. The *time* is the evening of the day preceding the crucifixion. The first fact recited in this chapter is, that the Devil had already put it into the heart of Judas to betray his Lord and Master. The word is *βαβληκοτος*, put or cast it. The idea is that the Devil had *instigated* Judas to commit the crime, and the necessary implication is that Judas had cherished the temptation. Doubtless, Satan was permitted during the whole of our Lord's ministry to the Jews, to instigate individuals to purposes of evil against him, and this appears to have been one of them. But the reader will please to mark the word selected to express it—(*βαλλω*—jacio, immitto.) Judas by cherishing the temptation instead of rejecting it with horror, deserved to be abandoned of God and given over to Satan, to be used as his instrument. God did give him over, and he became and was named the son of perdition. The evangelist then proceeds to record a lesson of humility and love which the Redeemer taught by condescending to wash the feet of his disciples: this done, we are informed in the next place, that our Lord was greatly disturbed in spirit, and solemnly affirmed that one of their number would betray him. This prediction produced consternation among the disciples. They were silent. The next words which appear to have been audibly uttered, were the words of Jesus, "That thou doest, do quickly."

The description is graphic. Let the reader depict to his own mind the scene. The Redeemer troubled in spirit and betraying it to the eyes of his disciples—his solemn assertion that one of the little number would betray him—the disciples looking at each other with distressing doubts—Peter beckoning to John, who was lying

on Jesus's bosom—John inquiring inaudibly, and Jesus answering him in the same way, Jesus then dips a morsel and gives it to Judas. The silence is then broken by his address apparently to Judas—"What thou doest, do quickly." Judas then rises and withdraws from the circle. The silence is then broken again by the saying of Jesus, "Now is the Son of man glorified," &c. Most of this scene was addressed to the eye—the ear caught only the three short sentences uttered by the Saviour at brief intervals, "one of you shall betray be"—"that thou doest do quickly"—"now is the Son of man glorified." The Saviour then soon resumes his discourse which was suspended by the evangelist, at verse 20 of this chapter, for the purpose of recording the mysterious transaction by which Judas was separated from the twelve, and Satan permitted (as we shall endeavour to show) to accomplish the death of the Redeemer.

The reader will now please to consult the original text of this passage, and observe the peculiarity of the expressions, and particularly the use of the pronouns *αυτος* and *εκεινος*. After the sop, then Satan entered into him—(μετα τὸ ψωμίον τότε εισηλθεν εις εκεινον ὁ Σατανας.) Observe here a change of phraseology. In verse 2 we are informed that the Devil had *already* (ἤδη) put it into the heart (βεληκος) of Judas to betray him, but in this verse (27) it is intimated that Satan took possession of Judas, at the particular moment indicated. The word (τοτε) "then," is omitted in our translation, but it appears to be emphatic—"After the sop, then Satan entered," &c. That is, Satan did not enter into Judas *before* the giving of the sop, although he had *already* (that is, before the sop,) put it into the heart of Judas to betray him—(ἤδη βεληκος, verse 2) Now, are we to understand by Satan's entering into Judas, merely a new temptation—a repeated and stronger instigation? Luke uses the same expression, (xxii. 3,) (εισηλθε δε ὁ Σατανας εις Ιουδαν,) though he does not mark the moment at which the event took place, but John informs us that it took place at the moment before Judas finally separated himself from the twelve, which was the same night he was betrayed—(verse 30.)

This form of expression does not elsewhere occur in the New Testament, except with reference to demoniacal possession. Peter in his address to Ananias (in Acts v. 3,) uses the expression, why hath Satan filled thy heart, (επληρωσε την καρδιαν σου,) yet this implies nothing more, perhaps, than a strong instigation of Satan. The same remark may be made upon the expressions in Eph. ii. 2; 2 Tim. ii. 26. See also Eph. iv. 27. Why then does the evangelist in the place under consideration use an expression so peculiar, unless he intended to declare that Satan did literally and actually enter into Judas at that time? *Corporaliter eum inhabitando*. Not that he became incarnate in the sense of a hypostatic union; for that would be impossible for any creature. If the reader should withhold his assent from this suggestion, he must contend that the word (εισηλθε) *entered*, is used metaphorically. The primary or plain use of the word occurs in such passages as the following, "enter thy closet" Matt. vi. 6; "enter the straight gate," Matt. vii. 13; "enter a city or village," Matt. x. 11; "enter a house," Matt. xii.

4. But it is unnecessary to cite further examples of this sort. A passage more to the purpose occurs in Luke viii. 33, (also in Mark v. 12, 13,) whereby permission of the Saviour, devils (*δαίμονια*) entered into (*εἰσῆλθε*) swine. Doubtless this was an (*obsessio carnalis*) actual incarnation if we may so say. Certainly these brute beasts were not susceptible of instigation in the sense of the word as applied to rational beings. Mark ix. 26, may also be referred to in connexion with this passage, where it is recorded that our Lord upon casting out an evil spirit, commanded him not only to come out, (*εἰσῆλθε*) but that he should no more enter into (*μὴ εἰσέλθῃς εἰς αὐτόν*) the person possessed. The reader has doubtless observed the phrase used to express a demoniacal possession, and that the words commonly, if not universally used to express a dispossession, is "to cast out," (*εκβάλλω*) Matt. xvii. 19; x. 1. In fact the world itself is described as being possessed of the devil, whom our Lord will in due time wholly expel and cast out of it—(the words are *εκβληθῆσονται ἐξ αὐτοῦ*, John xii. 31.)\*

These passages are referred to, merely for the purpose of showing the use of the word under consideration. It is not supposed that Judas became a demoniac in the ordinary sense of the word, when Satan entered into him. His reason remained unimpaired, no doubt, and his conduct was guilty at every step. He acted freely as guide to them that took Jesus, Acts i. 18. He afterwards felt and confessed his guilt, Matt. xxvii. 3, 4, and our Lord himself declared it had been good for him if he had never been born, Mark xiv. 21. His character, however, was perfectly known from the beginning. "Have not I chosen you twelve, and one of you is a devil. He spake of Judas Iscariot—(John vi. 70, 71.) Indeed the treachery of Judas was predicted in Ps. xli. 9, and the prophesy was applied to him in the chapter under consideration—(John xiii. 18.) "I speak not of you all, I know whom I have chosen, but that the scripture may be fulfilled—he that eateth bread with me hath lifted up his heel against me." Now why did our Lord

\* If this act of Satan were only an instigation of a stronger nature, why should John note it as a fact occurring in a certain order? "After the sop, then Satan entered into (*εἰσῆλθε*) that one." He had already instigated him successfully (see verse 2.) Judas doubtless had been cherishing the purpose to betray his Lord and Master, all along, and Satan had doubtless been incessant in his instigations, not being willing to relinquish any advantage he had gained. Why then, if it were merely a repeated act of instigation, should it be recorded as one distinct fact occurring after the giving of the sop and before Judas went out? Again, was not the giving of the morsel some-how connected with the entering of Satan into Judas? Is there not here a fulfilment of the prophesy cited from Ps. xli. 9—(in *Ps. 40; 9*, see verse 18.) "He that eateth bread with me," &c. Was not the act of eating that morsel, the more especial fulfilment of this prophesy? If so, could Satan accomplish his purpose till that prophesy was fulfilled? And if this act of giving a morsel of food was especially designed by the Saviour as the fulfilment of that prophesy on his part, we may see a reason why he should fix upon that as a sign to indicate the traitor, and we may see also that on the reception of the morsel by Judas and his eating it, nothing remained to be fulfilled as a prerequisite to the lifting up of the heel;—so that our Lord upon giving this sign, and saying "that thou doest do quickly," may be supposed to revert to what he had said in verse 18th, (quoting Ps. xli. 9,) and this prophesy, therefore, was completely fulfilled by this act, and the events which followed it.

choose Judas as one of the twelve apostles (Mark iii. 14, 19,) if not for some mysterious purpose in the Divine economy? All things that were written in the scriptures concerning Christ, must be fulfilled—of course his betrayal by one of his professed followers; and in his sufferings and the events leading to them, he must destroy the great enemy of God and man, whose ruin was predicted at the fall; and may we not suppose that the treacherous disciple, and this super-human enemy both concurring towards the same end, would in some mysterious way be conjoined, or if we may so say, be identified? But is there not involved in this fact also another matter? Does not Judas exhibit in image, or rather by way of type, the antichrist of whom Daniel and Paul prophesied? Both are called the "son of perdition"—John xvii. 12; 2 Thess. ii. 3, and this epithet is applied only to Judas and the man of sin, or the antichrist. Some look for a personal antichrist yet to appear; while the larger portion of Protestant Christians understand by antichrist and the man of sin, that portion of the professing church which consists of carnal and ungodly men who are governed, as Judas was, by motives of gain—who make merchandise of the souls of men, and cruelly persecute or betray to the secular powers, the humble followers of Christ, that they may be destroyed; Judas may be a type of those false teachers described in 2 Peter ii., who in the name of Christ oppose Christ, and do what they can to destroy his kingdom. In character he corresponds with that of Sebna described in Isaiah xxii. 15, 16, who, as Vitringa supposes, was the type of the Jewish rulers at the time of our Lord's advent—carnal, sensual, proud men, whom the prophet predicted should be cast out of their place—(see 2 Kings xviii. 18; Vitringa Anacrisis Apocalypseos, cap. i. 20, No. xxx., and on Isaiah in loco; also Scott's Note, and Ps. lv. 12, 21.) And as Sebna was the type of the generation of Jewish rulers that rejected our Lord. So Eliakim [which signifies Deus resurgens vel Dei resurrectio—filius Helkia id est patris Domini,] was the type of Christ.

If we may assume, then, that Judas was typical of that son of perdition whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth and destroy with the brightness of his coming, the suggestion that Satan actually entered into the typical son of perdition, is, to say the least, not improbable, inasmuch as we know that when the man of sin shall be destroyed, Satan himself will be expelled from this world, and his dominion terminate in the destruction of the man of sin. How Satan could act conjunctively with Judas and through his person, and yet with a more direct agency than by mere instigation (which ordinarily may be resisted) and yet both act freely, is a matter which we cannot explain. These remarks, however, are digressive, and we return to the passage under consideration.

"After the sop, then entered into him (*επισην*) Satan." This is the order in which the words stand in the original text. "Jesus (*ου*) therefore says (*αυτω*) to him, what thou art doing, do (*that is*, accomplish or finish doing it) quickly, (*ταχιστα*) that is, more quickly than you appear willing to do; (Winer, who cites Lucke in loco,) or rather, more quickly than you would do it if left at liberty to prolong it. (Quod jam) *facis*, quo jam occupatus es id (fac) per-

*fice ocuis Vide Winer.*) The particle *ου* is illative. "Therefore," that is because Satan had entered into Judas, "Jesus says (*αυτω*) to him. To whom? The reader will probably answer to Judas. But the word is *αυτω*, and the nearest antecedent is *Σατανας*, and the rules of grammar allow us to refer the word (*αυτω*) him, to (*Σατανας*) Satan. Besides, the word *αυτω* seems to be used in contradistinction to *εαυτος*. The word *εαυτος* is thrice used in the context. Thus in verse 25, He then (*εαυτος*) lying on Jesus breast, viz. John. In verse 26, Jesus answered, (*εαυτος*) he it is to whom I shall give a sop. In verse 27, after the sop, Satan entered into (*εαυτω*) him, i. e., that one to whom he gave the sop. "Then Jesus said" (not *εαυτω* to that one to whom he gave the sop, but *αυτω* "to him," that is to the personage last named; Satan. Why did the evangelist change the pronoun except for the purpose of avoiding ambiguity? In verse 28 the word *αυτω* occurs again, and evidently having reference to Judas, but there the immediate antecedent is Judas. But some thought because Judas had the bag, that Jesus said (*αυτω*) to him.\* It is obvious that the meaning of our Lord was not understood by any one at the table, not even by John himself; for he says no one of those at the table knew, and of course he did not perceive the real import of the transaction. But the spirit of God revealed it to him afterwards, and he writes (as one who understood at the time of his writing, the mysterious occurrence,) for the express purpose of explaining clearly what was quite unintelligible to the disciples who witnessed it. The discrimination between Judas and Satan which is made by the use of these pronouns, is the key to the meaning. This discrimination could not be made by the eye of those present. They saw only Judas and he seemed to be the only person addressed.

If the next verse be read with the emphasis on the word *him*, it will bring out the sense suggested. Indeed if the word *him* in the second clause of verse 27 (*λεγει ουν αυτω*) refers to Judas, the word (*αυτω*) *him* in verse 29 would seem superfluous. The fact that

\* It is proper to remark that neither the vulgate nor the translations of Montanus, Erasmus, Fabricius, or Tremellius preserve the distinction in the use of the pronouns *αυτος* and *εαυτος*. They render both by the Latin pronoun *is*. But Beza translates *εαυτος* by *illum*, and *αυτω* by *ei*.

Et post buccellam introivit in eum Satanas et dixit ei Jesus, etc.—Vulgate.

Ac post panem tunc ingressus est in eum Satanas, et dixit ei Jeschua, etc.—Fabricius.

Et post buccellam tunc in troivit in eum Satanas; Dicit ergo ei Jesus, etc.—Montanus.

Et post offulam ingressus est in eum Satanas; Dicit igitur ei Jesus, etc.—Erasmus.

Et post sumptum panem tunc, ingressus est in eum Satanas; et dixit ei Jeschua, etc.—Tremellius.

Et post sumptam offulam tunc ingressus est in illum Satanas; Dicit igitur ei Jesus, etc. Beza.

The vulgate also omits to translate the word *τουτ*. Wicklif's translation, made in A. D. 1380, follows the original, "and after the mossel, thanne Sathanas entrid into him." The English version made at Rheims (commonly called the Anglo-Rhemish) also translates this particle. The particle is translated also in the Italian versions of De la Lega and Ravizza, also in that of Mattia D'Erberg, but not in Deodati's.

Judas had the bag is the reason assigned for the conjecture of the disciples, and of course it was not necessary for the evangelist to record the fact that a direction to buy something, or to give something to the poor was addressed to *him*, and not to some other disciple. But if we refer the pronoun (*αὐτῷ*) *him*, in each of these clauses, to the (*nomen proximè antecedens*) immediate antecedent, the use of it in the latter instance (verse 29) is to show wherein the mistake of the disciples' supposition consisted. "For some of those at the table supposed, since Judas had the bag, that Jesus said to *him*," &c., whereas in truth Judas was not the personage chiefly addressed, but Satan, who had, the instant before entered into Judas. The Saviour addressed himself towards Judas, because Satan was within him. He actually addressed Judas, but not him alone, because by speaking to Judas he also spoke to Satan.\*

The sense suggested gives a fulness of meaning to the words (*ὁ ἔστις*) *what thou art doing*, which otherwise they would not possess. And this brings us to another leading idea of this essay. Satan was plotting the death of the Redeemer, and the time had

\* It should be observed that verses 28 and 29 break in upon the narration of the facts—they are incidental remarks of the evangelist, and do not contribute to form the scene or the picture which he draws. Again, the last clause of verse 26 is a remark thrown in for the benefit of the readers of the gospel. Its design is to give the reader to understand what the writer understood by witnessing the act. This remark will appear to have some importance if we consider that the evangelist suits his narrative to the method or exterior of the transaction, stopping every now and then to make an explanatory remark for the sake of the reader.

Verse 26. "Jesus answered (*εἰπὼς*) that one" of you (*εἰς ὑμᾶν*, verse 21) "it is, to whom I shall give a sop when I have dipped it. And when he had dipped the sop he gave it "to one of the disciples. As both John and Peter witnessed the act, they knew who was thus designated by observation. The reader, however, could not know to whom the sop was given without being informed by an eye witness, and the evangelist gives the necessary information in the last clause of the 26th verse, which is really parenthetical, as is evident from the fact, that in the very next verse John resumes the impersonal method of narration. (Verse 27.) And after the sop, Satan entered into (*εἰς εὐχρίστος*) that one (*viz.*, that one of the disciples to whom he had given the sop.) Had the evangelist used the pronoun *αὐτος*, (*εἰς αὐτόν*) we should have been obliged to refer the pronoun to Judas Iscariot, son of Simon, mentioned in the last clause of the preceding verse, and this would be inconsistent with the idea that the clause itself is a parenthesis. By using the word *εὐχρίστος*, the evangelist resumes the unpersonal method, and treats the matter as it appeared to eye-witnesses, he having apprised the reader, once for all, that *that one* to whom he gave it was Judas. Then (or rather *therefore*) Jesus said (not *εὐχρίστος* to that one to whom he gave the sop, but *αὐτῷ*) to him, That thou doest do quickly. (The next two verses, 28, 29, are a narrative parenthesis, and we pass over them so as to take verse 30 in connexion with verse 27.)

Verse 30. He then (*εὐχρίστος* that one to whom he had given the sop,) having received the sop, immediately went out. And it was night when he went out.

If we are right in treating the last clause of verse 26 and verses 28 and 29 as parenthetical, then we must exclude them from consideration in giving a grammatical analysis of the residue of the passage. We could not do that supposition refer *αὐτῷ*, in verse 27th, to Judas Iscariot, in the end of verse 26th; nor could we refer it to *εὐχρίστος*, in the preceding clause of the same verse, because no reason can be given why *εὐχρίστος* (instead of *αὐτῷ*) should not have been used if Judas were the person intended, as is done three times in this passage.

come when the Redeemer would permit him to accomplish it. He had closed his public ministry to the nation, and had finally withdrawn from the temple. The hour had come to accomplish the work of atonement, through the blood of the cross, which was the great object of his incarnation, John xii. 27, by means of which Satan and the curse should be expelled from the world, and all things restored, Col. i. 20; John xii. 31, 32. Satan, whose power had been paralyzed by the very name of Jesus, until that time, but who nevertheless would not relinquish his usurped dominion over the world, had doubtless been meditating the Redeemer's death from the beginning of his ministry, not knowing perhaps this mystery of the divine counsels, that by so doing he would forever destroy the dominion which he sought to retain. But the time had come when the Redeemer would surrender himself to be bruised by him. These words then, (*ὅτι σὺ σκεπτόμενος*) *what thou art plotting*, allude to the machinations of Satan, and the words, (*καὶ ἵνα ταχέως*) *do it, accomplish it, or finish doing it more quickly*, (as explained above) are both a permission and a command, and as such loosed Satan from the restraints to which he had thus far been subject. It was the commencement of our Lord's voluntarily surrendering his life, (John x. 18.) It was followed by the agony in the garden, and by the agony of the cross upon which the work of redemption from sin, the curse and the power of Satan was finished—it was the beginning of the hour of the enemy and the power of darkness, (Luke xxii. 53,) and of the appointed time referred to in Luke iv. 13, *ἀρχὴ καίρου*, before explained.

The common opinion is that these words were addressed *exclusively* to Judas; and a difficulty has arisen from the consideration that apparently *they are a command*. Augustine, however, denies that they are a command. "Non præcipit faciens sed prædixit Judæ malum, nobis bonum." He did not *command* a crime, but he *predicted* evil to Judas and good to us. Leo, magnus Serm. vii. de pass. cap. 4, says, "vox hæc non jubentis est, sed sinentis, nec trepidi sed parati; qui habens omnium temporum potestatem ostendit se moram non facere traditori," etc. These are the words, not of one *commanding*, but of one *permitting*, &c. The words express, says Augustine, rather the readiness of the Saviour to enter upon his passion than anger requiring punishment.\* Christ, he remarks, was delivered for our offences, and he loved the church and *delivered himself* for it. Whence the apostle says of himself, who loved me and *gave himself* for me, Gal. ii. 20. Unless Christ *had delivered himself*, none would have delivered him. "Nisi ergo se traderet Christus nemo traderet Christum." But what, he continues, had Judas but sin? He thought not of our salvation, but of money, and he found the loss of his soul. "Tradidit Judas Christum—tradidit Christus se ipsum—Quod facis fac citius non quia tu potes

\* A little acquaintance with the fathers would convince the reader that they were quite as much in the habit of copying from one another as the modern commentators. See Bede on this passage. But it is impossible for any one man to write a commentary on the whole Bible without copying a large part of it from others almost without thought. Hence those authors are best who have bestowed the efforts of their life upon a single book.

sed quia hoc vult qui omnia potest. It is evident, however, that Paul means by the phrase, (in Rom. iv. 25,) "who was delivered for our offences," not merely the betrayal of the person of our Lord into the hands of the chief priests, but he includes all the acts which followed it inclusive of the crucifixion. So in Gal. ii. 20. If, therefore, Augustin is right in supposing that the words, "what thou doest do quickly," signify rather the Saviour's submission, and are to be considered rather a permission than a command, the import of them cannot be restricted to Judas, but they must be extended to Satan, whose agency through successive instruments—Judas, the chief priests, the Roman soldiery, Pilate and the reviling multitudes—extended to the consummation of the Saviour's sufferings when he voluntarily surrendered his Spirit to God the Father.\* But we have a few more critical observations to submit to the reader.

The 28th verse may be rendered thus: "But this, no one of those at the table perceived ( $\omega\gamma\omega\varsigma\ \tau\iota$ ) for what (*quo consilio*) he spoke ( $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omega$ ) to him"—the last antecedent of ( $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omega$ ) him is ( $\Sigma\alpha\tau\alpha\upsilon\alpha\varsigma$ ) Satan, in verse 27.—But some supposed, inasmuch as Judas had the bag, that Jesus spoke to him, ( $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omega$ , the last antecedent of which is ( $\text{Ioudas}$ ) Judas,) buy what we have need of for the feast, or that he should give something to the poor." This is the remark of the evangelist. He then resumes the narrative, and the use of the word  $\epsilon\kappa\lambda\iota\theta\omicron\varsigma$ . "He then ( $\epsilon\kappa\lambda\iota\theta\omicron\varsigma$ ) receiving the sop, immediately went out." Probably Judas went out before the reflexions mentioned in verse 29 had occurred to the disciples, and the fact that he retired immediately after our Lord had said "what thou doest do quickly," may have given the turn which their thoughts took.—The word ( $\tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omega$ ) this, (in verse 28.) does not, as it appears to the writer, refer to the expression, "what thou doest do quickly," in the end of verse 27, but it refers to the ( $\omega\gamma\omega\varsigma\ \tau\iota\ \epsilon\text{ἵνεκεν}\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omega$ ) why or with what design he spoke to him, that is, no one of them at the table perceived this, viz., for what he spoke ( $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omega$ ) to him, (that is to Satan, if  $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omega$  refers to the nearest antecedent.) The disciples not knowing that Satan had come into their company, and not being gifted to discern his entrance into Judas, of course did not know or perceive that he spoke to any but Judas, ( $\epsilon\kappa\lambda\iota\theta\omicron\varsigma$ ) and of course could not know

\* Reinhard adopts the same mode of interpretation. "Non mandat Christus peccatum sed indicat quid Judas facturuse sit, et se promittit obedientiam fore voluntati patris." But considering the passage in the light suggested as addressed primarily to Satan, we may explain it not as a command to do any thing except to accelerate the work which it was foreseen he would do, and which God purposed to permit him to do from the beginning. The relation which Satan sustains towards God, is not in all respects like that which sinners of mankind sustain. At the pronouncing of the curse, a difference was put between the tempter and the tempted. The consequence of this difference and the remote bearing which it may have in the government of God, we are not able to judge of. It is, however a difference—God had said to Satan at the origin of his usurped dominion over this world, "It shall bruise thee as to thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel." Does not this indicate the purpose of God to crush that great enemy—not to reclaim him? And keeping this purpose in view, and understanding the words in question as addressed to Satan, why should we feel any difficulty in considering them words of command in the sense explained—that it is a command to do speedily that which the purpose of God left him free to do?

that he spoke (*αὐτῷ*) to Satan at all. The sudden departure of Judas from their circle probably inclined some of them (as has been intimated) to connect the purport of the command with Judas, and confine it to him, but their discordant conjectures show not merely *mistake* as to the object, for which the command was given, but ignorance of any common want or purpose to which it could apply. The disciples appear to have been sensible of this themselves, and the evangelist means to inform us that their mistake lay farther back than they themselves supposed. They not only did not know to what the command applied, but they did not discern *to whom, primarily*, it was addressed. Judas, as well as the rest, doubtless supposed that he was spoken to, but the invisible enemy then incarnate in the traitor, understood it better, and being set at liberty, by these words freely to act, speedily accomplished our Lord's death.

It should be remarked in this connexion, that the giving of the sop or morsel to Judas; the entering of Satan into Judas; the command or permission which followed, and the departure of Judas, were immediately connected by our Lord with his glorification, as the Son of man. Bearing in mind the conjectures of some of the disciples as to the object of the departure of Judas, we may easily believe they would not be likely to trace the connexion between the occurrence signalized by his departure, and the declarations of our Lord consequent upon it. Probably it did not occur to them that there was any connexion. The glorification of the Son of man involved in it his triumph over the prince of this world, but how was that event connected with the departure of Judas? We ask them again: Did not the Redeemer chiefly contemplate that spiritual enemy which had entered the room unperceived by the disciples, which took possession of Judas, upon the giving of the sop—which departed instantly upon the command of the Redeemer to do quickly that which he now received permission to do?

If this supposition be admitted, we should not expect the disciples at the moment to have apprehended the import of the scene. Well might the command excite surprise. It was authoritative, abrupt and unconnected with any thing the Redeemer had previously said or done. It was unexplained:—The last words which he had previously uttered in an audible voice, were the words of a troubled spirit, "Verily, verily, I say unto you, one of you shall betray me." The words which followed those in question, were words of exultation, "Now is the Son of man glorified," like those in John xii. 31, 32, "Now is the judgment of this world; now shall the prince of this world be cast out, and although I must be lifted up from the earth, yet will I draw all unto me."

The evangelist adds, "and it was night," or as Mill, and Janius, and Tramelius prints the clause, "But it was night when he went out"—(*καὶ τότε ἐξῆλθε Ἄγγελος ὁ Ἰησοῦς κ. τ. λ.*) This circumstance was added not merely because it *was a fact*, but because the fact was important to some part of the narrative. This is evident, because John does not narrate all the circumstances which occurred. The Lord's supper was instituted, as it appears to the writer, after Judas had retired—(See vol. iv. p. 507 of Balt. Lit. and Rel. Magazine.) If the apostle had intended to give a full account of *all*

that transpired, he would have introduced the institution of the Lord's supper after verse 32. All that follows that verse, beginning with "little children" in verse 33, to the words "arise let us go hence," at the end of chapter xiv., appears to have been addressed by our Lord to his disciples while they were still at the table, and after the supper. In fact, both Matthew (xxvi. 30) and Mark (xiv. 26) add that they also sang a hymn before they departed from the chamber in which they were assembled.

But however this may be, those who believe in the verbal inspiration of the Scriptures, cannot, consistently with their principles, allow that any fact or circumstance, which the Holy Spirit has caused to be recorded, is unimportant. Why then is this circumstance added, "it was night," or "it was night when he went out?" Probably to show how the injunction to Satan "to do (*ταχως*) quickly" what he was plotting, was executed. Had Satan been left at liberty to prolong the sufferings of the Saviour, it is impossible to say that he would not have done so. But again—there was a divine necessity that Christ should suffer at the appointed time—at the time prefigured by the sacrifice of the paschal lamb which was very near.\* The day on which this transaction

---

\* It is extraordinary that the Jews should have asked of Pilate to condemn the Lord Jesus to crucifixion on the passover. Calmet says (and he cites the Misna) "that whatever was forbidden on the Sabbath was also forbidden on the day of the feast, except that the Jews might cook their food on the day of the feast, and yet you see the commotions of the priests and the people on this day, the bearing of the cross—the crucifixion, and the taking of the body down from the cross. All this," says Calmet, "is quite incompatible with the repose and the joy of that day." In commenting on Acts xii. 3, this author returns to the subject; where it is said that Herod intended after Easter (not *Easter*, the word is *τη πασχα*, *the Passover*.) to bring Peter forth to the people. Calmet says "that Herod purposed to delay this execution until after the passover, apparently because, that during the days of this solemnity, it was not permitted to put a man to a violent death. They postponed the punishment of criminals until after the festivals. Those who pretend that our Saviour was crucified the very day of the passover, find themselves embarrassed by this example, and seek different means to explain this delay of Herod." It cannot be reasonably doubted, however, that Christ suffered on the very day of the passover, 1 Cor. v. 7. The public joy of the festival would indeed be marred by so sad a spectacle as a crucifixion. Nay more: the Jews esteemed it a species of sacrilege to commence even a law suit upon the feast, and the evangelist John (xviii. 28) informs us that the Jews would not go into the judgment hall of Pilate lest they should be defiled, but that they might eat the passover—(a singular spectacle of a court of justice, where the judge and the accused were alone within the hall of justice, and the accusers and the *whole audience*, if we may so say, outside, and refusing to enter)—when we take into view the Jewish laws and customs, their habits and feelings in relation to this festival, is it not very extraordinary that the Jews themselves should have demanded the crucifixion at such a time? Some account for it by supposing, that the Roman Government had fixed upon that day for the purpose of executing state criminals, in order that the spectacle might more extensively affect the popular mind—for at the feast of the passover, vast multitudes were collected at Jerusalem. Barrabbas had been guilty of *sedition* as well as murder, and it was in conformity with this feeling that his execution was appointed. The Jews, therefore, it is supposed by some, made the effort to have Barrabbas released and Jesus substituted in his place, so that the execution which had been previously appointed would only go on, and Jesus (who was guilty of no sedition, and who was without sin,) would be the sufferer instead of Barrabbas,

occurred as expressed by John, was *πρὸ δὲ τῆς ἑστῆς τοῦ πάσχα*—(John xiii. 1.) The injunction in Lev. xxiii. 5, and Numb. ix. 3, requires that the paschal lamb should be eaten at the end of the 13th and the beginning of the 14th of Nisan. See Joseph Antiq. ii. 5, iii. 10. These words, then, signify the day before the feast, the proper paschal day, when the paschal lamb was eaten: accordingly, John xviii. 28, does not refer to the paschal lamb, but to the other sacrifices; and the day of preparation mentioned (in xix. 31) in connexion with the crucifixion, is the parasceve of the Sabbath, a great day and the first day of the festival. This day, then, (John xiii. 1) was the day before the feast in the first hours of the 14th Nisan. On the night following, our Lord was taken a prisoner, and the next day, which was the parasceve of the festival, John xix. 14, 31, he was condemned about the sixth hour—as we should say about noon—and on the afternoon of the parasceve (after the ninth hour) he was taken down from the cross. Thus all was done in less than one day, i. e. on the 14th Nisan, from the evening until the last hours of the same day, and before the 15th began: as we should say, between the evening of Thursday and the evening of Friday—(See Tholuc on John in loco.) Judas received the sop on Thursday, at so late an hour that the evangelist calls it *night*. Then Satan entered into him and received permission to finish what he was plotting, and thereupon Judas and Satan retired immediately. Our Lord then instituted the sacrament of the supper—he comforted the sorrowing hearts of his disciples, with a long discourse, before rising from the table—(see John xiv. 31.) Then follows (in chapters xv. and xvi.) a discourse, uttered, as some have supposed, on the way to the garden, beginning, "I am the true vine,"\* &c., and then the intercessory prayer recorded in chap. xvii. Then our Lord entered the garden, where his agony occurred. Probably it was late when the Redeemer and his disciples arrived at the garden, as the disciples were overcome with sleep. From this time to the commencement of the crucifixion was perhaps not much more than six hours, and from the time that he received the sop, not more than 15 or 18 hours.†—See Pilkington's Harmony and Notes,

who had been guilty of sedition, and who was a murderer and robber, and who deserved to die by the laws of God. But there was a deeper reason—a divine necessity that Jesus should die at that time, not in the place of Barrabbas only, or of that nation only, but that he should gather together in one, the children of God that were scattered abroad, John xi. 51, 52. "What thou doest do quickly," for the time had come that the Lord Jesus should make that atonement which was typified by the paschal lamb.

\* This figure being suggested perhaps by the expression which he had used at the institution of the sacrament of the supper—see Matt. xxvi. 29; Mark xiv. 25; Luke xxii. 18;—see vol. v. of Balt. Lit. and Rel. Magazine, p. 262, and see Tholuc in loc.

† Some have supposed that from the time of the apprehension of our Lord in the garden of Gethsemane until the moment when he was nailed to the cross, were about ten or twelve hours. But allowing even this period of time, how many events transpired in the interval? Consider what occurred in the city—how many different procedures—how many different tribunals. At day break the chief priests assemble in the temple, where they held a council against Jesus—thence he is conducted to Pilate, who sends him to Herod—then the contests between Pilate and the Jews must have taken some time.—After the condemnation, the cross

pp. 58, 59, and Tholuck. Thus the evangelist, by recording the fact, that *it was night when he went out*, gives us the date from which to compute the time of this *last period* of the Saviour's life, when he began to surrender himself to the power of the enemy. In ch. xix. 14, John informs us that it was about the 6th hour of the passover of the festival, that Pilate delivered him to be crucified. Thus the scripture was fulfilled, (John xix. 36; Exod. xii. 46,) and Christ, who is our passover, was slain at the appointed time—and the last conflict of Christ was abridged by his express command, "Do quickly" (*ταχιστα*, more quickly than you would do it if left to yourself,) "that thou doest." Cocceius says these words were added to show that this event occurred (ad *noxam*) at a propitious time, opportunely, so that Judas might betray our Lord in silence, in the obscurity and without tumult. It cannot be denied, however, that the Redeemer, foresaw all the events of that night—(John xviii. 4.) He even foretold to Peter that he would thrice deny him before the morning watch, (see verse 38,) and foreseeing it, he did not, as upon other occasions, avoid the coming danger—See John vii. 1; xi. 54. His hour had come that he should depart out of the world—John xiii. 1—the hour of his enemies had come, and the power of darkness, Luke xxii. 53. There was therefore no necessity that the Jews should go out against him armed with swords and staves, or that they should seek a *propitious time* to apprehend him. The intent, therefore, for which this circumstance was recorded, was not to show that the enemies of the Redeemer by favour of the night accomplished what they would otherwise have failed in. Such a supposition would be derogatory to the Divine majesty of the Redeemer. The Jews who denied that he was the Son of God and the King of Israel, might indeed have supposed that they could secure his apprehension only by address, but the place which we are considering, contains no allusion to the Jews or to their opinions. John simply records the fact in connexion with occurrences which had taken place within the walls when they were assembled. It was night when the Saviour said to him, that thou doest do quickly—and he afterwards informs us how quickly it was done.

must have been prepared and other matters arranged for the execution—then the procession from Jerusalem to Calvary must have taken considerable time, as the persons condemned were obliged to carry their crosses. It would be impossible for them to advance rapidly. Our blessed Lord, was relieved of the burthen of his, by Simon, the Cyrenian. But after they had arrived at the place of crucifixion, the superscription prepared by Pilate gave rise to an incident which must have occupied a little space of time. The chief priests objected to the way in which Pilate had expressed the ground of this condemnation. They sent to Pilate and he refused to change what he had written. The interval was very short for so many occurrences as have been mentioned, yet it is by no means improbable that the relation which the evangelists give us is very much abridged. The day of the passover had already commenced when Satan entered into Judas, and all must needs be fulfilled before the day closed, and so it was—What thou doest do quickly—(*ταχιστα*, more quickly than the enemy appeared willing to do.)

[For the Spirit of the XIX. Century.]

ESSAYS ON THE CONSCIENCE—TRANSLATED FROM J. LA PLACETE,\* PASTOR OF THE FRENCH CHURCH OF COPENHAGEN.

No. I.

*Is the Conscience essentially a clear and evident perception?*

THERE is no one who has not spoken of the conscience, and this term is equally familiar to the learned and to the ignorant. Nevertheless it is sufficiently difficult to say precisely, what is meant by this expression. It seems even that the Doctors, instead of removing the difficulty, as was their duty and intention, have contributed to augment it; adopting different sentiments, they are divided among themselves, and hence have arisen controversies that are not soon to be terminated.

Some modern theologians of high estimation, have recently maintained that the conscience is that internal light by which we perceive clearly and distinctly all that is evident, whether relating to the truths of scientific investigation, or to that cognizance which the mind takes of its own operations, without excepting that which bears the least relation to religion and to morality, for they give for example these truths: *two and two are four; the whole is greater than one of its parts.*

They do not say very precisely, if by this light they understand the evidence itself of the objects which we perceive, or the perception which is the effect of that evidence. But without doubt they understand one or the other of these things, or perhaps both together.

As it is impossible that we deceive ourselves provided we proceed according to evidence, and affirm nothing but that which we perceive clearly and distinctly, these authors conclude from their definition of conscience, that it is infallible; and they maintain that the errors into which men fall, so frequently, are in no wise the acts of the conscience, but the natural consequences of their prejudices, of their precipitation, and of the little care which they take to discover the truth.

They go even further. They maintain that to accuse the conscience of deceiving us, is to say that God deceives us, and this is to undermine faith and religion, because it absolutely destroys all certainty, and substitutes Pyrrhonism in its place.

