

THE
BALTIMORE LITERARY
AND
RELIGIOUS MAGAZINE.

VOL. IV.

JULY 1838.

No. 7.

SPEECH OF ROBERT J. BRECKINRIDGE, IN THE SENATE CHAMBER
AT ANNAPOLIS, AT THE SIXTH ANNIVERSARY MEETING OF THE
MARYLAND STATE COLONIZATION SOCIETY.

THE sixth annual meeting of this important Society, took place at the seat of government of this state, during the late session of the legislature. On the evening of February 2, JOHN H. B. LATROBE Esqr. the President of the Society, took the chair, assisted by Dr. BOND and COL. WM. R. STEWART, Vice Presidents, FRANKLIN ANDERSON Esqr. Corresponding, and WM. F. GILES Esqr. Recording Secretary. After prayer by the Rev'd Mr. McILHENNY, and a short statement by the President, addresses were delivered by RICHARD H. THOMAS Esqr. President of the Senate, Wm. H. TUCK Esqr. Speaker of the House of Delegates, JOHN H. CULBRETH Esqr. of Annapolis, Wm. F. GILES Esqr. member of the House of Delegates from the city of Baltimore, and the Rev'd ROBERT J. BRECKINRIDGE; each in support of resolutions appropriate to the occasion. These speeches have been published in a handsome pamphlet of forty-five pages, by the society, and a very large edition thrown into circulation. We also understand, that they will be reprinted successively in the newspaper of the Society.

The peculiar circumstances and position of the author of the following address, as well as his particular connexion with this magazine, and its circulation amongst a class of persons, to the most of whom, the following speech would perhaps hardly reach through the channels indicated above; have led us to consider it rather a

duty to select it, instead of one of the other and abler efforts which accompany it, as the means of acquainting our readers with the progress and present state of our efforts in this commonwealth, upon the important subject of African Colonization. We do this the more especially in our July No., as cordially approving the practice, now too much neglected, of presenting this great cause to the people, in connexion with the anniversary of our national existence—the annual day of our glorious jubilee, which ought to be also a day of justice, of mercy and of recompense.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, before making the concluding address of the evening moved the following resolution, viz,

Resolved, That the society has marked with great pleasure the success which has attended the settlements in Africa of the State Societies of Philadelphia and New York, at Bassa Cove, and of the State Society of Mississippi at Greenville; and the return of prosperity to the elder settlements of the American Colonization Society at Monrovia.

AT this late stage of our meeting, Mr. President, and after hearing the full and able presentation of our cause, to which we have all listened with delighted attention—it would be exceedingly unbecoming in me, to attempt a regular defence of the society whose annual meeting this is, and of the immense interests staked upon our success. I shall be excused however, in offering a few considerations, not yet suggested, or not perhaps sufficiently insisted on, which may serve still further to show the grandeur of our enterprise, and the deep importance of the crisis at which we have arrived in its progress.

No sentiment could be more congenial to my feelings, than that expressed in the resolution I have been requested to submit—of cordial sympathy in the success of our great sister societies, in the work of colonization. I have long been convinced that this scheme was of proportions too vast, to be managed in all its greatness by any single board; that the interests involved were too great to be trusted to a single series of experiments; and that the principles on which the cause proceeds are too diversified to be capable of successful application by any single organization. Although, therefore I have been, and am, the firm friend of the parent Society at Washington,—and being so, have deplored its reverses, and now cordially rejoice in its returning prosperity,—I was one of those, who at a very early period laboured for the production of an independent action on the part of other societies, as being imperatively required, by all the great interests involved. And now,—while in looking around me, I see, or think I see, that if our efforts to secure this principle of separate action had unhappily failed, we should be in a position incapable, amid the storms which have assailed us, either of success abroad or defence at home,—I am still sincerely the friend of the great central board, and should as sensibly regret its withdrawal from the field, as the failure of our own cherished principle. In the same manner, when I look to those independent

societies which, since ours, have sprung up, and are continually springing up over the face of the country,—I rejoice to behold in them, the successive development of principles and grounds of action, which, though they all terminate in one result, yet each reaches that result by a different process. Especially, as it regards the united societies of Philadelphia and New York—the board of this society, and the individual who now addresses you, have a right to be “partakers of their joy,” as we were not idle labourers with them, in communicating the original impulse which founded their flourishing colony, and sent out their first emigrants.

