

THE  
BALTIMORE LITERARY  
AND  
RELIGIOUS MAGAZINE

---

VOL. IV.

JUNE 1838.

No. 6.

---

THE DOCTRINE OF ORIGINAL SIN.

A DISCOURSE, BY JOHN P. CARTER, LICENTIATE.

As by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned.—Rom. v. 12.

THIS passage of scripture, by all orthodox Christians, is believed to teach the doctrine of *original sin*. A doctrine which holds a prominent place in the system of divine truth, and which cannot be better defined than in the perspicuous and accurate language of the Westminster Confession and Catechisms. "The covenant being made with Adam, as a public person, not for himself only, but for his posterity; all mankind descending from him by ordinary generation, sinned in him and fell with him in his first transgression"—And—"the sinfulness of that estate whereinto man fell consisteth in the guilt of Adam's first sin, the want of that righteousness wherein he was created, and the corruption of his nature, whereby he is utterly indisposed, disabled and made opposite unto all that is spiritually good, and wholly inclined to all evil, and that continually; which is commonly called *original sin*, and from which do proceed all actual transgressions."

It is not my intention, at present, to adduce the particular proofs of this doctrine, but merely to meet some of the popular objections brought against it by many professing Christians of the present day.

1. The clearness with which this doctrine of *original sin* is taught in the word of God, together with its vast importance, has secured for it a general reception in the church of Christ. It was first called in question by Pelagius, a British monk, in the 5th century. He taught, that the doctrine of original sin was as false as it was pernicious: that the sins of our first parents were imputed to them alone, and not to their posterity: that we derive no corruption from their fall; but are born as unspotted as Adam when he

came from the forming hand of his Creator. "That mankind, therefore, are capable of repentance and amendment, and of arriving at the highest degrees of piety and virtue by the use of their natural faculties and powers: that, indeed internal grace is necessary to excite their endeavours, but that they have no need of the internal succors of the Divine Spirit."

Perhaps, a sufficient refutation of this heresy is found in its obvious and unavoidable consequences.—If men be by nature holy, they need no regeneration,—if they be naturally able of themselves to fulfil the requisitions of God's law, the gracious assistance of his Holy Spirit is altogether unnecessary.—And lastly, if they be not "*dead in trespasses and sins,*" salvation by faith in the atonement of Christ is but vain talk:—And thus, according to Pelagius, the whole plan of redemption as revealed in the scriptures, is to man, perfectly *useless*; for what need have *they* to be *enlightened*, who are not in *darkness*? And why is a *Saviour* necessary, if men are not lost? The foundation of the Pelagian system is that no relation of a federal character was instituted between Adam and his posterity, but that every individual is responsible only for his own voluntary acts. To prove this—it would be necessary so show that each individual of the human race has entered into a specific personal contract with his Maker, similar to the covenant established with Adam: for according to the plainest principles of justice, men are individually responsible only when they, personally, enter into voluntary engagements:—now, while none of Adam's posterity will pretend that any such personal transaction has passed between his Creator and himself; it is an incontrovertible fact that such a transaction took place between the Creator and Adam: and that he having failed to meet his engagements, incurred the penalty; which has been inflicted, not on himself *alone*, but also, upon all his posterity.—This certainly could not have been done, consistently with justice, if *no* relation existed between Adam and his descendants, and it *could* be done only in consequence of a *federal* relation existing between them: Adam acting as the legal representative of his descendants, incurred the penalty of God's violated law; and the lawgiver, having first identified the constituents with their representative, metes out to all alike the consequences of his transgression. Not that "*he who judgeth righteously,*" regards any other man as *actually* guilty in the same sense, in which Adam was: but in a legal point of view, all being guilty *by imputation*, are therefore obnoxious to the penalty of the law.

II. The opinions of Pelagius were ably refuted by the celebrated Augustine: nevertheless they have found supporters ever since. Socinus and his followers adopted the same views, and they have ever regarded as a pernicious error the doctrine of original sin. But the truth has little to fear from the sneers or the sophistry of avowed infidels; it is from theological temporizers, that danger is to be apprehended.—Men like Cassian the monk, who attempted to fix upon a certain temperature between the errors of Pelagius and the scripture doctrine of total depravity. His system is appropriately denominated Semi-Pelagianism; and from its congeniality with the *self-estimation* peculiar to half converted professors of religion, it

has received extensive patronage, and has produced much evil in the church.

The Semi-Pelagians believe "that inward preventing grace is not necessary to form in the soul the beginnings of true repentance and amendment," that every one is capable of producing these by the mere natural power of his faculties: as also of exercising faith in Christ, and forming the purposes of a holy and sincere obedience. But at the same time they acknowledge, "that none can persevere, or advance in that holy and virtuous course, which they have the power of beginning, without the perpetual support, and the powerful assistance of divine grace." That this is false doctrine is manifest: 1st from the palpable inconsistency in supposing, that the spiritual ability requisite to commence repentance and obedience is not, at least by exercise, rendered sufficient to persevere in a course of virtue. 2dly.—It is in direct opposition to those passages of scripture which teach that "no man can come to Christ except he be drawn by the Father"—and that it is necessary for God to *begin* as well as *carry on* the work of grace in the soul—that "Jesus is the *author* as well as the *finisher* of faith." And lastly, it is contradicted by the experience of all who have been delivered from the dominion of their natural corruption.—We confidently appeal to the experience of any man who has tasted that the Lord is gracious, in confirmation of the truth as we hold it. Where is the regenerated heart that will not *rejoice* to acknowledge,—that, it was "born not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God"—that it was raised from its state of spiritual death only by the power of Him, who once bade the sleeping Lazarus "come forth"—and that—so far as it has walked in the light of life, it has been quickened and sustained by Him who, himself, is the *way*, the *truth*,—and the *life*.

III. But the most formidable objection to the doctrine of original sin, is that brought against the principle of federal representation. It is asserted that since God is infinitely merciful and just, "He would not punish one man for the fault of another, much less would he punish all men for one sin of Adam." That Adam was actually constituted the federal head of the human race is a fact that admits not of successful contradiction. That God was unjust, and unkind in so ordering it, is another question. It is, however, a charge as unfounded as it is impious. "Let the potsherd strive with the potsherd of the earth, but let not man strive with his Maker"—"Who art thou that repliest against God? Shall the thing formed say to him that formed it, why hast thou made me thus?" This is a deep and solemn subject, connected as it is with the introduction of sin into the world, and all its consequent evils, it should, therefore, call forth humility; and instead of exciting objections, should inspire us with the most implicit confidence, that—"the Judge of all the earth will do right;" nevertheless, with becoming reverence, we may be permitted to speak a little.

Admitting the unquestioned right of the Almighty to create beings with the physical power of propagating their species, and at the same time, to be the subjects of moral government; it is obvious that the consequences of their actions must terminate upon them-

*selves* alone, upon their *posterity* alone, or upon themselves and their posterity together. If it had been determined that the consequences of our first parents' actions should terminate upon themselves alone, their most perfect obedience to God's law would have secured but to *themselves* the promised blessing. They would have enjoyed the unspeakable privilege of communion with their Maker, whose precious smile of approbation would have afforded perpetual joy. But, their first born, being like his parents, *personally* responsible, would have had to pass through the same ordeal that had awaited them, and therefore been exposed to continual liabilities of failing in his obedience, through the whole period of probation. And if he should have transgressed the law, he would have fallen without the possibility of recovery. But, admitting our first parents had transgressed the law: then, verily, according to the supposition, the penal consequences would have terminated upon themselves *alone*; but their children, born indeed, innocent, would have grown up in circumstances so exceedingly unfavourable to virtue that their dereliction from it, would have been rendered almost inevitable. It is apparent, therefore, that no one will contend for the wisdom or expediency of this arrangement.

2dly. Supposing that the consequences of Adam's conduct, had been arrested towards himself, but allowed to take effect upon his posterity. In this case, Adam would neither have been rewarded for obedience, nor punished for disobedience, and consequently he would not have been dealt with as a responsible being, which is inconsistent with the fact that he was constituted the subject of moral government—the supposition is therefore absurd, and the arrangement unjust.

Lastly, let us suppose, as we believe is the fact, that the consequences of Adam's actions were to terminate conjointly upon himself and all his posterity. That is, God having constituted Adam the federal representative of his descendants, was pleased to enter into a covenant with him, which if violated by Adam, would involve himself and all his posterity in one common calamity; and if adhered to on the part of Adam, would secure the promised reward alike to him and the whole human race.

In the first place, this arrangement is worthy of the Creator, because, the character of human responsibility is thus exalted and made commensurate with the extensive capacities for moral action with which man was endowed. Secondly, It harmonizes with the original constitution of the human mind, in recognizing the supremacy of the moral sentiments; from which it appears that man was not intended to be a selfish being; and the generous principle of benevolence, designed to be a governing principle of action, is never so delightfully exercised as when seeking to impart to others, the blessedness enjoyed by ourselves. Accordingly, this arrangement identified the highest happiness of Adam with that of all his children; for had he been faithful through the period of probation, he would not only have established in himself the principle of holiness, and received the reward of obedience, but these blessings would have been also perpetuated to all his posterity, who in the possession of the inherent and imputed righteousness derived

from their progenitor, would have advanced in holiness in each successive generation, secured from the commission of sin by a moral impossibility, as great as that which at present precludes their return to holiness. Thirdly, That this is a wise and benevolent arrangement appears from the fact that it secures a degree of improvement in the race, to be attained, humanly speaking, in no other way. It is admitted on all hands, man is a progressive being; and therefore, what degree of holiness soever characterised Adam at his creation, yet had he, not fallen, his holiness must have greatly augmented by continual exercise; then, in accordance with the federal relation, this augmented degree of holiness would have been transmitted by him to his immediate offspring, who in the exercise of their moral powers would have advanced from this point still farther in righteousness, and would have transmitted an accumulated amount of godliness to *their* offspring; and thus perpetually increasing, each new attainment conferring the right and the capacity for others still higher than itself, the progressively expanding holiness and happiness of the race would have been commensurate with interminable duration.

Fourthly, That the principle of federal representation is unexceptionable, there is abundant evidence in the fact, that it is *legalized* by the most enlightened nations. It is recognized in the most honorable mercantile transactions, and it is the characteristic feature of our national government—the wisest political constitution ever devised by man. No one thinks himself unjustly dealt with when legally called upon to meet the liabilities incurred by becoming responsible for another; true, it may be attended with many inconveniences; it may even reduce himself and family to the utmost pecuniary distress; yet in the eye of the law, he is answerable, and on the default of the principal contractor, it is strictly *just* that the security should fulfil the conditions of the contract. So, also, when an individual is elevated to the office of the chief magistrate of the nation, all his *official* acts become the acts of the nation, in so far as their consequences terminate not on the president alone, but on himself, together with the people at large of whom he is constituted the *federal* head. It may be objected, that the parallel between the federal relation of Adam to his posterity, and that of the president to the nation does not hold good, in that the latter takes place on the *choice* of the people, the president being *elected* by those whom he is to represent; whereas, Adam was constituted the representative of his descendants without their consent, or even their knowledge, and therefore, although the principle is just in the case of the president and nation, it is not so with regard to Adam and his posterity. This objection, tho' specious, is not unanswerable. For the peculiar advantages of our federal government, do not result from the elective franchise of the people, in itself considered; but, in the opportunity which is thus afforded of placing at the head of the nation the man who is the best qualified to promote its domestic happiness and maintain its relative dignity in the scale of nations. Now, it is manifest that these ends of good government would be as fully attained, if instead of a popular election, our rulers were appointed by an individual of wisdom and dis-

crimination adequate to the invariable selection of the wisest and the most virtuous men to govern the nation. And it is equally manifest that our Heavenly Father is the only being in the universe whose knowledge, wisdom, and benevolence are competent to make such a selection: for "He only knoweth the hearts of all the children of men." Where is the freeman who would not instantly surrender his elective franchise, and submit to a ruler appointed by unerring wisdom? Who does not perceive that under the government of a man after God's own heart, the nation might be consummately prosperous and happy: and therefore, free from the consequences of those errors in government, to which our best rulers are liable; committed no doubt unwittingly, and perhaps, with the best intentions, yet most ruinous in their effects upon the people. If then, we would gladly accept a ruler, given to be our *political* representative, by divine appointment, why should we refuse to be represented *morally* by an individual who was not only selected for us by infinite wisdom, but also in infinite benevolence amply qualified to secure for us our highest advantage. True, the latter involves consequences, of unspeakably greater importance than the former, yet not so important as to be beyond the sovereignty of God: for "the Lord hath prepared his throne in the heavens, and his kingdom ruleth over all." "He removeth kings and setteth up kings"—"He giveth wisdom to the wise, and knowledge to them that know understanding"—And with the same efficient and wise providence by which he regulates the phenomena of the material world, and settles the fate of nations; does he establish laws for the universe, and determine the everlasting destiny of all his intelligent creatures. Why then should man suppose, that in his federal relation to Adam he has been hardly dealt with?—Is it possible to conceive an arrangement more wise and benevolent?—Could so many great and glorious results have been secured in any other way? "Certainly not," it is replied, "provided Adam had not fallen, but since that is the case, the whole scheme is exceedingly objectionable." But this is taking a partial view of the matter. "Shall we receive good at the hand of the Lord and shall we not also receive evil?" Adam was constituted morally free in order to be responsible to a system of rewards and punishments: but he could not have been the subject of such a system of government, if he had not been *liable* to transgress; hence, so far as appears to our finite understandings, his *liability* to sin was essential to the peculiar kind and degree of moral responsibility with which he was invested; yet this *liability* to fall was not the *efficient cause* of his sinning; else an event would be produced by the *possibility* of its taking place, which is absurd. The cause of his sinning was an adequate temptation, but this temptation was not more than he could bear, for "with the temptation there was a way to escape that he might be able to bear it;" for the command given to Adam by the Almighty—"Thou shalt not eat of it," &c. necessarily implies that he had moral power to obey the command, and therefore, to resist the temptation—thus counterbalancing his *liability* to fall with adequate ability to maintain the rectitude of his nature in meeting the responsibilities imposed upon him. Since, then, there was

nothing in the nature of Adam's freedom which tended to evil rather than to good; if it would have been unobjectionable for mankind to have enjoyed the reward of his *obedience*, it is no less so, that they should suffer the consequences of his *disobedience*.

It may still be enquired why man was *tempted at all*? It would be as pertinent to ask, why he was *created at all*? It pleased God to make man, and to make him a responsible being—he was therefore invested with moral freedom, and in the exercise of this freedom he sinned against God. Further than this it behooves us not to attempt to proceed. Such knowledge is too high for us, we *cannot attain* unto it—and even if it were possible for us fully to comprehend all the circumstances which led to the fall of Adam, it would be but barren knowledge in our present condition. Involved as we are in sin and its consequences, it is more becoming and profitable for us to enquire if their be any means by which we can be delivered from its dominion and curse?

IV. And in the first place. Since the law of God which has been violated by us, was not a mere arbitrary institution; but resulting from the inherent and inalienable sovereignty of *God*: characterised by eternal justice—it remains sternly and immutably in force against us, notwithstanding our inability to meet its requisitions. Our rebellion cannot render us independent of our lawful sovereign. The malediction of the law, must therefore, abide on us so long as its claims are unanswered; but we have lost the ability to meet these claims. How, then are we to be delivered from the sentence of condemnation.