\* Jean de la Placete was born on the 19th of April, 1639, at Pontac in Bern, where his father was Minister. From his earliest youth he manifested a strong passion for study; and after having gone through the humanities, he devoted all his attention to theology. He was ordained in 1660, and soon after was appointed to the church of Oches. Four years after, he was called to the church of Nai, in the province of Bern, where he exercised his ministry until 1685. Driven out of France by the revocation of the edict of Nantz, he sought safety in the country of strangers. The elector of Brandenburg offered him the church of Königsburg; but the Queen of Denmark, who desired to obtain a chaplain for herself and a minister for the French church which she had founded at Copenhagen, selected him before he had made any other engagement. He accepted the offer of the Queen, and exercised his ministry at Copenhagen until the year 1711, when the Queen died. He retired the same year into Holland, being prevented by his age and infirmities from exercising any longer the functions of the ministry.

Other theologians of great reputation entertain an entirely different idea of the conscience, for whatever be its nature, they maintain that it is quite possible for it to deceive us. But while the one and the other wish to make this difference appear to be real and of much importance, it seems to me, that it consists, as many others, in a simple misunderstanding, or at most in a contest of words than which nothing can be of much less importance.

Let us for a moment abstain from the use of the word conscience, and let it suffice to ask if it is possible for us to deceive ourselves when we affirm of any thing that which we clearly and distinctly see it to be? The question thus proposed is cleared of difficulty. Every one will return the same answer. Every one will reply that it is impossible. All agree that evidence is the great characteristic of truth. All agree that it is the foundation of certainty, and that to maintain the contrary is to introduce Pyrrhonism, and to banish from the world all belief and all religion.

There is, then, agreement concerning the thing itself, and the whole question is reduced simply to ascertain whether it is the *perception* of self-evident things, or the *light by which they are perceived*, that merit the name of conscience? But is not this one of those questions of words which so little deserves the attention of sensible and enlightened persons?

We may employ the word conscience to designate all kinds of perceptions, clear or obscure, as the case may be, provided that those to whom we speak know that this is the sense in which we use the expression.

I add that not only is it allowable to employ this term in this sense, but that there is some necessity to do so. The reason is, as even they who oppose it really avow, *the vulgar do not speak otherwise*. There can be no greater necessity than this, for it has passed into a maxim that we should think with the learned and speak with the vulgar—“*Sentiendum cum doctis, et loquendum cum vulgo*.”

The people, however, are not all who express themselves thus. Theologians of all sects, excepting a small number of those of whom I speak, do not express themselves in any other way, as it appears from that which they all speak, of erring consciences, of scrupulous consciences, doubtful consciences, and probable consciences.—They all maintain that it is very rare that the conscience perceives clearly and evidently that which is good or evil in each action.

In fine, the scriptures, which are as good a rule for our expressions as for our faith, frequently use this expression in a sense very different from that which these modern authors wish to give it. St. Paul understands a very different thing from evident perceptions, when he says “*the blood of Jesus Christ purgeth our consciences from dead works*.” Again, he takes this word in another sense, when he speaks of a “*seared conscience*,” a “*weak conscience*,” a “*defiled conscience*.”

I believe, then, that on one hand, the signification of the word conscience is too much restricted, when they are not willing that it should designate things that are not evident. And on the other hand, that it signifies a little too much when external things are said to be its objects; such as these, *one and one are two; the whole*

is greater than one of its parts. I well know that the conscience can have for its object the perception of these truths, but I do not admit that it can have for its object these truths themselves. When I say, *one and one are two*, I well know that I say it, and this perception is an act of the conscience. But the direct act is another thing; that is simple knowledge, a direct view of the intellect.

But even if what I maintain will not be admitted, I hope at least it will be acknowledged that the reasons of these theologians are by no means conclusive. They say that if the conscience can be deceived, it will be to impute its errors to God, who gave it to us, we can never depend upon what it says; it will lead us to doubt of every thing; certainty will be banished from the world, and Pyrrhonism will then insolently triumph over religion.

This reasoning will admit of three different senses, which it is important not to confound. The first is this. No one can deny any of these consequences, if the conscience, taken in the sense of these modern theologians, can be deceived, that is to say, if there can be error in any clear, distinct and evident perceptions. The second is this: these consequences will necessarily result, if the conscience taken in the sense of the other theologians can be deceived, that is to say, if there can be error in the judgments, clear or obscure, confused or distinct, which we pronounce on our actions. The third is this: It is necessary to admit these consequences, if it is allowable to employ the word conscience in the second sense, and to designate by it, all sorts of judgments which we can pronounce on our actions.

The first of these three senses is certain, and I know no one who will contest it. The second is evidently false, and I do not believe there is any person in the world who would wish to maintain it. The third is not only false, but absurd. If it have place, the word conscience would become a word more than magical, since it would change the nature of every thing, and nothing would remain in the state in which it is.

But it may be asked, if the conscience can be deceived, how shall we know when to be guided by it? We can know it by the clearness or obscurity of its perceptions. If they are obscure, there is reason to fear that it is deceived. If they are clear, we may be assured that it is not deceived. And this also is maintained by those theologians. Thus the whole difference between them and myself is, that they wish to appropriate the name conscience only to clear perceptions, whilst I employ it to designate all kinds of perceptions produced by the character of our actions. We are then agreed as to the thing, and we dispute only concerning words.

But I will not even contend about the words, if these gentlemen will be satisfied to employ them in any sense they may please to give them, provided they do not draw from the sense in which others use them, those odious consequences which all the world detests. Let them permit us to speak as mankind have always spoken, whilst they explain themselves according to their own meaning. It honours them too much to hold with them, the least controversy upon the subject.

# SPIRIT OF THE XIX. CENTURY.

VOL. I.

NOVEMBER, 1842.

No. 11.

AN ENGLISH TRANSLATION OF THE CONSTITUTION UNIGENITUS; THE FAMOUS BULL OF POPE CLEMENT XI., SIGNED ON THE 8TH OF SEPTEMBER, 1713, (THE NATIVITY OF THE VIRGIN MARY,) WHICH ESTABLISHED PELAGIANISM IN THE CHURCH OF ROME.\*

“CLEMENT, bishop, and servant of the servants of God.—To all the faithful in Christ, health and apostolic benediction.

The only begotten Son of God, who was made the Son of man for our salvation, and for that of the whole world, when he instructed his disciples in the doctrine of truth, and in his apostles taught the universal church, disposing things present, and foreseeing things to come, admonished us by a well-known and salutary warning to beware of false prophets, who come to us in sheep's clothing; by which those lying teachers and specious deceivers are principally pointed out, who, covertly insinuating wicked doctrines under the show of extraordinary piety, introduce sects of perdition under the exterior of sanctity; and in order the more easily to ensnare the unwary, laying aside as it were the wolf's skin, and enveloping themselves in the phraseology of the divine law, as in the fleece of sheep, wickedly mis-use the words of the divine scriptures, and even of the New Testament itself, which they in many ways pervert to their own destruction and that of others; being taught by the example and instruction of the ancient

\* The reader will find some account of this Bull on pp. 3, 4, and a still fuller one on pp. 193-202 of this volume. The original of the Bull in Latin, he will find in the *Bullarium Magnum*, and in the viii. vol. (Dublin edition) of *Peter Den's Theology*. It is from this latter, that the present translation appears to have been made, by the hand of one altogether competent. We take it from the *Weekly Messenger of the German Reformed Church*; and considering the extreme importance of the Bull, the difficulty of obtaining access to it, and the absolute want of a complete English version of it, (we know of none but this, in reach of the common reader)—we think we perform an important service to the public, in giving it at once a permanent and accessible form. Very few have any just notions of the state of theological opinion in the ranks even of the most respectable and learned of the Roman clergy. We have little doubt that the doctrinal errors of Rome in regard to points about which she is hardly ever called in question, are so thorough and so gross, that these alone utterly deprive her of all claim to the title of a true church of Jesus Christ. This Bull is one proof directly to point, and is by itself conclusive, as it appears to us; for it is the authorised and universally received standard of faith, in regard to the points it settles; and these, the reader will see, are the doctrines of grace, as far as they were understood by the best men in that communion.—[ED.]

father of lies, from whom they are sprung, that there is no readier way whatever to deceive, than to support the fraudulent introduction of nefarious error by the pretended authority of the divine word.

Taught therefore by the divine admonition, when first we learned, not without deep bitterness of heart, that a certain book, formerly printed in the French tongue, and divided into several volumes, entitled the "New Testament in French, with moral reflections upon each verse, printed at Paris, 1699," otherwise called "An Abridgement of the Gospel, of the Acts of the Apostles, of the Epistles of St. Paul, of the Canonical epistles and of the Apocalypse, or Christian thoughts upon the text of the Sacred books, &c., printed at Paris, 1693 and 1694," notwithstanding its having been condemned by us, and notwithstanding moreover its frequently mixing up the falsehoods of corrupt doctrines with Catholic truth, is still possessed by many persons as if it were free from all error, and is every where thrust into the hands of the faithful in Christ, and by the advice and assistance of some, who always try new devices, is every where only too studiously disseminated, translated even into Latin, in order that the contagion of this pernicious institution may pass, if possible, from nation to nation, and from one kingdom to the people of another kingdom; we have exceedingly lamented that the Lord's flock, which has been entrusted to us, should be gradually allured into the path of perdition by the aforesaid crafty seductions and deceits: and for this cause, impelled not less by the stimulus of our pastoral solicitude, than by the frequent complaints of those who are zealously attached to the orthodox faith, and principally by the letters and prayers of our venerable brethren, the Bishops of France especially, we have decided to meet the growing disease, which might by and by, even grow rapidly worse, with some stronger remedy. And, indeed, when we closely applied our careful consideration to the true cause of the evil which assails us, we clearly discovered that the great destructiveness of this book very much advanced and increased in strength, because it was inwardly concealed, and like corrupt matter, would not appear externally, unless the ulcer were cut open; orasmuch as the book itself, at the first aspect, entices those who read it, with a certain show of piety; for its discourses are smoothed with oil; but they are arrows, and the bows being bent, they are so prepared for mischief, that they transfix in the dark the true in heart. For this reason, we have thought that nothing could be produced by us more seasonable and salutary, than to explain more distinctly and openly the fallacious doctrine of this book, which has hitherto been only generally pointed out by us, by selecting one by one, several propositions from it; and by laying before the eyes of all the faithful in Christ the noxious seeds of the tares, brought out of the middle of the wheat, by which they were concealed. These errors, not one indeed, nor two only, but many and very serious ones, some of them formerly condemned, and some of them newly invented, having been thus laid bare, and placed as it were in the open air, we are confident, that, with the divine blessing, all will be compelled to yield to the declared and manifest truth.

That this will be the result in Catholic affairs, and that it will be exceedingly profitable in allaying the differences which have chiefly arisen from the variety of opinions in the most flourishing kingdom of France, and which are tending to more violent schisms; and that it will be useful and almost necessary for tranquillizing consciences, not only have the aforesaid Bishops, but Louis, our most dear son in Christ, the most Christian King of the French, whose extraordinary zeal in defending the purity of the Catholic faith, and of extirpating errors we cannot sufficiently praise, has frequently protested to us—requiring us by the repetition of his pious offices, so truly worthy of a Christian king, and by his ardent wishes, to consult the urgent necessity of souls by the most speedy production possible of the censure of our apostolic judgment.

Hence, the Lord inspiring us, and confiding in his heavenly aid, we have approached this salutary work with the sedulousness and diligence which the magnitude of the affair demanded; and we have commanded that several propositions, faithfully extracted from the aforesaid book, according to the above cited additions respectively, and expressed both in the French and Latin tongue, should be *carefully discussed* by several masters in sacred theology; first, indeed, before two cardinals of our venerable brethren of the Holy Romish church; but afterwards that they should be weighed and examined before us, the advice of many other Cardinals being added with the greatest possible care, and the most exact comparison being instituted of each of the propositions with the text itself of the book, in many repeated congregations.

Of this nature are the propositions that follow, viz.:—

1. What else remains to the soul which has lost God and his grace, but sin, and the consequences of sin, a proud poverty and a slothful indigence, that is to say, a general impotence for labor, prayer and every good work? Luke xvi. 3.

2. The grace of Jesus Christ, the efficacious principle of good of every kind, is necessary for every good work; without it, not only is there no good, but there can be no good. John. xv. 5.

3. Thou commandest in vain, O Lord, if thou dost not give what thou commandest. Acts xvi. 10.

4. Thus, O Lord, all things are possible to him, to whom thou makest all things possible, by working the same in him. Mark ix. 22.

5. When God does not soften the heart by the internal unctions of his grace, exhortations and external privileges serve only to harden it the more. Rom. ix. 18.

6. The difference between the Jewish and Christian covenant is this, that in the one, God demands the avoiding of sin, and the fulfilment of the law by the sinner, leaving him in his impotence; but in the other, God gives what he demands, purifying him by his grace. Rom. ii. 27.

7. What advantage was there for man in the old covenant in which God left him to his own infirmity, imposing upon him his law? But what blessedness is not to be admitted to the covenant in which God gives us what he demands of us? Heb. viii. 7.

8. We only belong to the new covenant in proportion as we are partakers of that very new grace which works in us.

9. *The grace of Christ is supreme grace, without which we cannot confess Christ, and with which we never deny him.* 1 Cor. xii. 3.

10. *Grace is the operation of the hand of Almighty God which nothing can hinder or retard.* Matt. xx. 34.

11. *Grace is nothing else than the will of Almighty God, ordering and performing what he orders.* Mark ii. 11.

12. *When God wills to save a soul whenever and wherever, an unfailing effect follows the will of God.* Mark ii. 11.

13. *When God wills to save a soul, and touches it with the interior hand of his grace, no human being will resist it.* Luke v. 19.

14. *However remote an obstinate sinner may be from salvation, when Jesus exhibits himself to him to be beheld in the salutary light of his grace, he must necessarily surrender himself up, run to him, humble himself and adore his Saviour.* Mark v. 6.

15. *When God accompanies his command and his outward address by the unction of his Spirit, and the internal power of his grace, these work in the heart the obedience which he seeks.* Luke ix. 6.

16. *There are no allurements which do not yield to the allurements of grace, because nothing resists the Almighty.* Acts vii. 12.

17. *Grace is that voice of the Father which teaches men internally, and causes them to Jesus Christ; whoever does not come to him after he has heard the external voice of the Son, is by no means taught of the Father.* John vi. 45.

18. *The seed of the word which God waters always bears fruit.* Acts ix. 21.

19. *The grace of God is nothing else than his omnipotent will; this is the idea which God himself gives us in all his Scriptures.* Rom. xiv. 4.

20. *The only true idea of grace is, that God desires within himself to be obeyed by us, and he is obeyed; he commands, and all things take place; he speaks as the Lord and all things are subjected to him.* Mark iv. 39.

21. *The grace of Jesus Christ is a grace, strong, powerful, supreme, invincible; as being the operation of the will of the Almighty, it is the consequence, and the imitation of God, who made his Son incarnate and raised him up again.*

22. *The agreement of the Almighty working of God in the heart of man with the free consent of his will, is forthwith exhibited to us in the incarnation, as in the fountain and archetype of the other operations of mercy and grace, which are all as gratuitous and as dependent on God as was that original operation.* Luke i. 38.

23. *God gave us the idea of the almighty operation of his grace, signifying it by that by which he produces creatures out of nothing, and restores life to the dead.* Rom. iv. 17.

24. *The just idea which the centurion had of the omnipotence of God in Jesus Christ, in curing bodies by the exercise of his will only is the image of the idea which a man ought to have, respecting the omnipotence of his grace in curing souls from evil lusts.* Luke viii. 7.

25. *God enlightens the soul, and cures it in the same manner that he does the body, by his will alone; he commands, and he is obeyed.* Luke xviii. 42.

26. *No graces are given except through faith.* Luke viii. 48.

27. Faith is the first grace, and the fountain of all other graces. 2 Pet. i. 3.

28. The first grace which God grants is the remission of sins. Mark xi. 25.

29. No grace is given out of the church. Luke x. 36.

30. All whom God wills to save by Christ, are infallibly saved. John vi. 40.

31. The desires of Christ are always effectual; he introduces peace in the inmost heart when he desires that it should possess it. John xx. 19.

32. Jesus Christ delivered himself to death, to free forever by his blood the first born, that is to say, the elect, from the hand of the exterminating angel. Gal. iv. 4-7.

33. Oh! how greatly does it behove a man to have renounced earthly goods and himself, to the end that he may have the assurance, if I may so speak, of appropriating Christ Jesus to himself, his love, his death, and his mysteries; as St. Paul does, when he says, "Who loved me and gave himself for me." Gal. ii. 10.

34. The grace of Adam produced nothing but human merits.

35. The grace of Adam was the consequence of creation, and was due to a sound and perfect nature. 2 Cor. v. 21.

36. The essential difference between the grace of Adam and of a state of innocence, and the Christian grace is; that every one would have received the first in his own person, but the latter is only received in the person of Jesus Christ, who has risen again, and to whom we are united. Rom. vii. 4.

37. The grace of Adam by sanctifying him in himself, was proportioned to him; Christian grace by sanctifying us in Jesus Christ is omnipotent and worthy of the Son of God. Eph. i. 6.

38. The sinner is only free to evil without the grace of the Redeemer. Luke viii. 27.

39. The will which grace does not prevent, has no light, except to go astray; no energy, except to cast itself down headlong; no strength, except to wound itself; it is capable of all evil and powerless of all good. Matt. xxv. 4.

40. Without grace we can love nothing, except to our condemnation. 2 Thess. iii. 18.

41. All knowledge of God, as well that which is natural, as that which is found in pagan philosophers, can only come from God and without grace produces nothing but presumption, vanity and opposition to God himself, in the place of feelings of adoration, gratitude and love. Rom. i. 19.

42. The grace of Christ alone renders a man fit for the sacrifice of faith; in the absence of this there exists nothing but un purity, nothing but unworthiness. Acts xi. 9.

43. The first effect of baptismal grace is to cause death unto sin; so that the spirit, the heart, the senses have no more life for sin than a dead man for the things of the world. Rom. vi. 2.

44. There are but two kinds of love, whence our volitions and all our actions sprung: the love of God which does all things for God, and which God rewards; and the love with which we love ourselves and the world, which does not refer to God what ought to be referred to him, and on this very account is evil. John v. 29.

45. When the love of God ceases to reign in the heart, carnal cupidity necessarily reigns in it and corrupts all its actions. Luke xv. 13.

46. Concupiscence, or love, renders the use of the senses good or bad. Matt. v. 28.

47. Obedience to the law must flow from the fountain; and this fountain is love. When the love of God is its interior principle, and the glory of God its end, then that which appears externally is pure; otherwise it is nothing else than hypocrisy or false righteousness. Matt. xxiii. 26.

48. What else can exist than darkness, wandering and sin, without the light of faith, without Christ, and without love. Eph. v. 8.

49. As nothing is sin without selfishness, so no work is good without the love of God. Mark vii. 21, 22.

50. In vain we cry to God, My Father, if it is not the spirit of love which cries. Rom. viii. 15.

51. *Faith justifies when it works; but it works not but by love.* Acts xiii. 39.

52. All other means of salvation are included in faith as in their germ a seed; but this faith exists not without love and confidence. Acts x. 43.

53. Love performs Christian actions in a Christian manner, this relation to God and Jesus Christ, Colos. iii. 14.

54. It is love alone which speaks to God; that alone God hears. 1 Cor. xiii. 1.

55. God crowns nothing but love; he who runs from any other impulse and from any other motive, runs in vain. 1 Cor. ix. 24.

56. God rewards nothing but love, since love alone honors God. Matt. xxv. 36.

57. Every thing is wanting to the sinner when hope is wanting; and there is no hope in God when there is no love of God. Matt. xxvii. 5.

58. There is neither God nor religion where love is not. John x. 25.

59. The prayer of the impious is a new sin, and what God grants to them is a fresh judgment against them. John x. 25.

60. If the fear of punishment alone incites to repentance; in proportion as this is more violent, it the more leads to desperation. Matt. xxvii. 5.

61. Fear restrains only the hand; but the heart as long as it is addicted to sin is not led by the love of righteousness. Luke xx. 19.

62. He who abstains from evil only from fear of punishment, commits the sin in his heart and is already guilty before God. Matt. xxi. 46.

63. A baptized person, as much as a Jew, is as yet under the law, if he fulfil not the law, or fulfil it influenced by fear merely. Rom. vi. 14.

64. Nothing good can ever be under the curse of the law; because a man sins either by doing evil, or by avoiding it through fear. Gal. v. 18.

65. Moses, the Prophets, and doctors of the law are dead, having given to God no son, since they only made bondsmen through fear. Mark xii. 19.

66. Whoever desires to approach God ought neither to come to him with brutal passions, nor be led by natural instinct, or by favor, like brutes, but through faith and love as sons. Heb. xii. 20.

67. Servile fear, views God as a hard, imperious, unjust Master, incapable of being influenced by our prayers. Luke xix. 21.

68. The goodness of God has shortened the way of salvation by wholly closing it up in faith and prayers. Acts ii. 21.

69. Faith, the use, the increase and the reward of faith, all are gifts springing from the pure beneficence of God. Mark ix. 22.

70. Never does God afflict the innocent; afflictions always serve either to punish sin, or to purify the sinner. John ix. 3.

71. Man for self-preservation may dispense himself from the observance of that law which God has established for his use. Mark ii. 23.

72. It is a mark of the Christian church that it is Catholic, comprehending all the angels of heaven, all the elect, all the righteous of earth and those of all ages. Heb. xii. 22, 23, 24.

73. What is the Church but the company of the sons of God dwelling in his bosom, adopted in Christ, subsisting in his pardon, redeemed by his blood, living by his Spirit acting through his grace, and expecting the grace of the world to come? 2 Thess. i. 1, 2.

74. The Church, or Christ entire, has the Incarnate Word as its head, but all the saints as its members. 1 Kings iii. 16.

75. The church is one man alone, composed of many members, of which Christ is the head, life, subsistence, and person; there is one Christ only, composed of many saints of whom he is sanctifier. Ephes. ii. 14, 15, 16.

76. Nothing is more spacious than the church of God, because it is made up of all the elect and the righteous of all ages. Eph. ii. 22.

77. He who leads not a life becoming a son of God and a member of Christ, ceases to have God within him as his Father, and Christ as his head. 1 John ii. 22.

78. A man is separated from the elect people (of which the Jewish people was a figure, and Christ Jesus is the head, as much by not living according to the gospel as by not believing the gospel. Acts iii. 23.

79. (Aye, there's the rub!) IT IS USEFUL AND NECESSARY AT ALL TIMES AND IN EVERY PLACE, AND FOR EVERY KIND OF PERSON, TO STUDY AND KNOW THE SPIRIT, PIETY AND MYSTERIES OF HOLY SCRIPTURE. 1 Cor. xiv. 5.

80. THE READING OF HOLY SCRIPTURE IS FOR ALL. Acts viii. 28.

81. The obscurity of the word of God furnishes no reason why lay people should dispense themselves from reading it.

82. The Lord's day ought to be sanctified by Christians, by reading pious works, and above all, the holy Scriptures. It is damnably to desire to withhold a Christian from this kind of reading. Acts xv. 21.

83. It is a delusion to persuade ones self that a knowledge of the mysteries of religion ought not to be communicated to females, by the reading of the sacred volume. Abuse of Scripture has arisen, not from the simplicity of females, but from the proud science of man, and hence have heresies taken their origin. John iv. 26.

84. To take the New Testament out of the hands of Christians,

or to render it a sealed book to them, by depriving them of the means of understanding it, is to close the mouth of Christ against them. *Matt. v. 3.*

85. To interdict to Christians the reading of the Holy Scriptures, of the gospel especially, is to interdict the use of a light to the children of light, and to cause them to suffer a kind of excommunication. *Luke xi. 33.*

86. To snatch from the hands of ignorant people the comfort of joining their voice to that of the entire church, is a custom contrary to apostolic practice and the intention of God. *1 Cor. xiv. 16.*

87. It is a method full of wisdom, light and love, to give souls an opportunity to bear with humility and feel a state of sin, of seeking the spirit of repentance and contrition, and of beginning at least to satisfy the justice of God, before they are reconciled. *Acts ix. 9.*

88. We are ignorant of what sin and true penitence are, when we wish to be immediately restored to the possession of goods of which sin has deprived us, and when we refuse separation to introduce confusion. *Luke xvii. 11, 12.*

89. The fourteenth stage of the conversion of a sinner is, when having been already reconciled, he has the right of assisting at the sacrifice of the church. *Luke xv. 23.*

90. The Church has the power of communication, when she exercises it by the chief pastors, with the consent, at least implied, of the whole body. *Matt xviii. 17.*

91. The fear of iniquitous excommunication is never to hinder us from doing our duty; never do we depart from the Church, even when by the injustice of men we seem to be expelled from it, so long as we are united to God, Jesus Christ and the Church itself through charity. *John ix. 22, 23.*

92. To suffer peaceably excommunication and unrighteous anathema rather than betray the truth, is to imitate holy Paul; so far is it from withstanding authority or violating unity. *Rom. ix. 3.*

93. Jesus sometimes heals wounds which the headlong haste of the chief pastors inflicts without his command; Jesus restores what they cut off with an inconsiderate zeal. *John xviii. 11.*

94. Nothing infuses into its enemies a worse opinion of the church than to see domination there exercised over the faith of believers, and divisions fomented regarding things which injure neither faith nor morals. *Rom. xiv. 16.*

95. Truths have come to that pass, that they are as it were a foreign language; and the method of preaching them is almost an unknown idiom: so remote is it from the simplicity of the apostles and above the common apprehension of the faithful; nor is it sufficiently adverted to, that this defect is one of the very perceptible signs of dotage of the church and of the wrath of God against his children. *1 Cor. xiv. 21.*

96. God permits all powers to approve the preachers of truth, that its victory may be attributed only to divine grace.

97. It very often happens that those members who are most holly and most strictly united to the church, are regarded and treated unworthily to be in the church or as actually separated from it; but the just lives by faith and not by the opinion of men. *Acts. iv. 11.*

98. The state of persecution and penalty which any one sustains as a heretic, wicked and impious man, is very often the final probation, and greatly meritorious, as rendering a man conformed to Jesus Christ. Luke xxii. 37.

99. Stubbornness, prejudice and obstinacy in being either unwilling to examine a thing or acknowledge that one has been deceived, daily change, with regard to many, that into an odour of death which God established in his church to be an odour of life; for instance good books, instructions, holy examples, &c. 1 Cor. ii. 16.

100. Those are deplorable times in which it is held that God is honored by persecuting the truth and its disciples. This time has arrived.—To be doomed and treated by ministers of religion and impious and unworthy of all intercourse with God, as a putrid member capable of corrupting all things in the society of the saints, is to pious men a death more terrible than that of the body. A man vainly flatters himself respecting the purity of his intentions and a certain zeal for religion, by persecuting good men with fire and sword, if he is blinded by his own passion, or carried away by another person's passion, because he will not examine any thing. We frequently believe that we sacrifice the wicked to God when we sacrifice the servant of God to the Devil. John xvi. 2.

101. Nothing is more opposed to the Spirit of God and the doctrine of Jesus Christ than to make oaths common in the church; because this multiplies the opportunities of perjury, sets snares for the weak and foolish, and causes the name and truth of God to be subservient sometimes to the counsel of the wicked. Matt. v. 37.

The opinions, therefore, of the above mentioned cardinals and other theologians, having been both heard by word of mouth and exhibited to us in writing: and above all, the aid of Divine illumination having been imposed by private and public prayers appointed for this end; we respectively DECLARE, CONDEMN AND REPROBATE, by this our perpetually—enduring—Constitution, ALL AND SINGULAR THE ABOVE INSERTED PROPOSITIONS AS FALSE, captious, ill-sounding, OFFENSIVE TO PIOUS EARS; scandalous, pernicious, rash, injurious to the church and its usages, contumelious not only towards the church but also towards the secular powers, seditious, IMPIOUS, BLASPHEMOUS, suspected of heresy, and savouring of heresy itself, favouring moreover of heretics and heresies, and also schism; as erroneous nearly allied to heresy, often condemned, and finally EVEN HERETICAL: and also various heresies, manifestly introducing novelties, and chiefly those which are in the infamous propositions of Jansenius, taken in that sense in which they were condemned. And we command all the faithful in Christ of both sexes, NOT TO PRESUME TO THINK, touch or preach otherwise on the said propositions, than is contained in this our Constitution; and whosoever shall have taught, defended or published them, or any of them conjointly, or separately, or shall have treated of them even in disputation, publicly or privately, unless perchance by impugning them, shall be subject without further declaration, to ecclesiastical censures, and other penalties enacted by law against those who commit the like offence. Moreover, we do not intend, by this express reprobation of the above said propositions to approve of the other

things contained in the book; especially as we have detected in many other propositions similar and a-kin to those which, as above, have been condemned, and are imbued with the same errors; and not a few indeed which nourish disobedience and obstinacy under a certain imaginary pretence of a seemingly growing persecution, and which preach them under the false name of Christian charity (which [propositions] we have deemed it too long and unnecessary to rehearse one by one;) and lastly, what is intolerable, we have found the sacred text of the New Testament damnably corrupted, and in many respects, conformed to another already condemned version of Moses; in many places differing and departing from the Vulgate edition, which is approved by the use of many ages in the Church, and which ought to be deemed authentic by all the orthodox; and very frequently distorted not without the greatest wilfulness, into foreign, exotic and often noxious meanings.

WHEREFORE BY OUR APOSTOLIC AUTHORITY, and by the tenor of these presents, we again prohibit, and in like manner, condemn the same book, in all places, and in whatever language, edition or version it shall hitherto have been printed, or shall hereafter (which God forbid) be printed: whether it be described as in these premises, or under any other title—as admirably adapted by its soft speeches and benedictions, as the Apostle says—that is to say, under the false show of pious intention, to seduce the hearts of the innocent; and in like manner we similarly prohibit and forbid to all and singular the faithful in Christ, under the pain of excommunication, to be ipso facto incurred by those who disobey, all and singular books or pamphlets, as well as those published in writing, or in print, or, (which God avert) which shall be published in its defence, and their perusal, description, retention and use.

We, moreover, charge our venerable brethren, the Patriarchs, Archbishops and Bishops, and the other Ordinaries of districts, and moreover THE INQUISITORS OF HERETICAL WICKEDNESS, utterly to COERCE and COMPEL by the above mentioned censures and penalties, and by the other remedies of law and deed, all who oppose or resist, THE AID OF THE SECULAR ARM BEING INVOKED FOR THIS PURPOSE IF IT BE NECESSARY.

We will, also, that precisely the same credit be given to transcripts of the same presents, even if they be printed, when subscribed by the hand of any public notary, and furnished with the seal of a person appointed to an ecclesiastical dignity, which would be ascribed to the original letters themselves, if they were exhibited.

LET NO MAN, THEREFORE, infringe, or by a daring boldness oppose this instrument of our declaration, our enjoined prohibition and interdiction. But if any one shall presume to attempt it, let him know that he will incur the anger of the Almighty God, and of the Blessed Apostles, Peter and Paul.

Given at Rome, at St. Maria Majora in the 1713th year of our Lord's Incarnation, in the sixth of the Ides of September and in the thirteenth year of our Pontificate.

I CARD. PRODOTARIUS.

F. OLIVERIUS,

*Registrata in Secretaria Brevium.*

Visa de Curia L. Legardus.

[For the Spirit of the XIX. Century.]

## THE TEMPTATION AND BETRAYAL OF OUR LORD.—PART III.

*And when the Devil had ended all the temptation, he (απιστη stood or kept off or away,) departed from him for a season—(αχρεi καιρου until the season.—(Luke iv. 13.)*

THE view which has been taken of this passage may help us to explain some other parts of the narrative of John.—The evangelist drops his account of the traitor Judas at the 30th verse of the 13th chapter, for the purpose of recording the interesting discourses of the blessed Redeemer with his disciples. He resumes the narrative at chapter 18th. Let us then pass over these intermediate chapters, and read the 13th chapter as far as the 30th verse in connexion with the 18th chapter. Judas having received the sop went out, and Jesus and the eleven disciples having remained a while, proceeded together over the brook Cedron into the garden to which Judas knew he often resorted. It is implied (from xviii. 3.) that Judas went to the chief priests and pharisees, for otherwise he could not have received a band of men and officers (υπηρητας) from them.—From the chief priest, Judas proceeded to this garden—(xviii. 3.) As he drew nigh, Jesus advanced and said unto them, "Whom seek ye?" They answered, "Jesus, the Nazarene." Jesus saith unto them, "I am he." Now mark a peculiarity. The evangelist had already said that Judas had come to the garden with an armed company, and yet he here interrupts the narrative to say, "and Judas also which betrayed him stood with them." Why this, if not with a view to the fact which he next states, "and as soon as he had said 'I am he,' they went backward and fell to the ground"—that is, the evangelist would have us to observe particularly that Judas was one of those who went backward and fell to the ground. But what is the importance of this circumstance? Our Lord had often shown his power over the laws and the powers of nature. His voice had hushed the winds and the waves to silence and rest. He had continually exerted over Satan and evil spirits, the most absolute power, and it was but a small thing that he should do so over Judas or a much larger company of feeble men. But if we may suppose the higher agency of Satan to be present—if in fact we may suppose him, still incarnate, or incorporate in Judas, we may discover a peculiar fitness in this exhibition of his power at that time. He was about to surrender himself into the power of the enemy, and it was suitable to prove even to Satan himself that the surrender was voluntary—that he was going to lay down his life, and that no one took it from him. The moment was the commencement of the hour and the power of darkness. Never before or since was the power of Satan permitted to become so signally triumphant in this world as when the righteous Lord yielded himself to that hostile company.—Again, observe the expression, *απηλθον εις τα οπισω και επισωι χαμαι.* This does not mean necessarily that they retired by walking backwards (*απαχαιζω*, It. v. 443, *αναποδιζω*). We have the expression *απηλθον εις τα οπισω*, in John vi. 66, "From

that time many of his disciples went back"—i. e. returned to their homes and former occupations. In John xx. 14., we have the expression, "and when she had thus said, *she turned back*, ἐπιστρέφουσιν τα ὀπίσω. In the place under consideration, the meaning is that as soon as he said to them, *I am he*, they went back—they retired towards the place from which they came, and after having gone a certain distance—how far we are not informed—they fell to the ground. The power of his word compelled the hostile party to retire, and would have compelled them to return to the place from which they came had not the Saviour suspended the influence his voice and his will had exerted on them. On a former occasion, when officers were sent to arrest him, they returned without executing their commission, saying, never man spake as this man. So now the voice of Jesus would have produced the same effect though Satan himself was the chief actor. It was a convincing proof to Satan how powerless he was in the presence of Jesus. But having retired they fell prostrate. This was a further token of the Saviour's power. It was an extorted homage to his name. Soon he was to be highly exalted, that at his name every knee should bow and every tongue confess him Lord. In the wilderness Satan had tempted him to fall down and worship. He replied, (ὁμολογῶ ὀπίσω σου,) get thee behind me, Satan. Now Satan himself in the person of Judas, falls and pays involuntary homage, at the very moment before the Lord Jesus surrendered himself to be bruised.

Then again (verse 7,) he asked them whom seek ye? And they said, Jesus, the Nazarene. They had probably risen from the ground, perhaps had advanced again towards him, or perhaps our Lord had (as previously, verse 4,) advanced to them. "Jesus answered, I said to you, I am he. If, then, ye seek me, let these (meaning the eleven disciples) go their way."

On the occasion of this answer they did not again retire or fall prostrate, because what he added was virtually a voluntary surrender of himself. He stipulated only for the departure of the disciples, not for his own. Had he said as before; simply, "I am he," no doubt they would have retired and fallen as before. But the word (ἀφῆρα) *let* these go their way, was not a request but a command. It secured the safety of the disciples, and the word operated with the power of his first answer. This is evident because, the evangelist makes it the fulfilment of the Saviour's saying recorded in John xvii. 12, "While I was with them, I kept them in thy name—those that thou gavest me I have guarded, and no one of them is lost except the son of perdition, that the Scripture might be fulfilled." This expression, then, was an act of guardianship. The Saviour's command, "let them go," protected them; yet the disciples did not then know the almighty energy of the Saviour's word. They fled, Matt. xxiv. 56. Still this only fulfilled other declarations of the Saviour, John xvi. 32. Had Peter known how powerful this word was, he probably would have had more courage and not have denied his Lord, but Jesus had told him he would do so, John xiii. 36, 38. Still though Peter and John were in the house of the high priest, and many of the disciples, perhaps all witnessed the crucifixion;

and though the high priest enquired of the Saviour concerning his disciples, (xviii. 19,) yet none of them were apprehended. The young man mentioned (Mark xiv. 51, 52,) was not one of the disciples.

Another passage may be referred to in this connexion, although it occurs in another evangelist, Matt. xxvi. 53. Peter, it will be remembered, had cut off the right ear of Malchus. This called forth the expression from our Lord, "Dost thou suppose that I cannot now call upon my Father, and he will give me more than twelve legions of angels?—How then could the Scriptures be fulfilled?" It is recorded that one angel in one night destroyed an hundred, four score and five thousand of the Assyrians, 2 Kings xix. 35. Could twelve legions of angels be necessary to protect the person of the Redeemer against a small company of men? Or is the expression designed merely to show in a very emphatic way that our Lord did not need Peter's help? \* Rather does it not intimate that if it were not the purpose of the Redeemer to surrender himself, and if he needed protection against his enemies, more than human assistance would be needful for his deliverance, *namely*, angelic hosts to combat a spiritual adversary then present, whom no eye but his own saw, and against whom Peter and the power of the material sword were impotent? And is not this suggestion confirmed by the inquiry, "but how then shall the Scriptures be fulfilled," that thus it must be? Matt. xxvi. 54. Among these scriptures was that earliest prophesy and promise, the seed of the woman—"it shall bruise thy head and thou shalt bruise his heel," Gen. iii. 15. Had the Redeemer summoned the angelic hosts to conflict with Satan and the powers of darkness, the victory would be easy, but how then should the scriptures be fulfilled? See Rev. xii. 7, 8, which refers to a subsequent time.