The truth is, that if the fact of colonization be a good thing to the emigrant, to the country which he colonizes, and to that which sends him forth; or, if for either one of these three signal advantages, it be pronounced good to send colonies to Africa, we must be content to agree in the good, and allow the utmost latitude in the mode and reasons of action. We are not able to fathom the whole depths of future time; and therefore let us act with modesty and candour, as well as with perfect conscientiousness. The friends of colonization north of us, may favour this great attempt, for reasons which those south of us may entirely reject; and we in the centre may proceed on grounds quite different from those on either extreme; while the parent board may find it most advisable to take its stand upon principles somewhat different from all. In this one point we all agree, that the necessities of the world, and the strong dictates of wisdom and humanity, require the planting of colonies of blacks from this country in Africa—and to that grand object we all direct our energies. Sir, it gives me peculiar pleasure to bear this open testimony, and to be the means of thus fully committing this society to these sound and liberal sentiments.

For ourselves, the good people of this commonwealth must be expected to look with intense interest at any scheme of operations, which is avowedly directed in such a manner, and to such results, as must affect at least one third of her entire population, and through these, the wealth, the public order, the social state, and the political relations of the whole community. Nor is it to be concealed, that the peculiar geographical position of Maryland, and the vehement contentions of these unhappy times, give to the subject before us, an unusual importance, and to the public sensibilities regarding it, a greatly increased keenness. After what we have heard to-night I shall not attempt to speak particularly of the principles, the spirit, or the aims of the abolition party. I fully believe that their principles are false, their spirit in the highest degree fanatical, and their aim wholly unattainable. No principles are more clear to my mind, than that slavery never can be, and never should be attempted to be abolished in this country, except in a manner exceedingly gradual, and then unaccompanied with the grant of political and social equality to the blacks, but attended as far as possible with foreign colonization. This conviction, is I think universal throughout the slave country. But at the same time, there is a considerable, and of late years a growing party, which deterred by the greatness of the difficulties and sacrifices which the enterprise involves, or not convinced of the general injustice, im-

policy, and unprofitableness of a state of slavery—deny the necessity of abolishing it at all. For our part, Mr. President, we do not, nor does your society, nor does our commonwealth, consent to the principles of this party. It must indeed be confessed that the atrocious conduct of the abolitionists, has greatly increased this party, and greatly weakened ours throughout the country; and that it would scarcely be prudent to attempt the application of any principles of gradual emancipation,—perhaps it would be unwise even to argue them before the people, in the face of such a storm of fire and brimstone as is now sweeping over the north. But this, sir, is what I would say; not only is the colonization cause, the great platform on which the friends of the country and of man every where, may meet and unite; but especially in this commonwealth, at the present moment, every consideration should impel every class of our citizens to rally around this enterprise, and carry it forward with constancy and vigour.

This idea appears to me, to be unspeakably important. The abolition fanaticism is not a national, nor even an indigenous monster. It is a foreign, an *English* scheme, engendered more in hereditary animosity to this republic, than in any enlightened, or even serious regard for the interests of humanity, not well understood. I can solemnly declare, after much personal experience, that I found no man in England who seemed to be half as attentive, or half as much excited in regard to the evils of British slavery, diffused almost every where over their immense colonies, and every where more terrible than any that exists in any part of the United States, as all seemed to be upon this subject as it affects us! Evils they can cure, and which are personal to themselves, are little regarded, and except in the West India Islands not even cared for; while their bowels yearn over us with inexpressible tenderness, and language fails them to express their horror for that in us, which in themselves disturbs not their lightest slumbers.