Our Heavenly Father, in the revelation of his will, not only informs us that we are diseased and perishing: but also, exhibits the remedy and preserves our life. "First, by the sacrifice of his Son upon the cross, he purchased eternal redemption for us"—"On that Son was laid the iniquity of us all"—"He hath borne our griefs and carried our sorrows"—"He hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us"—"There is now redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches of his grace." But, secondly, depravity has so darkened our understandings and our spiritual vision, that this redemption appears to us unimportant, and unnecessary.—We see no beauty in it, that we should desire it—we are ignorant of the nature of our disease, and therefore, we are unable to appreciate the remedy. Hence the necessity of the super-natural enlightening and regenerating influences of a divine power on our hearts, that we may perceive the preciousness of Christ's redemption—that we may believe him to be, "The only begotten of the Father full of grace and truth" and be willing to receive him as "the Lord our righteousness, our strength and our Redeemer." Accordingly, the same blood which redeemed from the condemnation of sin; has also purchased for us the Holy Spirit, to awaken us to a just sense of our danger—to turn us from darkness to light—and in presenting a crucified Saviour, to impart the willingness and the ability to receive him. Lastly, our Heavenly Father, in planning our redemption through the meditation of his Son has gloriously illustrated the principle of federal representation; the blessings and privileges lost by us in Adam,

have been more than restored in Jesus Christ—the penalty of the law, incurred by us in the fall, has been inflicted on Jesus, in his sufferings and death. The requirements of the law which we are unable to meet, have been rendered by him in his immaculate obedience; “For he hath made him who knew no sin, to be a sin-offering for us, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him.” Since, then, Christ suffered in our stead, and his righteousness is imputed to us; the relation existing between him and his people is the *federal* relation—the same that exists between Adam and his posterity. And as the means of union between Adam and his descendants is *natural birth by ordinary generation*—so the means of union between Christ, the new federal head, and his children—is the *new birth*—the *spiritual regeneration*. The parallel, then is perfect between the 1st and 2nd Adam, so far as concerns the principle of union between each and his respective children—“But not as the offence, so also is the free gift, for if through the offence of one many be dead; much more, the grace of God, and the gift by grace, which is by one man, Jesus Christ, hath abounded unto many.” And as a farther manifestation of the love of God in Christ Jesus, we are not left in the conviction of sin with the mere general information that a way of escape has been provided, but the Holy Spirit who unites *Jesus Christ* to his people, also works in them a living faith whereby *they* are united to him; and in the exercise of this faith they are freely justified from all things from which they could not be justified by their own works, and are enabled to rejoice in the hope of eternal glory—“Therefore being justified by faith we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ”—“For as by one man’s disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous.” “That as sin hath reigned unto death, even so might grace reign through righteousness, unto eternal life, by Jesus Christ our Lord.”

In view of these solemn and interesting truths, our duty is plain. True, “we are by nature the children of wrath,” and as such exposed to the consequences of everlasting condemnation: yet we have the most unequivocal assurance, that God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world: but that the world through him might be saved.” Let us, then, relying on the faithfulness of God, “Flee from the wrath to come” and cordially embrace the offers of mercy.” “He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life;” “He that believeth not on the Son, shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth on him.”

LETTER FROM THE REV. MR. BAIRD, AT PARIS.

Paris, Feb'y 12, 1838.

REV'D R. J. BRECKINRIDGE.

*My Dear Brother*:—NOTHING but the most pressing engagements could have prevented an earlier compliance with your request:—and even now, all that I can do is to give you some information of a general and miscellaneous character, in relation to France. Leaving the state of religion in the other parts of Europe which I have visited since I saw you in this city a year ago, to other and future letters, which if God spare my life, I purpose to write.

As a general thing, it may be said that all of the great benevolent and religious societies of this country,—such as the Bible, Tract, Missionary, &c.—are going on well. Every year witnesses a sturdy and healthy advance. Last year more than half a million of evangelical tracts were distributed throughout the kingdom, and upwards of one hundred thousand copies of the sacred scriptures. That the truth which has been thus to a considerable extent disseminated in this important country may be rendered the means of doing great good, is your constant prayer, I doubt not, as it is that of many other dear friends of the kingdom of our Lord in France.

The Evangelical Society of France, whose object you so properly appreciate, has made considerable progress since you were here. As I have been a member of its committee, as well as that of the French and Foreign Bible Societies, for nearly a year, I have had good opportunities of knowing its progress. The number of its labourers (exclusive of students, who are preparing for the work of the ministry, or the colportage, or the teaching of school,) is now above fifty, and I am happy to say that their labours meet, on the whole, with encouraging though various success. The demands upon the society for more labourers, from all parts of the kingdom, far exceed its ability to comply with them. To sustain the constantly increasing number of its labourers is beyond its native resources, and it is greatly to be regretted, that for the want of means, any thing should remain undone which might be accomplished to advance the reign of the truth in this great nation.

You know well what the little band of evangelical Christians of France, dispersed as they are, are endeavouring to do for missions among the heathen. You are aware that they have ten excellent ministers, with their wives, in south Africa, and that the Lord is blessing the labours of those dear brethren in that field. You know also that the Society (the Society for Evangelical Missions among the nations which are still Pagan) has a missionary seminary or institution, in this city, under the superintendence of the Rev'd Mr. Grandpierre. In that institution there are now ten or twelve young brethren preparing to go forth to the heathen, and several applications are made for admission into it, which, have been refused for want of means to support them. This denial will, however, not continue much longer, as the society is likely to have the ability to receive them. God has in the most wonderful manner put it into

the hearts of his dear people to relieve the society from its embarrassments.

It is a striking and most encouraging fact that love for the missionary cause has characterized the revival of evangelical religion, from its very commencement, in France. One would think, judging according to the principles of man's wisdom, that the poor and scattered evangelical churches in this kingdom would have considered their own country, with its vast moral desolations, quite ample enough for all the efforts which they can make. But it is not so. They wish to share in the glory of carrying the gospel to the heathen. For this purpose, they formed a missionary society several years ago, and no other society has seemed to share so much of the affections of Christians as this, whose object is to send the gospel to those who, in heathen lands, are ready to perish for lack of "vision." This is a good omen. There could be no better. The church which is penetrated with the spirit of missions must flourish now a-days.

A few months ago, this French Society for Foreign Missions, became much embarrassed for want of money,—though it has always been better supported than any other. This led to an able appeal to the churches in France and Switzerland, in the shape of a circular letter from the committee. The result was, that within a month, between thirty and forty thousand franks were sent to the society, in sums of almost every size, from three thousand franks and downwards, from Christians in France and Switzerland; so that the society is enabled to go on its way rejoicing, and to extend its efforts.

Since you were here, some important appointments have been made to churches connected with the government, of faithful pastors. One of these is that of the Rev'd Mr. Myer, to the church of the Augsburg Confession in this city. There are now two excellent ministers in that church, which until within two years, if I have been rightly informed, never possessed a pastor who was thoroughly evangelical. Another appointment is that of the Rev'd Mr. Rousset (lately at Algiers, and whose place in that city is supplied by an excellent man) to be one of the pastors of the Protestant church in Marseilles,—a city whose importance you are well aware of.

You will be happy to learn that the Rev'd Mr. Cordès continues to be blest in his labours at Lyons. He wants exceedingly, a church capable of holding some thousand or twelve hundred people. His chapel, which now will hold four or five hundred, is crowded to excess: yet there are one hundred families under pastoral and other Christian visitation, which cannot be invited to the chapel, for there is not room to receive them! It is my opinion that there is more good doing in Lyons, than in any other city in this kingdom. The aid which you sent them was most seasonable. I trust you have received before this time, the warm and truly Christian letter of the evangelical church in that city.

If you receive the *Semur* and the *Archives du Chaistianisme*, you will have seen, before this reaches you, an account of the most interesting and important trial which took place three weeks ago, before the Royal court of Orleans, in relation to the efforts of the Evangelical Society to maintain the preaching of the gospel at Mon-

targis, a small town in that part of the kingdom, celebrated for having been the residence, for a while, of the Princess René, and for the protection which that distinguished Protestant of the persecuting House of Bourbon, afforded to the Protestants in the time of pressing need. The decision of the court sustained the society, in the most noble manner. The cause must now come up to the court of cassation—the highest tribunal of the kingdom. It will there be tried by a branch or section of that court. If the decision of the Royal court of Orleans be sustained, the matter may end there. But should the decision of the inferior court be disapproved, then the case will be referred to the Royal Court, which is nearest to Orleans. Should that court coincide with the Orleans court, and not with the section of the court of cassation, then the case must come up to the court of cassation again, to be tried in what is called a *solemn* meeting, that is, before all that court, embracing about fifty judges. *That decision will be final.*

The trial which has just occurred at Orleans is one of immense importance. It will lead to a decision of immense moment, being nothing more nor less than the decision of the question whether there is really any such a thing as true religious liberty in France. May God guide to the right result. I am of opinion that it will cost a long struggle to establish religious liberty here on its proper basis. Nothing short of a thorough reformation of the existing laws on this subject will be of permanent avail.

There has been a most remarkable movement in the commune of Lionville, about ten miles distant from Cherbourg. The population in mass, headed by the mayor of the commune, (which is what may be called a parish, or rather a small district) has requested their Roman Catholic Priest to go off; and invited the excellent evangelical minister who is in the established Protestant church at Cherbourg to come out and preach to them. This he has often done, to their great satisfaction. The society has lately sent an excellent young minister, to labour there. The government has, however, tried to prevent Protestant efforts from being made there. But the new mayor, who has been appointed to take the place of the former one (on account of his having favoured the *movement*) proves to be also favourable to it; and it is said that it is not possible to find a mayor who will do otherwise. What will be the result we cannot foresee, though we feel encouraged. One or two other communes in the vicinity are on the point of taking the same course! So much for an abundant distribution of the Bible and religious tracts.

The most discouraging fact in regard to this kingdom, all things considered, is the continued opposition of the government to the efforts which evangelical Christians are making. I do not think, however, that the king is personally hostile to Christianity. It is to be feared that his mind is wholly uninterested in the subject of religion, excepting as a measure of state policy. Indeed not only the king, but also almost all the members of the present cabinet seem to have no higher views of Christianity than as an appendage to the state, and to be maintained because it is part of a great whole. The government pays the salaries of the Catholic and Protestant

clergy who officiate in the churches united with the state (as almost all are,) as well as that of the Jewish Rabbies. And the very consummation of the desire and object of the government is to keep things just as they are. It is therefore opposed to every thing which might lead to any change. And what seems to be its intention is that those who were born Catholics shall live and die such; those that are Protestants must continue such; and so with the Jews. The only change which meets with no opposition from the government is from Christianity to infidelity!—As to letting all efforts be made, unmolested and unrestricted, which any may choose to make, to diffuse widely the word of God, and to call men's minds to the subject of a pure religion, leaving them of course, to follow their convictions—it is a thing which, however simple it may appear to our minds, which neither this government nor any other on this continent is sufficiently enlightened to do.

The fact that now three of the children of the king have married into Protestant families, has a very unfavourable influence upon religious liberty in this country. It matters not whether these marriages have had any thing to do with a secret preference, on the part of the king (which I for one, do not for a moment believe) or not; it is certain that they have alarmed the Roman Catholics, and made them redouble every effort to induce the government to hinder the efforts of Protestants. And the government does not hesitate to yield to their urgency, and is perhaps inclined of its own accord to do so, in order to keep up the appearance at least of not being partial to Protestantism. So that every such marriage is a present misfortune for the cause of evangelical effort in this land.

The last marriage—that of one of the princesses with a Wirtemberg prince—was very exasperating to the Catholics, for by the terms of it, it is provided that the children which may be born of this marriage shall be educated Protestants—all of them—the royal house of Wirtemberg being very decidedly Protestant. And if it should prove true that the duke of Nemours, is going to marry a Protestant princess, as report says, I do not know what the Catholics will do, in order to express adequately their alarm.

I have stated enough to show you why the government acts as it does. Every now and then, the local authorities in some part or other of the kingdom do some act which is in its spirit clearly contrary to the charter. The closing of the Wesleyan Chapel at Caen lately, was an instance of this kind. After years of comparatively unsuccessful labour there, it pleased the Lord to pour out his spirit and excite among the French a great desire to hear the gospel. The consequence was that hundreds of persons flocked to the chapel. A larger place had to be taken. Even it could not hold the crowds; but after a few weeks had passed away, the mayor of the city shut up the chapel, sans cérémonie, and I know not whether it is yetre-opened! And this was a chapel which had been regularly licensed according to the requirements of the laws. That the civil authorities of Caen have taken this high-handed and oppressive step through the instigation of the Roman Catholic priests, there can be no doubt.

But as I have already said, notwithstanding these embarrassments, the kingdom of God is undoubtedly making progress, gradually, but

surely, in this great country, and amongst a people who will one day act a great part, if I am not mistaken, in the work of converting the world unto God.

But I am making this letter entirely too long. I conclude it, therefore, by calling your attention to a most important measure which I have recently taken, and in the execution of which I ask your assistance. It is this: I have just made an arrangement to have the invaluable Commentary of Dr. Hodge, on the Romans, translated into the French language. The translator is Mr. Horace Monod, the youngest brother of the Rev'd Frederick Monod, who has just finished his theological studies at the University of Lansanne. A better translator could not have been found. He is a young man of extraordinary talents and promise; of devoted piety, and of extensive knowledge of the English language, which, like all his brothers, he has known from his childhood. Professor Stapfer is to unite an introduction to the work and recommend it to the churches in France and Switzerland. This will be very important, for Professor Stapfer is well known in both countries, and has great influence. He is delighted with the work, and says it far surpasses any other commentary which he has ever read.

That the translation and publication of this excellent work is an exceedingly important undertaking, at this time, when evangelical doctrine is yet, in so great a degree, in an unestablished state not only in France and Switzerland, but also in Belgium, in Holland, and Germany, is too obvious to need a remark from me. And you know that there will be no difficulty in having the work to circulate in all these countries, when well translated into French, because almost every minister of the gospel in the Protestant parts of this continent reads French.

But now how is this work to be published? This is an important question, for it is not possible to have this work published by a bookseller, and in the ordinary way. There are here no Protestant booksellers who have means to undertake a work of this kind, which must require several years to sell off, and so reimburse the cost of publication. The best way is to have it published at the expense of some friends in America. If your people for instance, or if they in co-operation with the efforts of other friends, would raise eight hundred or a thousand dollars, this sum would publish a sufficiently large edition. In the course of a few years, the entire edition would be sold, and the sum which the undertaking cost would be returned and might be appropriated to some important enterprize for the advancement of the kingdom of God in France and Switzerland. I propose that it be appropriated to the *New Theological Seminary at Geneva*. This plan meets the cordial approbation of the friends here, and would be extremely popular, and ensure extensive effort to promote the sale of the work when published. What do you think of it? Can you not undertake to see that the requisite funds be raised? I am sure that it would cost you but a little effort! And to no one does it more appropriately belong. It would be a double good, the importance of which no one I apprehend, can too highly estimate.