There is one other passage upon which these suggestions if well founded, may throw some light—it is the reply of our Lord to Pilate recorded in John xix. 11. Pilate had said to him, "I have power to crucify thee, and I have power to release thee." Our Lord replied that he "would have no power against him if it were not given him from above, (*Δια τουτο*) *therefore* he that delivered me to thee hath the greater sin." Now attend a moment to the history: Judas had betrayed him to the band, the captain and the officers of the Jews, John xviii. 1, 2, 3. They led him to Annas—(verse 13.) Annas sent him to Caiphas—(verse 24.) Caiphas examined him in the presence of the officers—(verses 19, 22.) As soon as it was day he was taken to the council, and the elders, chief priests and scribes came together, Luke xxii. 66, and the whole multitude took him to Pilate, Luke xxiii. 1, 10, 13, 14; John xviii. 28. To whom then does the Saviour refer by the word *he*—"he that delivered me (*ὁ παρὰ διδους με σοι*) to thee," &c.? Judas did not deliver

\* "Perhaps," says Mr. King, "the very reason why Peter was permitted to draw his sword and to endeavour to fight, was to show that our Lord did not mean," by his answer to Pilate, if my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight, "such servants as men are, or could be in their mortal state; but those superior beings, whom he described in Matt. xxvi. 53"—twelve legions of angels, &c.

him to Pilate. The chief priests cannot be meant exclusively,—the council, the rulers and the people were all actors and sharers of the guilt. Some commentators say that the singular *he*, is put for the plural, and includes Judas, the high priest, and the Sanhedrim. Diodati says it refers to the chief priest and the Jews. Dr. Adam Clark thinks Judas and the Jews were meant. Henry says, *he* that delivered him was either the Jews or Caiphas in particular; that some think Judas. Doddridge says, the Jewish high priest and his council. But again, Pilate's sin is said to be less than his was who delivered him—but why? Was it because that Pilate was rather passive or urged to action, while *he* that delivered him was active? This is not the reason assigned. The sin of him who delivered me to thee is greater than thy sin, (*δια τοσούτο*) for this reason, viz., thou couldst have no power against me except it were given thee from above. The power to deliver, then, was not given from above to him who delivered Jesus to Pilate, for if it were, then the reason would fail. Pilate had said, knowest thou not that I have power to crucify thee, that is, *I have the power of death over thee*. It is to this part of the expression our Lord refers when he says, thou couldst have no power against me, &c. But who has the power of death? We are informed (in Heb. ii. 14,) the Devil has the power of death, and that by the death of the Lord Jesus, which Pilate then threatened, the Devil and his power should both be destroyed. We cannot suppose that Judas, or the chief priest, or the Jews, had or could exercise an independent power any more than Pilate. Nor do we know the nature of the power of Satan. Still there are expressions which may justify us in supposing that it was very great. Our Lord's declaration to Paul clearly implies thus much, when he said "he should turn men from the power of Satan unto God," Acts xxvi. 18. Satan is called the God of this world—2 Cor. iv. 2,—the prince of this world—John xiv 30; xvi. 11—the prince of the power of the air—Eph. ii. 2. Our Lord was manifested to destroy the works of the Devil, 1 John iii. 8, and as has just been said, he suffered death to destroy the Devil himself. We are told, too, of a war in heaven between Michael and his angels and the Devil and Satan, that old Serpent, and his angels, Rev. xii. 7, 10. We learn from these passages that Satan is an enemy of great power and malignity—that he has many spirits under his control—that he is said to have the power of death which Pilate then threatened—that it was the purpose of God to despoil Satan of this power, by the very death which Satan was preparing to inflict upon the human nature of Christ. Must we not, then, in order to solve the difficulty of the expression we are considering, extend it to the chief agent in this last sense, including indeed all the subordinate voluntary agency employed by him? Is not this expression a personification not unlike the expression, *man of sin, son of perdition*? 2 Thess. ii. 3, 4. What difficulty can we have in admitting that our Lord here refers to Satan, who acted by a power so very peculiar? He had just before said, "the prince of this world cometh," John xiv. 30. Was this a metaphor? "This is your hour and the power of darkness," Luke xxii. 53. Surely this power was a real power, and more; it was not a merely human

power. It was the hour when the power of the serpent should be exerted to bruise the heel of the woman's seed. Paul says in 1 Cor. ii. 7, 8, "We speak the wisdom of God hidden in a mystery, which none of the rulers (*αρχόντων*) of this (dispensation, *αιωνος*) world knew; for had they known, they would not have crucified the Lord of glory?" Did it ever occur to the reader to inquire whether this wisdom was not in a great degree hidden from Satan? Would Satan (who undoubtedly is (*αρχων*) a ruler of this world, and had the power of death,) have exercised his power, or (if it be denied that he did so) would he have instigated the Jews to put the Redeemer to death *had he known* the consequences to himself and his dominion? The force of our Lord's argument in reply to the blasphemous assertion that he cast out devils by Belzebub, allows us to say that Satan would not knowingly and voluntarily do that which would be destructive of his own kingdom—(Luke xi. 15-18; Matt. xii. 24, 30.) May we not then understand Paul as including Satan among the princes of this world (*αρχόντων*, the very word used in John xii. 31,) who did not perceive this wisdom hidden in a mystery, and not perceiving it, crucified the Lord of glory? But we cannot pursue this topic further at present, and we return to the answer of our Lord to Pilate. There was, it will be conceded, a great mystery involved in the transaction then in progress before Pilate—the mystery of man's redemption from sin, from the power of Satan, and the restoration of the world to allegiance and the favour of God. The exigencies of that hour reached backward to the temptation in Eden, where the origin, of the accursed dominion of Satan over this world commenced. Pilate had inquired of the Lord Jesus concerning his kingdom, and he replied in effect that though he was a king, yet his kingdom would not co-exist with the actual condition of the world. It would begin with the expulsion of Satan and the curse, and with the restitution of all things. Therefore his servants did not fight. The material sword was ill adapted to accomplish those purposes. Satan was plotting his death, and by our Lord's own permission would in a few hours accomplish it, through the instrumentality of Judas, of the chief priests, of the Jews, and of Pilate and the Roman soldiery. Satan, therefore, was the chief enemy and the chief sinner in that awful transaction. Yet the sin of all the men whom he employed was great—that of the Jewish priests and rulers was greater than that of Pilate—and that of Judas was greater than theirs. It was a mystery of iniquity, originating with Satan then incarnate in the son of perdition—it was *a man of sin*, comprising a multitude of actors having various degrees of guilt, but actuated by the great enemy whose works the Lord especially came to destroy.\*

\* Philo, the Jew, describes Pilate as a judge who sold justice—who would for money render just such a judgment as should be desired. He writes of his rapines—his murders—the tortures he inflicted on the innocent, and of persons he had put to death without even the forms of law: in short, he describes him as a man who exercised excessive cruelties during the whole period of his government—(See *De Legatione ad Caium*.) Josephus describes him as a proud, hasty man, of violent temper, who by his inflexible obstinacy troubled the repose of Judaea, and gave occasion to the seditions and revolt which followed. This historian

In conclusion, it may be inquired what is there incredible or contrary to the analogy of the faith in the exposition suggested? Does the reader doubt that Satan was really present in the chamber where Jesus and the twelve were gathered? If so, it would be difficult for him to explain how he could produce *any influence* upon the mind of Judas—that even of instigation; for although Satan by permission of God still retains great power, yet he has not the attribute of ubiquity. He cannot tempt, where he is not. Hence the apostolic precept, resist the Devil and he will *fly from you*. If it be admitted that Satan had entered the room at some time previous to the giving of the sop, or rather the uttering of the words, “*That thou doest, do quickly*”—suppose it to be but barely an instant previous—is it doubted that he could actually enter into Judas in the manner suggested? The reader then must deny also the fact of demoniacal possession, and explain away those scriptures which represent devils and unclean spirits as entering into and going out of a man. But if no difficulty be felt on this score, is there any thing incredible in the supposition that our Lord *should speak* to Satan? The reader will find the same difficulty in the

gives examples of the too great stiffness or obstinacy of Pilate—(See Antiquities, book 18, chap. 4.) Bearing in mind that such was his character, it is hard to account for his conduct in relation to the Lord Jesus. Evidently he wished to release him. It is so said expressly by the Evangelist, John xix. 12. He knew that the chief priests had delivered him for envy, Mark xv. 10. His wife admonished him, Matt. xxvii. 19. Pilate was not imposed upon by the false accusation. Doubtless he had all along emissaries who had kept him accurately informed of what was going on in his province. He made efforts to avoid condemning him. He sent him to Herod Antipas, probably to avoid condemning him, or perhaps to prevent his being condemned at all. Another expedient was to induce the people to ask his release according to the custom at the passover. Pilate then had recourse to severity, and condemned the blessed Redeemer to be scourged; hoping, perhaps, thereby to allay the popular mind; but this afflicting spectacle had no such effect. Then he ordered a basin of water to be brought and washed his hands before the people, protesting that he was innocent of the blood of that just person. It was indeed a vain ceremony, for it was his duty to have protected him against an unjust accusation. Why did Pilate yield to the Jews? Why did he not send him to prison if he wanted a pretext for the purpose of deliberately inquiring into the grounds of the accusations which the Jews persisted in making? Why did he not set on foot an inquiry as to the persons who were accomplices in this pretended crime of treason against Cesar? Pilate could have taken time upon a false pretence, (and such a pretence would have been false, because he knew that the accused was innocent,) and in a few weeks (he might have supposed) the rage of the Jews would have gone by. But instead of this, he reluctantly yields to the popular cry, and is hurried into the act of condemning our Lord while declaring him innocent—and himself innocent too of the guilt of knowingly condemning the innocent. It is the more extraordinary, when we know that Pilate was naturally obstinate, and even perversely set in his own way. He lacked probity, no doubt, and had he not manifested a desire to release Jesus, his conduct might be accounted for by his lack of principle. But why did not his obstinacy come to the aid of his desire in this case, and thus secure the acquittal of the Lord Jesus? He would not change the superscription to please the Jews. Our Lord himself declared that Pilate did not commit the greatest sin in that matter, John xix. 11. If the suggestion that Satan was the chief actor in these transactions be adopted, the reader may find reason for this extraordinary yielding of Pilate contrary to his natural obstinacy, while it was so ordered that that wicked judge should bear his fullest testimony to the innocence of the Lord Jesus. See what Peter says in Acts ii. 23—Him being delivered, &c.

account of the Saviour's temptation in the wilderness, Matt. iv. 3, 10; Luke iv. 3, 13, and also in the accounts we have of the various ejections of devils and foul spirits, by the Lord Jesus and his disciples. Is there a difficulty in admitting that the Lord Jesus should address Satan (being present, though invisible to the disciples,) without giving his disciples at least a clue to discern who it was that he spoke to? Why is this more difficult than the fact that he should have so framed his speech (upon the supposition that he spoke only to Judas,) that his words should not be understood by them? That he was not understood is distinctly asserted in verse 28, and why is it more difficult to admit that the misconception arose from their ignorance of the actual presence of Satan than from their ignorance of the treacherous purpose of Judas? Nay, did not our Lord say and do many things which his disciples did not understand at the time? John xiii. 7; xvi. 12. They certainly were ignorant of the danger to which they were momentarily exposed from the assaults of Satan, till our Lord shortly after the transaction in question informed them of it. "Simon, Simon," said he to Peter, "behold Satan hath desired to have you that he may sift you as wheat, but I have prayed for thee that thy faith fail not," Luke xxii. 31, 32. When and where did Satan express this desire? When and where did the Saviour utter this prayer? When—since the temptation in the wilderness—when, it may be asked, was Satan more bold than now, seeing he invades the little flock though protected by the sacred presence of the Saviour, and intrudes himself into the midst of the most solemn engagements? Could the description given of him in 1 Peter v. 8, ever be applied to him with more propriety than when he entered the guest chamber where Jesus and his disciples were assembled? Was it not then that Satan desired to have more of the disciples than Judas? Was it not then that the Saviour knowing the especial danger of Peter, prayed for him?

Be this as it may, we know the fact that Satan desired still farther to invade the little flock, and they knew it not, though their Lord and Master did know it and protected them.

It will not be denied that the rules of grammar allow us to refer the word *αυτου*, in verse 27, to (*ὁ Σατανας*) the nearest noun antecedent. It is not contended that it *must* in *all cases* be referred to the nearest antecedent; the reader is required only to admit that this word *may be referred* to the nearest antecedent without violence to the rules of grammar whenever the sense will admit of it; and is not the objection in the present instance really this, that the analogy of the faith and the common opinion of interpreters requires us to understand *αυτου* as referring to Judas?

But wherein is the analogy of faith violated by the exposition suggested? On the contrary, does it not relieve the passage of difficulties which press upon the common interpretation?

But we close, by saying that nothing more is intended by these remarks than to put the reader upon inquiry into one of the most interesting and most mysterious parts of the gospel narrative.

[For the Spirit of the XIX. Century.]

ESSAYS ON THE CONSCIENCE—TRANSLATED FROM THE FRENCH  
OF J. LA PLACETTE, PASTOR AT COPENHAGEN.

No. II.

*Is the Conscience an Act, a Habit, or a Faculty?*

THERE is another controversy on the nature of the conscience which very much resembles the preceding. There are theologians who maintain that the conscience is that natural faculty which judges of our actions: the understanding, according to some, and the will according to others. There are those who maintain that the conscience is not the faculty, but it is composed of those habits, infused, acquired, or natural, of which that faculty is possessed. Finally, there are those who maintain that it consists of those acts which flow from that faculty and from those habits.

This diversity of sentiment proceeds from the supposition that the word conscience has but one sense, and designates but one thing. Whereas nothing is more false than that supposition, for this word designates three things, sufficiently distinguishable. First. The faculty which judges of our actions, that is to say, the understanding or the will. The understanding, if we follow the opinions of the school which attributes three functions to that power; viz., conception, judgment, and discourse; and the will, if we agree with the modern philosophers, who leaving to the understanding, only the first of these three operations, give the two other to the will. Secondly. The opinions, and the other persuasions, true or false, of which that faculty is prepossessed, and which determine it to exercise good or bad judgments. Thirdly. The judgments themselves, which that faculty pronounces.

The holy scriptures, theologians, and men generally, use this word in all these three senses. First. The scripture very often speaks of the conscience as of a faculty. It sometimes calls it the mind, but almost always the heart. The Hebrew language has no other term by which to designate it, and therefore this sense is very usual in the Old Testament. And there are not wanting examples in the New Testament. St. John says, "*If our heart condemn us, God is greater than our heart.*" Now every one knows that, in scripture language, the heart frequently means either the understanding or the will, or these two faculties together.

The scripture also, frequently employs the terms spirit, and understanding, or mind, to designate the conscience. When St. Paul says, "*For what man knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of man which is in him?*" 1 Cor. ii. 11; and, "*Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind,*" or understanding, Rom. xiv. 3; and again, "*But unto them that are defiled and unbelieving is nothing pure, but even their mind and conscience is defiled*"—this spirit and this mind or understanding of which he speaks, are without doubt, the conscience, and this agrees with the exposition of most commentators.

When the apostle tells us (Heb. ix. 14) that "*the blood of Christ purges our consciences from dead works*"—it is evident, that

by this conscience he understands neither acts nor habits. He understands the faculties of the mind, or rather the mind itself, which according to the soundest philosophy, is not really distinct from its faculties.

But further. The scripture represents the conscience as subsisting even after it has lost its habits; and while it is wholly inactive. This it does when it speaks of a conscience hardened and seared. The conscience, then, is a thing totally distinct from its acts, its habits, and by necessary consequence, it must be a faculty of the mind.

When we speak of the conscience, and say of it, that it *judges*, that it *condemns*, that it *reproaches*, that it *produces the feeling of remorse*; we take this term in the same sense. For if we should understand that to be the conscience which is but one of its *acts*, it would amount to the same as saying that *the judgment judges*, *the reproach reproaches*, &c., which is absurd; whereas, these expressions are correct and reasonable, if we understand them of the *faculty* which performs these acts.

Finally, when we speak of a *conscience enlightened*, or of an *ignorant conscience*, we plainly use the term in the same sense, and we could not apply it either to acts or habits. On the contrary, it is certain this word sometimes designates habits. St. Paul, without doubt, uses it in this sense, when he says to Timothy, that *some having cast away a good conscience, have made shipwreck of faith*. Now this good conscience of which those unhappy persons had deprived themselves, could have been neither the understanding nor the will, for these are faculties which they could not lose. It was that *habit or state* of the conscience produced by their unstable attachment to wholesome truth.

When theologians say that it is necessary to avoid an erring conscience, '*conscientia errans est deponenda*,' they unquestionably understand this term in the same sense. For what can they mean by this erring conscience, which they recommend us to avoid, but *the errors* with which it is imbued?

Again, this word sometimes marks the act only. For the conscience is really a kind of knowledge, as the term itself shows; and St. Paul some times employs the term knowledge to designate the conscience, as when he says, Rom. xiv. 14, *I know and am persuaded by the Lord Jesus, that nothing is unclean of itself*. Now no one is ignorant that the exercise of knowledge is an act of the mind.

This apostle, again, understands the thoughts and the conscience to be the same thing; saying of the gentiles, "*their conscience also bearing witness, and their thoughts the mean while accusing or else excusing one another*," Rom. ii. 15. Who can doubt that the thoughts are the acts of the mind?

When it is said that a man who lies, speaks against his conscience, this word is used in the last sense; and likewise, when in speaking of sins that are committed with the knowledge that they are sins, we call them sins against conscience. In reality, this conscience which is contradicted and opposed in saying that which is known to be false, and in doing that which is known to be for-

bidden, is unquestionably an actual knowledge of the truth, and of that which is prohibited by God.

This last sense is, if I am not deceived, the most natural and the most appropriate of the three. The word *conscience*, is a Latin word, which comes from *consciens*, which in its first signification designates one who is privy to a secret design, for example, an accomplice in a conspiracy. It was afterwards employed to designate the knowledge which we have of that which passes in our own minds, as when we say *consciens mihi sum*, for I bear witness to myself. Thence has been formed the word *conscience*, which designates as much that knowledge which we have of the designs of others, as that which we have of what passes in ourselves: originally with respect to facts, and afterwards with respect to right and wrong.

In consequence of this, this term which properly designated only the knowledge of the past, or of the present, has been employed to express that of the future; there being scarcely any one who has not used it to designate the knowledge which we possess of the good or the evil in our actions, and frequently, also, that which we possess concerning our duty. The signification of this word has been extended even further. It has been employed to designate *the faculty* of which it is *the subject*, or the principle of that knowledge, and I have shown that the scripture often takes this term in this last sense.

Thus this word has had the fate of many others, that without losing their first and natural signification, have with time acquired those that are new. For example, the word prophet, originally and properly designated a man who foretold future events. It is a Greek word, the formation of which does not admit of more than this single sense. Afterwards it was used to designate a simple preacher, and St. Paul has some times used it in this second sense. He has also designated by it, either those who listened to the discourses; or those who sung the praises of God in the assemblies. For we can give but the one, or the other of these two senses to that which St. Paul says of the women who prophesied with their heads uncovered, 1 Cor. xi. 5.

It is well to notice the weakness of the reasoning in which some place much confidence. "The conscience," say they, "is a species of knowledge. Knowledge is directly opposed to error. There can, therefore, be no *erring conscience*." That the conscience in its first signification is a kind of knowledge, I admit, but in another sense it is the faculty which judges of our actions. Sometimes it judges according to truth, sometimes it is deceived. In the former case it is a right conscience; in the latter, it is an *erring conscience*. To reason after the above manner is the same as to say, "the prophets predicted future events. The women of Corinth prophesied; therefore they *predicted* future events."

## THE FUNERAL OF THE MASS.

## CHAPTER V.—Against the Adoration or Worshipping of the Host.

1. AGAINST the adoration of the Host, I form three propositions; The first is this, We are not obliged to adore or worship God every where, or in all places where he is, at least not with external adoration, but we are only obliged to worship him in all places where he appears in his glorious majesty. The first part of this proposition, viz., That we are not obliged to worship God in all places where he is, appears by the practice of all Christians. For God being every where, and consequently in stones, trees, beasts, devils, and all other creatures, there is no man so extravagant as to fall on his knees before a tree, an ass, or a devil, that he may worship God in them, who is as really present in them as he is in heaven.

2. The second part of this proposition, viz., That we are only obliged to worship God both with internal and external adoration in all places where he appears in his glorious majesty, is proved, first, by the commands which Jesus Christ gave his apostles, when they asked him how they should pray; for he answered them thus: *When ye pray, say our Father which art in heaven*, St. Matt. vi. Luke xi. Why doth he say, *which art in heaven*, and not which art on earth, or in the sea, or in the air, seeing God is equally in all these places, but only, because God appears in heaven in his glorious majesty, and there crowns all the blessed spirits with his glory? Secondly. When God appeared to Moses in the burning bush, which was not consumed, he said to him, *Take thy shoes from off thy feet, for the place where thou standest is holy ground*, Exod. iii. Why is this ground called holy, and Moses commanded to approach it with reverence, submission, and adoration, seeing any other ground is equally God's creature, and that he is equally present every where, but only, because God did manifest somewhat of his power and glory in that place, by causing the bush to burn without being consumed? Thirdly, *Joshua and the Israelites did prostrate themselves before the ark of the covenant*, Joshua vii. 6, because God appeared there in a peculiar and glorious manner; for, from the mercy-seat which covered it, he gave his oracles, and made known his will, Exod. xxv. 22. Numb. vii. 89.

Fourthly, When the priest celebrates mass, a little before the consecration, he recommends the *sursum corda*, that is, the lifting up of their hearts; why the lifting them up, seeing God is equally both above and below? but only because God appears in heaven in his glorious majesty; and consequently it is thither that we must direct our vows, our prayers, and our worship.

3. The second proposition is this, We are not obliged to adore Jesus Christ in the water of baptism, though he be really there in regard of all that is adorable in him. The first part of this proposition, viz., That we are not obliged to worship Jesus Christ in the water of baptism, is chiefly proved by the practice of all Christians; for no man ever fell on his knees before the water of baptism, and adored Jesus Christ in it, at least not with external worship, which is only here intended; and doubtless the reason is, because Jesus

Christ discovers no beam of his glory there; nor doth he appear in the water of baptism, any more than in other waters; so that as we are not obliged to worship God, save only where he appears in his glorious majesty, as hath been proved, so neither are we obliged to worship Jesus Christ, but only where he discovers some beam of his glory, which he doth not in the water of baptism.

4. The second part of this proposition, viz., That Jesus Christ is really present in the water of baptism, in respect of all that is to be adored in him, is proved thus. All that is of itself adorable in Jesus Christ, is either his godhead, or his divine person, or his divine attributes. As for his godhead, seeing it is really every where, it cannot be denied but that it is also in the water of baptism. As for his person, seeing it is divine, and eternal, and infinite, it is really every where, and consequently in the water of baptism; and as for his divine attributes, seeing they are not really different from the godhead, or the person of Jesus Christ, it necessarily follows, that seeing the Godhead and person of Jesus Christ are really in the water of baptism, his divine attributes must really be there likewise.

5. The third proposition is this: we are not obliged to adore Jesus Christ in the Host, though he be really there in respect of all that is to be adored in him, viz., in respect of his Godhead, his divine person, and his divine attributes; yea, though he were there invisibly in respect of his manhood too. The principal reason of this hath been touched upon already, viz., that as we are not obliged to worship God in all places where he is (at least not with external worship) but there only where he appears in his glorious majesty, viz., ordinarily in heaven, and extraordinarily elsewhere, as hath been proved in the first proposition; and as we are not obliged to worship Jesus Christ in the water of baptism with external adoration, though he be really there in respect of all that is adorable in him, because he doth not discover the least beam of his glory there, nor appears in the water of baptism more than in other waters, as hath been proved in the second proposition; even so we are not obliged to worship Jesus Christ in the Host with external adoration, although he be there in respect of all that is to be adored in him, yea, though he were there in respect of his manhood too; because Jesus Christ doth not discover any beam of his glory there, nor doth he appear in the consecrated Hosts any more than in those that are not consecrated, for no man can distinguish the one from the other. And as for his manhood, which is pretended to be there invisibly, I say that there is no sensible mark of its presence, and consequently nothing which obligeth us to external worship, for the same reason as is already alleged; for, if the invisible presence of the Godhead, divine person, and divine attributes of Jesus Christ which are of themselves adorable, should not oblige us to external worship in the water of baptism, why should the manhood of Jesus Christ, which is not of itself adorable, oblige us to external adoration, though it were in the Host, it being there only, as they say, invisibly? In a word, they must show us the disparity, and tell us the reason why we are not obliged to adore Jesus Christ with external worship in the water of baptism, though

he be really there present in respect of all that which is adorable in him, viz., in respect of his Godhead, his divine person, and his divine attributes; and yet are obliged to worship Jesus Christ in the Host with an external worship, though nothing renders him more adorable there than in the water of baptism.

6. To this the Jesuit S. Rigant, one of the most learned of his order, answers, That although there be nothing in the consecrated Host that renders him more adorable than in the water of baptism; yet there is something in the Host which obligeth us to external worship, which is not in the water of baptism; because, saith he, the manhood of Jesus Christ is in the Host, and is there instead of a ray of glory; and God will be adored in all places, where the manhood personally united to the Godhead, is present: but, in the water of baptism, Jesus Christ discovers no beam of his glory, and his manhood which is equivalent to a ray of glory, is not there.

7. To this I reply, That the rays or beams of glory which oblige us to external adoration in a certain place, must be sensibly in that place. And, therefore, seeing the manhood of Jesus Christ which is pretended and supposed to be really present in the Host, is neither visible nor sensible, it cannot be equivalent to a beam of glory. To which I add, That, as the Godhead and divine person of Jesus Christ, which are equally present in the water of baptism and in the Host, do not oblige us to external worship; for this only reason, viz., because they do not discover any ray of their glory there: so neither doth the manhood of Jesus Christ, pretended and supposed to be really present in the Host, oblige us to external adoration, for this only reason, viz., because it appears not there, nor discovers any ray of its glory. Lastly, I affirm that, by the very doctrine and practice of the Romish church itself, we are not obliged to adore Jesus Christ in all places where his manhood is, because, as the Romish doctors confess, we are not obliged to adore Jesus Christ in that Host which the priest hath newly eaten, and whose accidents are not yet destroyed; nor in that Host which is locked up in the cupboard that is on the altar; nor in that Host which a priest carries under his cloak to a sick person in the country.

8. To this the same Jesuit answers, That, although the glory of Christ's manhood appears not to our bodily eyes, yet it appears to the eyes of our soul, viz., to our faith; for the greatest glory of Christ's manhood consists in its being personally united to the Godhead, and in being sustained in a peculiar manner by the Word. Suppose then, says he, that Jesus Christ be in the Host, we are sure that it is personally united to the Godhead, and consequently, the glory of Christ's manhood, which consists in this personal union, doth certainly appear to our faith, which is sufficient to oblige us to an external adoration of Jesus Christ in the Host.

9. To this I reply, that there is a two-fold glory of God, and of Jesus Christ, or of his manhood, viz., the one essential, internal, and hid from our senses; the other accidental, external and apparent to our senses: the essential and internal glory of God which is hid from our senses, consists in the eminence of his perfections, which are, to be in infinite, almighty, most wise, &c., and

the accidental and external glory of God, which appears to our senses, consists in some miraculous and extraordinary effect, which is sensible; as when God caused a bush to burn without being consumed, when he pronounced his oracles from above the mercy seat, and when, being made man, and having manifested himself in the flesh, he commanded the winds and the waves, cast out devils, raised the dead, &c. But I affirm that we are not obliged to worship God with an external adoration in all places where he is, in his essential and internal glory only, although it appears to our faith, because God being every where with this essential, and internal glory, we should be obliged to worship him with an external adoration in trees, in beasts, yea and in devils too, which is absurd: but we are only obliged to worship God with external worship in all places where he makes his essential and internal glory appear by some accidental and external glory, viz., by some miraculous or extraordinary effect, which is sensible, and equivalent to a ray of his essential and internal glory, as appears by what is said in the first proposition. In like manner, the personal union of the Godhead and manhood, being an essential glory of Jesus Christ, and an internal glory of his manhood, wholly hid from our senses, doth not oblige us to the external adoration of Jesus Christ, although it certainly appears to our faith, except it be accompanied with an external and sensible glory; for if the essential and internal glory of the Godhead and divine person of Jesus Christ, which appear equally present to our faith in the water of baptism, do not oblige us to an external adoration of Jesus Christ, except it be accompanied with an accidental, external and sensible glory, why should the internal glory of Christ's manhood, which is infinitely beneath the essential and internal glory of the Godhead, and appears present to the faith of those of the *Romish* church, oblige them to the external adoration of Jesus Christ, if it be separated from all external and sensible glory? To this I add, that according to the doctrine and practice of the *Romish* church, we are not obliged to adore Jesus Christ with external adoration in all places where the personal union of the manhood with the Word, appears to the faith of those of that church; for we are not obliged to adore Jesus Christ in that Host which a priest hath newly swallowed, nor in that Host which is locked up, nor in that Host which a priest carries under his cloak to a sick person in the country; although the essential glory of Jesus Christ, and the internal glory of his manhood (which this Jesuit makes to consist in the personal union of the manhood with the Word) appear certain to the faith of those of the *Romish* church.

10. To this the Jesuit answers, that as if we would obtain any grace from God, considered as he really exists in a stone, we should be obliged to prostration and external worship of the Godhead really present in that stone; so, if we would obtain any grace from Jesus Christ really existing in the Host, we are obliged to approach unto it with reverence, and external adoration; and consequently we are obliged to worship Jesus Christ in the Host with external adoration whensoever we would obtain any grace from him as he exists in the Host.

11. To this I reply, that as we are never obliged to beg grace of God, as he exists in a stone, except he discovers some beam of his glory there, (for it is sufficient to beg grace of God, considered as he exists in heaven where he appears in his glorious majesty, according to the command of Jesus Christ, *when ye pray, say, our Father which art in heaven*, and according to the command of the apostles, *lift up your hearts*.) so we are never obliged to beg grace of God or Jesus Christ, considered as existing in the Host, because he discovers no ray of his glory there; but it is sufficient to beg grace of God or Jesus Christ, considered as existing in heaven, because he always appears there in his glorious majesty. Therefore, as we are never obliged to beg grace of God, considered as existing in a stone, so we are never obliged to adore him there: and as we are never obliged to beg grace of God or Jesus Christ, considered as existing in the Host, so we are never obliged to adore him there with external adoration.

12. To this the Jesuit answers, that God hath done many miracles by this sacrament, and in it, both by punishing profane persons, and the despisers of it; and also by making a little child appear upon the altar, or flesh instead of the bread, or blood instead of the wine; all which ought to be acknowledged as so many rays of the glory of Christ's manhood, and that they ever oblige us to the external adoration of Jesus Christ in the Host.

13. To this I reply, that I do not at all doubt but that God hath many times punished profane persons, and the contemners of this sacrament, both ordinarily and extraordinarily; for St. Paul, 1 Cor. xi. 30, tells us that many of those that did receive this sacrament unworthily were sick, and many slept, that is, were dead: and St. Cyprian, in the treatise of those that fall, observes God's judgment against wicked and profane persons, and the contemners of this sacrament. But as for those apparitions of Jesus Christ in the form of a child, and of flesh and blood, &c., I look on them as fabulous stories invented by monks and other superstitious persons, above seven or eight hundred years after Christ, when the doctrine of the real presence of Christ's manhood in the Host, began to prevail, and was powerfully opposed by God's people in those days.

14. Secondly, I say, That, although there had been such apparitions, yet we must not infer from thence, either the presence of Christ's manhood, or external adoration; because that is not Christ's flesh which seems to be so; and these apparitions may be illusions of the Devil. The Jesuit Vasquez, in Disput. 193, chap. ii. speaks thus: *I answer, That which appears is not the flesh of Christ, nor of any other that is really flesh; but it is only an effigies, or appearance of flesh, as St. Thomas saith; and whereas the simple are deceived, and do believe that Christ's flesh is there in a divisible and bloody manner, it is no great matter, and this deceit must be corrected by the right instruction of the doctors.* Gabriel Biell, a famous doctor of the Romish Church, Lesson 51, upon the Canon of the Mass, saith, *that such apparitions of flesh and blood may be made by the illusions of the Devil, to deceive the simple, God permitting it to be so; and he gives an example of it, viz., That, in a Convent of Minor Friars at Ysennes, in Thuringia, a certain person like unto an angel, appeared*

to a lay friar that was preparing himself for the communion, and thrust into his mouth a piece of flesh, which, as soon as he had swallowed, he was possessed, and grievously tormented by the Devil. The Jesuit Suarez, Tom. iii. Disp. 55, Sect. 3, speaks thus, *Experience tells us, that, by length of time, this flesh and this blood which appear in the Eucharist are changed and corrupted. But when this happens, saith that famous Romish doctor, Alexander Hales, Sent. iv. Quest. 11, It is a sign that the apparition which was made in that form, was not made by the power of God, but by the power of the Devil, or by the craft of man.*

15. Thirdly, If it were as true as it is false, that Jesus Christ hath appeared sometimes in the sacrament of the Eucharist in the form of a little child, or of flesh and of blood; yet I say, that as God, when he appeared to Moses in the bush that burned without being consumed, was to be worshipped there, for this only reason, because he discovered a beam of his glory by causing the bush to burn without being consumed; but it doth not follow that God must be worshipped in all other bushes, though he be as really in them as he was in that, for this only reason, because he doth not discover in them any ray of his glory; so, if Jesus Christ hath sometimes appeared visibly in the Host, (which I do not grant,) I think then he should have been worshipped, because of such a visible appearance, which is equivalent to a ray of glory; but it follows not that Jesus Christ must be adored in other Hosts, where his manhood appears not, though it be really there, for this only reason, because no ray of his glory appears there.

16. To the three foregoing propositions I add this argument, which is very considerable: in lawful adoration, it is requisite that he who adores, be well assured that what he adores is the true God, else he may justly be reproached, as Jesus Christ reproached the woman of Samaria, *Ye worship ye know not what.* But the Romanists can never be assured (according to their own maxims), that the Host which they worship is the true God; and they have always cause to suspect that they worship a morsel of bread instead of the Redeemer of the world; because, according to their own doctrine, the real presence of Christ's body in the Host, depends on lawful consecration; and lawful consecration depends on the quality of the priest, and on the pronouncing of the words of consecration, and on his intention in pronouncing them; for there is no consecration (as they say,) when either he that celebrates mass is no priest, or doth not pronounce the words that are essentially requisite to consecration, viz., *this is my body, &c.*, or doth not pronounce them with intention to consecrate; and, consequently, in these cases the Host remains mere bread. But it is impossible certainly to know these three things. For as for the quality of the priest, he must have been baptized; and he that baptized him must have observed the essential form of baptism, and have had intention to baptize him. Again, he must have received ordination from a true bishop; and the bishop must have observed the essential form of ordination, and have had intention to make him a priest; and to make this bishop a true bishop, he must have been baptized in due form, and with the requisite intention, and must have received ordination in due form, and with the requisite intention from other

bishops; and they again, for the making them true bishops, must also have received baptism and ordination in due form, and with the requisite intention, from other true bishops, and these from others, and so back to the apostles. But who can be assured that from the apostles to a bishop, or priest, now-a-days, there hath been no failing, either in the essential form of baptism or ordination, or in the requisite intention? As for the pronouncing of the words requisite to consecration, none but the priest can know whether he hath pronounced them or not, because in the celebration of the mass, those words are pronounced so softly, that no person present can hear them. And, as for the intention, it is evident that no man but himself can know it. Besides, it is known that some priests are magicians, as Lewis Goffredi, and other wicked priests, who do neither consecrate in due form, nor with the requisite intention, especially such as believe nothing of what they profess; yea, divers monks and priests that have been converted to our religion, have assured us that for a long time before their conversion they did abhor the idolatry that was practiced in the adoration of the Host. Judge then if such persons as these had any intention to consecrate in the celebration of the mass.