The party with us, is but the reflector of this foreign malignity, and every sentiment of patriotism and national wisdom should impel us at the same time that we rebuke this anti-national spirit at home, and despise and defy it from abroad, to take out of the way of our immediate fellow-citizens, who may be less thoroughly acquainted with the posture of affairs, every temptation to mingle in the cry against the country, and every inducement to do ought that even in appearance could give countenance to our enemies, either at home or abroad. Heretofore the people of this state, have gone forward calmly, steadily, and nobly. Great unanimity of sentiment, great fixedness of public opinion, has every-where exhibited itself; and we behold the blessed result, in the total freedom from all commotion, and every scene of violence in all our borders, in times and upon subjects, that convulse nearly all our sister communities. Let us preserve this honourable distinction. And that we may do so, let us cherish the grand interest, which perhaps more than all things else confers upon us our present enviable peace and unity. Who is there that doubts what must immediately ensue, if the favourable progress of this cause be arrested—or worse still, if it be divorced from the state policy, which has given it so much strength,

and the state patronage which has made it so stable, and be thrown open again in the whole imposing greatness of the subject, for discussion and settlement, in our pulpits, through our presses, before our popular assemblies, in our courts of justice, and in our legislative halls? We have by its settlement, effected a great compromise of all the conflicting interests and views which enter into the composition of society, as it exists with us. Let him who would disturb it, at the present moment, that he may more rapidly advance the cause of freedom, be considered the enemy of freedom itself! Let him who would unsettle the grand experiment whose successful issue we are ready to command, because our plans too much incline towards ultimate emancipation, be considered the enemy of the state, and of all the interests whose advocate he would desire to be esteemed! As it regards the commonwealth of Maryland, this cause may justly challenge her confidence and gratitude, rather than sue for her reluctant and scanty bounty. For it has conferred upon her present blessings, which no man can too highly appreciate; it promises to her the peaceful and fortunate solution of the most difficult and agitating of all the problems which disorder society; and it secures to her name and institutions, a redoubled glory and perpetuity, on either shore of that vast ocean beyond which her wisdom and goodness have reached to rebuild the noblest emblem of human supremacy and majesty, an empire in which laws reign, and men are happy.

In whatever light we regard this subject, it grows upon our contemplations, into proportions of surprising grandeur. How short is the span of time run over, since the whole interest which it excited was locked up in a few devoted hearts; when the meditations of a score or less of great minds, and the prayers of as many fervent spirits, contained the secret history of these august plans, which to-day Senates receive as fixed principles of wisdom, and States engraft upon their settled codes—and which another age will hail as the glory of this, and the grand engine of enlarging the bounds of knowledge and civilization! This is the progress of all that is truly great; it is the mode in which God himself proceeds. The small seed hardly visible in the palm of the child's hand, is by and by, the lofty tree, whose branches shelter, and whose fruit nourishes mankind. The feeble impulse stricken by celestial power from some trembling heart, swells onward and upward into an overflowing sentiment, that sweeps before it the venerable ruins of departed ages. The idle question of mere names and words, as judged by the stern and erring tribunal of human power, is in truth the very point, in which all earthly blessedness, and all heavenly glory, lie secretly involved. And so with us, another sacred lesson is exhibited, rebuking all contempt of the day of small things, and putting to shame that restless, daring, and impatient ignorance, that will not be guided in its prompt and vehement madness, even by the wisdom which cometh from above.