I am yours, truly,

R. BAIRD.

## ERROR OF PLACE AND NOT OF PERSON.

*Or the Idolatry of the Papist in worshipping God under the representation of a wafer.*

THERE is not a nation upon the earth, the inhabitants of which have suffered more on account of their religion, than have the Protestant citizens of France. In this country, the seeds of the ever memorable reformation were early sown by Calvin, Beza &c; and bid fair to produce a glorious harvest. No sooner however, did they begin to spread, than the spirits of the leading Papists were stirred to extirpate them from the land. Every art and stratagem that their fiendish ingenuity could contrive were brought into exercise to effect their one end. In these dreadful persecutions, France lost thousands upon thousands of her most useful, enterprising, industrious, and patriotic citizens.

While the one party were carrying on the work of destruction, and proving to demonstration to the world, that their weapons were not those of the Christian warfare, *but carnal*, the ministers of the reformed church were setting forth their doctrines, and proving from the word of God that they were the doctrines and principles which Jesus our Divine Master and his Apostles, had preached. Thus by the use of these *spiritual* weapons, they have established a defence of their faith, and left a testimony for Jesus, that will abide when the angel is heard in the midst of heaven, crying "Babylon the great is fallen, is fallen." (Rev. xviii.) It is even so now, that the names of many of those faithful men are remembered and honoured while the names of their persecutors are passed by and despised.

In the works of many of those ministers of the Reformed church in France, will be found some of the ablest defences of the Protestant faith.—The extract following, is from SAURIN, a most eloquent and popular preacher of that church, in which he lays open the gross idolatry of the papal church in his day (and suiting our times as well) attempting to worship the Most High under the form of a wafer, and then arguing, that *if they did err*, it was only *an error of place*, not of *the person*. No one can impartially read it without coming to the conclusion that if this be not idolatry—gross idolatry—then the worshipping of the golden calf by the children of Israel, was not.

"Under the pretence that we have never been willing to denounce a sentence of eternal damnation against members of the most impure sects, (the members of the Papal Church) they affirm that in our opinion, people may be saved in their community, and this, they say, is one of the articles of our faith.

This is a sophism which has been attributed to a prince, who had united so far as two such different things could be united, the qualities of a great king, with those of a bad Christian. Having a long time hesitated between the peaceable possession of an earthly crown and the steadfast hope of a heavenly one, his historians tell us, he assembled some of the doctors of the Roman communion and some of ours. He asked the first, whether it

were possible to be saved in the Protestant communion? and they answered, no. He then asked the second, whether it were possible to be saved in the Roman communion? They replied, they durst not decide the question. On this, the prince reasoned in this manner: "The Roman Catholic doctors assure me there is no salvation in the Protestant communion. 'The Protestants dare not affirm that there is no salvation in the communion of Rome. Prudence, therefore, requires me to abandon the Protestant religion, and to embrace the Roman; because in the opinion of the Protestants, it is at the most only probable that I should perish in the church of Rome, whereas, in the opinion of the Roman Catholics, it is demonstrative that I should be damned in the Protestant community.'" We will not attempt to investigate this point of history, by examining whether these Protestant ministers betrayed our religion by advancing a proposition contrary to it or whether these historians betrayed the truth by altering the answer attributed to our ministers. Whatever we think of this historical fact, we affirm with St. John, that "Idolaters shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone."

However, we ought to make a cautious distinction concerning doctrines, as we do concerning precepts—a distinction between questions of *fact* and questions of *right*. There is a question of right in regard to precepts: as for example—Is a course of life opposite to the precepts of the gospel a damnable state? To this we reply, undoubtedly it is. There is also a question of fact, as for example—Shall all those who follow such a course of life suffer all the rigour of damnation? A wise man ought to pause before he answers this question; because he does not know whether a man who hath spent one part of his life in a course of vice, may not employ the remaining part in repentance, and so pass into a state to which the privileges of repentance are annexed. In like manner, there are questions of fact, and questions of right in regard to doctrines. The question of *right* in regard to the present doctrine is this: *can we be saved in an idolatrous community?* certainly we cannot. The question of *fact* is this: *will every member of an idolatrous community be damned?* A wise man ought to suspend his judgment on this question, because he who had spent one part of his life in an idolatrous community, may employ the remaining part in repenting, and consequently may share the privileges of repentance. Except in this case, according to our principles, "idolaters shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone." But according to our principles, the Roman Catholic Church is guilty of idolatry; consequently according to our principles, the members of the church of Rome, if they do not forsake that community, are among such as "shall have their part &c."

If it be necessary to prove according to our principles, the church of Rome is guilty of idolatry, the evidence is easily obtained. Let us form a distinct idea of what, agreeably to scripture, we call *idolatry*. To regard a simple creature as God, supreme; to render to a simple creature, the worship that is due only to the supreme God, is what we call idolatry. Now according to our principles, the members of the church of Rome do render to a creature, to a bit of bread such worship as is due only to the supreme God. By consequence according to our principles, the members of the church of Rome are guilty of idolatry.

They defend themselves by a somewhat specious, but groundless argument. It was employed by a man who disgraced his name by abandoning the Protestant religion, though, thanks be to God, I hope I and my family shall always be enabled to continue it in the list of sincere Protestants. His words are these, "Two or three articles, saith he, excited strong prejudices in my mind against the church of Rome; transubstantiation, the adoration of the holy sacrament, and the infallibility of the church. Of these three articles, that of the adoration of the holy sacrament led me to consider the church of Rome as idolatrous, and separated me from

“ its communion. A book which I one day opened without design, instantly removed this objection. There I found a distinction between *error of place* in worship and *error of object*. The Catholic worships Jesus Christ in the eucharist, an *object* truly adorable. There is no error in this respect. If Jesus Christ be not really present in the eucharist, the Catholic worships him where he is not; this is merely an error of *place*, and no crime of idolatry.” A mere sophism! By the same argument, the Israelites may be exculpated for rendering divine honours to the golden calf. We must distinguish error of *place* from error of *object*. The Israelite worships in the golden calf the true God, an object truly adorable. “ Tomorrow is a feast to the Lord, O Israel, which brought thee up out of the land of Egypt,” Exod. xxxii. 4. 5. &c. There is no error in this respect; if God be not really present in the golden calf, the Israelite worships him where he is not, a mere error of *place*, and not the crime of idolatry. But St. Stephen saith expressly that this calf was an idol. “ They made a calf, and offered sacrifice unto the idol,” Acts. vii. 41. By consequence, error of place in worship, doth not exculpate men from idolatry. As, therefore according to our principles, there is an error of place in the worship which Roman Catholics render to their host, so also, according to our principles, they are guilty of idolatry.

But are we only speaking according to our own principles? Have we seen any thing in the wilderness of Sinai that we do not daily see in the Roman communion? Behold, as in the deserts of Sinai an innumerable multitude, tired of rendering spiritual worship to an invisible God, and demanding *Gods to be made, which shall go before them!* Behold as in the desert of Sinai, a priest forming with his own hands, a God to receive supreme adoration! See as in the desert, a little matter modified by a mortal man, and placed upon the throne of the God of heaven and earth! Observe as in the desert the Israelites liberally bestowing their gold and their jewels, to deck and adorn, if not to construct the idol! Hark! as in the desert of Sinai, priests publish profane solemnities, and make proclamation, saying, *To-morrow is a feast to the Lord!* Behold, as in the desert, the people *rising early* on festivals to perform matins! Hearken! criminal voices declare, as at Sinai, *These are thy Gods, or this thy God, O Israel, who brought thee up out of the land of Egypt.* What am I saying? I hear expressions more shocking still. This is, O shame to Christianity! O scandal in the eyes of all true Christians! *This is, yea, this bit of bread*, on which a priest hath written, Jesus Christ *the Saviour of mankind—this is thy God.* This is the God whom all the angels in heaven adore.—This is the God *by whom all things were created that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers:* This is the God who upholdeth all things by the word of his power. This is the God, who in the fulness of time took mortal flesh. This is the God who, for thy salvation, O Israel, was stretched on the cross. This is he, who in the garden of Gethsemane said, “ O my Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me,” Math. xxvi. 39. who rose conqueror over death and the grave, who passed into the heavens, and at whose ascension, the heavenly intelligences exclaimed, “ Lift up your heads O ye gates, even lift then up, ye everlasting doors, that the Lord of Hosts, the King of Glory may come in,” Ps. xxiv. 7 &c. O Judah, Judah, thou hast justified thy sister Samaria. O ye deserts of Sinai, never did ye see any thing equal to what our weeping eyes behold! Who is on the Lord’s side? Let him come hither. Ye sons of Levi, separated to the service of the Lord, consecrate yourselves to day to Jehovah—But what are we about? Are we interrupting the soft still voice of the gospel, to utter the thundering commands of mount Sinai? Shall we command you to day, as Moses did formerly the Levites, “ Put every man his sword by his side, and go in and out, from gate to gate, throughout the camp, and slay every man his brother, and every man his companion, and every

man his neighbour?"—Ah, Rome! Were we to adopt this method, you could not reproach us; you could only complain that we were too ready to learn the lessons you have taught us, and too ready to imitate your bloody example! Even in such a case, we should have one great advantage over you; our hands would grasp the murdering sword to destroy thee only for the glory of God, whereas thou hast butchered us for the honour of an idol! We are not come with fire, and blackness, and darkness, and tempest; but Zion, though all mangled by thy cruelty, utters only cool exhortations, affectionate remonstrances, and tender intreaties; she fights only with the "sword of the spirit," and the "hammer of the word," Ep. vi. 17. Jer. xxiii. 29. Ah poor people! How long will you live without perceiving the golden candlestick which Jesus Christ hath lighted up in his church! May God take that fatal bandage which hides the truth from thine eyes! Or, if this favour be refused us, may God enable us to take away from thee such of our children as thou hast barbarously torn from the breasts of their mothers, in order to make them, like thine own, the children of a harlot."

---

[For the Baltimore Literary and Religious Magazine.]

*Sketches and Recollections from my Note Book. No. II.*

DEATH BED REPENTANCE.

"Man sleeps; and man alone; and man whose fate,  
Fate irreversible, entire, extreme,  
Eadless, hair-hung, breeze-shaken o'er the gulf  
A moment trembles; drops! And man, for whom  
All else is in alarm; man, the sole cause  
Of this surrounding storm! And yet he sleeps,  
As the storm rocked to rest."

YOUNG.

WHEN we are brought to meditate upon "righteousness and judgment to come," we must feel interested in some measure in proportion to the intellectual vigor of our minds. The man of strong mental energy, who in his moments of abstraction from sensible objects brings his intellectual faculties to survey the realities of eternity under the light which revelation casts upon them, must feel deeply concerned, though the concern may be as transient as the early dew. The brevity of time;—the dark valley of the shadow of death;—an arraignment of the soul before the Omniscient;—the recompense which shall be in accordance with our doings;—eternity, never ending or changing eternity, with all its weal or wo, are subjects of terrible interest, even to the most hardened, when he brings his mind to rest and ruminates upon them, with a special application to his own case. And why, it may be asked, can the mind come back after such a survey, and mingle again with the evils of life, and wallow in wickedness, and grow in opposition to the Omnipotent disposer of the destinies of the eternal world? This, in my opinion, depends much upon the promise which Satan makes to him of days in the distant prospective, when repentance will come more easily, and be more in character. He is told of

a "more convenient time," than the present, and he believes it, and as there is, in reality, no time but the *present*, the more convenient period is always *to come*, and thus, "wisdom is pushed out of life." But still Satan has the specific of a "death bed repentance," which, like opium, with the empirick, is always at hand, and is suited to every case, and produces a tempory quietus or a delirium, either of which, takes the mind from the contemplation or feeling of the principle subject of its uneasiness, and helps it out of life, sooner and more sweetly than it would otherwise have escaped. And what makes the foul opiate of a death bed repentance more fatal, is the fact, that the poor soul goes beyond our vision; and we have neither the means nor opportunity of knowing ought of its reception beyond the grave;—and that surviving friends, the mantle of whose charity, is always large and ready at such a time, dwell upon the most casual word which the deceased has uttered, whether extorted by fear or pain or grace, and treasure up every look, and press into their service every gesture, to satisfy themselves and prove to the world the genuiness and the depth of his repentance and piety. This is all conjecture, and it is wrong, for

"—————Who can take  
Death's portrait true? The tyrant never sat,  
Our sketch all random strokes, conjecture all;  
Close shuts the grave, nor tells one single tale."

This I believe to be, "a great evil under the sun," for it gives a value and a currency to counterfeit graces; adds a sanction to the suggestions of the tempter when he would dissuade from immediate duty;—throws around upon society the narcotic influence of contentment in sin, and drives many a poor soul, perhaps, into eternity with, "a lie in its right hand."

That true and genuine repentance never takes place on a death bed, I would not say;—that it occurs very seldom, and is rather to be regarded as an exception, than a rule, I feel fully confident in asserting. I am now speaking of sickness, of ordinary duration, which takes away the patient in a few weeks, not of those long and lingering affections which continue for months and years! Indeed if we carefully and critically search the word of God, we will be convinced that he gives no room, upon which, we can with any propriety predicate the probability of such repentance;—nay but that the very reverse is inculcated, with all the weight and veracity of divine wisdom. Future time is always kept out of view by the God of grace, for his time is universally, "to day;" and every opportunity of age and experience and circumstance which passes by unimproved, makes repentance less likely to take place. For instance, God says that, "those who seek him *early* shall find him," but it is evident that if the morning of life, when the heart is young and comparatively pure, and the conscience tender and awake, and the passions alive to the influence of holy emotions; if this morning time is suffered to pass by unimproved, that with it we are carried beyond the reach and region of this promise, for none but the young have any part in it. When this period arrives then, we have *one promise less* than we previously had; and hence salvation is not so easily or likely to be attained by any, who have neglected to

"seek God early." And as we live and continue in sin, promise after promise, passes by; and the influence of first and novel impressions are resisted; and the heart that does not melt becomes calcined and seared; and thus the sinner ripens for destruction under the influence of those very means which are ripening the saint for glory! Again, the apostle, as a preparative for glory, says to the Christian, "give all diligence to add to your faith, virtue; and to virtue knowledge; and to knowledge temperance; and to temperance, patience; and to patience, godliness; and to godliness, brotherly kindness; and to brotherly kindness, charity. For if these things be in you and abound, they make you that ye shall neither be barren nor unfruitful in the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ. But he that lacketh these things is blind."—Now surely this cannot contemplate a death bed penitence, because there is neither space, nor opportunity nor ability, for the exercise and exhibition of these graces on a death bed, either to glorify God, or prepare the soul for the high destinies and doings of the eternal world. I am the more anxious on this subject because I fear that many, very many, are daily falling into this specious, but fatal snare which Satan places for the souls of men. This fear has been generated in me by the word of God, and strengthened by the experience which my profession has given me, of the secrets and doings of the chambers of disease and death. I do think that were we able to follow many such penitents into the world of spirits, we would have an awful exhibition of their mistake when too late to remedy; but as we cannot do this, our only way of judging in absence of a better, is from the subsequent conduct of those, who thinking they were on the verge of eternity, after preparing for death, were unexpectedly brought back again into life.

I shall endeavour to enforce and elucidate my views on this subject by the recital of two cases which came under my own immediate cognizance; the subject of one of which is still in the land of hope—the other is now an inhabitant of eternity.