17. The Romish doctors have sought all the remedies imaginable to prevent this danger. Pope Adrian, Quest. 3, speaks thus: *In the adoration of the Eucharist, there is always a tacit condition, viz., if the consecration be duly made; (as hath been decided at the Council of Constance,) otherwise they could not be excused from idolatry, that worship the Host when the priest pretends to celebrate, but celebrates not; or pretends to celebrate, and is no priest, as it many times happens.* Observe these words, *it many times happens*, for they show that there is great cause of doubting, and that much caution must be used. For, as if a woman, in her husband's absence, should say to a man that comes to her, and tells her he is her husband, (and she hath probable grounds to suspect him,) *If thou art my husband I will receive thee*, and thereupon endeavours to clear it before she admits him to any privacy; this condition frees her promise from blame; but if she gives herself up to him before she clears this doubt, saying, *I will receive thee if thou art my husband*, this condition doth not free her action from blame, but she will be reputed an adulteress. Even so if a man to whom an Host is proposed to be adored, and he hath reason to doubt whether it ought to be adored, should only say, *If thou art Christ I will adore thee*, and should not adore it before he be well assured of it, this condition would render him blameless; but if, notwithstanding his doubt, he adores it, this condition, *If thou art Christ, I adore thee*, doth not exempt him from the crime of idolatry; for to what purposes is the condition, whether it be tacit, or expressed, *I adore thee if thou art Christ*, because he actually adores it, without knowing whether it be so or not.

18. To what hath been said, I add, That the primitive church never adored the Host, nor believed that the body and blood of Christ were really and invisibly in the Sacrament of the Eucharist; for if the Christians of the primitive church had believed it, they had furnished the heathens with specious pretences to excuse the idolatry of their image-worship, and to retort upon the Christians, those very arguments which they had made use of against them.

19. First, The heathens did maintain that their idols were composed of two things, viz., of a visible image and an invisible deity dwelling in it. *They bring their Gods, saith St. Chrysostom, in Theodoret in Atrep, into their base images of wood and stone, and shut them up there as in a prison. Your gods, saith Arnobius, Book vi., dwell in plaster and baked earth; and, that they may make these materials more venerable, they suffer themselves to be shut up, and to remain hid and detained in an obscure prison.* But might not the heathens have justly replied to the ancient Christians, if they had believed what the Romish doctors do now-a-days, And do not you believe the very same of your Host, that it is composed of two things, viz., of the visible species of bread, and the invisible body of Christ, which is hid under the species? Doth not your Christ dwell in baked dough, and that he may make a piece of bread more venerable, doth he not suffer himself to be shut up, and doth he not remain hid, as in a prison?

20. Secondly, The heathens held that consecration was the means whereby the Deity which they adored, was made present in the image. So Tertullian, in his Apolog. chap. xii., saith, *I find nothing to object against images, but that the matter of them is such as our frying-pans and kettles are made of, which changeth its destiny by consecration.* And Minutius Felix speaks thus of a pagan image, *Behold it is melted, forged, fashioned, and yet is not God; behold it is gilded, finished, erected, and yet is not God; behold it is adorned, consecrated, and worshipped, and then it is God.* And Arnobius, in Book vi., *Dedication or consecration makes them dwell in images, they refuse not to dwell in habitations of earth, or rather, being forced to go into them by the right of dedication, they are incorporated, and joined to the images.* But might not the heathens have replied to the Christians thus: We find it just so in your Eucharist, viz., that the signs are of the same matter with our common bread and wine, but change their destiny by consecration; behold, it is kneaded, and moulded, and yet it is not God; behold it is baked in the oven, and yet it is not God; behold, it is consecrated and adored, and then it is God; for your Christ doth not refuse to enter into these earthly matters, or rather, being forced to go into them by the right of consecration, he is incorporated and joined to the species of the bread and wine.

21. Thirdly, The heathens had both great and little images, and did believe that the deity which they worshipped, was as well in the little as in the great ones. Arnobius, in Book vi., jeers them for this, saying, that, *If their gods had their great and little images in which they dwell, they must needs be straightened for want of room in the little ones, whereas in the great ones, they might stretch themselves out at their full length.* But might not the heathens have reproached the Christians of those times in the same manner if they had believed that Jesus Christ had been wholly contained as well in a little Host as in a great one, and as well in the least part of the Host as in the greatest?

22. Lastly, The heathens were reproached for worshipping wood and stone, the work of men's hands; things that cannot see, hear, smell, taste, breathe, speak, or move; things exposed to age, rust, corruption, dust, falling, breaking, burning, &c., to the injuries of

worms, mice, and other beasts; subject to the power of enemies, to be stolen, locked up, &c., as you may read in Arnobius, Lactantius, Minutius Felix, and other ancient doctors of the church. But, if those ancient Christians had believed what the Romanists now do, might not the heathens have replied thus; can you deny that the Host which you worship, is the work of a man's hands, that moulded it, and gave it such a form as pleased him, and then consecrated it with certain words to make your Christ come into it whole and entire? Do not you adore your Host, which neither sees, nor hears, nor smells, nor breathes, nor walks, nor speaks, nor moves? Is not your Host subject to age, dust, falling, burning; to worms, to mice, and other beasts? Is it not subject to be taken away, stolen, locked up, &c.? But if it be said that the accidents of the Host are only subject to these inconveniences, and not Jesus Christ that is under them, I answer that the heathens had said the same, viz., that their gods were not subject to these inconveniences, but the images only in which they were; for, in Arnobius, Book vi., they speak thus: *We believe not the copper, gold, and silver, whereof the images are made, to be gods and deities, that of themselves deserve adoration; but in these materials we adore those that sacred dedication introduceth, and causeth to dwell in the images.*

---

"LETTER ON CHRISTIAN UNION, ADDRESSED TO THE BISHOPS OF THE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH, BY THE RIGHT REV'D FRANCIS PATRICK KENRICK, BISHOP OF ARATH, AND COADJUTOR OF THE BISHOP OF PHILADELPHIA."\*

"*To the Right Reverend Bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States.*

RIGHT REVEREND SIRS:—A few years since, some remarks on Christian union, from the pen of one of your body, led me to address to him a letter, wherein I extended the principles he laid down to what I conceived to be their legitimate consequences. At a later period, an elaborate work, addressed to the Catholic

---

\* This letter was published in 1841, in a pamphlet of 16 pages, by "Engene Cammskey, 130, south Sixth street, Philadelphia." It has been noticed by several of the prelates of the Episcopal church; Bishop Doan of N. J., Bishop Griswald of R. I., and perhaps some others. It is a very curious affair, and not a little characteristic of the state of the times, and the relations of the Roman and Protestant Episcopal communions. It is certainly to be desired that the latter sect would clearly "define its position;" for it seems that both Protestants and Papists consider it rapidly and eagerly on the run towards Papism; and yet, it takes the expression of this opinion as unjust and unkind. Its lofty pretensions are insolent enough and silly enough—especially in a country and age like this—to subject it to misconstruction even by those whose kind feelings towards it, for the good and great men it has formerly produced, and those it still tolerates, are not fully weaned even from their arrogant and degenerate successors and followers. And, on the opposite hand, this letter shows reason enough why good Papists should mistake, if they do indeed mistake the principles and predilections of this daughter of Rome—as her children willingly call her. For ourselves we should really be glad to know whether we are any longer permitted to count the Episcopal church amongst Reformed churches or not.—[Ed.]

Hierarchy, by another dignitary of your communion, which concluded with overtures for union, emboldened me to write a treatise in defence of the Primacy of the Apostolical See, which is the essential centre of Catholic unity. Neither the letter nor the treatise has been noticed by either of the prelates. In the meantime, controversy beyond the Atlantic has taken a retrograde march, and, in a celebrated English university, several points of ancient faith and discipline have been vindicated with much learning; popular errors and prejudices have been attacked and overthrown; and principles have been put forward, which the admirers of the new school, as well as its adversaries, seem now to regard as the preliminaries to peace and concord between the Anglican Establishment and the Roman Catholic Church.

The late tract of the Rev. Mr. Newman not obscurely favors the infallible authority of Catholic councils, which he carefully distinguishes from convocations by royal authority,\* the inspiration of the books called Deutero-Canonical, the seven sacraments, purgatory and prayers for the dead, indulgences, invocation of saints, the real presence,† the sacrifice of mass,‡ and other controverted doctrines. Whilst appearing to wish to guard the members of the Establishment from straggling towards Rome, he sufficiently betrays a desire to re-establish all the ancient doctrines in the Anglican church, that thus it may be prepared for returning to the communion of the Catholic Church. He remarks that the leading spirits of the age have observed the many indications of a general desire to return to something that is only to be found in the Church of Rome,—the reverential awe for the mysteries of faith, and the tenderness

\*“General councils then may err, *unless* in any case it is promised, as a matter of express supernatural privilege, that they shall *not* err. . . . Such a promise, however, *does* exist in cases when general councils are not only gathered together according to ‘the commandment and will of princes,’ but in the *name* of CHRIST according to our Lord’s promise. The article merely contemplates the human prince, not the King of Saints. While councils are a thing of earth, their infallibility of course is not guaranteed; when they are a thing of heaven, their deliberations are overruled and their decrees authoritative. In such cases, they are Catholic councils . . . what these *conditions* are which fulfil the notion of a gathering ‘in the name of CHRIST’ in the case of a particular council, it is not necessary here to determine. Some have included among these conditions, the subsequent reception of its decrees by the Universal Church; others a ratification by the Pope.”—pp. 21–22.

†The “Homilies” occupy the 11th section of the Tract, and numerous extracts are given from them to prove that,—

“The authority of the fathers, of the first six councils, and of the judgments of the Church generally, the holiness of the primitive Church, the *inspiration* of the apocrypha, the sacramental character of marriage, and other ordinances, the real presence in the Eucharist, the Church’s power of excommunicating kings, the profitableness of fasting, the propitiatory virtue of good works, the Eucharistic commemoration, and justification by inherent righteousness, are taught in the homilies.”—p. 75.

‡Mr. Newman maintains that the 31st Article against masses—

“Neither speaks against the mass in itself, nor against it being an offering for the quick and the dead for the remission of sin; but against its being viewed on the one hand as independent of or distinct from the sacrifice of the cross, which is blasphemy; and on the other, its being directed to the emolument of those to whom it pertains to celebrate it, which is imposture, in addition.”—p. 63.

of Christian devotion.\* The measures which have followed the appearance of this extraordinary publication, confirm the belief that his views are not peculiar. The mildness of the censures passed on the work, is indicative of no very hostile feeling, and if it has been thought expedient to disavow it in a semi-official manner, and to direct the discontinuance of the publication of the Tracts, there is much to persuade us that these are purely measures of expediency. The tone of the Tracts has found an echo on this side of the Atlantic; and some appear willing to follow whither they are led by their Oxford brethren, even though it be to Rome.

The crisis has seemed to me opportune for soliciting your co-operation, Right Reverend Sirs, to effect a reconciliation with the Parent Church, and, at the risk of appearing obtrusive, I venture to submit some considerations which may recommend it to your serious attention. I disclaim most sincerely all wish to provoke a controversy, as I imagine that enough has been written on both sides to satisfy every inquirer; and the only thing worth writing about at present seems to me to be the means of effecting a union. Hitherto most persons have despaired of its possibility, in consequence of the ever-widening breach, and of the failure of many efforts made to re-unite the discordant communions; but present circumstances are peculiarly propitious, and every effort for such a purpose is laudable, whatever be the chance of success. The advantages of union are acknowledged. It would be more comforting to the Christian to be sustained in his belief by the consent of millions, than to remain isolated in the convictions of his own mind, or to be distracted by the discord of large bodies of Christian professors, at variance on most important points of revelation. It would exhibit the evidences of Christianity with increased lustre, if not only its general truth were admitted, but its doctrines received with equal unanimity; and the infidel's sarcasm, so often directed against the dissensions of believers, would lose its point, and his homage would be won for religion. The waters of bitterness would cease to flow from the fountain from which the sweet streams of living waters should alone issue; the scandals of controversial strife would no longer disfigure the unity of Christian teaching; the mutual recriminations and calumnies of jarring sects would be heard no more; and peace and charity would commence their

\*“ In truth, there is at this moment a great progress of the religious mind of our Church to something deeper and truer than satisfied the last century. I always have contended, and will contend, that it is not satisfactorily accounted for by any particular movements of individuals on a particular spot. The poets and philosophers of the age have borne witness to it many years. Those great names in our literature, Sir Walter Scott, Mr. Wordsworth, Mr. Coleridge, though in different ways, and with essential differences one from another, and perhaps from any Church system, still all bear witness to it. Mr. Alexander Knox, in Ireland, bears a most surprising witness to it. The system of Mr. Irving is another witness to it. The age is moving towards something; and most unhappily, the one religious communion among us which has of late years been practically in possession of this something, is THE CHURCH OF ROME. (!!!) She alone, amid all the errors and evils of her practical system, has given free scope to the feelings of awe, mystery, tenderness, reverence, devotedness, and other feelings which may be especially called Catholic.”—Letter to Dr. Jelf.

golden reign. How good and how pleasant would it not be to abide as brethren in unity! How great a triumph for the Gospel were all its professors as one great family, having but one heart and soul! The infidel would involuntarily exclaim at the sight:—"How beautiful are thy tabernacles, O Jacob, and thy tents, O Israel! As woody valleys, as watered gardens near the rivers, as tabernacles which the Lord hath pitched, as cedars by the water-side."\*

I do not conceive that discussion, either oral or written, is the means most likely to bring about this desirable union. So amply have the points of controversy been investigated by men of the most powerful intellect and deep research, that little additional light can be thrown on them. The dispassionate lecture of their works, after earnest prayer to God, seems best calculated to produce unity of sentiment, in regard to the tenets in question, and to the principle of church authority, without the recognition of which any coincidence in special doctrines would not secure the end. Unless the church be admitted to be "the pillar and ground of the truth," the faithful witness of revelation, and the unerring judge of doctrine, all efforts to unite in communion must necessarily be nugatory. We should have no sure motive on which to ground our assent to the revealed doctrines, and no safeguard against division. With the same facility wherewith certain tenets are admitted as derived from Scripture, and consonant with the faith of antiquity, they might be speedily rejected by the revolting pride of individuals or societies, wanting the principle of authority whereon to repose. Hence, this has been correctly styled by an old controversial writer, "the shortest way to end disputes about religion;" and it has given occasion to the excellent work of the celebrated Milner, "The End of Controversy," than which I know of nothing better suited to satisfy persons of intelligence and learning on this important topic, and thereby to dispose them for unity of faith. May I recommend it then for serious perusal?

The unerring authority of the Catholic church in matters of faith being once admitted, the union would be easily accomplished. The special tenets would all be embraced on this principle, whilst they would at the same time be sustained by the most satisfactory evidence from Scripture and tradition. In the detailed review of them, care should be taken to confine ourselves to the strict definitions of faith, and not at all to mingle with them the opinions of theologians, however respectable and weighty. The profession of faith, published by the authority of Pius IV., embraces all that is proposed for our belief on the points of controversy agitated in the sixteenth century; and a reference to the decrees of the Council of Trent can be made by those who desire to see further details. If union be desired, our differences should be simplified to the greatest degree possible; and no one should be called on to believe more than what is clearly defined, or to reject what the authority of the Catholic church has not condemned. To begin by requiring disclaimers of odious tenets, which have been unjustly imputed to us, or disavowals of theological opinions, which are free, is not to pro-

\* Numbers xxiv. 5.

mote union, but to throw obstacles in its way. Let us plainly see what is precisely necessary to be believed as of faith, and if there be no just objection to the terms of the definitions, let us not refuse to unite, because of the practical abuses that are alleged to be built on them. The celebrated writers of the Oxford Tracts admit that the doctrine proposed by the Council of Trent, concerning Purgatory, is such as against which, taken in the letter, they should scarcely be able to sustain an objection; but they allege that its practical influence is widely different. For union the admission of no mere opinion is necessary; the approbation of no abuse is desired; even the practical operation of the tenet is not proposed for approval; the dogma alone is to be considered; and if this be admissible, it will be for those who embrace it to concur in giving it the purest and best influence. Let me then entreat all who yearn after Christian unity, to seek with great singleness of purpose this "one faith," and entirely to set aside all considerations which might encumber or embarrass the investigation. I cannot persuade myself that this is unattainable, where sincerity and love of unity exist. May I suggest the propriety of repeating daily that beautiful prayer which the church uses on the third Sunday after Easter?—"O God, who dost show the light of thy truth to those that are in error, that they may return to the path of justice; grant to all that profess the Christian faith to reject all that is opposed to this profession, and to embrace all that is conformable to it, through our Lord Jesus Christ," etc. This prayer is most suitable at this time, and might with great propriety be repeated daily by all who desire Christian unity. The prayers offered up on the continent of Europe and in England for the return of the English nation to its ancient faith, may well be imitated by us; and, with still more enlarged views, we may, in these words, supplicate the same blessings for all wandering children of error. I hope that the Catholics of this country will not fail to offer up their most fervent supplications for this purpose: as it is to prayer alone that this grace will be granted, that the glory may redound to God alone.

It may appear that all hope of union is taken away, by requiring an unreserved submission to all the doctrines of faith; but it is impossible that any real union could be hoped for on any other condition. To attempt any compromise would be to betray the interests of truth, and to destroy all security for its maintenance. If the sacrifice of favorite opinions to its integrity be deemed too great for human pride or weakness, let it be remembered that it is not made to man, but to God. The homage is rendered to his wisdom, that has provided this safeguard for revelation. There is no room for human triumph. We can claim nothing for ourselves, since "we are not sufficient to think any thing of ourselves as of ourselves." Faith is the gift of God, and is not the mere effort of superior intellect, or the reward of a better disposition of heart. It is bestowed by an unsearchable dispensation of divine mercy; and the very correspondence of man to grace is ultimately to be referred to the unmerited bounty of God. "O the depth of the riches of the wisdom and of the knowledge of God! How incomprehensible are his judgments, and how

unsearchable his ways!" God forbid that we should glory in ourselves, or that we should seek the gratification of personal vanity in your return to the unity of the church. It would be the triumph of divine truth over human error; and it would become us to glorify God, wonderful and merciful in all his dispensations. We regard your errors not as the wanton inventions of proud and corrupt minds, but as the unhappy legacy left by those who wandered beyond the limits placed by the fathers: and we should unite with you in deploring them, mingling our tears with your tears,—whilst you, being made partakers of our joy, should unite with us in proclaiming the praises of God, whose mercy is confirmed upon us, and whose truth abideth forever. It is not for us to form a human coalition by mutual sacrifices; but it is our duty to maintain the eternal covenant of God, whose truth suffers no adulteration—whose institutions cannot be remodelled by man.

The admission of the doctrinal tenets implies the fundamental principles of church organization. It is defined by the Council of Trent, that there is a hierarchy constituted by divine ordination, and consisting of bishops, priests, and ministers. The power of the bishop of Rome, as successor of St. Peter, over all the church, is defined by the Council of Florence, and is embraced in the profession of faith, which contains a promise of true obedience to the vicar of Jesus Christ. Against the admission of this authority, the strongest prejudices are, I know, enlisted. The Oxford Divines themselves, who have shown no great reluctance to admit almost all our other tenets which were formerly contested with great warmth, have scarcely ventured to touch the very delicate point of Papal supremacy. Yet this is the rock on which the whole edifice of Christianity rests in immovable firmness; this is the essential centre of unity, around which all the faithful must gather in harmony of faith and obedience. For three centuries the experiment has been made to dispense with this conservative power: and the result has been that every separated mass has been broken into numberless fragments. And may I ask, what is there in this authority that should shock prejudice? Its absolute undefined nature: its interference with liberty and independence. There can be no absolute power in the church of God, since the divine revelation and law put limits which none can remove. The Vicar of Jesus Christ is powerless against the truth; all his power being in support of it. His power is for edification, not for destruction, and tends essentially to combine and preserve in unity all the members of Christ. With civil liberty and independence it interferes no further than the divine law puts bounds to human power, and says to the pride of man: "Thus far thou shalt go, and here thou shalt break thy swelling waves." As to any assumption by the Pope, at this day, of any political power over Catholics residing out of the Roman states, it is idle to think of it; and if the history of the middle ages present examples of this character, modern writers of celebrity have not been wanting to trace them to the peculiar state of society at that time, and to a principle eminently republican, namely, that power is a trust, which, if abused, reverts to the people. If facts of history be dispassionately considered, the Pontiff will appear to have been the organ of the people, in circumstances when they

durst not speak: their shield, when they could oppose no resistance: their avenger, when they should otherwise have been trampled under foot with impunity. At all events, it is wrong to make facts of this kind a ground for refusing to admit the authority of the Pontiff in the government of the church, which is alone required as a condition for communion. To call for disclaimers is not rightly to estimate the majesty and dignity of the Catholic church: to wish to fix with precision the limits of a power which must be great to meet all the exigencies of the church, in the numberless vicissitudes of ages, is to create unnecessary embarrassment. For every sincere friend of union it should suffice, that the authority is conservative and paternal, confessedly limited by the divine law, and only to be exercised for the spiritual interests of the Christian commonwealth.

Bishops are sometimes flattered by the enemies of the Papacy, which is represented as hostile to the free exercise of their rightful prerogatives. When Dupin devised the union of Anglicans and Gallicans, though he professed his intention to seek the sanction of the Pope, when the articles of union should be agreed on, he avoided shocking the sensibilities of Archbishop Wake, whose pride, he felt, would revolt at the bare mention of an authority superior to that of his Grace of Canterbury. Yet who does not know, that Augustin, acting under the direction of Gregory the Great, had more real authority throughout Britain than any modern occupant of his See lays claim to? The admission of the pontifical power secures the freedom of the prelacy from the unjust local restraints, which the civil power oftentimes is disposed to impose, and strengthens every just exercise of episcopal authority. A Catholic bishop is no wise fettered in the exercise of his rightful prerogatives by the consideration that he is responsible for their abuse to a distant superior. It is the wise dispensation of Providence, that submission to superior authority should be the guarantee of every subaltern power, and that independence, assumed in violation of the divine constitution of the church, should be punished by the forfeiture of all that is valuable in government. The prelate who refuses obedience to the Pope, becomes the crouching slave of a monarch; and the priest who discards the protecting authority of his bishop, is forced to fawn on laymen.

That there are other serious difficulties in the way of union, cannot be dissembled. To treat of them on this occasion might be premature. Not only are errors to be renounced, and a governing authority to be recognized, but personal interests and claims are at stake. For the present I shall only say, that the object to be attained merits the greatest sacrifices, and that the Father of the faithful would, no doubt, extend the indulgence of the church to the utmost limits consistent with principle, and with the general interests of religion. For myself and my colleagues I can safely say, without having had any communication with them on this subject, that nothing shall be wanting on our part to facilitate this reconciliation. In these circumstances can we despair of seeing it accomplished? Will you hesitate to concur to so glorious a work? Will you refuse to apply the necessary remedies to heal the breach of the daughter of God's people? Shall our hopes be

disappointed, and shall we be left to repeat the lamentations of the prophet: "We looked for peace, and no good came: for a time of healing, and behold fear. . . . For the affliction of the daughter of my people I am afflicted, and made sorrowful, astonishment hath taken hold on me. Is there no balm in Gabaad, or is there no physician there? Why then is not the wound of the daughter of my people closed?"\*

An impulse, Right Rev. Sirs, has been given to the religious mind which you will find it impossible to check, and difficult to resist, and if you pass not speedily with your adherents to the camp of Catholicity, there is every appearance that numbers may break from your ranks, and without you, rally under its glorious banner. The will of our heart and our petition to God is for you unto salvation, and we count as dross every worldly advantage, to gain to the church of Christ your souls, and the numbers whose eternal destinies are bound up with yours. In the sincerity of our souls we have wished to be anathema from Christ for your sakes: and we are ready to advance to the utmost limits to which the divine law allows us, in order to facilitate your return, that we may embrace you with all the warmth of fraternal affection. We feel that we ought to be bound together by cords of love in holy unity; but it is not permitted us to go beyond the precincts of the church to reach you in your present position; and therefore from afar we raise our voice, and with all the earnestness and affection of brothers, we exhort and conjure you to come to us, that we may impart unto you some spiritual grace to strengthen you, that is to say, that we may be comforted together in you, by that which will then be common to us all, your faith and ours. "*Cum unanimitas et concordia nostra scindi omnino non debeat, quia nos, Ecclesia derelicta, foras exire, et ad vos venire non possumus, ut vos magis ad Ecclesiam matrem, et ad nostram fraternitatem revertamini, quibus possumus hortamentis petimus et rogamus.*"†

Come to us, then, brethren, and be engrafted in the vine, that you may bear fruit unto everlasting life. It afflicts us deeply to see you still separated from the church, by reason of the unhappy revolt of your ancestors from the authority of Peter. Look up, we entreat you, to that chair, which amidst the wreck of empires remains in its sublime elevation. Dynasties have passed away, and even within our days the occupants of thrones have changed, like the actors on a stage; whilst the successor of the fisherman continues to sit in the chair of unity, repeating, without regard to the prevailing prejudices of the day, the unchangeable maxims of religion, and presenting the lasting miracle of a power, serene and secure amidst the storms of a convulsed world, and baffling, by its clear and deep tones, the efforts of hell to drown divine truth in the discordant sounds of erring teachers. Gregory XVI. invites you to return to the church with the same authority and affection wherewith the first Gregory called your ancestors to her communion.

Dolor est cum vos videmus ita præcisos jacere,  
 Numerate sacerdotes vel ab ipsa Petri sede,  
 Et in ordine illo patrum quis cui successit videte:  
 Ipsa est petra, quam non vincant superbæ inferorum portæ.‡

\*Jer. viii. 15-21. †S. Cyprian, ep. xlv. ‡Aug. Psalm, contra partem Donati.

With sincere affection in Christ, and great personal consideration,  
I have the honor to remain, Right Reverend Sirs,

Your obedient servant,

† FRANCIS PATRICK KENRICK,

*Bishop of Arath, and Coadj. of Bishop of Phila.*

PHILADELPHIA.

Feast of St. John at the Latin Gate, 1841.

---

SOME ACCOUNT OF THE LATE REV. JOHN H. REDINGTON, WITH  
PARTS OF HIS CORRESPONDENCE AND ILLUSTRATIVE NOTES  
THEREON.

*Article Fifth.—Letters written in 1840.*

BALTIMORE, June 8, 1840.

*My Dear Brother:*—I came to your city last Friday night, and have been at your house since Saturday morning. I supplied your pulpit yesterday as well as I could and leave my work with the Lord. I am under the necessity of returning to Philadelphia without seeing you, which I greatly regret. I might indeed stay till to-morrow afternoon, but must then leave about the time you would arrive.

I have been very agreeably entertained at your house, and desire that the Lord's blessing may be on you all. Especially, dear brother, do I desire and will endeavor to pray that the Lord may gird you with strength, and fully support you in the great work whereunto he hath called you. God hath done great things for our Zion, whereof we should be glad; but much, very much remains to be done. I beg your prayers that I may take heed unto myself and to the doctrine, and be faithful to the Lord.

The cars will soon leave, and I must close.—Farewell.

Yours, affectionately, in Christ.

Rev'd R. J. Breckinridge, Baltimore.

JOHN H. REDINGTON.

---

Moscow, Livingston Co., N. Y., July 9, 1840.

*My Dear Brother:*—Through the mercy of God I arrived at home, after a long and circuitous journey, on the 3d inst., and found all well. For this I give the Lord thanks, as well as for his manifold mercies to me during my absence. "What shall I render unto the Lord for all his benefits?"

I found yours of the 19th inst. on my arrival at home, and on perusing it, regretted I had not staid in Baltimore another day. I made some inquiry and concluded you could not reach home before Tuesday afternoon—at which time I was obliged to leave. I perceive I did not take your known activity and perseverance sufficiently into consideration, when I despaired of your arriving on Monday. But I am taught by experience, and may reckon better in future. I was really very desirous to see you on several accounts, and wished for a free conversation on important matters; which can only be touched upon, as it were, in epistolary correspondence.

These important matters are the concerns of our beloved church, and the great work of reform which God has carried on among us, and I trust will still carry on to its completion, to the praise of his great and holy name.

The Lord Jesus has indeed done great things for us, whereof I trust we are truly glad. In my judgment, there is scarcely any work of reform since the days of Luther, that will compare with the present work in our church, in the magnitude and importance of the interests involved. Let the Lord's name be praised for what he has done. Let him have all the glory, and let our continual prayer be that this great and glorious work may still be carried on, and that it may not be marred in the hands of those to whom it is committed. That the Lord has been pleased to make use of you, my dear brother, as a principal instrument in this matter, is what should greatly humble you and cause you to make deep searchings into the abyss of your heart, least pride be found lurking there; least there be something of the spirit so strikingly reprov'd, Is. x. 15. Not that I have discovered any thing of this in you, my brother. On the contrary, greatly have I rejoiced to see you constantly ascribing the success of every great and good work to God. I shall not soon forget what took place in the Convention of '37—in our first session, after it was known we had a majority of about 30 in the Assembly. I was deeply impressed that it was the duty of the Convention to return public and solemn thanks to God for this great and unexpected mercy—and I even ventured to suggest it to Dr. Wilson and some others—but though they all rejoiced in the event, they did not any of them seem inclined to make the suggestion to the body. I was restrained from making the suggestion myself, because it should properly come from some person more known and of more consequence. I was almost in despair about the matter, when you arose and moved (I do not remember whether you had just come in or not) that public thanks be given to God, for his special favour in giving us a majority—and some one was designated to perform this duty, so appropriate and so much called for by the occasion. I think, dear brother, you never made a better motion or more timely.\*

I observed also with deep interest, that in your controversy with the Universalist, *Everett*, in which God enabled you under very trying circumstances to confute and successfully overthrow a pernicious, soul destroying error, I observed, I say, that you ascribed the victory and glory to God and to his truth.†

\* On the 10th page of the *printed Minutes* of the Convention, it is stated that certain business was "laid on the table, that the Convention might offer up thanksgivings to Almighty God, for the present favourable indications in the General Assembly, by the election this day of an orthodox Moderator and Clerks." It also appears from p. 4, that the first day of the sessions of the Convention was spent "in humiliation and prayer before God, to seek the divine aid and direction in the discharge of the important duties to which it is called." Dr. Baxter, Dr. Witherspoon, Dr. Green, and Mr. Coe led in prayer in the forenoon; Dr. Jenkin, Mr. Yate, and Dr. Krebs, in the afternoon, and Dr. Goulding and Dr. Plummer delivered addresses; Dr. Wilson preached at night, from John xiv. 1. It is sweet to remember these things. Of a truth God was with us.—[Ed.]

† See *Balt. Lit. and Rel. Magazine* for 1836, for *fourteen letters* on Universalism, forming our part of our first, or written controversy with the individual

And I in general observe the same thing in your great controversy with the papists.

Now may the God of Israel give you a deeper and deeper sense of your own nothingness in yourself, but that in him you have all needful grace and strength for every work to which in his providence he may call you. And may the sentiment of your heart, as well as the expression of your lips, always be when God gives you success in any matter, "not unto me—not unto me—but unto thy name, O Lord, be glory."

That you have many and powerful enemies, is, alas, too true. But what instrument of any prominence has God ever raised up in the church, who has not had them? On the supposition of the corruption of the church, (and she always has been corrupted more or less,) no reformation can ever take place without the most bitter opposition to the reformers, who are, as it were, but the saw and the axe in the hand of him who uses them. Then let me say in the language of inspired Peter, "Beloved, think it not strange concerning the fiery trial which is to try you," &c.,—(See the whole passage, 1 Pet. iv. 12-16.)

If there is a man in our church, who needs to have on the whole armour of God, that he may be able to stand against the wiles of the Devil, and having done all to stand, I think it is yourself. O, then, mind what the apostle says, and "pray always, with all prayer and supplication in the spirit, and watch thereunto with all perseverance"—saying with the Psalmist, "hold thou me up, and I shall be safe"—"hold up my goings in thy paths that my footsteps slip not." But I find I am writing a sermon instead of a letter.

I thank the Lord that you inform me that my preaching was, by his grace, acceptable to your people. I love to preach, but find so many corrupt motions and influences at work in my heart, that I am often greatly ashamed and humbled on account of my labours. I will not say that the spirit of Eliub was not present with me in Baltimore, to reprove me, saying, "Why camest thou down hither? And with whom hast thou left those few sheep in the wilderness? I know thy pride and the naughtiness of thy heart; for thou art come down that thou mightest see the battle." Nor will I say what influence this had in hastening my departure from your city.

I was perfectly lost in your library, and when I heard your dear wife say you were in your study 15 hours a day for weeks together, poring over your pondrous volumes and preparing matter to batter down the ramparts of error, I shrunk into nothing, in view of such labours. Perhaps you do not know, dear brother, that I was neither a prophet nor a prophet's son, but as it were a gatherer of sycamore fruit—and that not having had academical advantages, I am but poorly qualified for the great work of the holy ministry. I came into the ministry under the rule of exception in our Constitution, but perhaps there is not a man in our church more sensible of the need of thorough training for the work of the ministry, than myself.

here named. They were afterwards published in a pamphlet of 60 pages under the title, "*There is a Never-Ending Hell.*" In the same *Magazine* for 1837, pp. 280-8 and pp. 495-9, the reader will find an account of our *second* or oral controversy with the same person. The allusion in the text is to these matters.—[Ed.]

But by the grace of God, I am what I am, and being in the ministry, as it has heretofore been my general endeavor to preach *Christ*, so my firm purpose in the Lord is hereafter to preach him more and more, as he is revealed in the scriptures—and to this end I beg your prayers. O let me not preach myself, but Christ Jesus the Lord. I thank the Lord for the kind sympathies of yourself and people.

In regard to the person who called on you, and made the inquiries about me, I unite with you in saying "it is singular." You call the affair "a curious thing," and so indeed it is—and being curious, it has in some degree excited my curiosity to know more of this singular person. Should you see her again, you can say that no one is more sensible of the manifold defects of his preaching than Mr. R. himself, but he thinks he can truly say, so far as he knows his own heart, it is his desire and determination in the Lord, not to preach "a quarter gospel," nor "half a gospel," but "the full gospel," even the whole counsel of God. I beg her prayers, and the prayers of all, that I may so preach.\* I thank my God through Jesus Christ, he gives me an increased desire to preach, and an increased relish for the work. You remember, I suppose, that the Lord, last December, bereaved me of my beloved wife. I have two little ones on my hands, for whom I feel a deep solicitude. Were it not for them, I might come to the conclusion that duty called me to set the trumpet to my mouth and sally forth as an itinerant missionary. As it is, I shall probably continue my anchorage here.

I had a good visit at your house, and am much indebted to your dear wife for her kindness to a stranger. May the Lord bless you and her, and your dear children. O take care of them for the Lord.

Grace be with you all.

Affectionately, yours,

Rev. R. J. Breckinridge, D. D., Baltimore. JOHN H. REDINGTON.

Moscow, Livingston Co., N. Y., Aug't 15th, 1840.

*My Dear Brother:*—Since my return, I have read the report of your trial, and the notes.† The Lord has given you a great deliverance, dear brother, and to his name be the glory. Let this fiery trial have the effect to cause you to put your trust in God alone. May it have the effect to make you humble, and circumspect as well as increasingly bold and valiant for the truth as it is in Jesus.

\* After Mr. R. had left Baltimore, after his brief visit in the summer of 1840, a lady who had accidentally heard him preach, called to see him, and expressed a great desire to have an interview with him; saying that since she had come to the country, (she was a Scotch woman,) she was worn out hearing "half, and quarter gospel sermons," and earnestly desired to know the only man from whom she had yet heard a "full gospel sermon." The incident was related to him; and his reference is to it. It is not amiss to say here, that he was a remarkably clear, faithful, pungent preacher.—[Ed.]

† The trial was for an alleged libel upon a certain *James L. Maguire*; but in reality, it was a trial for writing against Popery. *The Balt. Lit. and Rel. Magazine* for 1840, contains a full account of this affair, so disreputable to our enemies and so triumphant as it personally regards ourself.—[Ed.]

Your letter to Dr. Annan, is like a sharp sword.\* It must cut him to the quick. It is severe, as doubtless you intended it to be. I do not say it is too severe—perhaps he deserved it all and more, and in any case, may the Lord bless it to him. In cases where truth and duty are concerned, let us speak with all plainness, in the fear of God, not caring for the judgment of men, nor fearing what flesh can do unto us. But where principle and the truth of God are not involved, let us lean to the side of mercy, according to the precepts and examples of our blessed Lord and his apostles. Paul says, "Being reviled, we bless; being persecuted, we suffer it; being defamed, we entreat;"—see 1 Cor. iv. 12, 13; also the record of his trials and sufferings, 2 Cor. xi. 23—27. Blessed Paul, he is now reaping his reward! May we be followers of him as he followed Christ.

I like your plan of dividing the Synod of Philadelphia. I hope it or something like it will succeed, so as to equalize things, and make better provision for your extensive dissolutions.