From the point which we have reached, we look back, almost with awe, to the slight agencies upon which so great results have been staked. We look around us, and we confidently demand, can the black race—can the great interests of the nation—can the

Christian feeling of the country afford to part with our principles, or to give up our succour, or to surrender our victories won over so much prejudice and ignorance? We look forward—and our appeal is to the nations, to posterity and to God; and we abide the issue in joyful confidence. We are laying the foundations of republics, where liberty may dwell in safety, when the altars around which she is worshipped now, are left desolate; they who would obstruct our labours are her foes. We are upbuilding what forty centuries have not been able to produce, a civilized people of the race of Ham; they are the enemies of a third part of mankind who would stop our progress. We are toiling for what the world never yet saw, a powerful, well-ordered, enlightened state within the tropics; the earth itself, if it could utter its voice, would rebuke the folly that dares to resist so great a purpose. We are planting the gospel of God, where a wide and effectual door is opened to our attempts, and where if we be hindered, that gospel is excluded from millions of souls; let their blood be required, not of us, but of those who in the name of Christ deny him to those who stretch out their hands and raise their piteous lamentations for the long delay of his promised coming. We see already, almost the certainty of complete success in these magnificent designs. We have planted germs; we know not which will bear fruit, nor can we read the future to foretell that any will grow into a free, civilized, Christian state of tolerable power. But this we know, that the moment one city, one single city of free, civilized, Christian blacks, is planted near the equator, on the western coast of Africa, then the mighty prize is won! From that instant, the whole problem in all its complexity and vastness as to the black race, is solved. The slave trade dies; the civilization and conversion of Africa is fixed; the destiny of the race of Ham redeemed; the equatorial region of the earth reclaimed; and the human race itself launched into a new and glorious career, of which all the triumphs of the past, afford no parallel. Ages may be required to render all these triumphs perfect; but ages are nothing, when continents are the subjects of their tuition, and nations sit their willing pupils. Once plant the leaven thoroughly, then fear not but that it works. Remember Plymouth. For a hundred and sixty years from its settlement, light had not scaled the Alleghanies, though almost visible from its rock. Their summit reached, in less than thirty years more, the tide had already crossed the Mississippi. Who doubts that it will one day, penetrate to the shores of the Pacific? The facts of history are but the illustrations of a profound philosophy.

Let us for a moment reverse the subject. Suppose we intermit all our efforts, and leave the vast interests staked upon them to the decision of chance, or to the guidance of those adverse influences which exert already so severe and bad a pressure. The most casual glance at the evils which would ensue, is enough to fire every heart amongst us with redoubled zeal in the cause in which we are embarked.

There is no point upon which the entire slave-holding states are more united in opinion, than that there ought not to be any attempt to liberate the slaves without a certain and immediate prospect of

an emigration somewhat proportioned to the number set free. It may not be of especial consequence to Maryland, at the present moment, whether our liberated slaves remove to Africa or to New England; nor indeed whether the black race, as a point of state policy, be removed free or bond. But I believe, there is no difference of opinion in the commonwealth, that the interests of the whites, as well as those of the blacks both bond and free, are by no means favoured, by accumulating still further the free coloured population amongst us: but that on the other hand, the strongest argument of a popular kind that could be used for the total extinction of slavery, would be proof that thereby the whole black race could be removed from the state. I concur to a great extent in the wisdom of this popular sentiment: being thoroughly persuaded after much examination of the case, that no single fact has proved in all ages more dangerous to states than the existence of distinct races of men in their bosom; that all attempts at amalgamation are immoral and impracticable; and that a harmonious residence together on equal terms, has never occurred in any civilized state, where the respective parties were nearly equal—and never can occur, while human nature remains unchanged. For us to stop short then, in our fixed and active efforts to encourage the emigration of the black race from this state, is just the same thing as to labour that we may entail on our own state all the evils of that condition of society, which in every past age, has been found most unmanageable and dangerous. We discharge a great duty to Maryland, by favouring the progress of things towards a unity of race, and that the white race, no matter how that progress is effected, as touching the question of free or slave emigration. But as we are American citizens, we do a corresponding damage to other portions of the confederacy by encouraging a slave emigration into them, instead of a free black emigration abroad; and we effect, on the other hand, a good to the whole nation, by favouring an emigration from it of this hostile ingredient. So that, to arrest the current of African colonization, is to gather and thicken over the southern country, if not also over all central America, those elements of social debility and discord which have proved the most intractable to other ages, and to rob us at the same moment of the only outlet by which the subject can escape, at last, a bloody solution. The intense hatred, which has marked the whole conduct of the foreign and northern incendiaries towards the southern states, affords the most direct and natural explanation, of their bitter and unreasonable opposition to African colonization. They were not content to prove us worthy of infamy and death, and to stimulate the hate of all nations, while they mocked the slave for his too tardy vengeance; they were careful at the same time, to seek by all means to reduce us to such extremes, that if in the issue our ruin occurred, their first wish was fulfilled as they rejoiced over our mangled bodies and desolated firesides; or if we triumphed, our necessary severity might inure to the gratification of that other great wish of their benevolent hearts, in our condemnation at the bar of the human race! That wisdom, which is represented by the greatest of poets to be supremely diabolical, consists in the ability 'to dash wise counsels.'