On a Sabbath day a few years ago,—I was hastily and anxiously called to the chamber of sickness and sorrow. When I entered I beheld a man, apparently in the morning of life, but that morning was overcast with a pitchy darkness, and the sun of his existence, which had not been many years above the horizon, was about to sink rapidly into the ocean of eternity. He was pale and emaciated;—he breathed as if the soul was just upon the thresh-hold of its departure, and yet right loath to go. Beside him sat in sorrow the young wife of his first love tortured with a sort of despairing hope. It seemed as if her heart like the quick-sand, swallowed and absorbed every thing, whether of hope or despair, which was thrown upon it, and ever and anon, there was an alternation of light and shade upon her feelings. It was indeed the heaviest of all mental loads, and she could not have borne it but for the strength which she experienced from the excitations of hope and despair. In addition to this, two physicians were in attendance, whose faces evidently reflected the sadness which prevailed, and whose tongues spoke not a word of consolation. I looked upon this scene, and my heart almost fainted within me. I was a stranger to the par-

ties.—I had not before known or heard of them ;—I hoped, for some tidings of alleviation from the medical attendants, but my inquiries were answered in a slow and solemn whisper, which said that the case they feared was decided, for mortification had most probably taken place in the bowels, and from all appearance, in a few hours the wheel of life would cease its motion. My feelings were now excited to the highest pitch ; I felt that every moment was precious, far beyond earthly calculation, for up to the hour of his recent attack, he “lived without God and without Christ in the world.” He had neglected, and worse than neglected, the “great salvation.” I spoke to him, and was astonished at his composure ;—I examined into the grounds of it and was delighted with the result of my inquiries. He had been busy, he said, with Christ ; he cast all his cares upon him ; he was penitent, deeply penitent, for his sins, and he believed he was accepted and prepared for glory. He had not a fear or doubt ; his wife he was willing to leave beneath the shadowing wings of a gracious providence, and, almost, longed to take his flight over the Jordan of death, into those sunny climes of everlasting glory, where “the weary are at rest.” I remained with him, until nearly midnight, at which time the physicians told me that the medicines which they had given him, more in duty than in hope, must shortly operate, if life was to be prolonged. He felt however himself, that he must die, and he was prepared for death ; and with these prospects I commended him to Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, and took my leave of him, never again expecting to see him, until we should meet among “the dead small and great,” in the general judgment.

Next morning I repaired by times to the house, thinking that there might be a possibility of his still being in existence, and I read in the first face which met my eye, that the danger was past. I entered his room—the scene was changed ; hope sat on every feature, diffusing light and love around. I was informed the medicines had operated favorably a few minutes after mid night, and that his physicians pronounced him almost out of danger. He was now much more able to discourse ; and I introduced the important subject which had occupied our thoughts and prayers during the past night, but alas ! before I left him, I discovered that the penitent needed repentance, and that his faith fled as danger receded. Yet still he said he trusted in God, and was sorry he had not loved him more ; and was determined should he live, to live more in the performance of piety and prayer. He did live, and as might be expected, lived as far from Christ as ever, and is to this day a woful monument of unsanctified affliction, as well as a living proof of the shallowness and insufficiency of that repentance which is induced upon the heart by the fear of death. Had he died, his friends, and family, and indeed all who saw him would have been confident that he opened up his eyes in Abraham’s bosom, though he has since sufficiently proven that, “he had neither lot nor part in the matter,” affording another proof to the verity of the poet’s song:

“ We bleed, we tremble ; we forget, we smile.  
The mind turns fool, before the cheek is dry.  
Our quick-returning folly cancels all ;  
As the tide rushing, razes what is writ  
In yielding sands, and smoothes the lettered shore.”

The next case is one of a more melancholy nature still. The subject of it was born and educated in the bosom of a religious community, and I believe in a pious family. Youth, however, was accompanied in his case as in that of many others with great levity and thoughtlessness. He was a child of prayer, but prayer seemed in vain as it respected him. While still young and giddy, he was the subject of a miraculous preservation from sudden death by drowning. It was a circumstance widely felt, for two of his companions sunk to rise no more, while he was spared to see other days. It made a deep impression upon him, which the friends of Christ labored to mature into conversion unto eternal life. Under these instructions and prayers, and in the view of the awful danger from which he had been rescued, he became "almost a Christian." An eminent child of God told him in the spirit, and almost in the language and authority of the days of prophecy, to turn unto God, and not wait for another monition from on high, for he would one day die suddenly and unexpectedly by the agency of water. This, though Satan endeavoured to laugh him out of it, remained for a long time upon his mind, but finally it was effaced, and he became as formerly, thoughtless and indifferent.

When I knew him, he was perhaps twenty-four years of age; of a fine figure, a good countenance, affable and kind in his manners; an intelligent and ingenious mind, but perfectly regardless of religion. At this time he lived upon a river, not far distant from a settlement of Indians, who were in the habit of frequently visiting the place of his abode, in order to traffic with the inhabitants of the little town. During one of their visits he went down to the water and seeing their bark canoes, determined to take a sail in one of them. It is well known that the construction of these fragile skiffs is such, that a pound or two will upset them. He was successful in getting in, and had proceeded a few yards from the shore, when he upset the canoe, and was thrown into deep water altogether unable to swim. He cried for help and sunk; he arose and sunk again, as a person who had heard him, reached the shore, and being also unable to swim threw a board to him as he arose the second time, which, he providentially, though as it were by instinct, caught and by means of it was brought to land. He lay sometime on the bank before consciousness or any appearance of life returned, and was then carried, and for a length of time, confined to his bed. The pious now made another onset.—Past days and doings came powerfully to their assistance, and it is probable that, "some natural tears were shed," and regret for his former conduct expressed, and another determination of future amendment made, in so much that had he now died of the effects of this dispensation, his friends would have had a good hope of him. But he soon recovered; and he soon forgot; and his life and conduct soon began to flow in the old channel. Time rolled on, and the purposes of God did not tarry though he refused, or neglected to prepare for the part he was destined to act, in their accomplishment. *To-day*, to him, was so like *yesterday*, that time passed him unperceived and unimproved, though it was bearing him rapidly onward to the great ocean of eternity. And might it not do to throw ourselves upon life's cur-

rent, and float with it down towards the future, examining its shallows and its rapids; noting well the landscape on its banks; keeping a journal of our experience; and above all, forming a correct chart of the river, provided, we had power given us, to return up the stream, and commence anew, our voyage to eternity;—but alas! life glides away, and returns never.

“ Life glides away, Lorenzo! like a brook  
 Forever changing, unperceived the change.  
 In the same brook none ever bathed him twice;  
 To the same life none ever twice awoke.  
 We call the brook the same; the same we think  
 Our life, though still more rapid in its flow;  
 Nor mark the *much* irrevocably lapsed,  
 And mingled with the sea.”

But to return—it was a bright day in spring, when the last act in the drama of his life was performed, and the curtain of darkness and death dropt over him. He walked out upon an excursion to gather wild flowers to decorate the garden of her, to whom his heart was bound by ties as flowery as the smiling gems of nature which he gathered, and as strong as the omnipotent destiny which hurried him to the tomb. Full of the sweet passion of youthful love which smiling spring with her early flowers, and perfume, and music, feasted and excited, he wandered to a rock which hung over a deep and rapid turn of the river. As he sat upon it, looking at the busy waters hurrying past, to meet and mingle with their mighty parent, perhaps, in his estimation, with the haste of love; and as he listened to the carolling of the glad and enamoured inhabitants of the air, he beheld mid-way down the rock, a pretty wild flower, which he thought would be an agreeable present to her he loved. It was difficult to obtain, but that would only enhance its value, and as nothing is too difficult for the young and ardent heart of love—he descended to procure it. Within reach of it, a little stunted shrub grew out of a crevice of the rock, by which he proposed to suspend his weight—while with the other hand he could reach down, and pluck the little gift of love. He reached the spot in safety;—he grasped the fragile shrub, and bent down towards the flower, when his weight tore away the slender twig by which he held, and he tumbled down into the fatal deep beneath! He was seen by a person a short distance above, who flew to his relief—but when he arrived, there was nothing to be seen except his hat, floating down upon the waves, and the fatal spot looked as smiling and serene as if nothing had occurred. His body was not found for many days, the rapidity of the stream having carried it to some distance, and when it was gotten, those who loved him most, were fain to hide him in the grave, for he was in such a condition that the mother who loved him could not have recognised the son of her affections! And notwithstanding all his warnings, and mementos, he postponed his repentance too long, and this record relates the melancholy fact, that to all appearance, he died out of Christ!

“ Ah! how unjust to nature and himself,  
 Is thoughtless, thankless, inconsistent man!  
 Like children babbling nonsense in their sport

We censure nature for a span too short ;  
 That span too short, we tax as tedious too ;  
 Fortune, invention, all expedients tire  
 To lash the lingering moments into speed  
 And wheel us (happy riddance) from ourselves  
 And brainless art ! our furious charioteer  
 Drives headlong towards the precipice of death."

---

[For the Baltimore Literary and Religious Magazine.]

THE INSTITUTION OF CELIBACY IN THE PAPAL CHURCH.

No. III.

XXVIII. WERE the apostles married? Most of the fathers, and particularly those of the first age, believed that all the apostles married, except John. Ignatius, who must have conversed with several of the apostles, asserts it in his epistle to the Philadelphians. Clement of Alexandria, was of the same opinion. Also Polycrates, bishop of Ephesus, (*Euseb. Hist. l. III. c. 31.*) who lived near the end of the second century. Origen (*in Epist. ad Rom.*) Tertulian, (*de Monog.*) and several others, have spoken of the marriage of Paul. St. Basil (*de abd. serv.*) and St. Ambrose (*in Epist. 2, ad Cor. II, 2*) (though later) may also be cited for the same purpose. Their zeal for continence is known. The last, it is true, excepts Paul and John, *Omnes apostoli, exceptis Joanne et Paulo, uxores habuerunt*, but upon this point he is less credible than the fathers of the preceding ages, yet without this testimony, Paul proves it himself. (*1 Cor. ix. 5.*) "Have we not power to lead about a sister-wife, as well as other apostles, and the brethren of the Lord, and Cephas?" Some say these were matrons or rich females, who ministered to their necessities. But this is a false interpretation. The Vulgate has the word *mulier*, and the word according to Clement of Alexandria (*Strom. l. III. p. 48*) Eusebius, Tertulian, Nicephorus, Valla, Faber, and many others, is here used in the sense of *uxor*. The apostle had designated the sex by the word *sister*. It was useless to add the word *woman*, for that purpose or for any purpose except to express the idea that she was espoused; a *sister wife*—not a sister woman. Beside, the apostle having spoken in the preceding verses, of the other wants of life, these words could hardly have been used, except to designate marriage. But why dispute this point, since incontestibly, Peter was married, and he is deemed by the Roman Catholics, the chief Apostle, *primus apostolorum*. There is a story of the Deacon Nicholas, told in the third book of the *Stromata* of Clement, p. 436—which, whether true or false, proves that in the time of that writer, the apostles were thought to have had the power to marry.

XXIX. Clement of Alexandria has devoted the third book of his *Stromata* to the refutation of the heretics who denied the lawfulness of marriage. He compared them to the *Eucratites* who condemned the use of meats as well as of marriage—and who were

rejected by the church on account of their excessive severity. (*Strom.* page 305.) In reply to a passage from the gospel of the Egyptians, (an apocryphal work, though Clement appears to have thought it authentic, or at least to have treated it as such,) he says, "Neither continence nor marriage are of precept, they depend merely upon our will." He then adds, "He who cannot endure to live alone, but desires to marry, if such is his desire, he can do it without crime,—each one of us having power to marry a wife or to abstain from so doing." And farther on, he says, "There is no person among us who has not the power, lawfully to marry, I speak of the first marriage." It is worthy of remark, that the severest rules on continence are contained in these apocryphal works, which were composed by heretics. This indicates pretty clearly, the origin of these austerities. Tertullian was nearly contemporaneous (A. D. 200, reign of Severus) with Clement of Alexandria. Jerome (*de Script. Eccl.*) informs us he was a priest, and not only was he married, but it is plainly inferrible from two books of his writings addressed to his wife, that he exercised the rights of marriage. He inveighs with severity against second marriages, but says in regard to the first *prohiberi nuptias nusquam omnino legimus*. Nor does he any where say, that ecclesiastics are excepted from this rule, or that their marriage loses its effects or rights upon taking orders. (*See also, his Treatise de Monogamia and Euseb. Hist. lib. 4. c. 23.* Epistle of Dionysius to the Gnostians, in which he admonishes Pirytius.) Another proof which is somewhat later, is the Epistle of Cyprian to Pope Cornelius, in which he accuses Novatus of having kicked his wife, she being pregnant, and caused the death of her child. Cyprian found no fault with this priest for having a wife, but only for his brutality. (*Ep. 72. Edit. Baluz.*)

XXX. Another proof is the fifth of the apostolical canons as they are called, which forbids every bishop, presbyter, and deacon, to separate himself from his wife under pretext of religion, under pain of excommunication or even of deposition, if they persevere. *Episcopus aut presbyter aut diaconus uxorem suam pretextu religionis non abjiciat: si abjicit segregatur a communione: si perseverat deponitur*. Bellarmin and others pretend that this is to be understood to prohibit merely the turning of the wife out of doors; but the interpretation is ridiculous. What husband would turn his wife out of doors, under pretext of piety or conscience. But the fiftieth of these canons is not less explicit. *Si quis episcopus aut presbyter aut diaconus aut quisvis omnino de sacerdotali consortio, nuptiis et carnibus et vino abstinerit; non propterea quo mens, ad cultum pietatis reddatur exercitior, sed propter abominationem, oblitus quod omnia pulchra valde, et quod masculum et foeminam Deus creavit hominem. Sed diffamationibus lacessens creationem Dei vocat ad calumniam; aut corrigitur aut deponitur et ex ecclesia rejicitur; Consimiliter et laicus*. There are others of these canons equally pertinent to the question, but the reader must consult them for himself. The apostolical constitutions may also be referred to. Doubtless these are spurious. They were probably written in the third or fourth century, and though a forgery, they must be supposed to record with

accuracy the discipline of the church at that time. They expressly authorize the marriage of the clergy.