Yesterday I finished the reading of Mr. Crie's life of Knox. What a wonderful man of God he was in some things! An admirable instrument raised up of the Lord for the exigency of the times. How strong he was in the grace which is in Christ Jesus! What a bold and fearless advocate of the truth! How the enemies of Christ's gospel and of all true godliness hated him, and as it were, gnashed their teeth to devour him, and how God upheld him against all their machinations! O for some such men in our day! The times indeed in many respects are changed since the days of Knox, but the difficulties in the way of a true reformation in doctrine and manners, are as great now as they were then. We live in a corrupt and fastidious age, when men have itching ears and turn away their ears from the truth and are turned unto fables. Vital godliness is low in all our churches. We have, like Sardis, a name to live while we are dead. God has indeed, blessed be his name, done great things for the Presbyterian church in our work of reform, and none can tell how unspeakably glorious the results will be, if the work be carried on and fully completed. But is there no danger that the work will cease? In my poor judgment there is very great danger. See how the church is relapsing already into carnal security as though the battle were already fully won! Sure presage of final defeat, if the Lord in mercy prevent not! Wherefore, dear brother, set the trumpet to thy mouth, and let it give a cer-

\* This case was in a sort mixed up with the foregoing; though this was not avowed; nor did the case go beyond a war of pamphlets. The reader will find our part of it in the *Magazine* already referred to, for 1840.—We hope that those who think they have any thing to gain by destroying us, will hereafter simply read over one of the foregoing controversies, or any part of that with Mr. Wickliffe, or any other in which we have been obliged to turn upon our pursuers; and so take warning, and leave us unmolested to pursue our Master's work. We take no sort of pleasure in such combats, and have never in any case commenced one—nor ever pushed one beyond what plain duty required. And for the future, we trust we shall be let alone. This hint is not given at random; let it therefore be taken by those by whom it ought to be understood, lest the Lord deliver them over to their own folly, and its inevitable consequences.—[Ed.]

tain sound that the people may prepare themselves to the battle. It is an idle dream to imagine that we may safely for a moment put off our armour or cease to fight the good fight of faith, against our numerous adversaries. I speak not to flatter you, but to humble you and to cause you to cry to God for help, when I inquire, . . . . .?\*" Has not the Lord more than once honored you by placing you in the breach; in the hour of utmost peril to our church? Is there any man in our church of whom the adversaries speak more reproachfully and despitefully than of yourself? Yea, is there any man among us of whom the numerous class yet in our church, whose hearts are luke-warm, if not quite cold (shall I say opposed?) in the cause of our great reform? is there any man, I say, of whom this class are more justly afraid, than of yourself? I venture to say there is not. Nay, be not surprised, my brother, when I intimate that there may be very worthy men and of great note in our church, who look upon you with disfavour, because they judge you will adhere firmly and resolutely to the great principles of the reform acts of 1837 and 38, years of great note in our ecclesiastical calendar.†

Much rejoiced have I been to see you in the Magazine speak out plainly and boldly, against *Hopkinsianism*, *Emmonism*, and the like, as well as against Taylorism. There is a strong tendency on the part of a great many in our church (shall I say a majority?) to

\* A line is omitted here, which we cannot with propriety publish; at least the motive of its publication would hardly be appreciated. It is not unusual with us to admit into our pages unmerited accusations by those who oppose and even revile us, that the full statement of their grounds of censure may appear; and on the same principle we sometimes print opposite and commendatory statements, which are hardly less exaggerated by the partiality of friendship or the approval of a common sentiment and cause. And so we might do here, without just charge of want of delicacy; if men judged others justly. The commendations of holy men, who have entered into their rest, are, at any rate, more in the nature of solemn exhortations, than of common approbation. Their standard is higher and their knowledge purer now; and therefore their words should be taken in dependence upon their own advancement, as a call to us, rather than as praise of us.—[ED.]

† This is a painful truth; and one over which we have mourned. There are "*men of great note in our church*"—as this just and wise man intimates, who have always "looked upon" us "*with disfavour*;" though not always for reasons even as good as that stated in the text. We say it is painful; for who can see and know, that bad passions and sinful tempers are cultivated by any men, and especially by eminent ministers, without pain? We say it is mournful; for who can behold any men, and especially eminent ministers, devoting their talents and influence and labours to unworthy ends by unworthy means, and not mourn? Do such persons suppose they are not known of men even—much more of God? Let them read the text again; and learn how thin is their disguise. Do they suppose they can compass their evil designs—either public or personal? Let them ponder the history of the last ten years in the Presbyterian church. We do not think it worth while to speak of open enemies—out of our communion. We speak of "*men of great note in our church*;" and do it with sorrow and shame; praying God to give them grace to repent and amend. Why should these "*men of great note*"—begrudge us a seat in the King's gate? The only rivalry we ever allowed ourself to have with any of them, was to see who should work hardest for our common Master. If we had desired honour, or distinction, or power, or influence, or station, or riches; were they not all open before us, out-side of that ministry, which God constrained us to take before all these? And in that ministry, have we ever asked for any thing but the privilege to work?—[ED.]

open the doors again to the better sort of New England theologians, and receive ministers and others without requiring of them a strict and full conformity to our standards. Now if this policy obtains, it will certainly ruin us. Hence this is the very time to lift our voice distinctly and loudly against such pernicious latitudinarianism. I hope your *Memoirs* of the controversy in our church will be continued. I fear, however, Mr. —\*, will fail us. He wrote not long since, saying he thought he should decline. In reply, I strongly urged him to go on, and promised, if it would be any inducement to try to collect something to pay him for his labor.

I rejoice to see you publish Marshall†—and hope you will continue to give something from the old authors. Cannot you engage some able pens to write original articles in regard to the necessity of our strictly adhering to our principles, and carrying out our reform? Does Dr. Jenkin furnish any articles for you? Our cause is prospering in some places in this region—but alas, our people generally are too lukewarm. This is the case with my own little flock. I trust in the Lord that you and yours are in health and peace. My salutation in the Lord to Mrs. B. and the children. Also I would be remembered to Mrs. K., who I understand is a mother in your Israel. My sudden departure from Baltimore, precluded me from a compliance with her invitation to call.

I beg your prayers. The Lord Jesus Christ be with thy spirit.

Affectionately yours in Christ.

Rev'd R. J. Breckinridge, D. D., } JOHN H. REDINGTON.  
Baltimore. }

I expect, if God permit, to attend the meeting of our Synod at *Wilksbarre*, on 26th Oct. next, and it may be I shall have a commission from our church of *Scottsville*, to collect funds on their behalf, to help pay for their house and lot. There is some danger that they may be sold on mortgage, which would give our adversaries occasion to triumph, and would injure our cause. At W., I shall be nearly half way to your city. If I should have such a matter in hand, should I be an acceptable visiter among your people soliciting their aid? J. H. R.

Elizabethtown N. J., Nov. 12th, 1840.

*My Dear Brother:*—I am now acting as agent in the bounds of the Synod of New Jersey, on behalf of the church of *Scottsville*, N. Y., to raise \$500 to save their house of worship from the hammer, and themselves from dispersion, if not extinction, as a congregation. The case is a very strong one, and appeals directly to the heart of every true Presbyterian, and especially to every one

\* We think it best to suppress the name.—[Ed.]

† *On Sanctification*;\* abridged by a friend, and published in the Magazine about this time.—[Ed.]

imbued with the spirit of Reform of 1837 and 1838. Years never to be forgotten in the history of our church.

It is not necessary, neither have I now time, dear brother, to spread this case before you at length. I know that your sympathies are already enlisted on behalf of struggling orthodoxy in Western N. Y., and I trust also there are many warm and generous hearts in your congregation, that beat in unison with your own.

Collections are made with difficulty in N. J., though the Lord has given me some success, and by the grace of God, I intend to persevere in this matter till the requisite sum is raised, if I have to visit other regions and places.

In a case of this peculiar and urgent kind, should I fail of collecting the necessary amount in other places, would it be of any avail, for me to visit Baltimore? I know, indeed, the great liberality of your church, and that very few, if any, churches in the whole land, do proportionably so much as yours for many benevolent objects, and my principal hesitation in visiting you, arises hence, because you do so much abound in every good work, that I am loth to make application, lest more should be laid upon you, than in Christian consistency may be meet. "I mean not," says the apostle, "that other men be eased and you burdened." Still—I know "there is that scattereth and yet increaseth."

I need not say, dear brother, how much pleasure it would afford me, if God permitted, to have a personal interview with you—of which pleasure I was deprived last summer.

As you may be from home, I will direct this letter to Mr. John Wilson, as well as to yourself, and hope to have an immediate reply to it, (directed to me, at *Trenton, N. J.*), either from yourself or him. If the answer encourages me to visit Baltimore, and need so require, you may, God willing, expect to see me in due time.

My love in the Lord to Mrs. B. and to your dear family, and to all the dear brethren. I beg your prayers. May great grace be bestowed upon you, and your strength be equal to your day.

Affectionately, yours,

Rev. R. J. Breckinridge, D. D.,  
or,  
Mr. John Wilson, Baltimore. }

JOHN H. REDINGTON.

---

READING OR PREACHING—A FEW MORE WORDS ABOUT THAT QUESTION.

*Mr. Editor:*—I have read with great interest the articles which have, from time to time, appeared in your journal on the subject of reading sermons. I confess that I entirely agree with those who deem it *injudicious, as a general practice*, to do so. If any go farther than this, I cannot concur with them. I cannot believe it *unlawful* to read sermons, nor do I know that any one else holds this opinion. If this were true, it would never be proper, under any circumstances, to read them. But all my observation has sat-

ified me that ordinarily a discourse on any subject, written and read, produces far less effect than the same discourse, or even one somewhat inferior, would produce, if delivered memoriter, or not indeed without study, but without having been committed to memory. I have used the word *ordinarily*, because I know some who read so impressively and whose written compositions are so superior to their extemporaneous sermons, that were I one of their stated hearers, I should desire *them* always to read. Surely if there are others the structure of whose minds is similar to that of the persons I have spoken of, they too, should pursue the same course. There are others again who might have become impressive extemporaneous speakers, if they had attempted it in their youth, whose mental habits are now so fixed, that the attempt to change them would be vain; certainly these should retain their old habits. Even those who may be qualified to speak extemporaneously in the most impressive manner, may find special occasions presenting themselves, in their own congregations or elsewhere, when they would deem it most judicious to read their discourses. If these exceptions be admitted, I shall entirely agree with those who advocate unwritten, or at least unread discourses.

But my object in taking up my pen, was not to give my own opinions, but those of men whose talents, and learning, and knowledge of human nature, a thousand fold exceed any thing which the most extravagant vanity could induce me to ascribe to myself. They are men, too, who lived and shone in the literary and political world, and who have never been suspected of religious enthusiasm. In a word, they are JONATHAN SWIFT and RICHARD STEELE. The extract I send you is from the *Tattler*, No. 66, an article written by Steele and Swift, conjointly. The *Dean* who is spoken of, is *Atterbury*, afterwards Bishop of Rochester, not less distinguished for talents and learning than the writers of the article. *Daniel*, was *Dr. Daniel Burgess*, a pious and learned man, and an eloquent and able preacher, though he is said to have sometimes debased the dignity of the pulpit by ill timed wit and levity of expression. His evangelical doctrines, it will be seen, form a fruitful subject of ridicule with the writers of the article sent you. Of course, it is unnecessary for me to disclaim all sympathy with such sentiments. *Dapper*, is supposed to have been *Dr. Trapp*, chiefly known as a translator of *Virgil*. But I will not longer detain your readers from the article in question. A.

“Of all the people on the earth, there are none who puzzle me so much as the clergy of Great Britain, who are, I believe, the most learned body of men now in the world; and yet this art of speaking, with the proper ornaments of voice and gesture, is wholly neglected among them; and I will engage, were a deaf man to behold the greater part of them preach, he would rather think they were reading the contents only of some discourse they intended to make, than actually in the body of an oration, even when they were upon matters of such a nature, as one would believe it were impossible to think of without emotion.

I own there are exceptions to this general observation, and that the Dean we heard the other day together, is an orator. He has so much regard to his congregation, that he commits to his memory what he is to say to them; and has so soft and graceful a behaviour, that it must attract your attention. His person, it is to be confessed, is no small recommendation; but he is to be highly commended for not losing that advantage; and adding to the propriety of speech, which might pass the criticism of Longinus, an action which would have been approved by Demosthenes. He has a peculiar force in his way, and has charmed many of his audience who could not be intelligent hearers of his discourse, were there not explanation as well as grace in his action. This art of his is used with the most exact and honest skill: he never attempts your passions, until he has convinced your reason. All the objections which he can form, are laid open and dispersed, before he uses the least vehemence in his sermon; but when he thinks he has your head, he very soon wins your heart; and never pretends to show the beauty of holiness, until he has convinced you of the truth of it.

Would every one of our clergymen be thus careful to recommend truth and virtue in their proper figures, and show so much concern for them as to give them all additional force they were able; it is not possible that nonsense should have so many hearers as you find it has in dissenting congregations, for no reason in the world, but because it is spoken extempore: for ordinary minds are wholly governed by their eyes and ears; and there is no way to come at their hearts, but by power over their imaginations.

There is my friend and merry companion Daniel: he knows a great deal better than he speaks, and can form a proper discourse as well as any orthodox neighbour. But he knows very well, that to bawl out, "My beloved!" and the words "grace! regeneration! sanctification! a new light! the day! the day! ay, my beloved, the day! or rather the night! the night is coming!" and "judgment will come, when we least think of it!" and so forth—He knows, to be vehement is the only way to come at his audience. Daniel, when he sees my friend Greenhat come in, can give a good hint, and cry out, "This is only for the saints! the regenerated!" By this force of action, though mixed with all the incoherence and ribaldry imaginable, Daniel can laugh at his diocesan, and grow fat by voluntary subscription, while the parson of the parish goes to law for half his dues. Daniel will tell you, it is not the shepherd, but the sheep with the bell, which the flock follows.

Another thing, very wonderful this learned body should omit, is, learning to read: which is a most necessary part of eloquence in one who is to serve at the altar: for there is no man but must be sensible, that the lazy tone, and inarticulate sound of our common readers, depreciates the most proper form of words that were ever extant in any nation or language, to speak their own wants, or his power from whom we ask relief.

There cannot be a greater instance of the power of action than in little parson Dapper, who is the common relief to all the lazy pulpits in town. This smart youth has a very good memory, a

quick eye, and a clean handkerchief. Thus equipped, he opens his text, shuts his book fairly, shows he has no notes in his Bible, opens both palms, and shows all is fair there too. Thus, with a decisive air, my young man goes on without hesitation; and though from the beginning to the end of his pretty discourse, he has not used one proper gesture, yet, at the conclusion, the churchwarden pulls his gloves from his hands; "Pray, who is this extraordinary young man?" Thus the force of action is such, that it is more prevalent, even when improper, than all the reason and argument in the world without it. This gentleman concluded his discourse by saying, "I do not doubt but if our preachers would learn to speak, and our readers to read, within six months time we should not have a dissenter within a mile of a church in Great Britain."

[For the Spirit of the XIX. Century.]

CRITICAL OBSERVATIONS ON ACTS III. 8.

AND leaping (*εξαλλομενος*, rather springing) up, he stood and walked, and entered the temple with them, walking, *and leaping*, (*αλλομενος*) and praising God.

Dr. Paley observes that a child learning to walk is the greatest posture master in the world. We observe how difficult it is for children in their first attempts to keep an erect position, or keep the centre of gravity of the body between the feet. The same thing is observed in persons learning to skate. Persons coming on shore from a long sea voyage preserve for a time, to some extent the habit they have acquired of adjusting their posture to the motion of the ship. Now imagine how a man would walk who had never attempted it till he had acquired the ordinary vigour and strength of an adult. He would get along very awkwardly, to say the least of him. It may be doubted whether he would succeed much better than a child who is just beginning to try his strength in that way, because he would have to learn the art of balancing his body, and reduce his learning to an art or a habit before he could walk gracefully or even easily. In the passage referred to, we have the account of a miracle wrought upon a man who was forty years old, (Acts iv. 22,) and who had been lame from his birth, and so entirely that he had never walked, (Acts iii. 2.) Suddenly he receives strength, and rises at the command of Peter, (Acts iii. 6.) Now can we suppose that this man thus rising from a sitting posture, for the first time, would rise in the same easy, gradual way that a man would who had done so repeatedly every day, for eight and thirty years? Would he know how to put forth his newly received strength in that stinted measure, which would be just sufficient to assume an erect position in an easy (and as we would say, though perhaps not quite correctly,) natural way? Is it not more probable that he would exert it suddenly and to the full extent, and thus leap or spring up? The word *εξαλλομαι* (*exilio*) has

that meaning, and the remark just made, if well founded, shows how aptly the word was chosen by St. Luke. - But how would such a man walk, never having learned to walk? May we not suppose he would have a difficulty in keeping the balance of his body while sustaining his weight on one limb, and giving a forward motion to the other? Would he not, upon perceiving he was about to lose his balance, plunge or bound, and lay hold of any person or thing near him for support? Now mark the description which Luke gives. The man entered the temple walking, *and leaping*, (*αλλομενος*) or bounding; and in verse 11, he tells us the man which was healed *kept hold* on Peter and John. All this is perfectly natural, and what one would expect if the miracle extended no farther than to cure the disease and communicate strength to the feet and ankle bones—(verse 7.) And is there any reason why we should suppose that it included also the art or habitude of walking, which is acquired by time and practice? When our Lord raised the daughter of Jairus, he commanded that something should be given her to eat—(Mark v. 43.) The miraculous exertion of power which he put forth, did not dispense with the immediate use of means to preserve the life which he had just restored—(See also, Acts ix. 40 41.) It may be conceded, however, that in some cases the effect of a miracle was to place the individual upon whom it was wrought, by an instantaneous act, in the same situation in respect to the use and exercise of the power or faculty communicated, as he would have been in at the time, had he never wanted the power or faculty in question from his birth; yet is it necessary to suppose that such was the effect in all cases? And may not this be an example of the opposite kind, where the power was imparted and the individual left to learn the use of it by practice? If so, we have in this case an incidental proof of the veracity of the narrative which is not commonly observed. The sudden violent spring; the bounding motion, and the fact of the lame man's holding fast to Peter and John, are exactly what we should expect if the miracle stopped *with merely curing the disease and giving strength*. It is true that on the other supposition, the man might have leaped and danced for joy, and he might have held to Peter and John, from the ardour of his gratitude to them, yet that is not expressly said, and the question, therefore, is, which sense is most agreeable to the narrative, and the circumstances of the case. This speculation may be very fanciful, yet if those who have the ability, would habitually and closely study the import of words and phrases of the inspired volume, they would doubtless derive an abundant reward for the labour it would require.

# SPIRIT OF THE XIX. CENTURY.

VOL. I.

DECEMBER, 1842.

No. 12.

[For the Spirit of the XIX. Century.]

## CRITICAL REMARKS UPON MATTHEW XI. 12, 13, AND LUKE XVI. 16.

The Law and the Prophets *were* until John: since that time, the kingdom of God is preached, and every man *presseth* into it.—LUKE XVI. 16.

And from the days of John the Baptist until now, the kingdom of heaven *suffereth violence*, and the violent take it by force: for all the prophets and the Law prophesied until John. MATT. XI. 12, 13.

It is remarkable that the word *βιάζονται*, which occurs in both these places, is translated in the former by the word *presseth*, and in the latter by the words *suffereth violence*. We observe also a similar difference in the vulgate and the versions of Montanus and Erasmus “*vim patitur*”—“*vim facere* :” *that is to say*, in the one place the same word is understood in an active, or middle sense, and in the other in a passive sense. The difference in the translations was no doubt suggested by the different subjects or nominatives of the verb. In Luke, according to the authorised English version, it is affirmed of every man or every one, that he *presseth* into it—that is, into the kingdom of God. In the other place, according to our version, it is affirmed of the kingdom of the heavens (not that it *presseth*, but) that it *suffereth violence*. It is extraordinary that the same word should have such different significations, especially when we consider that both of these places relate to the same general subject. Indeed the motive which determined the translators to adopt these almost contradictory senses for the same word, probably was to harmonize what they supposed to be the general sense of these two expressions. The word, it will be agreed, is correctly rendered in Luke;—the doubt is, whether the sense given to it in Matthew can be justified. Let us adopt for a moment, in Matt. xi. 12, the signification *presseth*. “From the days of John the Baptist until now, the kingdom of heaven *presseth*”—(*ἡ βασιλεια των ουρανων βιάζονται*.) This expression so understood, is in close analogy with the preaching of John the Baptist and of our Lord. Both began by preaching, “The kingdom of heaven is at hand”—has come nigh—(*γγυκι ἡ βασιλεια των ουρανων*, Matt. iii. 2; iv. 17; Mark i. 15; *proxime abest*—*in propinquo est*.) Both these expressions may be considered figurative. What we may say of a material object, in a literal sense, *namely*, that “it has come nigh,” that “it *presseth*,” is here affirmed of the kingdom of heaven, which had come nigh, not by passing through space, but by lapse of time, (Mark i. 15,) and therefore may be said “to

press itself," or "urge itself upon" those to whom it had come, in a sense corresponding or analogous to the sense in which it had come nigh. The context of this expression in both places tends to support this idea. Luke says, "The Law and the prophets, until John." The translators of the authorised or commonly received English version have supplied the word *were*, but if we may interpret Luke by Matthew, we may with more propriety supply the word *prophesied*—(prophetaverunt, vaticinati sunt.) The meaning is, the law and all the prophets prophesied of the kingdom of God until John the Baptist came. They announced it as future, not as come: but he announced it as come nigh and no longer future. While it remained at a distance, it could neither press itself nor urge itself upon men, nor could it suffer violence from them, but having come nigh (by the fulfilling of the time appointed for offering it to the Jews, Mark i. 15,) it now presses itself—but upon what or whom? This question will come up for consideration hereafter.

But suppose this is so, it will be inquired what does the residue of the clause mean, "and the violent take it by force." The corresponding phrase in Luke xvi. 16, is, "and every man presseth into it"—(καὶ ἅπασιν ἀνθρώποις βιάζεται, "et omnis in illud vim facit," *Vulg. and Montanus*, "et quivis in illud vim facit," *Erasmus*, "et quivis in illud vi perrumpit," *Beza*, "et quis que ipsum premit ut ingrediatur," *Junius and Tremellius*, et quisque vim adhibet ut eo potiatur, *Næbe*.)

It is a good rule not to translate a doubtful expression in a sense which is not supported by the facts of the case, and it is proper therefore to inquire whether *every one*, (confining of course the expression to the Jewish nation,) or the people generally did press into the kingdom of God. John the evangelist says of the Lord Jesus Christ, "He came (ὡς τὰ ἴδια) to his own, (things, kingdom, property, peculiar right,) and his own (οἱ ἴδιοι, people, subjects,) received him not, John i. 11. Thus he states the fact generally, as if the rejection were universal. He gives us to understand, however, in the next verse, that some did receive him, but these were the few, not the many. That the number who believed in Christ during his personal ministry, was small, very small compared with the entire population, may be proved by many passages, Acts i. 15; 1 Cor. xv. 6. Though his miracles ought to have convinced the nation that he was their Messiah, yet they almost universally rejected him, Matt. xxii. 3, 5, 7; Luke xiv. 18, being blinded as it had been foretold, John xi. 37; Mark iv. 12; Luke viii. 10; Matt. xiii. 14; xxviii. 26, 27; Rom. xi. 8; Is. liii. 1; vi. 10. All the proofs which Christ gave of his Messiahship, were resisted—his miracles were ascribed to Belzebub—in fact, all means were resorted to for the purpose of opposing his doctrines and his proofs of the near approach of the kingdom of God. In Matt. xxiii. 13, we find this passage, "But woe unto you scribes and pharisees, hypocrites; for ye shut up the kingdom of heaven against men; for ye neither go in, neither suffer ye them that are entering to go in," which may mean that they so perverted and distorted the doctrine of the kingdom which he preached, and the proofs which he gave that it had come upon them, as to deter the common people from believing in

him. Without citing farther proofs, may we not say that neither the whole nation, nor the larger part of it, nor even any considerable number of the people, pressed into the kingdom?

But we shall get some light upon this expression of Luke, from the corresponding expression of Matthew, "the violent take it by force"—(βίασται ἀρπαζουσιν αὐτην, violenti rapiunt illud,) By the *violent*, we are undoubtedly to understand that class or body of persons to whom Luke refers by the words (was, omnis) *every man*, and as the kingdom was offered at the time in question only to the Jewish nation, we must understand by the *violent*, (βίασται, violenti,) and by *every man*, (was, omnis, quivis, quisque,) the whole Jewish nation without exception, or the great body of it. In what sense they were *violent*, will come up for consideration presently. The word (ἀρπαζουσιν) which is translated *take it by force*, is several times used in the New Testament. Examples of the sense in which it is used are the following. The wicked one (ἀρπαζῆς) *catcheth away* that which is sown in the heart, Matt. xiii. 19. When Jesus knew they would come and *take him by force*, John vi. 15. The wolf *catcheth them* and scattereth the sheep, John x. 12. None shall *pluck them* out of my hand, John x. 28, 29. The Spirit of the Lord *caught away* Philip, Acts viii. 49. The centurion commanded the soldiers to *take Paul by force*, Acts xxiii. 10. Then we that are alive and remain, shall be *caught up* together in clouds to meet the Lord, &c., 1 Thess. iv. 17. Others save with fear, *pulling them out* of the fire, Jude 23. Her child was *caught up* to God, Rev. xii. 5. Paul was *caught up* to the third heaven and *was caught* into Paradise, 2 Cor. xii. 2, 4. The kindred word ἀρπαγῆς, is translated *extortion*, in Matt. xxiii. 25; *ravening*, in Luke xi. 39; *spoiling*, (or despoiling of goods,) in Heb. x. 34. The word ἀρπαγῆς, is translated *robbery*, in Phil. ii. 6;—ἀρπαξ is joined with λύκος, in Matt. vii. 15, and is translated *ravening wolves—extortioners*, in Luke xviii. 11, and also in 1 Cor. v. 10, 11, and vi. 10. From this examination it appears that the word ἀρπαζω is not always used in a bad sense, and whether good or bad, must be determined by the context. Should we find it joined with ἀρπαξ, or λύκος, or ὁ πονηρός, there would be no difficulty in adopting the bad sense of the word. Nor could we hesitate to do so in the passage under consideration, if it were clear that the word βίασται translated "the violent" (*violenti*) contains the idea of *wicked, lawless, or rude violence*. But the commentators generally consider this word as implying a *holy urgency* to enter the kingdom of heaven and enjoy its blessings. The violent may mean, says one, "not men of bad characters, but men of ardent minds, who seek the Christian doctrine with avidity, and as it were, seize it." Another says, "and the violent take it, for a man born in earth cannot take heaven, unless he does violence to himself, by restraining his own appetites from delights." These two senses are very different. Jerome says, "Grandis enim est violentia in terra nos esse generatos, et coelorum sedem quaerere; possidere per virtutem quod non tenuimus per naturam." Beda says, "Grandis namque violentia est, nos in terra generatos, posse regnum coelorum possidere per virtutem quod non possumus per naturam." We add one example more of patristic commentary:

It is from Clemen's Alexandrius—οὐδε τῶν καθυπνούντων καὶ βλακούντων ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ, ἀλλ' οἱ βιασταὶ ἀρπάξουσιν αὐτήν, αὐτὴ γὰρ μόνον βία καλὴ, θεὸν βιάσασθαι, καὶ παρὰ θεοῦ ζῶν ἀρπάσαι. (Nor does the kingdom of God belong to those who indulge in sleep and sloth, but the violent take it : for this is the only good (or lawful) violence, (θεὸν βιάσασθαι, *Deo vim ferre*) to do violence to God, and to snatch life from God, &c. &c.) Clemens Alexandrinus, τῆς ὁ σωζόμενος πλουσιος—*Quisnam dives ille sit, qui salvetur*, §. 21. Segariius says upon this passage, "Spectat locum, Matt. xi. 12—Nescio, an hæc sit horum verborum sententia ; verum id non agimus. Plerique veterum et recentiorum, ita intellexerunt." Segariius professes to be a great admirer of Clement, and particularly of this performance of that father. His admiration, however, could not restrain him from expressing his doubts on this interpretation, though perhaps it prevented criticism. But surely such glosses of the word of God (and there are many of them) are nothing better than very bad guessing. But we pass on.

Some of the commentators understand the expression as the record of a matter of fact, *viz.*, that multitudes of the Jews were extremely urgent to obtain the blessings of the kingdom which John first began to preach. Others understand it in an abstract sense ; or as affirming what is required of those who desire to enter the kingdom, not that the Jews were violent in that sense. But although we might so understand this clause, it is not so easy to understand the expression in Luke xvi. 16, otherwise than as expressive of a matter of fact—"every man," according to our translation, "presseth into it." In order to avoid a difficulty which the *matter of fact* presents to such a translation, Erasmus and Beza translate (*πας, every one*) by the word *quivis*, and Junius and Tremellius by the word *quisque*, whereas the vulgate adopts the word *omnis*. The difference between these words may be stated thus : (*Omnis nullum excipit*.) The word *omnis* excepts none. (*Quivis est indefinitum*.) The word *quivis* is indefinite, and may be rendered *whomsoever you will—any one you please*. (*Quisque indefinitum quod distributivè sumitur*.) The word *quisque*, is indefinite, and is understood distributively. It is not denied that the word *πας* may signify *quivis* or *quisque*, but it must be conceded that its usual sense is *omnis*, all or every one—(See Matt xxiv. 22 ; Rom. iii. 20 ; Eph. v. 5 ; 1 John ii. 21 ; John iii. 15 ; 1 Cor. i. 29 ; Matt. vii. 21.) These observations lead to the suggestion that the difficulty will be removed and the two evangelists harmonized by translating the preposition *us*, not *into*, but *against* (*contra*) a sense which it often has, see Luke xii. 10 ; Matt. xviii. 21 ; Rom. iv. 20. The same sense may be given the Latin preposition *in*—*et omnium in illud vim facit*.\* The Anglo Rhemish version of this phrase is, "and every one doth force toward it." The phrase of the vulgate may be rendered, "and every one doth violence against it." Wickliff's translation of the place is, "and ech man doith violence in to

\**Accusativum regit quum sumitur in bonam partem pro ergo vel in malam pro contra, Nollens*. In this place the suggestion is that the proposition is used in *malam partem* for *against*.

it." Turning now to the expression in the original Greek, *και πας εις αυτην βιαζεται*, and adopting the word of the common version (for *βιαζεται*) *presseth*, the sense according to this suggestion would be "and every one *presseth*" or urges himself "against it," that is, resists it.\*

Let us now turn again to Matthew and compare this expression so understood with what is there affirmed—*και βιασται αρπαζουσι αυτην*. The word *αρπαζω* may be used to signify the treatment of a city which has been taken and given up to be sacked by the soldiery, and such appears to be the allusion here. "From the days of John the Baptist until now, the kingdom of heaven [has come nigh and] *presseth* [or *urgeth* itself upon men] and the violent sack or pillage it, like a city which has been taken and is given up to the soldiery to be plundered." This may not be precisely the meaning of the clause, but let it stand for the present; we shall be able to decide better as we proceed. A question arises in this place as to the meaning of the phrase "kingdom of heaven." The opinion of most commentators is, that the present dispensation of the gospel or the Christian church is the kingdom referred to. If this be the meaning of the phrase "kingdom of God," the common version of Luke xvi. 16, cannot be correct, for every man did not press into the Christian church. In fact the church of Christ was very small till the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost miraculously added three thousand persons to the company of the disciples. But the sufficient answer to this opinion is, that the Lord Jesus Christ was a minister of the circumcision, Rom. xv. 8. He appeared in the end of the Levitical economy, and preached a *kingdom* to that people which, when they rejected him, was taken from them—(Matt. xxi. 42, 43.) But this could not have been the

\* For an illustration of the use of this word as well as of some remarks to follow, the reader may be referred to Exodus xix. 20-24 in the LXX. The Lord had descended upon Mount Sinai, upon the top of the Mount, and had called Moses upon the top of the Mount, and Moses had ascended: and the Lord said to Moses, go down to warn the people (*μη ποτε εγγισωσι προς τον θεον κατανοησαι*) lest they come nigh to consider, (look on, gaze,) and a multitude of them fall—(verse 23.) But Moses said "the people cannot come up unto Mount Sinai, for thou chargest us, saying set bounds upon the mount," &c. But the Lord said, "Go, descend, and ascend thou and Aaron with thee; but the priests and the people let them not (*βιασθωσαν αναβηκαι προς τον θεον*) *press* to ascend, or *break through* to ascend unto the Lord, lest he break forth upon them." Paul alludes to this transaction in Heb. xii. 18, 22; "For ye are not come"—(*ου γαρ προσεληλυθατε* instead of *εγγισωσι*, the word used in the LXX., and the word used by John the Baptist and our Lord to announce that the kingdom of heaven had come nigh, Matt. iii. 2; iv. 17,) "to the Mount (Sinai) which could be touched," &c., "but to Mount Sion," &c., in order to show the difference between the Christian dispensation and the dispensation of law. But what we remark here, is the use of the word *βιασθωσαν*. The multitudes of Israel were encamped before Mount Sinai, preparatory to the giving of the law. The Lord had commanded Moses to set bounds to the people round about the Mount, which they were forbidden to pass under the penalty of death. The Lord appeared upon the summit in fire. The danger was that the people being moved by the appearance, and being eager to consider it more closely, should in a crowd or body, *press* over the bounds prescribed, and should perish in their rashness. The act forbidden is expressed by the word we are considering.

present dispensation of the gospel or the privileges of the Christian church, because these were from the first, offered as freely to Jews as to the Gentiles, Acts ii. 39; iii. 19, 20; xiii. 46. The nation was spared near forty years after the Holy Spirit was given—the gospel was universally proclaimed throughout the nation, and all might have enjoyed the privileges of the church of Christ, if they had desired them. By the kingdom of heaven, we must understand the kingdom which John the Baptist and our Lord himself preached—the kingdom which was offered to the Jews *exclusively* during the personal ministry of Christ—the kingdom which was taken from the nation, as such, when the nation rejected Christ, and the kingdom which will be given to the elect church, (to be gathered during the present dispensation out of all nations,) when the Lord Jesus Christ shall come again. It was the glorious kingdom of the Messiah. This kingdom, (acting of course as every kingdom must act,) by its king and its ministers, pressed itself upon that nation for its acceptance, and that nation (thus pressed and urged) not only did not accept it, but treated it as a victorious enemy treats a conquered city—they sacked and plundered it—*αεραζωον*—they violently tore it and rent it away, they subjected it to the every kind of rigour thereby to prevent its being established. This is a figurative expression. The kingdom was not nigh in a sense that it could be seen or touched. But its king was visible, and the exhibitions which he continually made of his power were a proof that he was able to establish it in manifest glory, if the nation would receive him. He that could raise *one* dead man to life—or by his word aione, restore sight to *one* person that was blind—or cleanse at will, a single leper—or deliver *one* person possessed of the Devil, and who could impart the like powers to his followers: He who could do these things in one instance, could raise all the dead—give sight to all that were blind—cleanse all lepers—cure all diseases, and cast Satan into the bottomless abyss.\* Such power must have appeared to be adequate to the establishment of the kingdom of heaven which the Saviour preached; when, therefore, he went to the Jewish nation preaching that kingdom, and exhibiting those almighty energies upon which its manifestation depends, the kingdom itself was really *come nigh* to them.

During the personal ministry of Christ and his immediate disciples, the kingdom may be said to have urged or pressed towards its

\* The difficulty in performing works like these, is as impossible to be overcome by human or finite power in one instance as it is in two, or three, or a thousand, or an infinite number of instances. It is like the difficulty in the way of creation, which consists in bringing something out of nothing; in giving existence to that which did not exist before; and he that can overcome it *at all*, can overcome it *altogether*. He that can create *one ounce* of matter, can create *another*, for what should prevent him from doing so? Why should he be able to produce *one* and not *another*? Non-existence cannot be used up, if we may so say, or be exhausted. Why should he have power to do so at one time and not at another? So in respect to the miracle of raising one dead man. The difficulty consists in re-embodiment of a disembodied spirit—in giving vitality to dead matter; and in regard to the cure of leprosy, the difficulty consists in creating healthy action of vital, but decaying parts, in place of diseased action, &c. &c. These things transcend the power of man altogether. The exertion, therefore, of such powers in a single instance was a convincing proof of the superhuman character of our blessed Lord.

own establishment, and the Jewish nation in the treatment which they gave to the Lord Jesus Christ and his doctrines and proofs of his kingship, may be said to have sacked and plundered the kingdom, by despoiling as far as they could; the king of his attributes, and his doctrines and miracles of their true character and qualities.

The expression, as we have repeatedly said, is undoubtedly figurative, as is that in Matt. xxiii. 13—Woe unto you Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites; for ye lock up (κλειετε, as with a key) before men, the kingdom of heaven; for ye neither go in yourselves nor let them go in who are entering. Here we have described under the image of *locking up a kingdom*, the same idea which in the passage under consideration is described by the image of snatching away or violently despoiling a kingdom. In Luke xvi. 16, the idea is yet differently expressed, as we have seen.