Nor should we forget, how greatly the difficulties of our undertaking may be augmented by delay; while the speedy and striking accomplishment of the first stages of it, will give certainty and security to all that remains behind. It is due to the free coloured population of the country that they should not be allowed for one moment to entertain the idea, that the pretensions set up on their behalf can ever be realized, especially in any of the slave-holding states. It is emphatically our duty to all concerned, to manifest in the clearest and most decided manner, that as in our opinion the best interests of all the parties, require the early and permanent separation, so it is not only the clear right, but the bounden duty, and fixed purpose of the community to effect that result; and that all opposing pretensions, whether on the part of the free blacks, or on that of the slaves, or on that of a handful of dissatisfied citizens on either extreme of opinion, must bend before the great necessities of the case. It is our duty to the cause itself to rally round it, and urge it forward, while the obstacles that oppose it are only such, as moral means may overcome. The increasing violence of our enemies; the growing strength of opposite parties which, agreeing in nothing else, mutually denounce us, the one on the pretext that we do not favour freedom enough, and the other, because we favour it at all; the growing excitability of the public mind, upon the whole subject, and the evil tendency of this contention and uncertainty upon the spirit of the blacks; the mixture of questions, which ought to be purely local and municipal in their decision, with national politics, ecclesiastical agitations, and even with questions of war and peace, alliance and treaty with foreign states; all these things show, that our work brooks no unnecessary delay. The accumulation of the Indian tribes on our slave frontier, making doubly defenceless our most vulnerable point, by concentrating upon it a warlike population, hostile to us by reason of hereditary wrongs, and more inclined by nature to sympathize with the dark man, than with the pale faces: the growing jealousy of the Spanish-American states along the southern edge of this continent, against us; states, in no sense deserving to be called white, and whether we consider the Spanish, the Negro, or the Indian origin of their population, equally inclined to hate, above all races, that illustrious anglo-saxon, whose destinies are so deeply staked on ours, the critical state of the immense black population in the West India islands; and the great, though imperfectly foreseen influence, which future developments in those islands must have upon the southern portion of this continent, and particularly upon the interests of the black race; the necessity, which the very nature of the political scheme on which the great family of European nations in our times regulates its various, conflicting, and nicely balanced interests, forcing upon them all, a ceaseless vigilance over every element which enters into the composition of modern states, and inclining them all to take advantage of every crisis, to weaken our posture at home, and to arrest the progress of our principles abroad; these with other equally urgent exterior considerations, no less than the whole tendency of all our interior affairs, urge us with importunate earnestness to give redoubled vigour to efforts, which by prompt success may disarm

so many difficulties, but which lukewarmness and delay may endanger from so great a variety of hostile points.