XXXI. The reader is next referred to the Council of Ancyra, held in 314, about ten years before the celebrated Council of Nice. Ancyra (now Anguri) was the metropolis of *Galatia prima*. The tenth canon orders that if deacons declare at the time of their ordination, that they intend to marry, they shall not be deprived of their functions, if they afterwards marry. But if they do not then declare their intention to marry, and afterwards marry, they shall be deprived of their ministry. Of course, marriage was not deemed by that council, incompatible with orders. Next comes the council of Nice (A. D. 325,) the first called œcumenical. Socrates (*Hist. Eccl. l. i. c. 11.*) says that the bishops having purposed to make a new law, by which bishops, priests, and deacons, should separate from their wives which they had married while laymen, Paphnutius, an old man, who had lost an eye during the persecution, opposed it. The historian proceeds to give some account of his arguments, and remarks, that he sustained his views so well that all the bishops came over to his opinion, and without further deliberation left the matter to the discretion of those who were married. But it is said, Eusebius is silent upon this matter. That is true. He is silent also, upon many other matters which transpired at this council. He says not one word about the term *consubstantial*. But are we to conclude from that omission, that the subject of the error of Arius was not discussed at that Council? But Socrates is not unsupported. Sozomen (*Hist. Eccl. l. i. c. 23.*) attests the same fact. Gelasius of Cyzicus (*ch. 33*) represents the Egyptian bishop as having said, "That the separation of husband and wife is too great an exposure of chastity, that marriage, in his opinion, was itself an excellent continence,—that it is not proper to separate those whom God has united, nor oblige a priest to send away her whom he hath espoused, while he was a porter, reader or layman." (*Waddington's Eccl. Hist. p. 210, c. 13.*)

XXXII. Polycarp, who is supposed to have been a disciple of John, mentions, in one of his epistles, the marriage of a priest, named Valens—Also, the marriage of a deacon. Eusebius (*Hist. Eccl. l. viii. c. 9.*) mentions the martyrdom of Phileas a bishop, who, it would seem from his language, was married and had children. He also, in another place, says the same of Cheremon, also an Egyptian bishop. (*see also, Fleury, ad annum 303.*) The father of Gregory Nazancenus, was a bishop. Athanasius in one of his epistles says, "we have known monks great eaters, and bishops great fasters—we have seen monks who drank wine, and bishops who did not drink it. Many bishops have never been married, and there have been monks who have had children. Finally, in whatever condition a man may be, he may practice such abstinence as he pleases." Augustine (*de Haeres,*) writing of certain heretics says, "They did not receive into their communion, those who, like many monks and clerks in the Catholic Church, lived with their wives, or possessed any thing of their own." *In suam communionem non recipiunt utentes conjugibus et res proprias possidentes quales habet Catholica ecclesia monachos et clericos quamplurimos.* Pass-

ages of this nature might be accumulated, yet history has transmitted very little of the domestic relations of early times. Do we know certainly that Herodotus, Plato, Sallust, or Virgil were married? Incidentally we find in history remarks, which prove that individuals were married and had families, though we have no direct account of it. Take, for example, the bishops of the Anglical church from the time of Henry VIII. If we had nothing but their theological and controversial writings, not connected with this subject, we could scarcely prove the marriage of one in twenty of them. We ought then to be satisfied with incidental proofs, if we had no other.

XXXIII. The creeds of heretics, have, in all ages, exerted an influence upon the creed and conduct of the orthodox. Sometimes the orthodox, to avoid reproach, have approximated by degrees to the usages of the heretics, and sometimes, to shew their abhorrence, have gone to the opposite extreme. Scarcely was the church established, before it was infested by dissensions. The epistles of the apostles prove this—St. Paul took great pains to forewarn the Christians of his time, not only by predicting heresies, but by describing before hand, their chief characteristics.—These were extreme rigour, austerity, the interdiction of marriage and of meats, 1 Tim. 4.—And such in fact, were the practices of the first heretics.

If we except the Ebionites, the larger number of the early sects were in fact, formed upon systems of philosophy, which were contrived to explain the origin of evil. Such was the system of Simon, of Menander, of Basilides, and of all the sects known by the name of *Gnostics*. Their dogmas were drawn from the darkness of metaphysics. These heretics, however, honoured marriage on account of its utility. But other heretics, who imagined the residence of the soul in the body, to be a punishment for sins committed in a previous state of being, took different views of marriage.

Such were the Platoniciens, Tatien, and the Encratites, and the celebrated Origen who believed that the coats of skin, spoken of in Gen. iii 21, were only an allegory to express their enveloping of souls in matter. Those who thus regarded the body made it a duty to torment it.—The most painful austerities were deemed meritorious. Marriage was, in their view, the means of preparing new prisons for souls, and of perpetrating their captivity. Tatien condemned it absolutely. Hence the name *Encratites*, or the *Continent*, is given to his sect. (*Newton on the Prophecies, Dessert, 23, No. viii.*) Perhaps, however, he did not forbid marriage to all his followers, but in imitation of other heretics, confined this prohibition to ecclesiastics. The celibacy of a few might be a sufficient decoration for the whole sect. Origen was in some measure, restrained by the authority of the church, but his views tended to the same results. He exaggerated the dangers of marriage,—declaimed against the weakness of those who contracted it,—lavished extravagant praise upon virginity, and appealed even to the vanity of Christians to engage them in vows of celibacy. The influence of Origen on his own age, and several which followed, was immense. In vain were

his errors proscribed. Compare Jerome with Origen on this point, and Jerome will be found more extravagant than Origen.—Other heretics ascribed the origin of evil to matter, or to a principle in matter which they supposed to be eternally at war with the divinity. Man thus coming from two sources, he must choose which he will serve. The principles of this sect led to opposite practical results. Some of them became penitents, others libertines; the Nicolaitans, the Carpocratians, Adamites, and some others, dishonoured their bodies with the most infamous debauches, while others tormented themselves with austerities. The latter, was the most numerous class, inasmuch as the fear of the civil magistrate operated in restraint of the former. The Carpocratians, and the kindred sects, were soon extinct, but not so with the others. Saturninus, who was nearly cotemporary with the apostles, founded the first of these sects. Marcion followed him soon. The Marcionites figured about two hundred years, not however, altogether by new recruits; which proves that marriage was not forbidden to all of them. Besides, the Manicheans, who derived the greater part of their doctrines and morals from the Marcionites, did not absolutely forbid marriage to all.—(*Augustin, Ep. 31, ad Deut. Faustus ap. Aug. l. xxx. 3.*)

All these heretics were at first condemned by the church, but we find, nevertheless, that most of the fathers of the fourth and fifth centuries hold similar language with these heretics. It would have been well, if the matter had stopped where these heretics stopped. But it did not. Zeal for virginity, at length made use of violence and seduction, and inculcated disobedience to parents, in order to make proselytes. (*Fleury, Hist. Eccl. an. 338, St. Ambrose de Virgin, lib. iii.*)

XXXIV. But it will be said, that the heretics condemned marriage as an evil in itself, whereas the Roman Catholics honour it. No distinction of this sort can be shown. These heretics did not regard it an evil, except relatively,—that is, as a state less perfect than virginity,—as a state of weakness and imperfection—as a necessary remedy or medicine for sick persons, but which the whole and perfect could dispense with. Now this is precisely the doctrine of the fathers, (so called) since the fourth century. But why then, were these heretics condemned by the church? Because when the Marcionites and Manicheans arose, the church had not adopted those severe rules. Afterwards the church did, in fact, adopt them; forgetting, perhaps, to whom she was indebted for her new practices, and also her own censures, or perhaps yielding advisedly, through motives of policy, to the force of public opinion. Previously, the church had rightly judged, that the forbidding of marriage to any class of persons, was in truth, regarding it as an evil. When this change took place, a distinction was attempted, by which the clergy pretended to reconcile the respect which our Saviour, and his apostles always showed to marriage, with the necessity of continence—a necessity, however, which our Saviour and his apostles did not think proper to impose,—as if it was not doing dishonour to marriage, to class it with the *weaknesses* of human nature, and on that ground, forbidding it to those who *would be esteemed perfect*.

Here then, the practices of the Catholics and of the heretics whom they had condemned met, as Faustus, (*Ap. Augus. l. xxx. 3.*) asserts.—Augustine had reproached him, with condemning marriage, which Paul calls the doctrine of devils. The heretic replied: "Tell me, does the doctrine of devils consist in persuading to virginity, or only in forbidding marriage? If, in the latter, our doctrine is not the doctrine of devils, for our doctrine then, would be as much of folly in wishing to prevent any one from marrying, who wishes to marry, as theirs would be; of crime and impiety in constraining a person to marry who would not. But if to favour the intentions of them who wish to remain virgins, or not to oppose them, is a doctrine of devils, you yourselves, are the bishops of devils, for you do not cease to use all your efforts to persuade virgins to preserve their virginity, so that even now, you have as many, if not more virgins in your church, than married women. If you say you use only persuasion, without forbidding any to marry, I answer, *we do no more*; for what folly it would be, for individuals to wish to prevent any one from marrying, which the public laws allow. Therefore it is, we only exhort those who wish to remain virgins, without constraining those who do not wish to remain virgins."

XXXV. In connexion with these heresies must be mentioned another sect, which differed from the Catholics only in discipline. The Montanists, at first agreed with the Catholics, in all points of doctrine, but they were condemned for differing in morals. They proscribed second marriages as adulterous—forbade flight in times of persecution—instituted new fasts and new xerophagies. The vehemence of those disputes may be discovered from Tertullian. But we do not find celibacy among their austerities. Besides Tertullian was undoubtedly married, and he was not reproached with this weakness upon his becoming a Montanist. Some say that until the time of the Montanists, the clergy were allowed to contract second marriages, but such having been decided by the Montanists as adulterous, the Catholics made it a point of honour to forbid them. Others, however, interpret the words of St. Paul, so as to allow only one marriage to the clergy. Doubtless, however, this sect exerted an influence upon the Catholics. The Montanists, after being sustained for a time, by the eloquence and talents of Tertullian, fell into disrepute when they lost this defender.

XXXVI. It should be constantly borne in mind, that the early Christian writers declaimed with great vehemence against involuntary celibacy and abstinence from meats: among the writers referred to, are Ignatius, Justin, Clement of Alexandria, Ireneus, and almost all others cotemporary with them. Why did the discipline of the church change so suddenly? If the reader, after a perusal of the Christian writers of the first age, should pass immediately to those of the end of the 5th and 6th century, he would think he had come to a new religion—a new system of morals;—so different are the precepts of the two periods, upon this and upon many other points. He would think so great a change in the same religion incredible, but upon an examination of the causes which were in operation during the intermediate space, his difficulties would be removed. We must not suppose that because we see certain

things established, that they have always subsisted. The Roman Catholic Church, by its collision with heresies—human passions—political institutions, &c. &c. has constantly received new modifications—In the tract of time it became disfigured, and at length terminated in many respects in the very opposite of primitive Christianity, just as a cube may by constant agitation in a stream, by degrees lose its angles, and be at length converted into a sphere.—But to return to our subject:—We have seen that celibacy was recommended by Paul, merely in consequence of the persecuted condition of the church in its time—We have seen that the first examples of celibacy which occurred after the times of persecution had ceased, were among those whom the church deemed heretics. Yet for a long time, celibacy was not forced upon any, but encouraged only as being a state of greater purity and perfection. We may add, that for a long time, the vow, or engagement of celibacy was not irrevocable. This was the state of things, during the first three centuries, interrupted, however, occasionally by an indiscreet and over-heated zeal. Persecution did not cease till the reign of Constantine, and there was, until then, occasion for the exercise of the discretion commended by St. Paul. But as the church descended from this period she lost sight of the motive for the practice. Habit consecrated as a virtue, that which was indifferent in itself. When virginity came to be ranked with the virtues, it may be easily supposed it became the topic of sermons. It was a thing, the practice of which could not be concealed. The bishops of course could convert it to their own honour. Hence there arose emulation among the churches, which should have the greatest number of virgins. The bishops made the first experiment of their authority upon the weaker sex. St. Augustine in his letter to Armentarius—asks why this sex, which is the most timid, showed the most courage in making the painful sacrifice. He forgot to give the answer, but he might have found it in the very timidity and weakness to which he referred.

XXXVII. When Paul advised celibacy on account of existing distress, he did not pretend to make a distinct order of persons. When he refers to deaconesses, he requires that they shall be selected from among the widows who were not less than sixty years of age. His motive is obvious. But the bishops afterwards, though they relied upon his authority, forgot to imitate his conduct. They preferred to have virgins. The churches, as has been intimated, vied with each other in the number of their virgins—in their ceremonies of giving the veil, or other ceremonies connected with it. These virgins at first were not bound by any vow, but the honour connected with virginity was a sort of chain, and the shame of leaving the state was as strong a security as a real vow. It appears by Tertullian (*de veland virgin*) and Cyprian (*de habit. virg.*) that they persevered, notwithstanding great irregularities, and held fast to their title, often when they were most unworthy of it.

XXXVIII. In short, the ties grew continually more strict. In Cyprian's time vows of virginity were already established, or if not, there was a sort of consecration which took the place of them, and some even then, contended that the engagement was irrevocable,

although Cyprian did not think so, as it appears in the case of a virgin who was the occasion of a great scandal. (*See Ep. 72, Edit. of Baluz.*) Cyprian being consulted in that case, and knowing from other sources how common these scandals were, answered, that virgins after their consecration were free to marry if their temperament was such as to show the indiscretion of their vow, and to deprive them of the power or the will to persevere. *Quod si ex fide se Christo dicaverint pudicae et castae sine ulla fabula perseverent et ita fortes et stabiles præmium virginitatis expectent : si autem perseverasse nolunt vel non possunt, melius est ut nubant, quam in ignem, suis delitiis, codant.* In another work, after praising virginity, he adds, *non hoc jubet Dominus, sed hortatur, nec jugum necessitatis imponit quando maneat voluntalis liberum arbitrium.* It appears by Epiphanius, that this liberty subsisted a century afterwards, as he says that it is better for a virgin to break her vow than to be guilty of impudicity. (*Haeres. 71.*) It is true, he gives as the reason, that it is better to have but one sin than many, and he prescribed a long penance to such. But Cyprian spoke neither of sin nor penance, and this is one of the many instances which show that each successive doctor gloried in adding something to the requirements of his predecessors. We observe this gradation in the celibacy of the ecclesiastics. Origen, who first spoke of it, was content to say, merely, that celibacy was preferable to marriage. Eusebius adds, that celibacy only, is suitable for priests. But the fathers of the fourth and fifth centuries did not hesitate to impose it as obligatory.

XXXIX. During the first three centuries these virgins did not live in communities separate from the other faithful, but in their families, and without any mark which distinguished them in public. They took part in the affairs and pleasures of the world. Cyprian, in a work already cited, reproaches them for adorning their persons, and declares against the ornaments of luxury then in fashion. This proves that they made use of them. *Non inficiantur auribus vulnera nec brachia includat aut colla de armillis et monilibus Catena pretiosa sint a compedibus aureis pedes liberi crines nullo colore fucati.* He blames them for appearing at weddings, and also for appearing at the public baths with men. The saint, as well he might, declaims with much warmth against the indecency and danger of this last practice. *Quid vero quæ promiscuas balneas adeunt quæ oculis ad libidinem curiosis pudori ac pudicitiae, corpora dicta prostituunt; quæ cum viros atque viris nuda vident turpiter ac videntur, nonne ipsæ vitiis illecebram praestant?* (*De Hab. Virgin.*) We may well be astonished that Christian females should be seen in such places, and might easily conclude, that the practice would diminish the number of virgins, as Cyprian asserts it did. *Sic ergo frequenter Ecclesia virgines suas plangit.* Clement, of Alexandria, proves that the same practice prevailed in Egypt, in his time. (*Paedog. l. iii. p. 232.*) From all which, it is evident, that continence only without seclusion, was required of virgins at that time, and that they might marry if they found it necessary. But the honours given to virgins by the churches, and the consideration attached to the condition of virginity, and the more abundant alms which they received, were only so many means of multiplying them. Jerome in his letter to Eustoch-

ia, says, that she was the first among the Roman virgins, distinguished by birth or wealth, who had consecrated herself to God by the vow of virginity.

XL. In proportion to the increase of virgins in the churches, was the increase of celibacy among ecclesiastics. Every body knows the influence of example. The love of honour and distinction is deeply rooted in the human soul, and it has power to compel the endurance of almost any privation, especially when the pleasures renounced, are accessible from another quarter. Upon this principle, celibacy extended, and emulation between the sexes, had a powerful influence.