There is a difficulty in understanding precisely the allusion of the word (βιασται) *violent*. That it refers to Jewish people appears to be clear: for at that time the kingdom of heaven was not offered to any other people, and could not be, Matt. x. 5. That the word is intended to be applied to the principal portion of the nation is evident from Luke xvi. 16, where those who "do violence" are referred to by the words (πας, omnis) *every one*. Again, if the word be correctly applied to the great body of the Jewish nation, and be understood as expressing a matter of fact, it cannot be interpreted in the sense of a holy violence or urgency to seize the blessings of the kingdom which was preached, because the fact was otherwise, as all the gospels prove. Why then are they described as violent (βιασται)? The writer is not satisfied with any answer to the question he has seen, nor can he give any which is not open to some objections. But although we should not be able to discover the reason, it is perhaps enough to know that the term is applied to the Jewish nation *as a body*, and (*in malam partem*) in a *bad sense*.—Perhaps the allusion may be to the transaction at the foot of Sinai, already referred to, Ex. xix. 20, 24; or perhaps the word was used as expressive of a characteristic of the nation, produced by the eager and constant expectation of the kingdom which was the great object of promise and of the national hope. The Jews as a body thought themselves ready to press with eagerness into the Messiah's kingdom, and to enrol themselves as his subjects the first moment of his appearing. They erred in this, as the event proved.\*

\* Paul calls Israel (in Rom. ix. 31) the people which followed after righteousness—δικαλον νομον δικαιοσυνης—He uses this expression as an epithet, because it is the characteristic of them that they ever *follow after*, but never reach or attain to what they follow. See a similar expression in Isaiah li. 1, version of the LXX. Hear ye ye who are following after righteousness (οι δικαιωντες το δικαιο) and are seeking the Lord—(και ζητουντες τον κυριον.) Now this chapter of Isaiah is unfulfilled prophecy, and the prophet may be understood as addressing the outcast and dispersed children of Abraham, not only during past ages, but at the present day. They are pursuers and seekers still. They are looking for their Lord Messiah still. Hence the prophet uses these expressions as a *descriptio personarum*—as a characteristic by which they may be known. In the same sense, our Lord calls them βιασται—such is the suggestion—*pressers* (as they thought themselves) into the kingdom, although in truth they were rejecters of the kingdom; violent opposers of the king who came to them and offered it, just as they were in truth unrighteous, notwithstanding they were, as they thought, following after righteousness.

Their zeal to press into the kingdom, was not such as to prevent them from using unholy violence to destroy it. Or finally, if the word *αγρὰ* should be understood in the sense which has been contended for, it predicates of the Jewish people (who are spoken of) that disposition to unholy and ruthless violence, which is primarily expressed by this word, and hence the people themselves may be denominated by the word which expresses a trait so prominent in their character. Leaving this question, however, to the reader, we pass on to another inquiry.

Adopting the translation suggested, the passage in Matthew would stand thus: "And from the days of John the Baptist until now, the kingdom of heaven *presseth* or urges itself;"—upon what or whom? Thus far we have treated the subject as though the proper answer were, *the Jewish people*. If we turn to Luke, the corresponding phrase is found to be, *is preached*. The verse reads thus:—The law and the prophets until John, (that is, prophesied until John,) since that time, the kingdom of God *is preached*, that is, its ministers have announced its advent to the Jewish people, and its claims upon them for acceptance. In this way, then, the expressions may be equivalent. But another idea may be suggested.

In the prophesies of Daniel, we have an account of four kingdoms which were successively to arise and prevail. These kingdoms were, according to the almost unanimous consent of the commentators, the Babylonian, the Medo-Persian, the Grecian, and the Roman. Three of these kingdoms had already appeared, and had been supplanted, each by its immediate successor; and the fourth kingdom had reached the climax of its power when John the Baptist began to preach the near approach of the kingdom of heaven; viz., the fifth kingdom, which the prophet had declared should break in pieces and consume all the preceding kingdoms, but should itself stand forever, Dan. ii. 44. In whatever sense, then, the kingdom of heaven had drawn nigh at that time, in the same sense the kingdom of Rome, or the fourth kingdom, had drawn near to destruction in consequence of the approximation of the kingdom of heaven which was to destroy it: for these kingdoms cannot co-exist according to the representation of the prophet—"Thou sawest till that a stone was cut out without hands, which smote the image upon his feet, that were of iron and clay, and brake them to pieces. Then was the iron, the clay, the brass, the silver and the gold broken to pieces together, and became like the chaff of the summer threshing floors, and the wind carried them away, and no place was found for them, and the stone that smote the image, became a great mountain and filled the whole earth," Dan. ii. 33, 34. This language is very forcible. The collision of stone against the image utterly destroyed the latter, and to this prophesy our Lord probably alluded when he said, (in Matt. xxi. 44.) "And whosoever shall fall on this stone shall be broken"—(The nation of the Jews stumbled and fell upon it, and were soon afterwards broken and dispersed among the nations,)—"but on whomsoever it shall fall,

it shall\* dissipate as chaff." The stone will fall upon the image which symbolically set forth the four kingdoms already mentioned, and these it shall dissipate as chaff is scattered by the wind. The stone was ready thus to fall when our Lord began to preach the gospel. The time was fulfilled, Mark i. 15. The kingdom symbolized by the stone, was upon the point of displacing the kingdoms represented in the image, by its own universal establishment. Nothing could have prevented its establishment but the infidelity and disobedience of the Jewish nation. It had come nigh, it was urging or pressing itself upon the kingdoms of the image. But because the Jews (the nationally elected subjects) rejected the kingdom, it was taken from them, and, as it were, taken from the world too, for a time—it did not then fall and smite the kingdoms of the image, because out of those kingdoms God designed to take a people for his name who should occupy the place designed originally for Israel, and for that end alone were these nations spared, and for that end alone have they been suffered to continue, and consequently when this elect people shall all be gathered, the kingdom of the stone will not only press upon or against but crush and utterly dissipate all these earthly kingdoms of which the prophet spoke.

We may remark, also, in passing, the difference which it is the design of God ultimately to put between Israel and those Gentile nations which are represented by the image. The Lord Jesus Christ, on several occasions, (see Matt. xxi. 33, 45; Luke xx. 18,) predicted his own rejection by the Jewish nation. He told them the kingdom of God would therefore be taken from them. But besides this loss, their nation would be broken and dispersed among all nations, (as appears by Luke xxi. 24,) until the ending of the period of mercy which God designed to allow to the Gentiles, (see Rom. xi. 25–31,) then their fragments shall be gathered again; but on the nations the stone itself shall then fall, and dissipate them as the chaff which cannot be gathered again. The consequence of the rejection of the kingdom by the generation of the Jews to whom our Lord went, was the final perdition of all but a remnant according to the election of grace. So Paul teaches in Rom. xi. 5. Nay we have less reason to entertain a favourable hope of many of the Jews of that day than of Sodom and Gomorrah. And the consequence (of rejecting the kingdom when personally offered to them by the Lord Jesus Christ) to the Jews of all succeeding generations during their present dispersion, has been their final ruin except so far as they have believed in the Lord Jesus Christ. But to those or to some of those who shall live at the end of this dispensation, when the period of mercy to the apostate Gentiles is about to expire, a happier end remains; for then the time will have come when God will restore the remnant of Israel

\* *Λιχμισι*, dissipabit, *Beza*—conteret, *Vulg.* and *Erasmus*—ventilabit, id est, ita comminuet ut minutæ partes in auras dispergantur: as chaff riseth to be scattered with the wind. The word properly signifieth to separate the chaff from the corn; with winnowing to scatter it abroad; *Leigh's Critica Sacra* ad verb *λιχμισι*. The words of the LXX, in Dan. ii. 44, are *λεπτυνι και λιχμισι πασαι τας βασιλειαις*—it shall break in pieces and blow away all those kingdoms.

which shall then live, to the land which he gave to Abraham, and though many will fall by the way, yet some shall be gathered, and be made a holy nation, while to the Gentiles of apostate Christendom (not the unevangelized nations, but only the kingdoms of the image) shall remain only judgment. Yet the remnant of Israel, which shall thus be gathered, will attain the blessings only of an earthly kingdom—they shall indeed have preeminence among the nations which shall dwell upon the habitable earth to come, (*οικουμένην τὴν μελλούσαν*, Heb. ii. 5,) but the kingdom of God, which was taken from their nation when they rejected Christ their king, will be filled and enjoyed exclusively by the glorified church, gathered out of all nations—all of whose members will be children of the first resurrection, (which will have taken place previously,) and be like the angels in office, and conformed to the image of Christ, Rom. viii. 29; 1 John iii. 2. But to return from this digression.

There may be then an allusion to this prophesy of Daniel. The expression, "the kingdom of heaven has come nigh," implies an object to which the kingdom has come nigh, yet neither John the Baptist nor our Lord declared in express terms to whom or to what the kingdom had come nigh, *ἤγγικεν ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν*, Matt. iii. 2; iv. 17; Mark i. 15. So in this place it is said the "kingdom of God presses or urgeth itself," which contains the same idea, with an additional thought—but here also, it is not said upon whom or what this urgency is exerted. But in regard to the former expression, the kingdom had come nigh especially to the Jewish nation, and mediately through them, it had come nigh to the world. But it was not offered to any other people at that time—and in regard to the latter expression, it may have a two-fold sense—it may express the urgency with which the kingdom pressed itself, through the Lord Messiah upon the Jewish people; and it may also express the tendency of the kingdom to displace and destroy all those kingdoms which it was to succeed.\*

The infidelity of the Jewish people, foreknown indeed and foretold, led them to reject the kingdom, and from that time it has remained in abeyance, waiting the gathering of another nation under the administration of the Holy Spirit. Here then we see why God restrains his wrath against the world—why he still holds in suspense the stone which has been, so to speak, ready to crush the image from the days of John the Baptist. God has elect ones yet to gather. The mystical body of Christ is not yet full. But how many remain to be added, and how long it will be before the work shall be finished, God only knoweth. Meantime, the apostate

\* That the word *βιάζομαι* has the signification contended for, may be proved by many texts. Thus, in Gen. xxxiii. 11, it is used to express the urgency which Jacob used with Esau to accept his gifts. So Gen. xix. 3, Lot *pressed* upon the angels greatly, and they turned in to him. Judges xix. 7, And when the man rose up, his father-in-law *urged* him. Therefore he lodged there again. In 2 Kings v. 16, it is said Naaman *urged* Elisha to take a gift, but he refused. In Exodus xii. 38, we are told the Egyptians *were urgent upon* (*κατιβιάζοντο*) the people to send them out of the land in haste. See also Prov. xvi. 26, in LXX. A man in labours, (*ποσει*) labours for himself, and (*εμβιάζεται*) *urges himself upon* (*τῷ αὐτοῦ ἀνωλείας αὐτοῦ*) his own destruction.

kingdoms of Christendom (like the ancient Canaanites) are filling up their cup of iniquities. The Holy Spirit of God makes no delay; and when he shall have accomplished the work appointed for this economy—when the last of God's elect shall be gathered into the fold of the great Shepherd, the stone will fall upon all the proud kingdoms symbolized by the image, and grind them to powder: then will the broken and scattered kingdom of Israel be gathered again upon the mountains of Judea—Judah shall be saved, Israel shall dwell safely and become the joy of the whole earth.

If the reader shall reject the foregoing interpretation of the passages quoted at the beginning of this essay, we shall not dispute the matter with him; still we think he would do well to consider whether the common interpretation is not beset with greater difficulties: we are more solicitous that he should believe the truths submitted, than that he should believe they are taught in the places considered. Those who believe and teach that long cycles of ages are yet in reserve for the world, as it now is, have not, as the writer believes, any scriptural warrant for so doing. The world in its present condition has no covenant or promise on the part of God that he will spare it an hour, any more than Sodom had after God had made known to Abraham his purpose to destroy that city. Sodom enjoyed a short respite, not for its own sake, but on account of God's purpose to save Lot. So the world now, or rather we would say the kingdoms of the image are spared for the sake of the elect. Israel as a nation is suffered to remain broken and dispersed, and under judicial blindness, for the sake of the elect church which is to be composed indiscriminately of Jews and Gentiles. "As concerning the Gospel," says Paul, "they are enemies for your sakes, but as concerning the election," *to wit*, of Abraham and his natural posterity, to be a peculiar and favoured nation among all the nations of the earth, "they are beloved" still "for the Father's sake," and therefore it is that "when the deliverer shall come to Zion (Is. lix. 20) and shall turn away ungodliness from Jacob nationally, Rom. xi. 26, (that is at the second advent of Christ which will put an end to this economy of the gospel to the Gentiles,) this broken and dispersed people shall be gathered again, and be made the chief and the favoured nation of the earth in the millennial economy or Messiah's reign. Yet the glory of restored Israel, though great, will be far inferior to the glory of the elect church which will be composed of the saints who shall be raised from the dead or changed at the glorious advent of our Lord, and made glorious, and like the angels, spiritual and immortal. But when will these things be accomplished? Can any one predict the time of Israel's conversion or restoration? Can any one say the time is surely a thousand years off? Can any one say that the elect church now being gathered, certainly will not be completed for a thousand years to come? Or can any man know or say that the apostacy of Gentile Christendom will not be ripe for the day of wrath and the righteous judgment of God, until a thousand years shall have elapsed? Certainly we have no revelation on these subjects. All these events have their appointed times and seasons, no doubt, but the Father has kept them in his own power. They

may all occur, for aught we know, during the life-time of some who are now on earth. Why should God continue to afflict the descendants of Abraham, and punish them for their unbelief for the sake of lengthening the time of mercy to the Gentiles, seeing they have shown themselves to be abusers of God's mercies as well as the Jews? Hath not God already shut up Gentiles as well as Jews in unbelief? that is, has he not, by assigning periods of mercy alternately to Jews and Gentiles, and allowing each people to display their unbelief and rebellion, shown both to be alike unbelievers?—See Romans xi. 32, and the preceding context. Is great Babylon, mystical Babylon, the corrupter of the nations, and drunk as she is, with the blood of the saints, to be converted? Or is she to be thrown down with violence, and be no more found at all, as when a millstone is thrown into the sea? Rev. xviii. Is the man of sin to be converted, or to be consumed by the brightness of the Lord's coming? 2 Thess. ii. 8. Is the little horn which is to prevail against the saints until the ancient of days shall come, (Dan. viii. 21, 22,) then to become a saint? Or is it to be given with the body of the beast to the burning flame? Dan. viii. 11. Now if the end of Babylon, of the man of sin, of the little horn, of anti-christ, be violent and awful destruction, who can say that God will certainly defer it yet a thousand years? Israel cannot be restored till this judgment shall be inflicted; for, said our Lord, Jerusalem shall be trodden down by the Gentiles, *till the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled*, Luke xxi. 24, that is, until the stone shall fall upon the image and grind it to powder, according to the prediction of the prophet Daniel, (see 2d chapter.) It is probable (judging from the signs of the times,) that the Jews will be excluded from their land yet another thousand years, for the benefit of the Turk, or for the benefit of apostate Christendom, whose fortunes appear to be, and really are inseparably connected with the Turkish empire? No; strong and vigorous as some of these nations seem to be, and increasing as they are in power and resources, the day of their extinction is drawing nigh; they will doubtless perish suddenly while some of them are in the height of their power, and their destruction will come in that day when God shall set his hand again the second time to recover the remnant of his people—and shall assemble the outcasts of Israel and gather together the dispersed of Judah from the four corners of the earth, Isaiah xi. The word of God is explicit—the restoration of Israel will occur at the same time with the excision and reprobation of the apostate Gentile church. But this awful and mysterious event may not be accomplished in a moment. As the apostles of our Lord had begun to extend the gospel beyond the confines of Judea, before their nation was destroyed and the worship of the synagogue was broken up, so it may be at the time when God is about to reject apostate Christendom or the kingdoms of the image, churches will be planted beyond the limits of what we call Christendom. And it may be with this design that God has been causing his servants for the last forty years to engage in the work of missions. This may pass as conjecture merely; we will only add that however it may be, the providence of God admonishes us that great events are at hand,

and let those who are wise be watchful, for the day will come as a snare upon all them that dwell on the face of the whole earth, Luke xxi. 34, 35.

[For the Spirit of the XIX. Century.]

MCQUEEN'S CASE.—MARRIAGE WITH A DECEASED WIFE'S SISTER.

MR. EDITOR:—The article, with the above title, bearing the signature of "A LAYMAN," which appeared in the number of your miscellany for August last, I have perused with much interest, and I respectfully ask your permission to submit to the consideration of your readers, a few brief remarks on that ingenious performance.

I would never, Sir, on any occasion, or under any circumstances, grudge, even to an adversary, that which I believe to be his just due; and therefore, I freely and cheerfully admit, that your eulogium on the author of the composition here referred to, contained in the pertinent and pithy editorial note with which you have introduced it, is abundantly justified, by the ability displayed in the article; and, moreover, I fully agree with you, in believing, "that the ablest things that can be said," are there "arrayed against" the "important decision" of the last General Assembly of our church, which the author of that piece opposes. To this just concession I hope his modesty will allow me to add, without offence, that my thanks, together with the thanks of all those who unite in judgment with me on the question he discusses, are certainly due to him, for writing anonymously: for, as I must, with the sentiments I confidently entertain, on this subject, be permitted to regret, that talents so powerful, have, in this instance, been sadly misdirected, I cannot feel otherwise than grateful, that he has withheld from the public, a name, which, in all probability, would have given a fearfully extensive influence, to what he must excuse me for denominating the *mischievous error*, which he has so ingeniously maintained. That, considering the ground he has taken, his production should be open to reprehension, can be no disparagement whatever to his talents: for, let *who will* try the experiment, it will *invariably* be found, that no attempt to support error, can ever abide the test of fair and impartial scrutiny.

These things being premised, I now proceed, with all practicable brevity, to review his performance.

And the first characteristic trait, claiming our attention, in the article under consideration, is, the *inconsistency* which the author betrays in speaking of the Confession of Faith of our church. In the commencement of the second paragraph, he not only speaks highly of that excellent formula, and gives it the due praise of *breathing piety*, and containing *truth and unction*, and being alike *profitable and refreshing*;—but he adds, with strong emphasis, that he has "*no fellowship with the tenets that openly avow the reception of the whole, but tacitly discard whatever does not suit*:" and yet, after all this, he soon discovers, very plainly, that he does, his own very self, hold a conspicuous place among those with whom he explicitly declares he has "*no fellowship*:" for, whatever else, in

the Confession of Faith, may, or may not, come up to his views of truth, it is very certain that the last clause of the fourth section of the twenty-fourth chapter "does not suit" HIM; and hence, he unceremoniously "discards" it; and employs all the force of his powerful mind, throughout more than fourteen pages, to destroy its credit, and its influence.

There is no need of any very minute or extended examination of our author's remarks, in the remainder of his second paragraph, about *superstition*, and *zeal*, and *bigotry*. Fraught with good sense, as those remarks are, in themselves considered, and abstracted from the subject to which he unhappily applies them, they certainly contribute nothing towards the proof of the main position for which he contends; viz., the lawfulness of the disputed connexion: nor can their application to the question at issue, or to the individuals whose views he controverts, answer any better end, than that of holding up to the contempt and scorn of the public, men, who, instead of meeting with such unkind treatment at his hands, ought rather to be considered by him as persons who have a just claim on his reverence and love.

Far be it from me, to utter any thing to the disadvantage of those distinguished men whom he claims, as being on his side of the disputed question. So far as their opinions may be found to agree with what the sacred oracles contain, they are certainly entitled to high regard; but, it ought to be recollected, that men of equal eminence, both in the learned and in the religious world, have sometimes appeared on opposite sides of the same question; and, as it is the dictate of inspired wisdom, that "*great men are not always wise; neither do the aged understand judgment;*" it can detract nothing from any man's merit, to have his opinions tried by the touch-stone of divine truth.

The ground on which our author places his objection to the disputed clause in our Confession of Faith, I believe to be utterly untenable. He contends, "that it is a restraint"—by which, I presume, he means, an *improper*, an *unlawful* "restraint of *Christian liberty*." This position, I deny; and call for the proof of it. What is *Christian liberty*? Does it imply or include a permission to transgress any part of the revealed will of God? Certainly it cannot. Our author, then, must prove that the marriage condemned in the disputed clause of our Confession, is not sinful, before he can, with any semblance of justice, maintain, that to prohibit it is a restraint on Christian liberty. What! Are women of suitable character and qualifications for promoting conjugal happiness, so scarce in the world, that some Christians must fail of obtaining them any where else, except among sisters-in-law? Away with such notions of Christian liberty! Let the author whose production is now before me, or any other person familiar with his Bible, and free from prejudice, seriously ponder this question:—Are you *absolutely certain*, *beyond the least rational doubt*—that the marriage of a man with his sister-in-law—whether she be the widow of his deceased brother, or the sister of his deceased wife—is *not*, either expressly or impliedly prohibited, in the word of God—and that Christians are at liberty to enter into such connexions, at pleasure?—and if I

am not greatly deceived, our author himself, or the most strenuous apologist for such connexions, would pause long, and deliberate seriously, before he could *confidently* answer this question in the *affirmative*. Were such a question *seriously* proposed to him, *accompanied by a solemn charge, to answer it in the fear of God*,—my impression is, that the utmost extent of his reply would be, that *he was not CLEARLY convinced of the sinfulness* of such a marriage; but, yet, that he could not, *positively, and without hesitation*, say, that it was *certainly lawful and innocent*. If, then, this impression of mine be not a mistaken one, (and I confess it is one which I cannot resist, until I am better informed;) I ask—and I do it with emphasis and earnestness—which is the *safe* side of this question? Is any *Christian* laid under a *necessity* to contract such a marriage? And if he be not, is it not *his duty*, to “*abstain from all appearance of evil*,” and *avoid* that which *he cannot but know*, must be *offensive*, *yea, exceedingly offensive* to many of his *Christian brethren*? In my judgment, nothing can be clearer, than that every *Christian is bound*, by the most indispensable obligations, to *walk inoffensively* even in reference to acts, the innocency of which is far less questioned than that now under consideration.

As I do not wish to extend this article beyond reasonable bounds, I shall not enter *at large*, or, *in detail*, on the scriptural proof of the unlawfulness of the disputed connexion, but shall content myself with a few remarks upon our author's efforts to invalidate the abundant evidence of this truth, which was exhibited at the trial before our last General Assembly, which has called forth this discussion.

He finds fault with the clause of our Confession herein referred to, because it is “*an induction*” from the prohibitory verses of the eighteenth chapter of Leviticus; and yet, to support his fault-finding, and render it plausible, he himself makes an *induction* from the fact of his finding, in our Confession, a clause which does not suit him. Thus it would seem that the liberty of “*induction*” must be yielded up as the *exclusive privilege* of the advocates of the marriage in question. But this will not do. Our author is too intelligent a man not to know that there are many truths cordially and unhesitatingly received by all well-informed Christians, the scriptural evidence and authority for which depend altogether on *good and necessary inference* from the language of the Bible, and no where found expressed *in so many words*. If, indeed, our inductions be not *fair* and *legitimate*, they may, with propriety, be assailed; but if they be, let our author be cautious how he rejects evidence thus obtained; lest in so doing he should be found virtually condemning our blessed Lord himself, who gave to the sceptical Sadducees an *inductive* proof of the doctrine of the resurrection.

As to the acts of the General Assemblies of 1799, 1802, and 1804, which our author speaks of as having been cited by the late Rev'd Dr. James P. Wilson, of Philadelphia, on a certain occasion to which he alludes, and which he thinks are strikingly illustrative of his own view of the question, it is enough to say at present, that those acts, on examination, will be found self-contradictory; for each of them sets out with the expression of a wish “to dis-

the Confession of Faith, may, or may not, come up to his views of truth, it is very certain that the last clause of the fourth section of the twenty-fourth chapter "*does not suit*" HIM; and hence, he unceremoniously "discards" it; and employs all the force of his powerful mind, throughout more than fourteen pages, to destroy its credit, and its influence.

There is no need of any very minute or extended examination of our author's remarks, in the remainder of his second paragraph, about *superstition*, and *zeal*, and *bigotry*. Fraught with good sense, as those remarks are, *in themselves considered*, and *abstracted from the subject to which he unhappily applies them*, they certainly contribute nothing towards the proof of the main position for which he contends; viz., the lawfulness of the disputed connexion: nor can their application to the question at issue, or to the individuals whose views he controverts, answer any better end, than that of holding up to the contempt and scorn of the public, men, who, instead of meeting with such unkind treatment at his hands, ought rather to be considered by him as persons who have a just claim on his reverence and love.

Far be it from me, to utter any thing to the disadvantage of those *distinguished men* whom he claims, as being on *his* side of the disputed question. So far as their opinions may be found to agree with what the sacred oracles contain, they are certainly entitled to high regard; but, it ought to be recollected, that men of equal eminence, both in the learned and in the religious world, have sometimes appeared on opposite sides of the same question; and, as it is the dictate of inspired wisdom, that "*great men are not always wise; neither do the aged understand judgment;*" it can detract nothing from any man's merit, to have his opinions tried by the touch-stone of divine truth.

The ground on which our author places his objection to the disputed clause in our Confession of Faith, I believe to be utterly untenable. He contends, "that it is a restraint"—by which, I presume, he means, an *improper*, an *unlawful* "restraint of *Christian liberty*." This position, I deny; and call for the proof of it. What is *Christian liberty*? Does it imply or include a permission to transgress any part of the revealed will of God? Certainly it cannot. Our author, then, must prove that the marriage condemned in the disputed clause of our Confession, is not sinful, before he can, with any semblance of justice, maintain, that to prohibit it is a restraint on Christian liberty. What! Are women of suitable character and qualifications for promoting conjugal happiness, so scarce in the world, that some Christians must fail of obtaining them any where else, except among sisters-in-law? Away with such notions of Christian liberty! Let the author whose production is now before me, or any other person familiar with his Bible, and free from prejudice, seriously ponder this question:—Are you *absolutely certain*, *beyond the least rational doubt*—that the marriage of a man with his sister-in-law—whether she be the widow of his deceased brother, or the sister of his deceased wife—is *not*, *either expressly or impliedly prohibited*, in the word of God—and that Christians are *at liberty* to enter into such connexions, at pleasure?—and if I

am not greatly deceived, our author himself, or the most strenuous apologist for such connexions, would pause long, and deliberate seriously, before he could *confidently* answer this question in the *affirmative*. Were such a question *seriously* proposed to him, *accompanied by a solemn charge, to answer it in the fear of God*,—my impression is, that the utmost extent of his reply would be, that *he was not CLEARLY convinced of the sinfulness* of such a marriage; but, yet, that he could not, *positively, and without hesitation*, say, that it was *certainly lawful and innocent*. If, then, this impression of mine be not a mistaken one, (and I confess it is one which I cannot resist, until I am better informed;) I ask—and I do it with emphasis and earnestness—which is the *safe* side of this question? Is any *Christian* laid under a *necessity* to contract such a marriage? And if he be not, is it not *his duty*, to “*abstain from all appearance of evil*,” and avoid that which *he cannot but know*, must be *offensive*, yea, *exceedingly offensive* to many of his *Christian brethren*? In my judgment, nothing can be clearer, than that every Christian is *bound*, by the most indispensable obligations, to *walk inoffensively* even in reference to acts, the innocency of which is far less questioned than that now under consideration.

As I do not wish to extend this article beyond reasonable bounds, I shall not enter at *large*, or, *in detail*, on the scriptural proof of the unlawfulness of the disputed connexion, but shall content myself with a few remarks upon our author's efforts to invalidate the abundant evidence of this truth, which was exhibited at the trial before our last General Assembly, which has called forth this discussion.

He finds fault with the clause of our Confession herein referred to, because it is “*an induction*” from the prohibitory verses of the eighteenth chapter of Leviticus; and yet, to support his fault-finding, and render it plausible, he himself makes an *induction* from the fact of his finding, in our Confession, a clause which does not suit him. Thus it would seem that the liberty of “*induction*” must be yielded up as the *exclusive privilege* of the advocates of the marriage in question. But this will not do. Our author is too intelligent a man not to know that there are many truths cordially and unhesitatingly received by all well-informed Christians, the scriptural evidence and authority for which depend altogether on *good and necessary inference* from the language of the Bible, and no where found expressed in *so many words*. If, indeed, our inductions be not *fair* and *legitimate*, they may, with propriety, be assailed; but if they be, let our author be cautious how he rejects evidence thus obtained; lest in so doing he should be found virtually condemning our blessed Lord himself, who gave to the sceptical Sadducees an *inductive* proof of the doctrine of the resurrection.

As to the acts of the General Assemblies of 1799, 1802, and 1804, which our author speaks of as having been cited by the late Rev'd Dr. James P. Wilson, of Philadelphia, on a certain occasion to which he alludes, and which he thinks are strikingly illustrative of his own view of the question, it is enough to say at present, that those acts, on examination, will be found self-contradictory; for each of them sets out with the expression of a wish “*to dis-*

*courage* imprudent marriages, or such as tend in any way, to give uneasiness to serious persons ;" and yet at the close of each, an opinion is expressed, the direct tendency of which is, to give to marriages of the very description referred to, no small *countenance* and *encouragement*. From those acts, then, no aid whatever can be derived, which can be of the least benefit to the cause for which our author pleads.

That the same prohibition which is *binding* upon a man, is *equally binding* upon a woman ;—that a *sister* is as nearly related to a *sister*, as a *brother* is to a *brother* ; and that, therefore, a *command* to a man not to marry his *brother's wife*, is equal to a *command* to a woman not to marry her *sister's husband* ; and hence, that a *brother's wife*, a *sister's husband*, and a *wife's sister*, are *precisely the same degree of affinity* ; are positions which the moment they are proposed, will commend themselves to common sense : yet our author seems to have persuaded himself that this reasoning is sufficiently refuted, by such sweeping assertions, as that it "is *without the slightest foundation* ;" that "*no one can see*" it ; and that it "is *preposterous*." This summary mode of despatching an argument which cannot be fairly controverted, may appropriately be responded to in our author's own emphatical language—"I cannot believe black is white upon authority."

But our author seems to be very confident that the eighteenth verse of the eighteenth chapter of Leviticus, settles the question in his favour, by expressly *confining* the prohibition of the marriage of a *wife's sister*, to the *life-time of the wife*. Upon this plea, the baseless fabric of the incestuous connexion in question, perhaps, principally rests. Two observations will suffice to show that it has no foundation. 1. The *whole law*, concerning *incest*, *closes* with the 17th verse. The precept contained in the 18th verse, respects altogether *another crime* ; and is as distinct from incest, as any of the other cases which follow in the chapter. It is a law upon another subject ; and relates, wholly and only, to *polygamy*. It forbids the taking of *any wife* beside the other, during her life-time ; and the reason is not derived from incest, but because polygamy is a source of domestic *vezation*, and destructive of some of the ends of marriage. 2. The undeniable proof, that this precept refers wholly to polygamy, and can suggest no argument in favour of marrying the *natural sister*, after the death of the wife, is deduced from the idiom peculiar to the Hebrew language, which is adopted in this text. This, I think, was clearly demonstrated in the discussion of the question which took place before our last General Assembly. Our author, after admitting that he is himself no Hebrew scholar, and that, therefore, he cannot *directly* meet this allegation, adds, "But the translators of the Bible were Hebrew scholars of the highest character ; their fidelity is unquestionable." Here, in common with all persons of intelligence, I cordially agree with him ; but to this just encomium on the learning and fidelity of those excellent men, he adds a *most strange assertion* : he says—"They considered the translation proposed, and *rejected* it." Now the *fact* is, that, so far from *rejecting* what he calls "the translation proposed," they expressly *adopted* it. Let our author open any copy that

may be within his reach of the English version of the Polyglott Bible, and he will find in the margin, with a mark of direct reference to this text, these words, "Or, *one wife to another.*"

Of the animadversions in the article before me, upon "the train of remarks connected with the argumentation" of this question before the Assembly, I am sorry to be obliged to say that I consider them unworthy of the good sense of their author. It is not so easy to overturn that train of remark, or to refute the reasoning it embraces, as it is gratuitously to assert, as our author does, that its intent and effect is, only "to set passion, not reason, to work: to drag men, by bug-bears held up before the eyes, when there is too much weakness or indolence in the mind to correct the impression, into obsequious concurrence." The chain of interrogations by which he would reprove the epithets applied to the crime of incest, he may possibly consider unanswerable: but he must excuse me for saying, that I must consider them all sufficiently answered, by simply referring him to the 24th and 25th verses of the 18th chapter of Leviticus; where, in my humble opinion, he will find a complete justification of all the obnoxious epithets which he so indignantly quotes. It may here, perhaps, serve to correct some mistaken impressions in relation to such matters, seriously to inquire, what is it that causes any thing to be "*unclean, abominable, filthy,*" or "*detestable?*" The true answer to this inquiry is, that what imparts any of these qualities to any given action, is *the fact, that God has forbidden it.* There was a time when it was alike lawful, innocent, and a matter of duty, for a man to marry even his own sister by consanguinity; as must have been the case in the family of Adam:—but it pleased God, afterwards, to prohibit that and some other connexions; and his prohibition, independently of any other consideration, rendered such connexions sinful, and stamped upon them all the turpitude included in those terms of infamy, which God himself has applied to them in his holy word. When HE has forbidden a given act, the wilful commission of that act is sin, and that in every case. When we know his positive commands, our business is, not to ask, "Why?" or "Wherefore?" but simply to obey. And if we do otherwise, we must meet the consequences.

Our author seems to think that much latitude should be allowed in the formation of matrimonial connexions, from the consideration, that we do not know enough of the manners and state of society anciently existing among the Jews, properly to appreciate their municipal regulations; and from the difficulty of determining, "how far Christianity, by its elevating and purifying spirit, rendering what was useful and necessary to them, needless to us, has superseded" the prohibitions contained in their laws. Without stopping here to inquire whether our author has, or has not, presumed too much on our necessary ignorance, arising from the supposed obscurity of the information which Moses has given us, and the time that has elapsed since that information was promulgated, there can be no impropriety in observing, that how little soever we may know respecting the state of society among the Jews, in the days of Moses, we ought surely to know enough of the state of society among

*ourselves in the present day*, to enable us to form an accurate judgment as to the *safety or propriety* of tolerating the connexion in question. And, in this point of view, it clearly appears to me that the very circumstances in which we are now placed, by the providence of God, and the consequent state of society among us, *strongly concur* with what we believe to be the unerring testimony of *his word*, in *condemning* the connexion in question. It is worth while, for a moment, to look at the subject in this aspect.

It will be allowed, I suppose, that a wife, if possible, ought to have female society: but a wife who would suffer a handsome, gay, and agreeable young woman, who had nothing else to do than to attend to her beauty and her gayety, to be constantly in the presence of her husband, would be at least injudicious, while there was a possibility of the husband's looking upon this gay personage as a future wife. But if this personage were one with whom by no possibility could marriage ever occur, the wife might enjoy female intercourse without hazard from the confidence. This is now the condition of a wife having sisters. Those sisters are her friends, fond, constant, and cheering. She needs not shrink from their most familiar intercourse; nor dread to give them her fullest confidence; nor be startled by seeing her husband receive them with a kindness like her own. She has, in them, by nature, friends; who, unlike the fickleness of other friends, can never interfere with her interests, rival her in the affections of her husband, or harbour a wish to see her removed. But let the possibility of their being rivals exist, and there is an end of the friendship and confidence of sisterhood. In such case, every common familiarity would become an object of suspicion; and the whole would end in the breaking off of all intercourse with her family. I admit, indeed, with pleasure, that there are instances where all the members of a family would be superior to such suspicions; but I speak not of individuals, but of various extensive communities in the civilized world, containing many millions of females. We are further to recollect, that we are also speaking of communities, in which there are vast multitudes of females of less intelligence and refinement, who are not restrained by the forms of more elevated society; and who would be peculiarly exposed to the influence of this dangerous liberty.

Or, if it be argued that the sister of a deceased wife is the fittest to take charge of her children, I say she may possibly be so, while she remains their *aunt*; but not when she becomes their step-mother, and has children of her own. The orphans, then, lose the advantage of having had an aunt; and exchange it for the more than doubtful superintendence of a woman with a family to provide for. As the law of our church now stands, the wife's sister may remain the aunt; and extend her personal care to the orphans;—but were this wholesome law abrogated, she would remain so no longer: the line of demarcation between the wife's sister and the widower's bride, would thus be swept away, and no woman could remain under the widower's roof, or even in confidential intimacy with his household, without exposing herself to the imputation of husband hunting, or worse; and as to this, no woman of character

will submit, the children are, in such cases, virtually deprived of one of their nearest friends. But suppose the aunt now become a wife, to have children: in what relationship do those children stand to the former family? In *one* point of view they are *first cousins*,—in *another*, they are *brothers and sisters*. Suppose they take a fancy to marry each other. *Cousins may marry: Brothers and sisters may not*. What is to remedy this confusion? In the sight of heaven, if there be any meaning in the words, "they twain shall be *one flesh*," the sisters of the wife are the sisters of the husband; for husband and wife, by that declaration, are *one*. If a man may not marry his own sister, he may not marry the sister of his wife; and any violation of that law, instead of relieving consciences, and taking off a yoke, would pollute consciences and lay a new burden of discomfort, distrust, and vice, upon society—a much heavier yoke than before.

In conclusion, Mr. Editor, suffer me to inquire, why has so much zeal been recently enlisted against this wholesome law of our church? Because a few ministers, who have heretofore stood on an eminence, and have enjoyed a large portion of the esteem and confidence of their brethren and the churches, are found who have wrought folly in Israel, a doleful tale about them is told, to awaken sympathy. Much is said to excite compassion for their respectable wives and connexions, and their innocent children. But let it be *remembered*, that those men, however distinguished, or loved, they have heretofore been, have sinned. They must bear their own iniquity. Ought the peace of the church to be disturbed, by those who know better, and would not comply with our own laws?

For my own part, I think I can see a great deal of evil, as well as of discomfort, to both man and woman, in the license of such a connexion as that now under consideration. For instance, take the simple and common case of a wife having sisters of inferior means to herself, and whom she therefore wishes to take under her roof. There are hundreds of such instances; and this shelter might be of great advantage, or even of the most absolute necessity, to those sisters. Yet, if the marriage in question be tolerated, how delicate and difficult a thing would it become to give that shelter? What painful feelings would arise, from the possible hazard of raising a rivalry; and how often would that rivalry be realized?