If we turn our regards to the continent of Africa, no thought of withholding our hands from this good work, can find a lodgment in any Christian heart, which is not pre-occupied with some strange fanaticism. If America has any work to do for the earth, if American patriots are under any obligations to enlarge the boundaries of civilization and liberty—if American Christians are bound by any tie to spread abroad to benighted men, the knowledge and the truth of their divine Lord, then above all other lands, is Africa committed to us for redemption, and above all other trusts, that to enlighten and to save her, ought to be considered the most sacred. If the past history of man, affords us any rule of judgment for the future, the continent of Africa, is destined in some way, and by some race to be still farther colonized to an immense extent: and if that portion of it inhabited by the black race be colonized by any other than a black race, the native population must inevitably be exterminated. These are the testimonies of all past knowledge: this the result of all unkindred colonization. Already in various portions of that great continent, these truths have received and are still receiving additional confirmation; and new interest is imparted to the subject by the conviction, that even now the fate of the black race in Africa itself begins to tremble. For ages the native race has been driven alike from the northern and southern portions of the continent; and now while the Europeans are steadily pressing from both extremities towards the equator, the tribes which perish or flee before their advancing steps, are not themselves the aboriginal inhabitants, but most generally, people of Asiatic origin; who in their turn encroach upon the great interior native race. All the information which the public possesses in regard to that unhappy country, conduces to prove that a large emigration into central Africa, of a civilized black race, within no distant period, can alone suffice to save the black man in his native seats. Whence, if not from us, can such an emigration flow?

And yet, Mr President, I would not be misunderstood, nor would I utter a syllable that can cause the most irresolute mind to faint. We may fail of draining Maryland of the whole black race; we may fail of making any adequate impression on that degraded class of persons scattered over the central and southern sections of the United States; we may be able to withdraw from the country, only the select and choice individuals found scattered amongst them, leaving the great mass as much undiminished and unaffected, as if no emigration had taken place; and thus we may never be allowed to accomplish the whole extent of good to our beloved country, of which our plans were capable, and for which our hearts yearned. So far we may come short through the ignorance of wicked men, and the perversity of untoward events. If so, let posterity judge between us and our opponents.

But there are points of unspeakable interest on which we cannot fail. If we be even prevented from doing what we would and might have done for the black race, and the African Continent, as well as for our own homes and kindred, much we have already done

—much we are in the act of doing, which is beyond the reach of malice to undo, or folly to recall. We have illustrated before the eyes of our countrymen, a noble lesson of practical justice, wisdom, and benevolence: in other times God may incline their hearts to follow it, and beyond our hopes, enable them to do so. We have set before the faces of the free black race throughout the earth, the surest, the shortest, the most effectual way, to their own happiness, and to the redemption of their scattered brethren, and their ancestral land; and when the fulness of the time is come, they may yet reap the benefits which now they seem, to so great an extent to be, and to deem themselves unworthy of. We have planted communities where laws were unknown before; we have diffused light where the darkness of midnight rested; we have hid the leaven of civilization amid the mass of African ignorance and barbarism; we have sown the precious seed of the gospel of God, on the face of dark and turbid waters, where misery and sin only dwelt before. These are triumphs of which nothing can rob us; labours over which we have rejoiced, and will still rejoice. It is a work absolutely good, in and of itself; full of mercy and of good fruits, to whatever extent it can be pushed; capable of illimitable development and application, and yet unspeakably excellent in the narrowest possible limit of its exercise. It may embrace nations of heathens, and continents of slaves; it may be diminished to a single village, or like the church of God in its day of darkness, to a single family. But great or small, it has no rule but a wise beneficence; proposes no result but to bless!

Such is our cause. Who shall dare deny to it the favour of God!

[For the Baltimore Literary and Religious Magazine.]

THE INSTITUTION OF CELIBACY IN THE PAPAL CHURCH.

No. IV.