There is no doubt, that as early as the third century, the major part of the clergy had embraced celibacy. Conformity of life naturally brought the unmarried clergy and the virgins into habits of intimacy, from the motive of mutual encouragement to perseverance in the sacrifice they had made, and this very thing served to soften very efficaciously the rigours of their professed condition. For under pretext of having renounced the pleasures of sense, and that there could be none but spiritual ties between them, they allowed themselves not only to dwell under the same roof—and occupy the same apartments—but sometimes a still more intimate co-habitation, pretending that notwithstanding such familiarities, the chastity of neither could receive any stain, and treating as carnal those who had the weakness to indulge a suspicion that it might be otherwise. Jerome, (*Epist. 21, ad Eustochiam,*) attests these facts. This was the origin of the *Agapetæ* or *sub-introductæ* mentioned by the fathers of the Council of Nice. They forbade expressly, every ecclesiastic to have with them, any of those females which were called *sub-introductæ* unless she were the mother, or a sister, or a paternal aunt of the ecclesiastic; with regard to whom, said they, it would be horrible to think the ministers of the Lord capable of violating the laws of nature *de quibus nominibus nefas est aliud quam natura constituit suspicari*. It is probable, if we may judge from this prohibition and the precautions taken by this Council, to prevent intercourse between the *Agapetæ* and the ecclesiastics, that disorders and scandals had occurred to a considerable extent; and Jerome insinuates perhaps as much, when he asks with a sort of indignation, *unde agapetarum pestis in ecclesia introiit?*

XLI. It is believed that the origin of the *agapetæ* was about the middle of the third century. Certainly they existed in the time of Paul of Samosates, who, according to Eusebius, (*Hist. Eccl. l. VII. c. 30,*) in order, the more effectually to gain his clergy, allowed them improper intimacies, and he himself gave an example of it. It is evident from Cyprian, (*Ep. 72, Ed. Baluz.*) that the *agapetæ* existed in Africa, in his time. So common were they, and so common were the scandals, of which they were the cause or occasion, that a mode of trial by midwives was adopted, in the cases of accused virgins; and this method of trial, was so much in harmony with the manners of the time, that Cyprian was obliged to submit to the adoption of it, notwithstanding his repugnance in the case already referred to. Hence, probably, the origin of the writ *de ventre inspiciendo* of the English law. And in the cen-

ture following, St. Ambrose ordered this method of trial, which was then in common use. (*Ep. ad Syagr.*) Husseric, king of the Vandals, in his persecution of the Consubstantialists, subjected the virgins of the orthodox church to examination by midwives of his own communion; and with such triers, and such a trial, we may easily imagine that few would be found innocent. Chrysostom, after his promotion to the see of Constantinople, wrote two small treatises upon the danger of these societies, but the *agapetæ*, or *sub-introductæ*, carried the clergy of Constantinople against Chrysostom, (*Chrys. in συνεισακτες*) because he wished to compel the ecclesiastics to drive them off. These females resisted, for a long time, the anathemas of Councils—(that of Nice, Ancyra, and the third Council of Arles) which, though able sometimes to dissipate error, had not power to stifle the propensities of nature. They disappeared about the end of the fifth century, to give place, however, to concubines. Thus the boasted perfection of celibacy terminated in a prolific harvest of scandals. Dodwell (*Diss. Cyprianic* 4,) attempts to prove that the intimacy of the *agapetæ* and the unmarried clergy, came from Platonism, and that the object of it was to exhibit the power which they possessed over the passions; but we can find motive enough for it, in that human vanity which seeks to gain honour by sacrifices, against which the force of human passions will compel them to seek out covert means of indemnity. Finally, these abuses of the institution of celibacy contributed very much to extend it by yielding commodious resources against its inconveniencies. The effect was converted into a cause, as happens not unfrequently. A multitude of examples gave courage to the most timid, and when usage (almost universal) had consecrated this mode of alleviation against the rigours of celibacy, the *ce-libitaires* could, without much pain, renounce marriage; since, in truth, it was only a deliverance from its yoke, and not a renunciation of all its pleasures.

“THE BIG BEGGAR MAN.”

*Papism, and Abolitionism.—English Bitterness, and American Subserviency.*

THIS appellation has been given to DANIEL O'CONNELL, by his political opponents in great Britain, and like many other nick-names, it fit so exactly, that it has stuck like a *san benito*. For above twenty years, O'CONNELL, has been in the receipt of a princely revenue, varying from one to two hundred thousand dollars a year, wrung by the most inflammatory and exciting appeals, from the poorest peasantry in Europe. Think of forty thousand sterling a year, dragged out of the starving population of Ireland, in sums varying from a half-penny, to a shilling, at a time!—It presents in the strongest light, an august picture of national devotedness,—sporting with, and abused by the vilest, most selfish, and most detestable individual baseness.—Poor Ireland! Is she doomed forever, to fall into the hands of pitiless enemies, or faithless and unworthy friends?

Our present object in directing attention to the *Big Beggar man*, is to show the nature and extent of his feelings towards this country. The following extract is from the *London Patriot* of Nov 27, 1837. It is part of a speech delivered by O'CONNELL, in Exeter Hall, London, on the 23rd of the same month, at a great public meeting of “Anti-Slavery delegates from all parts of the United Kingdom.” We quote only so much as relates to this country.—

Remember you have only to cast your eyes beyond the American waves, and see what is about to take place there. Behold those pretended sons of freedom, those who declared that all persons were equal in the presence of God, that every man had an inalienable right to liberty—and proclaiming it, too, in the name of God—behold them asseverating it in the name of honour, their paltry honour. (Loud cheers.) They are at this moment organising new slave states. Remember that another country has been committed to slave-holders. They have seized upon the territory of Texas, taking it from the Mexicans, the Mexicans having abolished slavery without apprenticeship. (Loud cheers.) Remember that they have stolen, cheated, swindled, robbed a country, for the horrible purpose of continuing it in slavery. (Hear, hear, and cries of “Shame.”) Remember that there is a treaty now on foot, in contemplation, at least, and only postponed between the President of the United States and these cruel ruffians, till this robbery of Texas from Mexico can be completed. Oh! raise the voice of humanity against these republicans, who have sentiments of pride and feelings of self-exaltation. (Cheers.) Let us tell these republicans, that instead of standing the highest in the scale of humanity, they are the basest of the base, and the vilest of the vile. (Immense cheers, waving of hats, and cries of “Hurrah.”) There is a community of sentiment all over the world, and on the wings of the press, whatever so humble and insignificant an individual as myself addresses to you will be borne across the waves of the Atlantic—it will go up the Missouri, it will be wafted along the banks of the Mississippi, and it will reach the infernal Texas itself. (Immense cheers.) And though that Pandemonium may scream at the sound, yet they shall suffer from the lash of human indignation applied

to their horrible crimes. (Loud cheers.) If they be not arrested in their career of guilt, four new slave-states will flow from it, and from Texas to the Mississippi will be filled with slaves. (Cheers.) O hideous breeders of human beings for slavery! (Cheers.) Such are the horrors of that system in the American States, that it is impossible in this presence to describe them, and it almost pollutes the mind to think of them. Should the measures now contemplated by the Americans be accomplished, these horrors will be increased fourfold. Every commandment of the living God is to be trampled under foot by Mammon, and the human soul is to be degraded worse than the degradation of the human body. (Cheers.) Expect nothing from their generosity. I cannot restrain myself. (Cheers.) It was only the other day that I read a letter from Philadelphia, in the *Morning Chronicle*, in which this scene is described:—A red man, who has got the name of Powell, whose Indian name I forget—(A voice, "Ocola")—had carried on a war, at the head of the Seminole Indians, against Florida. He had behaved with great boldness and bravery, fought for his country, and would have been one of those persons deified as a hero, had he fought in a civilised nation, and testimonials would have been reared to commemorate his deeds, equal to those which have been raised to a Napoleon or a Wellington—but what happens to this warrior? The Americans had been in treaty with him, they invited him to a conference, they promised him protection. Thus confiding in their honour is he allowed to return? Oh, no! the slave-owner is himself but a slave still. He is not allowed to return—he is carried back a prisoner, notwithstanding the promises of protection. (Cries of "Shame, shame.") Oh, cry out shame, and let the cry be heard across the waves of the mighty ocean! We are the teachers of humanity, the friends of humanity. What does it signify to us that the crime is not committed on British soil? Wherever it is committed, we are its execrators. (Cheers.) The American, it is true, boasts that he was the first to abolish the slave trade carried on in foreign vessels. He was. But what was the consequence? The man who abolished it, made his slaves at home of more value to him, when he had stopped the supply from abroad. (Cheers.) It was a swindling humanity—it was worse than our 20 millions scheme—it had the guise of humanity, but had in reality the spirit of avarice and oppression. (Applause.) Perhaps I ought to apologise. (Cries of "No, no; go on.") Oh no! where is the human being who does not belong to us? We are all children of the same Creator, heirs of the same promise, purchased by the blood of the same Redeemer, and what signifies it what their caste or colour or creed may be? It is our duty to embrace their cause as the cause of humanity, and while we insist upon doing away, to the best of our ability, the stain of slavery from our own possessions, our humanity extends beyond the confines of the mighty empire of Britain, and visits the huts of Africa, and amidst the swamps of Texas proclaims to the man panting for liberty that if we have not power to remove his bondage, yet he has friends and supporters among the British nation. (Loud cheers.) I thank you for having permitted this appeal, but I thank you more for having joined in it. (Renewed cheers.) Yours is not a selfish humanity, confined to any climate. You join with me, and I trust that the period will come when, if America does not redress the wrongs done to her slaves, no civilised man will feel himself justified in associating in private life with an American. (Cheers.) You would not keep company with a pick-pocket or a swindler, a murderer or a robber. (Laughter and loud applause.) And what signifies it to me whether they have murdered and robbed and swindled wholesale an entire people, a young and rising generation, or in any other manner.—(Cheers.)

This veracious and gentlemanly tirade, was delivered from a platform usually consecrated to religious and benevolent exercises and efforts; and from the midst of an array of members of Parliament,—Baronets, Doctors of Divinity (*all doctored, though unhappily not cured, on this side of the Atlantic*)—and a strong corps of the squirearchy of England,—of whom near a hundred are told by rote as a caption to the account of the meeting.

The decided favour with which these vulgar falsehoods concerning us were received, by the magnates on the platform, and the "*British audience*" in the hall—goes farther than any testimony we could personally bring, to establish the truth so little considered in this country, namely, that a deep-rooted and rancorous hatred of America and Americans, pervades the entire mass of the English nation;—mark us, of the *English* nation;—we do not say of the better and more enlightened portions of the Scotch and Irish. There is a party in the eastern section of the United States, whose sentiments, feelings, and opinions, are the mere reflections of this audacious spirit of English society—just enough modified to take off the foreign gloss. Nay there are *parties*—not one, but several. For there is one that sympathises so thoroughly with the tory and high church pretensions of Anglicanism—as to make its members forget often-times, that they pretend to be Americans and republicans, and cause them to prate about "the church," and "*dissent*" as glibly as if they already held tythes, church rates, and pluralities "as by law established."—And there is a second whose whole heart is so engrossed in Englishism, no matter what or how distilled,—whether theatrical with Miss Kemble—or warlike with Capt. Basil Hall, or infidel with Miss (?) Fanny Wright—or man-womanish with Mrs. Trollop—or merely twaddling with Dr. Cox, D. D! L. L. D!!—or abolitionist with George Thompson—or *speculative* (at three shillings per head per night) with Mr. B.—M. P;—all else is immaterial, so that *English*, be the basis of the gruel, it is swallowed more copiously than Dr. Sangrado's patient's gulped hot water.—We pray all these worthies—not to be choaked with the present dose; remembering it is *rare* English—and that they have swallowed the same before. We beseech our "O'Connell guards"—and "O'Connell blues"—and all that crew of patriots—to take courage and open their mouths wide. Patriotism is a small affair; national honour and pride are mere figments; and as men owe little to their native land—that little is well nigh nothing in the case of an *adopted* country.—But above all, we say to the country—remember O'Connell is a bigoted papist; remember he is the organ in Britain of the papal monarchy; remember he is the mouth-piece of the British papists; remember there are TWO HUNDRED THOUSAND foreign papists now dispersed throughout the United States who are capable of bearing arms, and who are absolutely subject to the foreign priesthood scattered amongst them, and all holding commissions from a foreign potentate, and making periodical reports, as spies to him, of our condition; and then remember, that the whole papal priesthood in this country, has preserved the silence of death, on the whole abolition question! Remember these things; for verily there is a day of reckoning to come.

It would be well, if it were within our present design, to direct the reader's attention to the braggart boastings, of what England has done and must do; and to the temper with which the crowd received these disgusting ebullitions of national vanity. Let Americans learn from this how to believe what England says, respectively of herself and others. Let her learn to appreciate herself. Let her recollect that England treats all the world on the same principles, here exhibited and rapturously applauded, as regards us—and let her do justice to other people, underrated through a too easy credulity of such Billingsgate. Let her place the opinions and the influence, moral and literary, of such a people where they deserve to be placed—that is, the very lowest of all in the scale, and by an enlightened public sentiment, frown down the American toad-eaters who regulate themselves after such a model.

We fear it will hardly appear credible, if we assert that on the very occasion and platform from which the foregoing extract was bellowed forth, against us, and in praise of England, the most conclusive proof was furnished that a state of things far more horrible than ever did or ever could exist in any part of the United States—at that very moment existed, yea had been created, in immense portions of the British Empire, by the policy of the government and the direct force of positive law. Proof for example that in many of the British possessions, slaves confined in jail, were well nigh starved; that females were whipped to death—and false verdicts sworn to; that slaves when regularly at work, were often put on half allowance of food; that cruel, novel, and frightful punishments were inflicted publicly on the aged and the sick; that in every conceivable way, those called apprentices, (and of whose *liberation* such lofty talk has gone out through all the abolition press of this country,) were cheated, deceived, defrauded, oppressed, starved, beaten, and killed out-right. Yet to all these points the proof was complete—at the very moment when the unblushing insolence we have quoted was uttered by O'Connell. Upon the single subject of the flogging--by law observe, of these unhappy *freemen*, *liberated* (!) in the British West Indies we take the following table, from a speech of MR. BOWLEY, of Gloucester, made a little while before O'Connell's.

“CORPORAL PUNISHMENTS WHICH CAN BE INFLICTED ON APPRENTICED LABOURERS UNDER THE EXISTING LAW IN THE ISLAND OF JAMAICA.

	Lashes.
Absence for two days in a fortnight - - - - -	20
Refusing or neglecting labour - - - - -	20
Wilful negligence—damaging property - - - - -	20
Drunkenness—first offence - - - - -	20
Frivolous complaints - - - - -	20
Absence for three successive days - - - - -	30
Wandering beyond plantation without leave - - - - -	30
Absence for one week - - - - -	39
Insolence - - - - -	39
Keeping fire arms, gunpowder, &c, - - - - -	39
Insubordination - - - - -	39

Drunkenness, second offence in the same month. . . . .	40
Endangering property by careless use of fire . . . . .	50
Ill using of cattle . . . . .	50
Injuring property . . . . .	50
Destroying property . . . . .	50
Combined resistance . . . . .	50
Riotous assemblage . . . . .	50
Attempting to quit the island . . . . .	50
Indolence . . . . .	50
Neglect of work . . . . .	50
Improper performance of work . . . . .	50
Assisting apprentice to quit the island . . . . .	50
Establishing a distinct community . . . . .	50
For inferior misdemeanours, whether against employers or any other persons . . . . .	50

Under the slavery law there was no domestic offence punishable with more than thirty nine lashes, but under the apprenticeship system here is a list of thirteen distinct offences punishable by fifty lashes.