Much more might be said: but lest I should be tediously prolix, I forbear.

May the Lord protect our beloved church from the land-defiling abomination of incestuous marriages; and may such connexions henceforth cease to have advocates among us.

So prays, Mr. Editor, yours truly.

A PRESBYTER,

AND MEMBER OF THE LAST GENERAL ASSEMBLY.

SOME ACCOUNT OF THE LATE REV. JOHN H. REDINGTON, WITH PARTS OF HIS CORRESPONDENCE AND ILLUSTRATIVE NOTES THEREON.

*Last Article.—Letters written in 1841.*

Moscow, Livingston Co., N. Y., March 10, 1841.

*My Dear Brother:*—Grace, mercy and peace, to you and yours. I trust in the Lord it has been well with you all since I was at your house. The Magazine gives me monthly, some account of your labours. I read your publication with increasing interest, and wish I could do more to spread it. It is just such a periodical as the times call for, and I think the Lord's hand is manifest in placing you at the head of it. Let the matter be properly weighed, and you will suffer no call of an ordinary kind to draw you away from this work. The future is big with events of vast importance to church and state. We need to stand with our loins girded, and our lamps burning, sword in hand, fighting the battles of the Lord. The coming shock between the true church and the united force of atheism and antichrist, will be dreadful, but the people that do know their God, shall be strong and do exploits—"and they shall be delivered, every one that shall be found written in the book."

May the Lord give you "a mouth and wisdom, that none of your adversaries can gainsay or resist." Speak the truth in love. Urge on the great wheels of reformation in our church by all good means. The work is great, and only well begun. Many dream the entire victory is already accomplished. There never was a greater mistake. Few have their eyes open to see what mighty strides our church has taken, in departing from the simplicity of the truth—and some are already crying "peace, peace, when there is no peace"—and seeking an unholy truce with the enemy. An eastern influence may yet prevail, and ruin us, if God prevent it not. I would it might be so ordered that you might be a member of the next General Assembly, to attend to the report of the committee appointed to modify our terms of correspondence with the General Association of Connecticut.\* All our churches and min-

\* One of the last things done by the Assembly of 1840, was, on the motion of Dr. Spring of New York, to appoint Dr. Philips and Dr. Krebs, with himself, a committee "to revise the articles of correspondence between the General Assembly and the General Association of Connecticut"—the particular object being to substitute the "*Pastoral Union*" in the place of the "*General Association*," as the body whose certificate would be required from ministers and candidates coming from that state.—(See *printed Minutes of 1840*, p. 307.) This is the subject, no doubt, which is alluded to. The next year, Dr. Krebs, on behalf of the committee made a detailed report, (see *printed Minutes of 1841*, pp. 417, 418,) which condenses the important facts of the case, and leaves the whole matter where it was; and this report was adopted by the Assembly. The writer of this note was that year Moderator of the Assembly, and of course could take no part in this business. It is manifest from this letter, that Mr. Redington had small confidence in New England orthodoxy. Whether his opinions were right or wrong, it must be conceded that few amongst us had better means of forming correct ones on this subject.—[Ed.]

isters (with few exceptions) along the eastern border, are leavened with New England-ism. Keep a vigilant eye in that direction. Is it not time to give us another article on the state of the church? The "*Memoirs*," notwithstanding your numerous appeals for articles, seem to be at an end.\*

God is still gracious and merciful to me the chiefest of sinners, for which I give him thanks. My two little ones are well. I am, if God permit, to be married on the 23d inst., and I most earnestly beg your prayers that this may issue to the glory of God, and the good of all concerned. There is no perfection on earth. God grant we may set our affections on things above. My love in Christ Jesus to dear Mrs. B. and the children. Let the little ones be trained for the Lord.

Affectionately yours.

Rev'd R. J. Breckinridge, D. D.,

JOHN H. REDINGTON.

I had almost forgotten to say any thing about my communication.† You see what it is. Do with it what you please. It is but a rough thing, but the subject is important. I rejoice in the action of the Presbytery of Louisville, and was glad to see your remarks in relation to it. I am pleased with Treffry, and I think his work is good. Are you acquainted with the *Literalist*? If not, I commend it to your notice. It may be had of Orren Rogers, No. 67,

\* Amongst the many articles which the *Balt. Lit. and Rel. Magazine* contained in relation to the Semi-Pelagian controversy, was a series written by several hands, but chiefly by the editor of this periodical, under the title, "*Memoirs, to serve as a History of the Semi-Pelagian Controversy in the Presbyterian Church.*" It is in this series that Mr. R. alludes; the last number of it (the xiii.) having been printed in March, 1840. It was interrupted at that time, by our indictment and trial by the Baltimore papists; and after our deliverance from that persecution, and we had fully liquidated the claim it gave the papists upon our special notice, we never found it convenient to return to the other matter in a systematic way. Man appoints and God disappoints, so that we never accomplish just what we propose. It may not be out of place to say here, that a series of articles entitled "*Documentary History of the Assembly of 1837*," the last of which (No. VII.) was printed in April, 1838, had preceded the series already alluded to, and contained a detailed vindication of the leading acts of that memorable body.—[Ed.]

† The communication alluded to, came on the same sheet with the letter now printed, and was published in the *Balt. Lit. and Rel. Mag.* for May, 1841, pp. 210-213, under the title, "*Action of the Presbytery of Louisville in the Case of the Rev. Mr. Huber*," and has the initials 'J. H. R.' at the end of it. It is a clear and almost vehement testimony against such incestuous marriages, as those condemned by the Church in the cases of Mr. Huber and, more recently, Mr. McQueen. There can be no question that as a general fact, the solid orthodoxy and settled piety of the age are utterly opposed to these connexions; and all that is needful is that the church stand by her doctrine, and all will come right. Mean time, it is plain enough that a general and violent attack has been concerted upon our standards and God's truth in this important matter. Witness the action of the last Synod of New Jersey, in connexion with the conduct of the northern press generally. Let us be on our guard, therefore, and valiantly maintain our ancient and scriptural testimony. We are not sure but that it will require the deposition of another minister or two, especially in those regions where this sin is most allowed, before the disturbers of our peace will learn that the church is in earnest in this business.—[Ed.]

south Second street, Philadelphia, in three volumes—price, three dollars.\*

Moscow, Livingston Co., N. Y., June 3d, 1841.

*My dear friend and brother in Christ:*—With a feeble hand I hold this pen. The Lord in judgment and mercy hath smitten me with disease. I am brought pretty low, yet I thank my God through Jesus Christ, that I am not so low that there is no hope. My trust is in the God of salvation, and not in an arm of flesh for recovery. Yet I employ the best physicians, and use the best means within my reach, knowing that the Lord maketh use of such. I will not trouble you with a detail of my case. I have what goes under the general name of *bronchitis*, not that kind that principally affects the throat and voice, but a more general disease. It is a certain form of consumption, differing from the pulmonary kind, and is curable under a right treatment, God so willing—my own private opinion is, that the Lord will raise me up, but I may be mistaken, and desire to be prepared for any issue.

But, my dear brother, my afflictions are *nothing*, and I should quite forget them, when I consider the *afflictions* of our *Zion*. When I read your name as a delegate to the Assembly, I rejoiced—and when you were elected Moderator, I rejoiced more, inferring that this indicated an orthodox majority in the body, and knowing that you were worthy of the place.

But alas, the reading of the proceedings of the Assembly, soon dispelled my dreams. I saw clear as day, that the *moderates* having a majority, put you into the chair to escape your opposition in debate to their corrupting plans.†

If I am mistaken in all this, gladly shall I be set right. But what

\* This is the only intimation we remember to have had from this excellent man, that his attention had been specially turned to the great and thrilling subject of the *latter day glory*; and we can only conjecture from the reference he makes, and the terms he uses, that he inclined to the doctrine of what is called the personal reign of Christ. The other volume, allusion to which seems to have called up this subject in his mind, was a work on "*The Eternal Sonship of our Lord Jesus Christ*," by a young Wesleyan minister of England, lately deceased, which has not, we believe, been printed in this country, but was sent to us, through a private hand, by the late venerable and Rev. Joseph Entwisle, Governor of the Wesleyan Institution at Hoxton, near London, and was taken by Mr. R. to be read. Some of his religious teachers had at one period of his life endeavoured to shake his faith in this important, indeed vital doctrine, which, in our day, is so little understood, if indeed we must not say so little held by all classes of new-light heretics.—[E*p*.]

† This is a mistake into which outward appearances naturally enough betrayed the upright mind of this holy man. His first conjecture was the right one. Our election to the Moderatorship of the Assembly of 1841, was an undeserved and unsolicited testimony to our principles, services and public conduct; and was resisted might and main, by the entire "*moderate*" interest, and was gall and wormwood to it. The distinguished gentleman, now deceased, who was run against us, was himself a man of unquestioned devotion to the great doctrines and interests of Presbyterianism, and was on every account, worthy of the station for which he was nominated. But the fact of his being selected as the opposing candidate, only proved the strength of the orthodox as compared with the "*moderates*"—in the Assembly of 1841, and, indeed, as we thank God, in the church.—[E*p*.]

means the receiving and sending delegates to the General Association of Connecticut? and the terms of correspondence remaining as they were? Oh, everlasting reproach to our church, unless redeemed by subsequent Assemblies, which may God grant!\*

I cannot write more—a few lines from you would comfort me. I beg your prayers. My love in Christ Jesus, to your wife and family.

May God gird you with strength, and greatly increase the circulation of your *Magazine*. It is, under God, the hope of our church.† Grace be with you.

Affectionately your afflicted brother in Christ.

Rev. R. J. Breckinridge, D. D., }  
Baltimore. }

JOHN H. REDINGTON.

We have now completed this mournfully pleasant duty, and commit the name and instructions of our departed friend, to such as love to cherish the memory of the blessed.

Within a few months after the date of the second letter published above, and which was the last we received from him, he fell asleep in Jesus, as already stated in the first article of this series.

\* We beg leave to direct the reader's attention to an article in a recent number of this periodical, in regard to the difficulties arising out of the case of the delegate from the General Association of Massachusetts, to the Assembly of 1842. This whole subject of Congregational and New School influence upon our church, by means of an indirect operation through the heterogeneous ecclesiastical bodies of the north, is a matter of intense interest and of fearful import. The theological seminaries of New England, under Congregational influence, are known to be deeply (and, except the one at Windsor, universally) tainted. The Associations nearly without exception, license and ordain men who would not be allowed amongst us, if known. And all the great national societies under Congregational control, openly act with and through the disowned and seceding portion of our church. Moreover, it is matter of incontrovertible history, that all our troubles, great and dreadful as they have been, came amongst us from this very quarter. And yet, as if blind to the past, we are in the high way to the same or greater troubles. If it is asked what we should do? we answer frankly—hold fellowship with the orthodox, and reject the Semi-Pelagians; and if the orthodox mix themselves up with the Pelagians so that we cannot distinguish them—reject all. What is the chaff to the wheat? Why should we tempt God?—[ED.]

† The reader will not suspect us of allowing ourself for one moment to consider such a statement as this, as any thing more than a strong expression of confidence by a very partial friend. Let it be set against the bitter and exaggerated abuse so often heaped upon us for the very conduct which extorted it. Indeed so far is it from being exact, that we have the authority of the *Board of Publication of the Presbyterian Church*, for saying that this periodical (which is but the former one under a new name,) is not Presbyterian at all, or if it is, is entirely insignificant; since it is excluded from the list of Presbyterian periodicals, otherwise complete, which is printed towards the close of its Almanac for 1843, lately put forth. As our various Boards have been well nigh sovereign in the church, we take this decision to be *ex cathedra*, and final to one of two intents, viz., either we are not Presbyterian at all, or if we are, our sound, though it has continued some years, and been heard in several places, has not yet gone out as far as "*the corner of 7th and George streets, Philadelphia*." And these facts are advertised officially, at the expense of the church, to all our congregations, and under injunction of the various church courts to purchase the knowledge. It is good to know, with Paul, "*how to abound*;" better, perhaps, to learn with him, "*how to be abased*."—[ED.]

A more upright, conscientious, and disinterested man remains not behind him; a more humble, simple minded, and stout hearted follower of the King Eternal, we have not found in the church; a more faithful and gentle friend none need expect to possess below.

The name of such a man deserves to live; and if history was just, it would survive to our children's children, as that of one who in his day was a favourable, though on the whole, a faithful representative of that great and undistinguished mass of Christ's devoted ministers, who by his grace, achieved the deliverance of the Presbyterian church.

Success does not always crown the best efforts of the best men; nor is it a safe test either of right or truth. But it is sweet to reflect that it is sometimes ample, signal and immediate, beyond our utmost faith or hope. In 1837, Mr. Redington and his comparatively small and divided congregation at Moscow, stood absolutely alone in the region covered by the three disowned Synods in western New York, on their firm and noble testimony for our doctrine and order. In the printed Minutes of the Assembly for 1839, we find the Presbytery of *Caledonia* containing eight ministers and five churches, and the Presbytery of *Ogdensburg* containing three ministers and three churches. In those Minutes for 1841, (the latest within our reach at the moment,) these Presbyteries report eighteen ministers, fifteen churches, and three candidates. And we understand that the Synod of New Jersey, during its recent sessions, divided the Presbytery of Caledonia, preparatory, we suppose, to the early erection of a new Synod, covering the territory of the three disowned. We shall be much surprised if such a Synod, when erected, does not rapidly extend itself over the entire region of Western New York. Let us neither forget the lesson such results should teach us, nor the man to whose fidelity they are, in a great degree, to be remotely traced.

Mr. Redington was ordained a minister of the everlasting gospel, in the month of August, 1835, and died on the 15th of September, 1841; his ministry, therefore, lasted but six years. When he entered upon it, he was thirty-five years of age; his education had been irregular, and as he modestly said, imperfect; he had been brought up and long engaged in business not calculated to fit him for extensive usefulness in his new calling; he was settled over a small congregation in a retired part of the country, and was very little known out of the sphere of his immediate operations; and besides all this, he was surrounded by difficulties, and apparently constantly on the eve of being overpowered. And yet thus circumstanced, he was enabled by divine grace, to do more than the bulk of ministers with the amplest preparations and opportunities, are usually found to achieve through a long life. Devoted piety, unwearied zeal, fidelity in our lot, oh! what are they not capable of achieving? What an example of their value and efficacy does this man's life afford us!

We linger over this page with unspeakable tenderness. For of all our brethren, not one has been more personally a help to our own soul than this good man. And this is but the more influential upon us, as God's dealings with us were always such, that we

could never with truth, call any man in particular, our spiritual father. One born, as it were, out of the common method of God's dealing, and by a wonder of mercy constrained away from ruin—may be allowed to cherish peculiar love to such as have helped him onward in the way of life.

---

"DOCTRINES AND PRACTICES" OF THE CHURCH OF ROME.

No. 4, of the Controversy with the Domestic Chaplains of the Archbishop of Baltimore.

JUSTIFICATION BY GRACE, THROUGH FAITH.\*

1. *Introductory Remarks.*—Roman Catholics are justly chargeable with numerous errors in doctrine and practice, but these errors are not all of like importance. The novel pretences respecting infallibility, transubstantiation, the ecclesiastical and secular supremacy of the pope, tradition, &c., and the unwarrantable practices of worshipping in a dead language, invoking the saints, withholding the eucharistic cup, adoring the consecrated host, &c., are indeed all grievous errors, and exceedingly deleterious in their moral influence. But it is nevertheless supposed that adherence to them, will not exclude an otherwise sincerely pious man from the kingdom of heaven, provided *sincere piety* can exist amid such a mass of anti-scriptural and demoralizing error. In other words, it is thought that those errors are not *fundamental*, and do not, therefore, necessarily constitute an invincible barrier to the salvation of the soul. Would that the same charitable opinion could be entertained in relation to all the other monstrous departures of the church of Rome from divine truth and apostolic practice! But alas, that church has gone astray in matters of *vital* import as well as on less momentous points, and it is mainly on this account that enlightened Protestants are so decidedly opposed to it, and so anxious for its recovery from its deep apostacy; or if that be impracticable, for its complete disorganization and entire overthrow.

2. *Importance of the Doctrine of Justification.*—This doctrine is a cardinal constituent of that religion which is from above, and a capital article of that faith which was once delivered to the saints. "Far from being a merely speculative point, it spreads its influence through the whole body of divinity, runs through all Christian experience, and operates in every part of practical godliness." Such is its immense importance, that a mistake about it has a malignant efficacy, and is attended with a long train of dangerous consequences.—Nor can this appear strange, when it is considered, that the doctrine of justification is emphatically *the way of a sinner's*

---

\* This is a clear and admirable refutation of the errors of Popery on this vital doctrine; but, as it regards the doctrine itself, the evangelical reader may probably see, as we think we do, something to change and something to add. Indeed we may say, with all respect and kindness, that a perfectly satisfactory exhibition of the doctrine of justification by grace, through faith, is scarcely possible, except upon grounds which involve the truth of the Calvinistic system; which the writer of this otherwise fine article, probably does not embrace.—[Ed.]

*acceptance with God.* Being of such infinite moment, it is inseparably connected with many other evangelical truths, the harmony and beauty of which we cannot behold while this is misunderstood. It is accordingly, if any thing may be so called, an *essential article*; the Reformers considered it so, and Luther, by way of eminence, denominated it the *articulus stantis vel cadentis ecclesiæ*, the article with which the church must stand or fall.

3. *The Import of the term Justification.*—The word *justify*, is a legal term, denoting a sentence of acquittal, passed upon a person who has been tried for an infraction of the law. The person tried, being found to have obeyed the law, is pronounced by the judge to be guiltless, and by an easy and natural figure, to be *justified*; in other words, he is declared to be *just* or blameless in the view of the law. Justification, accordingly, does not signify to *make* men holy, but simply the *holding* and *declaring* them to be so.

4. *Impossibility of Justification by the Law.*—In the original forensic sense of the term just explained, it must be obvious, that no human being can be justified by the law of God, that is, on the ground of his obedience to that law. Because—

(a) The only condition of justification, known by the law, is complete obedience to its precepts; its language is: "Do these things and thou shalt live." But as no human being can yield complete obedience, it follows that none can be justified on this ground.

(b) It is impossible for any man to do more than the law of God requires. The idea of supererogatory love or obedience is accordingly absurd, and utterly out of the question. If, then, we are ever guilty of disobedience, our subsequent obedience, however perfect, cannot contribute at all to our justification. But all men have disobeyed, and are disobedient every day and every hour; and no one therefore is justified, even for the time being.

(c) If it were even *possible* to do works of supererogation or services not required, we could still establish no ground of justification, because our sins are *enormous evils*, and our best services in a sense *nothing*,—the salvation of heaven is *infinite*, while the pretended merit of obedience is insignificant in view of such a reward.

These considerations and others that might be mentioned, plainly cut off all hope and ground of the justification of transgressors, on the score of justice; and prove the absolute impossibility of justification by the works of law. In corroboration of this doctrine, we might refer to numerous passages in God's word; but to save space, we quote only the following. "Therefore, by the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified in his sight." Rom. iii. 20. The words in the original are: *Διοτι εἰς ἔργων νόμου οὐ δικαιωθήσεται πᾶσα σαρξ ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ*; the true meaning is, *that no man shall be justified by any works whatever of any law, whether natural or revealed.* Vide also, Rom. iii. 28; Gal. iii. 21; ii. 21; ii. 16.

5. *The grace of God in Christ Jesus, the only source of Justification under the Gospel.*—A subject of law is justified only when he is in the full and strict sense just; that is, when he has completely obeyed all the requisitions of the law. But from this, the case of the penitent, under the gospel, entirely differs. *He* has been guilty

of innumerable acts of disobedience, and has not fulfilled the demands of the law, even in a single instance.—If, therefore, he ever be justified, it must be in a widely different sense from that which has been already explained. Justification under the gospel may be defined to be, *that judicial act of God, whereby a believing sinner is pardoned of his sins, released from the penalty of the law, and is declared to be entitled to the salvation of heaven.* It accordingly implies three things, viz., *remission of sin, acquittal from punishment, and a title to heaven.*—But as these inestimable blessings can in no sense or degree be merited by ourselves, or purchased by any works of obedience that we can perform, it follows that, if justified at all, it must be through *grace.* The word *grace* as used by the inspired writers, as the source of justification, denotes the free, unmerited love of God. That we are justified freely by the grace of God, thus understood, is manifest from the following considerations:—

(a) Under the influence of this love, our heavenly Parent formed the original design of saving mankind.

(b) The covenant of redemption whereby God engaged to pardon and save all who should believe in his Son, was the result of the same free grace.

(c) It was mercy that moved Christ to undertake and execute the glorious plan of redemption.

(d) The mission and agency of the divine Spirit were the result of this love only. And what is true of this act of the Holy Spirit, is equally true of his agency in enlightening, quickening, purifying and strengthening man in the Christian course, and conducting him finally to heaven.

As all these steps, so plainly necessary to the justification of man, are the exclusive result of the undeserved love of God; so his justification itself flows entirely from the same love. Christ in his sufferings and death made a complete atonement for the sins of men; but the atonement devolved no obligation upon God, to forgive them. They were still sinners, after the atonement, in the same sense, and in the same degree, as before. Thus it is evident, that the sinner, when he comes before God, comes in the character of a sinner only; and must, therefore, if strict justice be done, be condemned. If he escape condemnation, then, he can derive *these blessings* from *mercy* only, and in no degree from *justice.* In other words, every blessing which he receives, is a *free gift.* The pardon of his sins, his acquittal from condemnation, and his admission to the enjoyments of heaven, are all given to him *freely* and *graciously*, because God regards him with infinite compassion in Christ Jesus.

Should it be contended, that the sinner is renewed antecedently to his justification; and having thus become a holy person, has also become at least *partially* a *meritorious* object of justification: we answer, that as even the sanctified sinner is chargeable with many transgressions, he still deserves the wrath of God, and according to the sentence of the law, must, if considered only as he is in himself, be finally punished. Moreover, some persons are justified and sanctified *on a dying bed*, when they have no opportunity to perform any works of righteousness, which might be the ground of

their justification. Others are sanctified *from the womb*, (e. g., Jeremiah and John Baptist,) and of these some die antecedently to that period of life, when they become capable of direct acts of moral good and evil. In all these instances, it must be conceded that they are *in no sense* justified on account of their own righteousness; but *solely* by the free grace of God, on account of the righteousness of Christ. If others are justified *partially*, in consequence of their merits, then justification is given to some on *one ground*, and to others *on another, and very different ground*,—a diversity and incongruity no where countenanced in God's word.

We remark further, that the Scriptures no where teach, that we are justified partly on account of our own righteousness, and partly on account of the righteousness of Christ. Paul, discussing this subject, says: "Where is boasting, then? It is excluded. By what law? of works? Nay, but by the law of faith." Rom. ii. 27. All boasting is accordingly excluded. But the same apostle says, that "to him that worketh, the reward is reckoned, not of grace, but of debt:" that is, the reward of justification and its consequences would be due to him, who received it on account of his works. He then certainly *might boast*.—And yet, the same apostle elsewhere teaches, that it was one end of the system of redemption, as established by God, that "no flesh should glory in his presence:" but that "he who gloried," should "glory only in Christ." 1 Cor. i. 29-31.

If other proof were wanting, it might be insisted, that the works of the best men never fulfil the demands of the law; and therefore cannot be the ground, either *wholly* or *partially*, of their justification. The very best actions even of regenerated men are imperfect or defective, and therefore in some degree tinged with guilt, and can be the ground of justification to no man. As an illustration of this remark, we refer to the apostle's own experience as set forth in the 7th chapter of Romans.

If we mistake not, ample proof has now been furnished, that we are justified only through the grace of God in our Lord Jesus Christ, which is in exact accordance with Rom. iii. 24: "Being justified freely by the grace of God, through the redemption which is in Christ Jesus."

6. *The merits of Christ the only GROUND, and faith the only MEANS of Justification.*—As this proposition has more or less pervaded the whole discussion, and we are compelled to economise space, we shall do little more than refer to a few passages of inspired truth in support of it. "But now the righteousness of God without the law is manifested. . . . Even the righteousness of God, which is by faith of Jesus Christ, unto all and upon all them that believe." Rom. iii. 21-22. See also verse 28; Rom. iv. 3; Acta 16, 31.

The necessary conclusion from these authorities, and a multitude of others that might be cited, must be, that *men are saved by faith in Christ*; in other words, that they become God's children by means of faith and in virtue of (not their own merits, but) the righteousness of Christ. When Christ proposes himself as our Saviour, it is plain that we have no other security of the salvation which he promises, beside the promise itself; and this promise furnishes no

security, beside what is contained in his character. *Confidence*, then, in his character, and in his promise as founded on it, constitutes faith, and is that act of the mind by which alone the sinner yields himself to Christ, and becomes his disciple and follower.

But when the sinner thus surrenders, he does so *on Christ's own terms*. Conscious of his entire unworthiness and desert of the divine anger, the enormity of his guilt, the justice of his condemnation, and the impossibility of expiating his own sins, he renounces all dependence on his own righteousness, and casts himself at the footstool of divine mercy, as a suppliant for mere pardon; and welcomes Christ as the glorious, efficacious, and all-sufficient atonement for sin and intercessor for sinners. Thus, he by faith becomes one of Christ's redeemed people, and is justified on the ground of Christ's righteousness; thus, his name is written in the Lamb's Book of Life, and he is invested with a sure, indefeasible title to all the promises of the gospel.

*This view of the sinner's justification, not in conflict with that set forth by the apostle James.*—When this apostle teaches that "a man is justified by works, and not by faith only," he obviously refers to a speculative belief, or mere assent to probable evidence. As from this spurious faith obedience to God never sprang, and cannot spring, James very justly inveighed against it as the means of justification, and insisted on works as the evidence and fruit of that *living* faith just described, and which is the only means of justification under the gospel. The question which he discussed, was not whether we were justified by living faith only, or partially by faith and partially by works; but whether by faith in its nature unproductive of works, viz., mere speculative belief; or whether we are justified by faith of the gospel, from which all works of righteousness flow? So far from any disharmony between Paul and James, the proper apprehension of the argument of the latter, shows that he eloquently sustains the doctrine of the former, viz., that we are not justified, either partially or wholly, by works, in the common meaning of that phraseology, nor by a speculative belief which is without works; but by the faith of the gospel *which works by love; a living, active faith alone, productive of good works.*

7. *The errors of the Church of Rome on this doctrine.*—We have already remarked, that this doctrine is of the utmost importance; it enters into the very *essence* of the Christian system, and a mistake respecting it, must necessarily constitute a *capital error* and prove fatal to the salvation of the soul. We may lapse into a misapprehension as to the external or minor points of Christianity, and yet be devout Christians; but if we err on the subject of justification, we sin against the great remedy provided for our recovery from transgression and death; if instead of trusting wholly in the atonement of Christ, we build our hopes of salvation in any degree upon our own merits, thus "going about to establish a righteousness of our own," we are confiding in "refuges of lies," and must, just so certainly as the gospel is true, fall short of eternal life. "Other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Christ Jesus." 1 Cor. iii. 11. That the Church of Rome is in this respect essentially and fatally guilty, is not in our opinion difficult to prove:

(a) *She confounds justification with sanctification, making the former include the latter.* . . . —"Justification," says the Council of Trent, "is not remission of sin merely, but also sanctification, and the renewal of the inner man . . . so that he who was unrighteous is made righteous,"\* &c. Now, we beg leave to know, by what authority this dangerous error is taught? In our judgment the Bible distinguishes between things that plainly differ; justification is represented as the judicial, instantaneous act of the first person in the Trinity; — sanctification as the subsequent, gradual result of the second person of the Godhead? The former is the foundation; the latter the building; in the former, the rebel is pardoned and reconciled; the latter is the progressive purification of the obedient believer: — "by grace ye are saved, through faith," explains the one; the other is thus described: "we are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works," &c. Eph. ii. 8-10.

(b) *She teaches the necessity of "dispositions" and "preparations," holding that they constitute a fitness for the favor of God.* — After adverting to this error, the language of one of her Symbols is: "Justification itself follows this disposition or preparation,"† &c. Again, "Whoever shall affirm . . . that it is on no account necessary that he (the ungodly) should prepare and dispose himself by the effect of his own will: let him be accursed."‡ "The Council of Trent enumerates seven acts by which the ungodly are disposed to justice, viz., faith, fear, hope, love, penitence, the resolution to receive the sacrament, (of baptism,) and the purpose to lead a new life and keep the commandments."§ Whether this is not giving to the sinner a part of the honor of his justification, and consequently of the glory of his salvation, we willingly submit to the decision of the unbiassed Christian.

(c) *She connects justification with baptism, whether in the case of an infant or an adult.* Is an individual, who has been baptized, distressed on account of sin? He is told that in baptism he was justified, and that penance is now the path of peace, "the second plank after shipwreck." If he was not baptized in infancy, as soon as that ordinance is administered he is assured that he is safe. Instead of being directed to trust implicitly and exclusively in the merits of a crucified Saviour, his awakened conscience is falsely pacified by being told that he has been washed in the "laver of regeneration," the instrumental cause of justification, and with this he is to be satisfied.|| What room is here left for the apostolic declaration: "Being justified by faith, we have peace with God?" Rom. v. 1.

(d) *She denies the sufficiency of the merits of Christ in order to justification and salvation.* This she does in various ways:

*First*—By teaching that the good works of the sinner co-operate with the atonement of Christ in deserving eternal life; thus, in effect, declaring the atonement to be inadequate, robbing Christ of the glory of our redemption, and awarding to the poor, hell-deserving rebel at least a share of the honor of his salvation. That this is a

\* Conc. Trid. sess. 6, cap. 7. † Ib. sess. 6, cap. 7. ‡ Ib. sess. 6, Can. 9.

§ Bellarm. Justificatione, lib. 1., c. 12.

|| Conc. Trid. sess. 6, cap. 7. Also Cat. of Conc. Tri. art. Baptism.

prominent feature in the Roman Catholic system, will be shown in the sequel.

*Second*—By prescribing penances, acts of devotion, &c., as a means of appeasing God and obtaining pardon. The Bible teaches that "Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth." Rom. x. 4—that "God hath made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him." 2 Cor. v. 21; and that "the blood of Jesus Christ cleanseth us from all sin." 1 John i. 7. But in the church of Rome the penitent kneels before the priest; confession and absolution are substituted for repentance and faith; and austerities, mortifications or painful performances are imposed as something meritorious, as a means of pacifying God and purchasing remission. Thus, the poor deluded sinner is led away from Christ and puffed up with vain conceit of self-desert, supposing that his *ave Marias*, his *pater nosters*, his fasts and his alms, are daily increasing the stock of his worthiness, and diminishing the claims against him in the court of heaven.

*Third*—By holding to the doctrine of Purgatory.—Let us hear the Douay Catechism on this subject: Q. "Whither go such as die in venial sin, or not having fully satisfied for the punishment due to their mortal sins? A. To Purgatory, till they have made full satisfaction for them, and then to heaven."\* So then, it appears that our Lord has not made full satisfaction for the sins of believers, and that they themselves must, in part at least, atone for them in purgatory. Is not this setting aside the merits of Christ as insufficient, and blending the purgatorial pangs of the sinner with his righteousness as a joint-ground of justification before God? Has not the sinner, according to this doctrine, *whereof to boast?* And is this not in direct conflict with God's plan of saving sinners which expressly *shuts out all ground and plea for boasting?*

(e) Finally, she holds to and inculcates again and again, the doctrine of human merit, teaching that the good works of the justified man, "really deserve increase of grace, and eternal life." The Council of Trent declares that . . . "by the observance of the commandments of God, and the church (!) faith co-operating with good works, they gain an increase of that righteousness which was received by the grace of Christ, and are the more justified;"† . . . "it must be believed that the justified are in no respect deficient, but that they may be considered as fully satisfying the divine law, (as far as it is compatible with our present condition,) by their works, which are wrought in God, and as really deserving eternal life,"‡ &c. In accordance with this most unscriptural and soul-destructive doctrine of human merit, are other Roman Catholic authorities;§ we have only time to quote two: "We will prove," says Bellarmine, "that this is the common opinion of all Catholics, that the good works of the just are truly and properly merits, DESERVING ETERNAL LIFE ITSELF."|| In the Rhemish Testament it is expressly affirmed that "Christian men's works are joynd with God's grace, as causes of our salvation," and that they "doe merit

\* Douay Cat. p. 71. † Conc. Tri. sess. 6, cap. 10. ‡ Conc. Tri. s. 6, cap. 14.

§ See Notes of Rhem. Test. on Rom. viii. 17; also Conc. Tri. sess. 6, Can. 11; also Bellarm. de Justificatione, lib. 5, c. 5, 7, 17. "Which opinion," he adds, "is certainly true. *Quæ sententia verissima est.*" || De Justif. lib. 5, c. 1.

heaven."<sup>\*</sup> "Whoever shall affirm, that he (the justified man) does not really deserve increase of grace, eternal life . . . and even an increase of glory: *let him be accursed.*"†

It is unnecessary to multiply proofs. Now we ask, whether this doctrine of merits accords with the scripture view of justification as set forth in the preceding article;—whether it harmonizes with the declaration of our Lord: "When ye shall have done all those things which are commanded you, say, we are unprofitable servants; we have done that which was our duty to do." Luke xvii. 10;—with the account given of the glorified spirits of heaven, the confessors and martyrs of the church, who are represented as having "washed their robes and made them white in the blood of the Lamb, *therefore* are they before the throne of God?" Rev. vii. 14–15.

The reader has now the leading sentiments of the Protestants as well as of the Roman Catholic church on the doctrine of justification, and the conclusion appears to us to be necessarily this: that he who embraces those of the latter system and imbibes its spirit, is an enemy to the "righteousness of God which is by faith;" he is instructed either to overlook the finished work of the Saviour, or to use it simply as the passport for his doings, his fasts, his alms, and his penance; and the practical reliance for eternal life is partly on his own merits, and partly on the merits of others whose aid he is taught to implore. This we consider to be a cardinal error. Other errors are more or less egregious in their nature or baneful in their tendency; but the one in question is *fundamental*; it strikes at the very vitals of the gospel, *setting aside*, or at least *essentially corrupting* the stupendous scheme of redemption taught by our Lord and his apostles, and substituting a medley of human inventions destitute of even the semblance of scriptural authority; so that we are at a loss to conceive how those who adhere to it, can, in conformity to God's revealed plan of saving sinners, ever gain admittance into the courts of heaven, where there is no room whatever for human boasting, and where all the credit, and honor, and glory of salvation are ascribed wholly, exclusively, and individually to the "Lamb that was slain from the foundation of the world." This is in fact that very apostasy which Paul denominates "*another gospel*;" Gal. i. 6; but which he subsequently affirms is "not another gospel," v. 7, being utterly unworthy the name, since it is not *good tidings*, and only loads men with the burdens from which the *genuine gospel* has disencumbered them, and instead of being a *useful supplement* to the gospel, is a *fatal perversion* of it. It was in reference to this very *perversion*, that the apostle denounced the following awful anathema: "But though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you: let him be accursed." Gal. i. 8. Roman Catholic advocates may attempt to represent the dogmas of their church as less exceptionable, and refuse to admit some of our Protestant inferences. But with their theories and unauthorized "declarations," we have nothing to do; we have gone to the highest authority for our information, and now we demand of them to disprove our statements *if they can.* \* \* \*

\* Notes on Rom. ii. 6–32.

† Conc. Tri. sess. 6. Can. 32.

THE NEW HYMN BOOK, COMPILED BY ORDER OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH.

THE General Assembly of the Presbyterian church in the United States of America, as most of our readers know, appointed a Committee in the spring of 1838, to revise the Book of Psalms and Hymns, which had, some years before that, been printed under its auspices. This Committee has had connected with it a number of the most distinguished men in our church—such as the late Drs. Baxter and John Breckinridge,—Dr. Phillips, Mr. Gray, Dr. Krebbs, Dr. Engles, and Dr. Cuyler, along with one or two of very inferior note, such as the editor of this periodical. It has performed—in amount at least—an immense labour; and its members have done this at great personal inconvenience, and very considerable pecuniary expense. After four years of toil, they laid their work in a form pretty nearly complete upon the table of the Assembly of 1842. They had reported annually, and in great detail, to the Assembly, and that body had annually approved their reports and printed them for general information.

It might therefore appear to some not a little surprising when there suddenly broke out in the Assembly of 1842, a most violent though happily a very limited opposition to this work; and we presume, most, if not all the members of the committee, whether they were taken by surprise or not, have thought they had abundant reason to complain of attacks then and since made upon the book, and indeed from the bitterness manifested in some quarters, one might almost say personally upon themselves. It is to be feared that a few persons who happen to be in positions of influence, have set themselves to defeat the object entirely, by a concerted movement and by the use of methods intended to shake the confidence of the public in the Committee and the book, before the publication is made general, and then to cry out against it on account of these evidences of distrust, which they have themselves created.

We have never seen any evidence either of the poetical or musical talent of the most open impugnors of the work of the committee; and must therefore quietly appeal to the public award, after the book is published, against what we conceive to be a condemnation at once unreasonable and premeditated.