Let no one imagine that this ample catalogue of offences slept in humane forgetfulness—in the hands of those who had already received *twenty millions* sterling—(equal to about *one hundred millions of dollars*)—in lieu of all the rights of property in their slaves; who were thenceforth—as our abolitionists assert, *freemen*. Alas! for such freedom! For says "Big Beggar Man" in the very speech already quoted from;

I have had a melancholy account of the number who have been punished and flogged under the new system. In Jamaica, there are two hundred and sixty thousand of these persons now called apprentices—it is a wrong word, better call them slaves at once—it is a shorter word, it saves time, and it has another recommendation, it is more accurate. How many of these have been punished under the law of liberty? Upwards of thirty-five thousand males, and upwards of twenty-two thousand females—(Hear, hear)—making a total of fifty-eight thousand, four hundred and seventeen, being one out of every five. (Hear, hear.) And that in what period? In twenty-two months. No less than two hundred and forty two thousand, three hundred and eleven lashes were bestowed under this system of freedom.

In point of law and of plain common sense, the females under the apprenticeship system could not be flogged because white persons could not be flogged under the apprenticeship law; and it was only left open to flog apprentices for the same crimes that white persons might commit. They were intended to be put upon the same footing. True, the females are not ordered to be flogged—they are sent to the treadmill, but there is a man who flogs them there if they do not *dance*, as they call it, according to his pleasure. The poor creatures there receive the most brutal treatment. There is only one case with which I will trouble you. A letter has been received from a Baptist missionary at Falmouth, which states that a respectable female, one of the members of his communion, was sent to the workhouse for two weeks—for what do you think? for taking Morison's pills. (Laughter and cheers.) Really it seems ludicrous. The committal is dated in the present year, and was issued by Special Justice Price. It was written upon it, "For rejecting medicine, and taking nostrums." There was endorsed upon the committal, "Very insubordinate." For ta-

king Morison's pills she was to be put upon the treadmill twenty minutes daily for a fortnight. There is no man in this country brutal enough to place any female upon the treadmill—(Cheers)—it is a punishment reserved for ruffians of the male sex. In Jamaica it seems that an unfortunate woman, for imagining that she could be cured by a quack medicine—an imagination which is entertained by many respectable people in this country—is sent for a fortnight to the work house, to be put on the treadmill twenty minutes daily. (Hear, hear, hear.)

We know not how we could more appropriately conclude this article,—or how convey to our readers more vividly a picture of the recklessness, turgiversation, and moral worthlessness of this prince of ruffians and blackguards—than by laying before them the following brief synopsis of O'Connell against O'Connell. It is taken from the *London Record*, of December 7, 1837, where it is credited to *Frazer's Magazine*.

## O'CONNELL HOT.

"Lord Brougham is the pride of England."—*Speech in Dublin, Dec., 1830.*

"My excellent friend, Mr. Raphael."—*Address to the Electors of Carlow, 1835.*

"Mr. Guinness is a liberal Protestant of high character and respectability."—*Mr. O'Connell's Speech concerning the Dublin election of 1832.*

"The consistent and liberal Earl Grey."—*June, 1830.*

"Sir Charles Coote, one of the best men and landlords in Ireland."—*Mr. O'Connell, at the Catholic Association, 1825.*

"I enclose you the ballot of this morning. Nothing can be better. Yours, &c., DAN. O'CONNELL."—*Letter to Raphael, June 18, 1835.*

"Honest Jack Lawless."—*Speeches up to 1832 passim.*

"The straight forward Marquis of Downshire."—*Speech at the Catholic Association, Jan. 1829.*

"A former Duke of York, the legitimate King of England, was dethroned by the English Whigs, although he could only be charged with the crime of proclaiming perfect liberty of conscience."—*Speech, Nov., 1826, at Dublin.*

## O'CONNELL COLD.

"Buggaboo Brougham."—*Letter, dated Aug. 24, 1832.*

"The most incomprehensible of all imaginable vagabonds, Alexander Raphael."—*Letter to the Electors of Carlow, Nov., 1835.*

"Do not drink his beer."—*August, 1837.*

"There is another and a greater enemy to Ireland, Earl Grey."—*Letter, August 24, 1832.*

"It is cruel that Queen's County should be represented by that petty curmudgeon, Sir Charles Coote."—*Speech at Stradbally, Jan., 1836.*

"My opinion, from the moment the ballot was struck, was, that it was hopeless to contest the matter further."—*Letter to the Electors of Carlow, Nov., 1835.*

"Jack is in the dirt now."—*Speech, Jan. 2, 1832.*

"He (Mr. Lawless) has made an attempt to get out of a situation into which he had got by his foul delinquency."—*lb.*

"Downshire, famous at all times for gross duplicity."—*Aug. 25, 1834.*

"The Restoration came next, and the son of him they had beheaded was guilty of most abominable treachery; so they made him abdicate."—*Speech in Manchester, in 1835, against the House of Lords.*

"Mr. Mahony is up for Kinsale ; it could not have a better representative."—*Speech of National Association, June, 1837.*

"We never can be too grateful to Sir Francis Burdett, for the manner in which he introduced our Bill, and for the unwearied exertions he has made, and is making, in our cause."—*Letter, March 7, 1825.*

"The Roman Catholics are to my certain knowledge, as much attached to the connexion between Great Britain and Ireland as the Protestant can be."—*Evidence of Mr. O'Connell, before a Committee of the House of Commons, 1825.*

"A better family than the Kenmares does not exist, and it possesses a high claim to the praise of Kerry."—*Oct. 6, 1834.*

"He (Mr. O'Connell) was happy to say, that Mr. Lamb and the Duke of Devonshire would be opposed in Dungannon, by a gentleman who had given, in 1826, the most powerful aid in freeing Waterford from the Beresfords. The gentleman he alluded to was Mr. John Mathew Galway.

\* \* \* \* \*  
He (Mr. O'Connell) took credit to himself for inducing such a man as Mr. Galway to come forward."—*O'Connell's Speech, Dec. 2, 1832.*

"The noble and high-spirited Lord Londonderry."—*Jan., 1829.*

"The independent electors of Kerry."—*Speeches passim.*

Lord Anglesea is Ireland's friend."—*Speech at the Catholic Association, Nov., 1828.*

"The bone-grubber Cobbett ;" "the venal Cobbett."—*Speeches during 1825.*

"He (Mr. O'Connell) had no hesitation in saying, that, instead of being Ireland's pride, Limerick would be her shame, if she returned Don Pomposo Mahony. *December 3, 1832.*

"The prince of jobbers is among you ; avoid jobbers."—*Aug. 10, 1832.*

"That dotard, Burdett ;" "that old madman, Burdett," &c., &c.—*Speeches in 1837.*

"Burdett is a sort of incarnation of the impenitent thief upon the cross."—*Speech at Stockport, Nov. 13, 1837.*

"The impenitent thief died in his impiety, as Burdett has done."—*Ib.*

"He is a specimen, the Tories say, of a fine old English gentleman. They are right, quite right—for the prince of darkness was a gentleman."

"Hurrah for Repeal ! Wild Irish cry."—*Motto of O'Connell, Letter to Lord Duncannon, 1834.*

"The tyrannical Kenmares."—*Nov., 1834.*

"What a Luttrell that Galway is ! Don't mind such traitors as John Mathew Galway !"—*Speech in August, 1834.*

"The frantic Lord Londonderry."—*Jan. 22, 1836.*

"If any man vote for the Orange Knight of Kerry, let a death's head and cross-bones be placed over his door," &c.—*Speech at Tralee, during the election of 1834.*

"Anglesea's a Welshman ;" "tengun brig Anglesea ;" "Algerine Anglesea," &c., &c.—*Speeches passim during 1831 and 1832.*

"My excellent friend, Mr. Cobbett."—*Speech at the O'Connell dinner to Cobbett, in 1834.*

## THE BALTIMORE DISCUSSION ON UNIVERSALISM.

It has been our purpose to give our readers a slight sketch of the conference which took place in this city in the month of April, between the Senior Editor of this Magazine, and a Mr. EVERETT—on the doctrine of universal salvation; and we have waited until now, only under a kind of impression, that it would be best to see the end of the affair before we gave its history. This seems farther off every day, than the day before;—resembling in this, the hopes founded on the dogma we were called on to confute—and which are only more certain to perish—as the time of their completion appears to draw nigher. We will, therefore, without further delay—perform the duty which seems to devolve on us; and which appears to be the more necessary, as the Universalists of the city have issued a weekly newspaper, since the conference closed—whose chief object seems to be, to undo as far as possible, by every sort of mis-statement, as to its origin, progress, and effects, the evils which that discussion did their dreadful cause.

We had the misfortune to be placed in circumstances which hardly allowed us a choice of alternatives. The Universalists of Baltimore, for a number of years past, have been seeking controversy with all the Christians around them; urging, intruding, and boasting about the community, like an ill-mannered cur upon a village green. Their Berean Society, their discussion with Mr. McKee, their ill-mannered attack on the Methodist brethren on various occasions—and their repeated assaults through their newspapers, and finally their written controversy with Mr. Breckinridge, about two years ago, are in the recollection of many persons.—Whether it was, that other ministers considered them already sufficiently exposed—or unworthy of notice;—or whether some considered themselves above such work as Paul and Luther, never declined—and Christ often performed,—we perhaps are not obliged to decide. So it was, they seemed determined to be soundly drubbed—and as no one else could be persuaded to do it—they fastened their affections on us to such a degree—that nothing short of a castigation ample and thorough would satisfy their desires. Such we sincerely believe—they are now convinced they have got; and we hope they will let our brethren rest in peace hereafter.

We have before us, nearly a dozen and a half of documents to which the conference gave rise;—possibly at some future day, it may be necessary to publish them. At present, it need only be said, that after a good deal of trouble, and several sharp passes, and some narrow chances of missing—and not a few symptoms that practical Universalism, is the legitimate offspring of its theories—the terms were finally arranged, the thesis fixed, and the debate commenced.

In brief, the matter stood thus. Mr. EVERETT undertook to prove in terms that *“the Scriptures of the New and Old Testaments teach, that no punishment will be inflicted, after the death of the body,*

on any human being, for sins committed in this life." His own church was, at his suggestion and on the proffer of its board of trustees, agreed on as the place of meeting. Eleven hundred persons were to be admitted; and they by tickets, sold from day to day, by booksellers and others. And the proceeds of the sale of these tickets, were, after defraying the *expenses* of the conference, to be appropriated to publishing the debate, if a stenographer could be got, (*Mr. Everett undertook to procure one, if possible—and failed!!*)—or otherwise, to such objects of charity as should be *jointly* agreed on after the business was closed. The conference was agreed to last for two hours every night; each speaker to hold forth one hour—divided into two addresses, of which the first should be forty five minutes, and the second, by way of reply, fifteen minutes long.—Each party was to be the exclusive judge of the propriety and relevancy of his own remarks—and neither be interrupted on any pretext, or by any person whatsoever. Three moderators presided, Mr. THOMAS KELSO, an Episcopal Methodist selected by us; Mr. SKINNER, a Universalist, chosen by Mr. Everett; and Col. STEUART, a Protestant Methodist, agreed on by the other two. The only matter insisted by Mr. Everett in regard to them, was that one of them should be a Universalist; while we were as positive that neither of them should be a Presbyterian. Mr. Everett claimed the right to make the first speech every night, which gave him the double advantage of a whole day to prepare his reply to us—and a good cover for his inability to do so promptly. His demand, like most others made by him, was, however, granted.

The principal matter that could not be adjusted, was the duration of the conference; in regard to which Mr. Everett insisted that it should last as long as he pleased! And when pressed to define the time—said he supposed *a year would not be too long!* Those who heard the discussion, supposed he made this demand, not from the greatness of his stores, but from the greatness of the difficulty in getting at them. For when towards the close of the conference he declared that he had above eighty arguments and proofs, not yet touched,—the universal smile of the audience, showed plainly enough—that they thought he had been far too economical, in his use of so ample a reserved balance. In effect, the debate lasted eight nights; four, namely, from Tuesday to Friday, both inclusive, of two successive weeks.

The excitement which pervaded the community during the progress of this conference was, we may truly say, immense. We have the best reasons for believing that three or four times as many tickets, as were issued, could have been sold every day, at three or four times the price which was agreed to be set on them; and which was indeed merely nominal, as we then supposed, being chiefly intended on the other side, as a means of keeping off idle and improper persons, from the nice new red cushions of the fine church of these unbelievers—and in that view was assented to, by us. The crowd in the church every night was great; and that on the first and last nights almost suffocating. The passages, pulpit steps—and every corner, were occupied from night to night—and the anxiety to get admission, so great—that the house was gen-

erally filled some time before the hour to commence the discussion arrived. We heard of tickets being regularly sold from day to day—on speculation, at second hand, at an advance of eight hundred, and a thousand per cent.;—nay we heard on several occasions, of persons offering three and four dollars, for a single ticket, for a single night.

We are free to confess, that we were thankful to God for so remarkable an opportunity to preach plainly, fully and solemnly the gospel of Jesus Christ our Lord, to such multitudes who, in great part, we fear, have not often availed themselves of the ordinary opportunities of hearing it. But yet we were agitated, and even alarmed by the prodigious interest which the conference excited. For it appeared to us, a manifest token, that the public mind was even more deeply unsettled than we had before supposed it to be, on that momentous doctrine, which formed the subject of conference. And we now record our profound gratitude to God—for the many evidences we have been allowed to enjoy, that by means of that discussion, the views of many have been made clear, who before were in doubt; that the faith of many who did not doubt, has been confirmed; that not a few have been entirely converted from the pest of Universalism; and as we believe that not one single Christian heart or mind, has been shaken, perplexed or troubled. This is the unanimous testimony of the Christians of Baltimore. Let the name of God be abundantly glorified, and all the praise be given to him. Bless the Lord, oh! my soul!

Our brethren will bear with us we trust, in a word of exhortation on this matter. Do any of them know the extent of the Universalist and Restorationist interest in this country? Have they put themselves to the trouble of examining and judging of the state of the public mind on the subject of the future punishment of the wicked? Is it common with them—to preach on the doctrine of "*eternal judgment*"—and on those kindred to it?—Our own conviction is, that the public mind is in a most alarming state, on this whole subject; that the disbelief of the eternal punishment of the enemies of God, is one of the most common forms of infidelity in our day; that most of the other heretics of the day, are strongly in doubt on this cardinal doctrine—and daily inclining farther from the truth, in regard to it; in short, that wicked men, in general, and that Unitarians, Hicksites, Campbellites, &c. &c,—most generally, incline to doubt, if not to favour error on this subject. We have observed the progress of this matter in this city for above five years; and our decided impression is, that the cause of Universalism here, has been eminently promoted by apostates from other churches who had become wearied with even a show of seriousness; and has been also greatly indebted for its rapid increase amongst us, to the unfaithful silence and indifference of the people and ministers of God here. It is indeed, true, that the chief supporters of such a system are to be naturally looked for, and generally found, amongst the most wicked portions of the community; for until the conscience be dead, some religion is demanded—and the more nearly dead the conscience is, the less and the worse religion, will answer its purposes; and after it is dead—the mere name and form

does as well as any. But still we had signal proof, during our recent conflict with these powers of iniquity, that all the kindred heresies of modern growth amongst us, were far more disposed to weep than to rejoice, at the public exposure and refutation—and the general condemnation concentrated against this audacious spiritual corruption.

It does not become us to speak of our part of the controversy. We will simply say, that rejecting all advantages which might have been drawn from the assumption of the whole Restorationist ground—in connection with the whole orthodox belief, which from the nature of the thesis we might easily have gained,—we addressed ourselves, directly and plainly, for four nights to the proof, out of God's word—that he has told us as plainly as it was possible for him to do so, that he intends to punish his enemies, whether men or devils, in hell forever.—We then undertook to show in the other four nights, that the thesis, if true as affirmed,—involved as its issue the subversion of all religion, of all morality, of all virtue, and of the very foundations of the social state; so that in fact the existence of any thing but hell, either here or hereafter, proved the thing, false in its terms. That, moreover, it must be false—seeing it was contrary to the dictates of the human conscience, to the conclusions of reason, to the universal testimony contained in the belief of the whole human race, to the whole consent of the church of God in past ages, to the entire mass of human wisdom, learning and knowledge however addressed to the subject—and to the spirit of the institutions of mankind, always, every where.—This is a sort of ragged syllabus of our argument—for these four nights.—Perhaps one fourth of our time, during the whole discussion, was occupied in replying to the arguments and scriptural expositions of our opponent.

On his part, Mr. Everett, did, we thought, pretty well. That is to say, he did all he could—to keep entirely clear of the subject matter of debate—and to draw us away from it; to blind the matter and darken counsel; to create prejudices against us personally, and against our doctrines, as a Calvinist; to rouse the hatred of other sects against us, and to excite their sympathy for himself: to embitter his own followers against the truth, by personal adulation of them, mixed up with vile caricatures of it: to unsettle every principle of evidence applicable to the discovery of truth in the case; to overthrow the common rules of settled morality; to shake public confidence in the fidelity of the English translation of the Bible; to create doubts as to the possibility of finding out what is really meant by the word of God, and still greater doubts as to what is in fact God's word, and what parts of the canon of scripture are truly inspired, and if so, when they were really written; to bring all helps to scripture knowledge into contempt, by showing that commentators generally either taught in effect Universalism, or else taught nonsense and contradictions; and finally to ridicule and revile every distinctive doctrine of true Christianity, such as saving faith and justification thereby through the imputed righteousness of Christ,—repentance, original sin, the doctrine of the Holy Ghost &c &c.—After this, it is needless to say, that Mr. Everett, is profoundly ignorant of the scriptures, merely as a book—(how else in-

deed should he ever undertake such a thesis?) and that as to any spiritual reception of, or belief in, its precious doctrines of grace,—we presume the suggestion that such was the fact, would be received as an insult.—Our own belief is, that Mr. Everett, is in the worst sense of the word, an Atheist.—

For the rest, he is rather a pleasant speaker than otherwise; with very much of a clerical air—a good deal of the down-east tone and manner: rather above the middle stature, and rather good looking—with a good many gifts of a respectable and forcible public speaker.—His education must have been neglected; and as an expositor of scripture—his furniture, is just nothing: our belief is, that he does not know how to read even the characters of either of the languages, in which the scriptures were first given to man; and such we are sure, is the full conviction of all who witnessed the overwhelming exposures, to which his vanity several times conducted him, during the progress of the debate.

No particular incident marked the progress of the meetings. The moderators presided with dignity and impartiality—and this gave a serious tone, to a matter otherwise sufficiently weighty and solemn. Several times, Mr. Everett transgressed, the bounds of strict etiquette,—and once or twice, there was an obvious impulse to interfere on the part of the presiding moderator. Once or twice there was a slight attempt to hiss us, by a few “lewd fellows of the baser sort.” Gatherings about the doors of ominous looking gentry, after the services were closed, occurred every night,—and “rumors of wars”—meditated against us, often reached our ears. But these are matters—not absolutely strange to us; and knowing, as we did, that Mr. Everett had taken a good deal of pains both in private and from his pulpit, before the debate began, to stir up the passions of his people, and prepare them for a row—which he said he expected—(to create perhaps?)—we were somewhat surprised that things went off so smoothly.—On the whole, the audience was attentive, composed and serious to a remarkable degree; which indeed could not be otherwise—where so large an infusion of our most weighty, and valuable citizens was from night to night, found.—Blessed be God: his hand was in all the matter.

The result of this discussion has left us no other feeling, but that of deep and humble gratitude to God. We entered on it, against the nearly unanimous advice of our most respected and trusted friends, so far as they expressed their minds to us: and the rest were silent, only out of a generous and noble delicacy.—We may almost say with Paul, that at our first answer no man stood with us. But we believe we may add, in perfect modesty and perfect truth, that after the first answer, a great change was wrought in these views of our own friends, and those of our Master generally in this city; and that when the matter closed, the public sentiment was as we have already declared.—This change was first produced by discovering, that on our part at least, the conference was designed to be a simple exposition of the truth as revealed by God, and confirmed by every thing we know or can discover, on the vast subject, of the destiny for eternity, of the souls of the wicked; a plain enforcement of the great duties founded on this truth; a solemn, and

some might fear, a severe, but all admitted a remitted rebuke and exposure, of vile licentiousness; and a candid and earnest appeal to men, to believe, repent and live, in view of the awful interests staked upon the subject thus laid open. And as the conference progressed, the people of God saw and felt, that his truth was mighty, that his hand was with us for good, and that his cause, was about to be signally advanced, even by such a poor and unworthy instrument. We believe few petitions, have been more cordially responded to,—and we are sure we never uttered one, with more sincere desires for acceptance and answer, than that with which, in concluding the whole matter, we chose to appeal rather to God than to man; and when having lodged with our sinful fellow men the message of our Master—we spent the last moments of the conference in a solemn call upon Jehovah of Hosts, to show speedily, mightily and openly, by some signal motion of his providence and grace, what and who, stood on his side;—and to bring fully and perfectly to nought, the part on which stood vanity and lies, and whichever of us twain, were found fighting against him.—

It is our cordial belief, that God has responded, is responding, and will still farther signally respond to this petition.—No one pretends to deny that truth and righteousness, have received a decided impulse, by reason of the events to which we have so often referred;—that the people of God have felt drawn more nearly together thereby: and that the pestiferous heresy, which had so long, boasted itself to be great things amongst us, has been subjected to an ordeal, out of which it has come, with the weight of public contempt and abhorrence, fixed upon it.—But much more than this is true.—Many reasons conspire to cherish the belief and hope, that the whole fabric of Universalism in this city, is ready to tumble to pieces.

It appears that in the “Society”—as they call themselves, there are some who believe with their minister, that there is not even a future state of punishment; while others profess to believe that there is such a state, but that its duration is limited: that is, some are Universalists, and some Restorationists. We are rather inclined to believe, that this distinction and division has been in great part the fruit of the conference; and produced by its exposures. Be that, as it may—we think it not improbable that the Restoration part of the “Society”—will either leave it, as many have already done—or cause the minister who has, they say, grossly and systematically deceived them—to change his quarters. Either event, will be a signal proof of God’s blessing on the truth elicited during the discussion.

The building which the “Society” occupies, was erected as a sort of speculation, partly by various warm lovers of the liberty of licentiousness—and partly by several mechanics who were out of work, and a few men of small means, who were anxious to increase them “in an honest way;” and all these were over-persuaded by Mr. Everett to believe, that a *fine* church, in a *fine* location, of a *fine* city, with such *fine* doctrine, and so incomparably *fine* a preacher, could not fail to draw a *fine* congregation, and result in a *fine* speculation. Under the same delusion, a *fine* discussion was to be got

up—and a *fine* impression produced, and so all their *fine* projects come to a *fine* conclusion.—They dug a pit; and fell into it. They laid a gin, and got caught in it.—At present, the stock of the company is reduced so low, as not to be a marketable commodity. Their debts are great, pressing, unpaid,—and apparently unpayable. Their creditors are losing all confidence in the success of the speculation, and the integrity, veracity, or even solvency, of some of its chief and responsible managers—and our conjecture is, that in a few years the *Methodists*, (who are always ready for every good work in this city)—will purchase, cleanse, and preach the gospel in the place.—Mr. Everett has lately told his “Society” from the pulpit, as we are credibly informed,—as a means of stimulating their exertions, that we had said, we expected the Presbyterians to purchase their building for our black congregation: but our opinion is mis-stated by him,—and is really that recorded above. Time will show.

The conduct of the Board of Trustees and other leading Universalists, headed by Mr. Everett, in attempting to use the funds which by agreement, were to be applied to charitable purposes,—in paying off their own debts: their want of fair dealing, in their attempts to settle this whole business; their false promises to their creditors, founded on this money, which was never theirs;—their strange attempts to conceal the facts, reduce the amount of receipts and swell unconscionably the amount of expenses;—indeed the whole progress of the affair from beginning to end, as a matter of business, has done and is doing them and their cause, as much harm in its place and degree, as the discussion did, as a matter of doctrine. Men begin to see plainly that practical morality, is not to be expected from those who claim exemption from the laws and principles of religion.

Let us particularize a little. If any one wishes to find out, how Mr. Everett and his “Society” get on, in their affairs—let them ask, Mr. Mowton the agent of the gas company, or Samuel Fenby Esqr. of Pratt street, or Mr. Richard J. Cross, or any other of their numerous creditors, not being Universalists.

Or if the reader would know, how civil, honest, candid and upright they are, in settling the ticket account—let him converse with Fielding Lucas Jun,—N. Hickman, or Bayly and Burns, all of whom sold tickets, by their appointment—and all of whom, they had difficulties with, and until now, have refused to settle with, except on terms, entirely inadmissible.—By the way, will Mr. Everett, tell us whether he counts Mr. Bayly amongst the recent additions to his “Society?”

If any one desires to know what the conduct of these worthy persons is, in the estimation of the legal men of the city—let them apply to Mr. TEAKLE, or Mr. LATROBE; the first of whom was the counsellor of the body, and threw up his agency rather than do a dirty and silly office for them; and the latter, as referee, examined and decided the points of the case, for Mr. Lucas, so far as his duty and interests were involved.

But the truth is, the whole affair, in its business aspect, has been one connected series of the most striking illustrations of Universalist doctrine, that could possibly have been imagined or contrived.

—By a written proffer, the “Society”—put their house, through their trustees and pastor, at our disposal, for the conference, “*free of expense* ;” and then charged for its use, wear, and cleaning, nearly six hundred dollars, for eight week-nights’ occupancy.—There was a written agreement that only eleven hundred tickets should be issued ; whereas, we are assured and believe that above fourteen hundred were issued ! The demand for tickets was immense always—and all the facts stated in the fore part of this article can be fully proved ; (the Rev’d Abel C. Thomas says that eighteen hundred persons were present the last night,) and yet although, only tickets enough to produce six hundred dollars were ever put into the hands of booksellers or other responsible persons not Universalists,—the “Society” admit the receipt of only about four hundred dollars more. But if they sold the balance of twelve hundred tickets at twelve and a half cents each per night—they should have received six hundred dollars ; if they sold the balance of fourteen hundred, at the same rate, they should have received eight hundred dollars ; and how much more for advanced rates, and money received at the door, who can tell ?—So too, although there was a written agreement, that the agency of the trustees of the “Society”—was limited to a mere power of arrangement—without the least shadow of right to collect one farthing—yet they managed to get, to keep, or spend all but six hundred dollars—and have done and are doing every thing they can to get that,—and have promised this, and ten times more, to their church creditors—although, not a farthing of it was ever justly theirs !—Although the tickets were to have been fairly disposed of, by responsible persons who should afterwards be settled with, under the direction of Mr. Everett and ourselves—yet Mr. E. refuses to settle, until we allow his trustees to get the balance of the money !!! Although, the tickets were to be fairly and justly sold, for the public accommodation—and by the promise of Mr. Sappington, in the presence of John Wilson Esqr. and others, not above three hundred tickets per night, were to be placed in the hands of any one but the selected booksellers, and all the rest to be placed in the hands of those booksellers, and those three hundred *or less* to be placed, *wholly* in the hands of the sexton of the Universalist church ; yet, in fact, never above seven hundred and fifty were put, any day, in the hands of all the Booksellers, unitedly ; while generally less than six hundred went to them ; and from six to nine hundred were reserved by the members of the “Society”—and not placed in the hands of their sexton only—but distributed about, to small traders, and shop keepers, and street walkers, and mere amateurs (one man had seventy a day given to him, to sell as he walked about)—which were traded on at advanced rates, (whether for public or private account we know not)—and even the number concealed from us, and the lowest rates, lowered in the aggregate, from two to four hundred dollars—on the bill furnished us through Mr. Lucas, to settle by !—These are facts, fully susceptible of proof ; and all these and more will be proved, when the suit which has been threatened for six weeks, shall be brought.

But what else could possibly be expected ? All men know by sad experience, that their intentions are better than their acts ; their

principles more exalted than their conduct. The good we would do, is often not present, with us ; and the evil we would not—finds its subtle way into our breasts, and poisons the current of our lives.—But here are those, claiming to be exempt from the ordinary obligations to virtue ; openly avowing principles worse than the vilest conduct of the vilest men—sedulously inculcating rules of life, which take from religion its very basis, from law all its chief sanction, from vice its greatest restraint ; such men are not only like all others, corrupt by nature,—but they are corrupt by settled principle, and are impelled to licentiousness by the very sanctions of their religious system.—We are therefore, not at all surprised to find such a system producing continually the fruits appropriate to its influence ; and are in the present instance, sensible of the goodness of God, in allowing such practical illustrations to follow so speedily on the public exposure of the principles which conduct men to them.—They are daily giving a helping hand to the ruin of Universalism amongst us ; and we sincerely trust the day is near, which this horrible combination of blasphemy and atheism shall be banished from our city ; or if any of its deluded followers are left—they will be placed by an enlightened public sentiment, in their true posture, and learn that they are safe from the indignation and horror which their principles so justly excite, only when silence, obscurity and darkness, shall envelope, what the light makes hideous, and the day abhors.

We were told by an individual, whose name has escaped us, but who represented himself as a practiced stenographer, and as being the same, who took down the debate between Mr. Campbell and the Papist Purcell at Cincinnati—that he had taken down a considerable portion of this conference, and would proceed to complete the whole.—We have not seen him or heard from him, since the debate closed. Has Mr. Everett caused him to change his mind?—We also received, some time ago through the post office, an anonymous letter, saying that its writer had six of the eight nights in manuscript. We never reply to anonymous letters ;—and have not since heard of this person. Does Mr. Everett—know any thing about him?—We will only say, that for our parts, we should be happy to see the whole discussion in print ; which as it regards Mr. Everett's part would be, we presume no difficult matter, seeing that, his forty-five minute speeches were nearly all either read, or repeated by rote.