The church at large has a very deep interest in this work; and so far as the mind of the people is ascertained, their expectations are high and their feelings kind, in regard to the book about to be submitted to them. Let them not permit themselves to be misled, or forestalled in regard to this subject. The old book has never found its way into general circulation, and never can; but on the contrary, after years of trial, it is condemned by the common voice, as being, to say the very least, extremely imperfect and inadequate. If after half the number of years allowed to this meagre and unsatisfactory performance, the new book does not obtain a circulation at least double as large as the other has got, we will heartily join in a plan to let the revilers of the present work try their hand upon a new one; a work for which they appear to consider them-

selves pre-eminently qualified. There are gentlemen, who seem to be so rarely gifted by nature, and so richly furnished by study, that they are prepared in fifteen minutes' notice, equally to undertake every duty of every human condition. Hymns are condemned in unmeasured terms, and butchered by unrelenting criticisms, which God's people sing with delight in all parts of the country, and which our pastors generally find to be most edifying to their flocks and most comforting to their own souls. Principles are boldly put forth, which not only show that their authors are alike ignorant of poetry and music, but which condemn many of the inspired Psalms; and upon them a theory is built which the church must reject the new collection in order to sustain. And gentlemen, well known and long trusted by the church, who in this important work have spent years in ransacking the whole of English poetry bearing on their subject, and who brought to the work years of previous study, reading, and practice as pastors, are knocked on the head without the slightest consideration, and their labour not only condemned but reviled before the church has seen it.

We say again, let the church see the book; and then our masters of songs for divine worship, may gratify their prejudices, and any other motives and feelings, good or bad, which have prompted them to make the unkind and extraordinary attacks which it appears to us, are, under the circumstances, worthy of severe rebuke. Let a fair trial be had, and we will venture the prediction, that the book will be cordially and generally received, and become a source not only of spiritual edification to the church, but of considerable and permanent income to its scheme for the publication of religious books generally.

It is very far from the object of these remarks to deprecate a free and fair examination of the merits of the new book, or to prevent just criticism. Indeed we have withheld them till the period allowed by the Assembly for criticisms and suggestions of all kinds from all quarters to be sent to the Committee, had expired. And it is well known that the Committee took, at every stage of their labors, much pains to obtain all the aid and suggestions they could from all quarters. Now when they have, at great labor, and we confidently assert with great success, collected the very marrow of the uninspired songs for divine worship, from all the immense mass scattered in the literature of our tongue and in the numerous collections heretofore made; it is, we must say, every way improper, unjust, and offensive, that any body, and especially persons no way fitted for such a business and whose positions demand a different conduct should volunteer public, uncalled for and sweeping accusations. And we must be excused for saying, that such a line of conduct creates painful suspicions that the merits of the collection form a very secondary consideration with such critics.

We do not understand whether our critics extend their condemnation to the *Psalms* as well as the *Hymns* proposed to be embraced in the new book.

A CARD PRELIMINARY TO A THIRD DEFENCE AGAINST THE CALUMNIES  
OF ROBERT WICKLIFFE.\*

CABELL'S DALE, Fayette Co., Ky. Oct. 7th, 1842.

THAT portion of the public which takes any interest in the affairs of an individual, so little solicitous as myself to obtrude on its notice, may remember that during the early part of last winter, *Robert Wickliffe, Sen.* published and circulated very extensively a series of most atrocious charges against me: the third attack he has publicly made upon me since the summer of 1840.

To those who may think I should have replied long ago, to these renewed slanders of this bad old man, I beg respectfully to say, that residing, as I do, far from the scene of these publications, and from the sources of most of that proof by which their calumnies must be confuted, engrossed moreover in duties both public and private, which do not admit of being suddenly laid aside at will, I have not had it in my power till very lately to visit Kentucky, and give such attention to this humiliating controversy as the interests of truth, and the obligations I owe to myself, to my family, and to the memory of the best of fathers, require at my hands.

Such as may suppose that any controversy, with such a person, requires an excuse, rather for its continuance, than its delay, are requested to remember, that *Mr. Wickliffe* is not known throughout the country as he is in Kentucky; that his great wealth, his respectable connections, and his former standing, taken in connection with his unparalleled hardihood of assertion, give a certain consequence to his vile accusations; and that all experience teaches us that no calumny is too improbable, or too outrageous, to find willing listeners and retailers, and, therefore, that the safe, as well as the honest and the manly course, is to meet it with a full and timely refutation. Added to all this, we owe it to society to disarm madmen.

The only favor I ask of mankind in regard to this subject, is a candid hearing. Having now completed such investigations as I could make during a hurried visit to this country, and in the midst of incessant interruptions, it is my purpose, at my earliest leisure, after my return to Baltimore, (from which the pressing duties of my ministry do not allow a longer absence,) to write out and publish my third defence against this relentless persecutor.

If any faith can be put in the public records of the country, and the testimony of many of the best men it has produced, I am fully able to prove that *Mr. Wickliffe's* infamous charges are utterly false. If any credit is due to his own solemn oath, or any meaning can be attached to his most deliberate conduct, I can clearly establish that he knew them to be false when he fabricated and uttered them. These things, few who have attentively read my two former defences, will probably think difficult; and if God spares my life, I will surely, and soon, do them.

ROBERT J. BRECKINRIDGE.

\*This is taken from the '*Lexington (Ky.) Intelligencer*,' of Oct. 14. The *Defence* will be published first in the western newspapers, and then in this periodical for January or February. An edition in the form of a separate pamphlet will also be struck off as an *extra* of this journal, and which being subject only to the postage of a periodical, will be sent free of all other charge to any who may desire it.—[Ed.

## NECROLOGY—MRS. MARIA T. C. PRESTON.

DIED at Abingdon, Virginia, on Tuesday the 24th of October, MARIA THORNTON CARTER PRESTON, wife of John M. Preston, Esq'r, daughter of the late Gen'l Francis Preston, and sister of Senator Preston, of South Carolina. On the maternal side, she was the grand-daughter of that heroic William Campbell, who by the brilliant action of King's Mountain may be almost said to have retrieved the cause of the American Revolution at its darkest moment; and the great-niece of Patrick Henry. She was born on the 12th of September 1805, and had therefore just completed her thirty-seventh year. She left two little boys, inheritors of the rich promises of God to the seed of the covenant.

Considerably above a century ago, there came to what was then the western frontier of Va., an Irish gentleman (whose ancestors had gone from England to Ireland during the wars of the commonwealth,) with a small family, and settled near the spot where Staunton now stands. He was a man who feared God with his whole house, and served him in his generation. His dust sleeps in the burial ground of the Tinkling Spring congregation in Augusta Co., Va., of which it is believed he was a Ruling Elder. The blessing of God has followed the children of his children's children, even to the fifth generation; and to the present moment his descendants scattered over this whole country, numbering several hundred persons, and bearing a score or more of honored names, cease not to cherish the memory of their common ancestor, *John Preston*, the man who loved and followed Christ. The excellent and beloved lady who is the subject of this notice, was the great grand-daughter of that remarkable man, and partook in a rich measure of his devoted spirit.

Her maternal grand-mother, was in some respects a still more marked disciple of the despised Jesus. The sister, as we have said, of him who might be called, after Washington, the man of the Revolution—and the widow of two general officers of that glorious army which achieved our independence, (William Campbell and William Russell,) that extraordinary woman, whom it was our happiness to know towards the close of her life—served King Immanuel, with a singleness of heart and a supreme devotedness, even beyond the fervor with which her illustrious friends gave themselves up to the cause of liberty. She was altogether a woman of prayer. Blessed be the name of God, her prayers and her example did not fall to the ground. When this grand-daughter, shortly after her venerable relative closed in triumph her mortal pilgrimage, publicly united herself with the people of the God of her fathers, so strong and so general was the impression of the piety of the departed saint, that one cried aloud in the public assembly, with uncontrolable emotion, "*another prayer answered;*" and every heart made the application.

For the last eighteen years of this lady's life, the great business of her existence has been to cultivate in her own heart, and to spread all around her, the influence of the religion she professed.

Moving in the very highest circle of society, where many compromise their principles, and many who strive to exhibit them, make them offensive; she, by the excellence of her natural gifts, and by the power of divine grace, was enabled every where and on all occasions, to commend while she obeyed the truth. There probably does not live a being who can truly say, either that she ever gave unnecessary pain or offense, or yet that she ever allowed a wrong impression of the supreme importance of religion to be taken from her. Nearly connected with her by blood and marriage, and united in the closest bonds of friendship with her, we have known her most intimately for above twenty years, and during that long period have seen her in all the relations which females ordinarily sustain here below; daughter, sister, wife, mother, friend; in joy, sorrow, trial, sickness, health. And we must say, that if a human character could come nearer to what the good and happiness of others might require, or the peace, dignity, usefulness, and glory of our own being exact, or the enjoyment, service and glory of God prompt; it would be hard to say how it would be done.

By hereditary descent in her father's family for many generations, attached to the pure and simple order of the Presbyterian church, and to its scriptural doctrine and usages, when she became personally and deeply interested in the great concern, she embraced with profound conviction, that which had been for so many ages to so many of her kindred, the light of life.

It was not our mournful privilege to see her during her last sickness. Possessing a sound constitution, and enjoying good health almost uninterruptedly, she was taken violently and suddenly ill in the month of July; and her disease, baffling the skill of her medical attendants, and wasting her away amidst much bodily suffering, gave the victory at last to the grim king. But the sting of death was gone. Her end was perfect peace.

We venture, without the knowledge of the excellent writer, to add a few sentences from a letter written to convey to a most tenderly attached sister, the mournful tidings. "No change, until the great change, took place in our sister from the time I wrote you. Indeed, the very day before her death our hopes were stronger than they had been for nearly two weeks. About eleven last Monday night she awoke, asking if her burial clothes were ready. On some one saying 't was time enough to think of them when they were needed; she said, "I dreamed, sister Sally, you were laying me out, and my spirit is only waiting for day-light to pass away." She said she was perfectly willing to go; that she was not afraid to leave her children; that she desired them to be brought up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord; that all she wished was that they might be Christians. From that time till ten next morning, she lingered, leaving a track of holy light, by her manner of death, on our souls, that will, I trust, help to light us all to heaven. Even her bereaved mother has been so comforted that a holy calm and perfect submission has pervaded her tearing since the death. "It is," she said, "not hope, but assurance, that my precious child is happy." She exhorted those around her to feel how much truth there must be in her faith, which enabled her so willingly to leave

her children, her mother, her husband, whom she loved so much. Her intellect continued unclouded, and a very little before her death, she said, "Oh! I had feared I might be deserted in this hour of trial. But how peacefully I am going. I have always wanted to leave my dying testimony. Jesus is all in all." That name she repeated many times over. I give you these particulars because I think they will comfort you, my sister. I know how you loved your sister, and I think it will soothe you to hear that her death was in conformity to her most exemplary life. Your prayer was most fully answered, for the Lord made all her bed in her long sickness. Patience had its perfect work in her. Her physicians and friends all said they had never witnessed such patient suffering, such anxiety to save others from trouble."

Here then is one more testimony to the reality and the power of vital Christianity; the testimony of one more life of exalted piety, one more death of triumphant faith, that Christ Jesus is able and willing to save sinners; one more of the blood-bought host has safely passed the valley of the dark shadow, and crossed the cold stream with songs of rapture. A covenant-keeping God has brought one more of the seed of the faithful to the promised crown.

Oh! what a company is that gathered beyond the river! What a Saviour reigns in their midst!

---

TESTIMONY OF THE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH AGAINST THE  
CHURCH OF ROME.\*

*Rev. and dear Sir:*—The accompanying copy of the Homilies is sent to you for the purpose of giving you a condensed and strong expression of the sentiments held by the Protestant Episcopal

---

\* It gives us pleasure to insert this article; and it would be still more gratifying to us, if we could see reason to believe that the body of the Episcopal clergy held the sentiments avowed by our correspondent, and set forth in the Articles and Homilies of his church. That the reverse is the fact, there is abundant reason to fear. The following facts occurred in Baltimore, and under our own notice: A Roman priest and an orthodox Protestant minister, about the same time *conformed* (as the phrase is) to the Episcopal church; the *minister* was re-ordained, the *priest* was not. How such a fact is to be explained on the theory of our correspondent, we see not. We have not the least doubt that a considerable portion of the clergy and people, and even a few of the prelates of the Protestant Episcopal church are truly evangelical Christians; but our impression is, that even these, are far more bigoted in their sectarian principles and practices than they formerly were, and that the tendency amongst them is decidedly in that direction. As to the Anglican church we must dissent utterly from the conclusion of our correspondent; for while we admit that there is a comparatively small fraction of that body more liberal and more evangelical even than their brethren in America who are classed in the same general category with them, yet to predicate of the church of England, as by law established, the notion of "liberal and catholic sentiments towards other churches where the pure word of God is preached," is, we grieve to say, inconsistent alike with her conduct, her principles, and her claims. The truth, we suppose, is that the two parties in the Episcopal church in England and America, are, at the bottom, radically different from each other both in spirit and doctrine; and as the points on which they hold together are essentially exterior to Christianity, it necessarily follows that the tendency of events as well as their very bond of union must steadily alienate the whole mass from all other Christians, and augment, to themselves, the influence of their common dogmas. Hence the great increase of high-churchism, hence Puseyism, and hence the inevitable final overthrow of evangelical doctrine in those churches, if they are not themselves respectively rent to pieces by the remaining Christian vitality which they contain. We say this with deep sorrow; but to us, the progression and result are as obvious as the operation of any moral causes whatever.—[E.D.]

church towards the church of Rome. You will find it in the second part of the homily on Whit-Sunday, 9th page. This homily plainly asserts that the church of Rome is not a church of Christ, that the popes have been distinguished for pride and hypocrisy, and have set up their own inventions instead of the commandments of God, which they have forsaken; that they are among those false prophets which should deceive the people to believe a lie; and that they would come in sheep's clothing, even as they appear to the American public—while their object is to devour and destroy.

The language here used is not stronger, than important, it is the language of the Church of England, speaking as a church and through her standards, which are also adopted and recommended by the General Convention of the Church in the United States.

Many persons have supposed that the Episcopal church sisters Rome. But this is not the case. She neither mothers her, nor sisters her. We deny that the Episcopal church had its origin from Rome, or has ever been connected with her in any way, save only by that usurped and tyrannical authority, which for a while was exercised in spilling the blood of her best sons. The church of Christ existed in Great Britain before the mission of Augustin, and when he came, he obtained ordination from the Arch-Bishop of Arles, and not from Rome.

Neither is she our sister, according to our articles and homilies. She has no sacraments, and we deny the purity of her succession, (if that be of any consequence,) and we repudiate and abhor her traditions—(See homily on reading the Scriptures, p. 2, and also articles.) We deny the jurisdiction of the Bishop of Rome, beyond his own diocese; and any one who carefully reads our homilies, the 39 articles, and our Catechism, will conclude that to be a good churchman, is synonymous with joining hands with Craumer and pronouncing Rome to be infinitely corrupt, and praying the Holy Ghost to beat down and destroy sin, death, the Pope, and the Devil, and all the kingdom of Antichrist. With regard to the Oxford writers; I would add that but a small portion of the church has been carried away with their sophistries; and while none of our bishops have openly or even privately adopted their peculiar views, the Bishop of Pennsylvania, who has great influence with our young men, has published, some months since, in the Banner of the Cross, a strong, manly article, in which he considers that these young writers have permitted themselves to be carried away by their passions, and are in error in sistering Rome, against which our church protests. I conclude, by stating what may easily be proved, that while there is no sympathy between the genius of our church and the corruptions of Rome; yet there is no church on earth which entertains more liberal and catholic sentiments towards other churches where the pure word of God is preached, than does the Protestant Episcopal church of the United States; and I will add, the Church of England.\*

Yours, &c.

A CLERGYMAN.

\* We regret that we have not space to publish in this No., the long extracts referred to in this communication; but will, with great pleasure, take an early opportunity to print entire, the "Second part of the Homily concerning the Holy Ghost." It is a pity it should not be believed, by the disciples of Mr. Newman and Dr. Pusey.—[Ed.]

## THE PROGRESS OF SENTIMENT ABOUT BOARDS AND AGENCIES.

In looking over the published reports of the fall meetings of our Presbyteries and Synods, we have been struck with the evidences of a steady return to the true principles of our system, in the methods of conducting benevolent operations. There is a manifest spirit awakened in the church, in regard to this great matter; and it seems to be more and more felt, that she must do her master's work in the way her master has appointed. We have no commission to make a religion, but only to practice and teach that which God has made; and while we persist in doing God's work by human inventions and contrivances, instead of the regular action of the church of Christ in its essential and heaven appointed organization, we can never bring up the people of our communion to any thing like the full measure of their duty and capacity; and have no right to look for that divine favour, which if we were more faithful, we might more confidently expect. There are, no doubt, many causes at work to hinder the full and effective co-operation of all our churches in the work of carrying forward the cause of Christ. But we have long thought and often said, that amongst the most operative were our departures from the simplicity of the gospel in our public methods, in the spirit generated by their action, and the class of motives made prominent by them. We therefore hail every evidence of the tendency to lay aside expensive and inefficient paid agencies, and ecclesiastical hierarchies contrived by men and virtually self-appointed, and the general spirit of such means, as a sure prognostic of better things for our Zion; and trust the church courts will more and more determine to do themselves, the great work which God set them to perform. Can any man doubt that all of these bodies are fully capable to do, by God's grace, the things which God instituted them to do? Does any man amongst us doubt that they are instituted by God? Then what more do we need, *as to modes of operation*, but only faith and zeal to do our own appointed work, instead of committing it to other agencies, unknown to the Book of God? If we would do this, the only limit to the efforts of our people would be their piety and means; that is, the action would be complete. At present, who believes that we have reached any thing like this mark? Nay, is not the argument for these boards and agencies chiefly this, that the church will not do without them? That is, they are a contrivance of man with which he substitutes an omitted or defective part of God's plan of operations, in order to supply by its quickening influence, the lack of piety and zeal in the people and their pastors. The objections are that the contrivance is unwarranted; that it is ineffectual; that the very resorting to it is proof of our want both of faith and knowledge; that its operation is evil in many respects; and that the ends it is said to propose are necessarily obtained by the regular and effective action of that which it substitutes, and impossible on any other condition. So that notwithstanding all the outcry of those who fear any change, and those who are deluded by a superficial view of subjects of this kind, and those who are interested to maintain the present state of things—still the church seems to have come steadily to the conclusion that matters do not work exactly right; and a pretty extensive determination to make a thorough experiment of doing their own business, is evident in the proceedings of the church courts. Let us thank God and take courage. Revolutions in opinion are apt to be slow, and are none the worse, when they work silently as well as patiently. '*Cunctando restituit*,' is amongst the most effective mottoes ever borne by man. Let us remember, however, that the more the church courts do, the less reason there must be for the use of contrivances.

## EDITORIAL STATEMENT—CLOSE OF 1842.

In closing the labors of the present volume, we offer our respectful salutations to its readers, and return humble and hearty thanks to God.

Eight years have we toiled in this vocation, sustained amidst incessant trials by the goodness of our Heavenly Parent, cheered by accumulated proofs that our labours have not been in vain, comforted by the kind and generous sympathy of many friends, and aided by the co-operation of many excellent and able men.

In those eight years we have been instrumental in scattering over the face of our great continent, and of sending to nearly all parts of the world where our language is read, a mass of matter which, considering our feeble means, is in the aggregate, immense, and must, with God's blessing, be felt in some degree, in shaping the destinies of our age. Not less, perhaps, than five and a half millions of pages have been printed and circulated in direct connexion with this enterprise, including our regular issues and various extras.

The systems of advertising, and agencies, to which it is found necessary to resort in order to support the periodical publications of the age, have not been put in requisition by us. While, therefore, we have never had a circulation which more than supported the work, by the voluntary patronage and payment of those who took it, and while taking the whole period of eight years, we are still considerably in advance to the publication, after counting our own labours as worth nothing; still, all things considered, we think the matter has worked better, even in this respect, than we had just reason to expect.

We shall address ourself energetically to our work, and so long as the indications of Divine Providence appear to make it our duty to continue this publication, its readers may rely on its being in all essential respects, what it has been and is. We serve a great Master, and must try to do our work in such a manner as his service exacts, and not as dying worms like ourself require, or our own apparent interests might suggest. Humbly but resolutely will we follow, by God's grace, the will of our Redeemer, as far as we know it; firmly, through his Spirit enabling us, will we maintain his cause, as we understand it. And when the public patronage will no longer enable us to do so in this form, we will consider it an intimation from God, not to change our principles, but to lay aside a work in which he no longer requires us to engage, and to spend in some other way what strength he gives us.

Oh! that we might be the means, by precept and example, of pointing out to our fellow servants the greatness of the work committed to us all, and the heinousness of unfaithfulness, indifference, and self-indulgence.

NOTICES, ACCOUNTS, ANSWERS TO LETTERS, &c.

*Neto Subscribers.*—Col. J. C. Meredith, Livingston, Ala.; in reply to the letter of the P. M., we can only say, there is no notice on our books of a previous order.—Rev. Mr. Berg, of Phila., by order of Hugh Stinson; the Nos. from Jan. to Oct. sent by private hand to H. S.; since then by mail.—Richard Findall, Esq. Lex., Ky., since Jan. 1842; back Nos. to Sept. inclusive sent, and afterwards by mail.—Rev. N. H. Hall, Lex., Ky., name added from Sept.—Mr. A. Fischer, Ellicott's Mills, Md., from Jan. '42, and back Nos. sent.—A. Cazenove, Esq., Alexandria, D. C., and \$2,50 for 1843, paid.—Mr. Wm. G. Allen, Henderson, Ky., from Jan. 1842, and the back Nos. sent.

*Discontinuances.*—Walton & Kemp, N. O., refuse to take from the office the copy sent to their care, for Rev. J. J. Henderson, Galveston, Texas; not knowing what else to do, and this being the second refusal by them, discontinued; due us \$3,75.—Literary Association, Circleville, Ohio, refused; due us \$3.—P. M. for Isaac Bridge, N. O., refused; owes \$6.—Daniel Kirkwood, York, Pa., discontinued, paid in full; and the error in the date of the credit to Capt. Donaldson, contained in the receipt given by D. Owen, corrected.—William Adger, Esq., Charleston, S. C.; Rev. Drury Lacy, Raleigh, N. C.; Matthew T. Scott, Esq., Lexington, Kentucky, and Rev'd Upton Beall, Norfolk, Virginia, paid in full to D. Owen and discontinued.

*Payments.*—James S. Scott, Esq., Columbia, S. C., \$10, in full the end of this year.—John Mahard, Jun, Cincinnati, Ohio, \$10, which we receive as in full to the end of this year, and offer him our Christian sympathies under his trials.—Prof. A. Ryors, Athens, Ohio, \$5, which pays to the end of this year, and leaves \$1,50 to his credit for next year.—Austin P. Cox, Frankfort, Ky., \$5, in full to the end of this year.—Mrs. Brent, Paris, Ky., \$2,50, for 1842.—Rev. John Lyle, Lexington Ky., \$5, for 1841 and 2.—John Todd, Esq., Paris, Ky., \$2,50, for 1842.—Rev. Wm. M. Preston, Georgetown, Ky., \$5, which pays till August, 1843.—Mr. S. S. Patterson, Lancaster Co., Pa., \$5, in full to the end of this year.—Wm. M. Marshall, Hagerstown, Md., \$5, for 1842 and 3.—Rev. T. Smyth, Charleston, S. C., \$2,50 for 1842.—Jackson Duff, Oxford, Ohio, \$5, for 1842 and 3; the transfer of the former credit in part to the account of Miss Lees, made as directed, and the Nos. written for sent without charge.

*Changes.*—Rev. Wm. P. Hickman, direction changed to Newbern, Palaski Co., Va.—Rev. Dr. H. R. Wilson, direction changed to Hartsville, P. O. Bucks Co., Pa.—Mr. G. A. D. Clarke, direction changed to Washington City; (the account stands thus, subscription for 1839, '40, 41, 42, \$10; cash paid in October '39, \$2.)—The copy heretofore sent to Mr. Thomas H. Morehead, Danville, Ky., is changed to Mr. Samuel J. Baird; in answer to the note of Mr. B., we have to say, the Nos. since Jan'y 1841 have been sent to Mr. M., and nothing is credited on our books.—Rev. Wm. A. Scott, direction changed to city of New Orleans.—Rev. D. Derville, changed to Princeton, New Jersey.—Mr. Charles Martin, changed to Martinsburg, Ohio.—Wilkins Tannehill, Esq., changed to Nashville, Tenn., by order of P. M. Louisville, Ky.

When money is paid to D. Owen, and receipted for by him, it is duly credited on our books, and his receipts for subscription are as good as our own; but in this case the payments are not published, except in special cases, or for special reasons.

The state of the affairs of this establishment will, we fear, render it necessary to send bills to those in arrears to it; to prevent this if possible, we shall wait till the first of February, hoping that in the interval, payments enough will be spontaneously made to render needless a proceeding more disagreeable to us, we dare say, than to our patrons.

# CONTENTS.

## JANUARY.

	PAGE
Editorial Statement, - - - - -	1
Allocation of the Pope of Rome (of March 2, 1841) against the Acts of the Spanish Government and the Laws of the Realm, - - - - -	3
Controversy with the Domestic Chaplains of the Arch-Bishop of Baltimore.—Finale.—Last Article of the Protestants—their Challenge, - - - - -	7
Molinism, No. XII.—Section XIX. (Of the Immoralities of the Jesuits arising from their Doctrinal Errors)—continued.—2. The Rule of our Duties in general, - - - - -	9
Critical Remarks on John xii. 23, 31, 32, and xvi. 8-11.—No. II., - - - - -	15
The Use of the Title Bishop, - - - - -	22
Shall we Read, or shall we Preach? - - - - -	24
A Serious Review of "A Calm Discussion of the Lawfulness, Scripturalness, and Expediency of Ecclesiastical Boards"—Being a Defence of the Ecclesiastical Boards of the Presbyterian Church.—Part Third.—Ecclesiastical Boards not contrary to, but in full accordance with the principles laid down in the Word of God, - - - - -	26
A Letter to the Presbyteries, particularly of the West—By an Old Servant of Christ, - - - - -	37
Necrology.—Mrs. Ann Chapman, - - - - -	45
Accounts of the Baltimore Literary and Religious Magazine, up to Dec. 25, 1841, - - - - -	47
Accounts of the present work, - - - - -	48

## FEBRUARY.

Reading no Preaching. The Fashionable mode of delivering Sermons considered as opposite to Scripture, the Practice of the Primitive church, Reason, and the Common Sense of Mankind, in a Letter to a Clergyman of the Church of England, - - - - -	49
The Provincial Letters of Pascal, and the Opposition of the Society of Port Royal to the Moral Theology of the Jesuits.—The Practice of the Jesuits in regard to Penance and Absolution—Molinism, No. XIII., - - - - -	57
Critical Remarks on John xii. 23, 31, 32, and xvi. 8-11.—No. III., - - - - -	64
"Doctrines and Practices" of the Church of Rome.—No. 1, Of the Controversy with the Domestic Chaplains of the Arch-Bishop of Baltimore, - - - - -	71

## PAGE

A Narrative of God's Dealings with a few poor Children of Ham—in Baltimore, - - - - -	77
Present Aspect of the Temperance Reformation, - - - - -	82
Some Account of the late Rev. John H. Redington, with parts of his Correspondence, and Illustrative Notes, thereon.—Article First, - - - - -	87
The Funeral of the Mass.—Chapter I. Concerning the Exposition of these words, "This is my body," - - - - -	93

## MARCH.

Merle D'Aubigne's History of the Reformation of the Sixteenth Century, - - - - -	97
The Opinions of the Jesuits concerning the Extent of the Power of the Pope, and his Infallibility.—Molinism, No. XIV., - - - - -	101
Reading no Preaching. The Fashionable mode of delivering Sermons considered as opposite to Scripture, the Practice of the Primitive church, Reason, and the Common Sense of Mankind, in a Letter to a Clergyman of the Church of England, - - - - -	107
The Funeral of the Mass.—Chapter II.—Concerning the Exposition of these words, "He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life. My flesh is meat indeed," &c., - - - - -	115
The Unity of the Church, No. III., - - - - -	119
Robert Wickliffe and his Calumnies.—His Success in Eating a File, - - - - -	126
Some Account of the late Rev. John H. Redington, with parts of his Correspondence, and Illustrative Notes thereon.—Article Second.—Letters written in 1837, - - - - -	130
Remonstrance, to the Honorable, the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Maryland, now in Session, against the Petition of the late "Slave-Holders' Convention," - - - - -	135
Lord Chancellor King's Inquiry into the Constitution, &c., of the Primitive Church. An Inquiry into the Constitution, Discipline, Unity and Worship of the Primitive Church, that flourished within the First Three Hundred Years after Christ. Faithfully Collected out of the Fathers and extant writings of those ages. By Peter King, Lord High Chancellor of England; New York: Methodist Episcopal Conference Office.—1841, - - - - -	141

H. V. WISSE

	PAGE		PAGE
☞ Accounts of the Balt. Lit. and Rel. Magazine, -	142	Papal Infallibility, -	267
☞ Accounts of this Periodical, &c., -	142	Will Antichrist be Destroyed Soon?—Letter from Rev. James C. Barnes, The Theological Examiner, No. V.,	273
☞ Bethel Academy, -	144	Some Account of the late Rev. John H. Redington, with parts of his Correspondence and Illustrative Notes thereon.—Article Third.—Letters written in 1838, -	277
<b>APRIL.</b>			
Reply to a "Serious Review of a 'Calm Discussion of the Lawfulness, Scripturalness, and Expediency of Ecclesiastical Boards,' being a Defence of the Ecclesiastical Boards of the Presbyterian Church;"—By the Author of the Calm Discussion, Sketches and Recollections from my Note Book, No. XII.—Doctors Differ, -	145	The Calling of the Church of Christ.—A Discourse to Illustrate the Posture and Duty of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America.—Delivered at the opening of the General Assembly of 1842, by Robert J. Breckinridge, Moderator of the previous Assembly, -	289
The Low State of True Religion.—Letter from Rev. James C. Barnes, The Funeral of the Mass.—Chapter III.—Against Transubstantiation, Iowa Territory—Its Condition, Resources, Population and wants, -	173	The Effect of the Bull Unigenitus, upon the Clergy and the Public generally, and the measures taken to Enforce its Adoption.—A Brief Description of the Court of Louis XIV.—Molinism, No. XVII, -	306
Evangelical Church at Lyons, in France.—Letter from the Rev. Mr. Cordes, -	176	The Funeral of the Mass.—Chapter IV.—Against the Real Presence of Christ's Body in the Host or Consecrated Wafer, -	312
☞ Notices, Accounts, &c., -	179	Are Ruling Elders Presbyters, or not? If they are Presbyters, how should they be ordained? And what part should they take in Presbyterial Ordinations? -	317
<b>MAY.</b>			
The Occasion of the Bull Unigenitus.—Some Observations upon that Bull—It Condemns all the Doctrines maintained by the Port Royalists, and Sanctions the Errors of the Jesuits—Molinism, No. XV., -	184	Archibald McQueen, Appellant from a Decision of the Presbytery of Fayetteville, before the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, in a case of Incest.—Opinion delivered by Robert J. Breckinridge, one of the members of the highest Spiritual Court, -	320
Systematic Benevolence, vs. Agency System, -	189	☞ Notices, Accounts, &c., -	336
The Unity of the Church, -	192	<b>AUGUST.</b>	
A Second Letter to the Presbyteries, particularly of the West—By an Old Servant of Jesus Christ, -	193	A Discourse in Memory of the late Reverend John Breckinridge, D. D.; pronounced in the Chapel of the Theological Seminary at Princeton, N. J., at the request of the Students, on the last day of January, 1842: by James W. Alexander, -	337
Critical Remarks on Matthew xii. 20, "Doctrines and Practices" of the Church of Rome.—No. 2. Of the Controversy with the Domestic Chaplains of the Arch-Bishop of Baltimore.—The Necessity of the Reformation, -	202	A Change in the Aspect of Affairs at the Death of Louis XIV.—Temporary Disgrace of the Jesuits.—These Expectations Frustrated.—Three Bishops Appeal from the Bull.—An Accommodation which proves abortive.—Persecutions Renewed.—Molinism, No. XVIII., -	349
The Result of the Efforts made by the 'Slave Holders' Convention' at Annapolis, -	206	Critical Observations on 2 Pet. iii. 5, 7, The Funeral of the Mass.—Chapter IV.—Against the Real Presence of Christ's Body in the Host or Consecrated Wafer, -	356
Inedited Letter of Catherine de Medici, to Pope Pius IV., in relation to the Huguenots, -	213	McQueen's Case—Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister, is lawful, A Letter to the Ruling Elders of the Presbyterian Church in the United States, -	361
Sir Robert Peel's Testimony in favor of Father Mathew's Teetotalism, -	213	Evangelical Church at Lyons, in	376
☞ Notices, Accounts, Receipts, &c., -	223		
<b>JUNE.</b>			
The Rule of Faith.—A Discourse to vindicate the Incarnate Word.—Delivered by order of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, for 1841, before that for 1842.—By Robert J. Breckinridge, Moderator of the former Assembly, The Account of the Bull Unigenitus, continued—Christian Morals—Prohibition of the Scriptures.—Molinism, No. XVI., -	238		
	239		

CONTENTS.

V

	PAGE
France.—Letter from the Rev. Mr. Cordes, - - -	379
Who are the "Mighty Angels" that will attend the Redeemer at his Second Coming? - - -	381
Critical Observations on Luke i. 22, - - -	383

SEPTEMBER.

A Sermon on the Atonement.—Preached at the Opening of the Synod of Cincinnati in Springfield, Ohio, October, 1841, by the Rev. Samuel Steel, Moderator thereof, - - -	385
The Temptation and Betrayal of our Lord.—Part I., - - -	393
Controversy with the Domestic Chaplains of the Arch-Bishop of Baltimore.—No. 3, of the Protestants.—The Necessity of the Reformation—Continued, - - -	399
A Second Letter to the Ruling Elders of the Presbyterian Church in the United States, - - -	406
Ought Ruling Elders to unite with Ministers in Laying on Hands, in the Ordination of Ministers? - - -	407
Intercourse between the General Association of Massachusetts and the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church.—Recent Troubles, - - -	414
Second Centennial Period of the Westminster Assembly, - - -	422
Some Account of the late Rev. John H. Redington, with parts of his Correspondence and Illustrative Notes thereon.—Article 4.—Letter written in 1839, - - -	425
Critical Observations on Acts iii 12, - - -	429
[F]Notices, Accounts, &c., - - -	432

OCTOBER.

Hints on Slavery.—Founded on the state of the Constitution, Laws, and Politics of Kentucky, thirteen years ago, - - -	433
A Third Letter to the Ruling Elders of the Presbyterian Church in the United States, - - -	459
Allocation of his Holiness, Pope Gregory XVI., in the Secret Consistory of the 19th of the Calends of December, (22d November,) 1839, upon the Schism in Russia, - - -	462
The Doctrine of the Church of Rome, that no Faith is to be held with Heretics, - - -	464
The Temptation and Betrayal of our Lord.—Part II., - - -	466
Essays on the Conscience.—Translated from J. La Placette, Pastor of the French Church of Copenhagen.—No. I.—Is the Conscience essentially a clear and evident perception? - - -	478

NOVEMBER.

	PAGE
An English Translation of the Constitution Unigenitus; the Famous Bull of Pope Clement XI., signed on the 8th of September, 1713, (the Nativity of the Virgin Mary,) which Established Pelagianism in the Church of Rome, - - -	481
The Temptation and Betrayal of our Lord.—Part III., - - -	491
Essays on the Conscience.—Translated from the French of J. La Placette, Pastor at Copenhagen.—No. II.—Is the Conscience an Act, a Habit, or a Faculty? - - -	498
The Funeral of the Mass.—Chapter V.—Against the Adoration or Worshipping of the Host, - - -	501
Letter on Christian Union, addressed to the Bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church, by the Right Rev'd Francis Patrick Kenrick, Bishop of Arath, and Coadjutor of the Bishop of Philadelphia, - - -	509
Some Account of the late Rev. John H. Redington, with parts of his Correspondence and Illustrative Notes thereon.—Article Fifth.—Letters written in 1840, - - -	517
Reading or Preaching.—A few more words about that question, - - -	524
Critical Observations on Acts iii. 8, - - -	527

DECEMBER.

Critical Remarks upon Matthew xi. 12, 13, and Luke xvi. 16, - - -	529
McQueen's Case.—Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister, - - -	541
Some Account of the late Rev. John H. Redington, with parts of his Correspondence and Illustrative Notes thereon.—Last Article.—Letters written in 1841, - - -	548
"Doctrines and Practices" of the Church of Rome.—No. 4, of the Controversy with the Domestic Chaplains of the Arch-Bishop of Baltimore.—Justification by Grace, through Faith, - - -	553
The New Hymn Book, compiled by order of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, - - -	561
A Card, Preliminary to a Third Defence against the Calumnies of Robert Wickliffe, - - -	563
Necrology.—Mrs. Maria T. C. Preston, - - -	564
Testimony of the Protestant Episcopal church against the church of Rome, - - -	566
The progress of Sentiment about Boards and Agencies, - - -	568
Editorial Statement—Close of 1842, - - -	569
[F]Notices, Accounts, &c., - - -	570