XLII. WE come now to the institution of monks—a cause not less fertile in mischief to good morals. Monks are of Egyptian origin,—and Egypt is the mother country of superstition and melancholy. It would be useless, to inquire what was the character of our monks before the time of Constantine. During the persecutions it is not probable that monks professing Christianity had any common asylums. If there were any, they were obliged to seek the most unknown retreats, and live separate in solitude. Notwithstanding the vast deserts around Egypt, and the influence of its climate, and the violence exercised against Christians, we find not one example of monachism during the first two centuries; so true it is that Christianity did not inspire the spirit of monachism: it sprang from the rivalry of heretics, and the intercourse which took place about the end of the second century, of Christians with the new Platonicians. The Christians of the first and second centuries were never induced to abandon the part which Divine Providence had assigned them,—but they made it a duty to serve with

26

their virtues and labours that society which endeavoured by persecution to exterminate them.

XLIII. The first monk we read of is Paul the hermit, whom it is said, St. Anthony went to visit in the desert at the age of ninety-two years. He had retired during the persecution of Decius. Jerome has written his history, in which we find much that deserves rather the name of fable than of truth. This patriarch of monks, lived a long time in the desert, alone, or with few companions, and did not begin to found monasteries till peace was given to the church. He soon had co-workers, or rivals, and each aimed at distinction, by some peculiar austerity, just as the ancient philosophers sought for distinction in the peculiarity of their respective systems. Some contented themselves with five figs a day; as their whole nourishment, others fasted during an entire week. The heads of the monasteries exchanged occasional visits, and each in his turn was astonished at some extraordinary abstinence. To abstinence they joined frightful macerations. (*Jo. Clim. Grad. 5. p. 116.*) In the monasteries of Tabenna (in Egypt on the banks of the Nile in Upper Thebais) there were nearly fifty thousand monks. In Oxyrinchus (another Egyptian city,) there were more monasteries than dwelling houses, containing, it is said, twenty thousand virgins, and ten thousand monks. (See Ruffin and Cassien :) A multitude of other establishments situated at other places contained not a less number of victims. Ruffin says the deserts of Egypt were not less peopled with monks, than the cities were with inhabitants; and St. Ambrose told his companions that more virgins were consecrated in Egypt, than there were of men born in Italy.*

* The island of *Capraria* in the Tuscan sea, between Corsica and the peninsula abounded in monks as early as the 5th century. *Rutilius Claudius Numatianus* in the reign of *Honorius* refers to the fact in the following verses.

Processu pelagi jam se Capraria tollit
Squallet lucifugis insula plena viris
Ipsi se monachos Graio cognomine dicunt
Quod soli nullo vivere teste volunt.
Munera fortunae metuunt, dum damna verentur
Quisquam sponte miser, ne miser esse queat
Quaenam perversi rabies tam stulta cerebri
Dum mala formides, nec bona posse pati?
Sive suas repetunt ex fato ergastula poenas
Tristia seu nigro viscera felle tument.
Sic nimiae bilis morbum assignavit Homerus
Bellerophontaeis sollicitudinibus.

Apollinaris Sidonius refers also to the monks in the island of *Lirina* or *Lerina* in the following verses,

Sen te Lirinus pris cum complexa parentem est
Qua tu jam fractus permagna saepe quiete
Discipulis servire venis, vixque otia somni,
Vix coctos captare cibos, abstemius aevum
Ducis, et insertis pingis jejunia psalmis,
Fratribus insinuans, quantas illa insula plana
Miserit in coelum mentes, quae sancta Caprasi
Vita senis, juvenisque Lupi; quae gratia patrem
Mansit Honoratum, fuerit quis Maximus ille
Urbem, tu cujus monachusque, antistes et abbas,
Bis successor agis, celebrans quoque laudibus illis
Eucherii venientis iter, redeuntis Hilari.

We learn from these verses the names of some of the famous monks of the monastery on this island—*Caprasius*, *Lupus*, *Honoratus*, *Maximus*, *Eucherius* and *Hilarius*. The name of the island itself was changed from *Lirina* to that of the Island of St.

XLIV. Had this senseless zeal continued to make progress, the human race would have disappeared from those countries. But superstition destroys itself by its excesses, while the attractions of nature are indestructible. It is said that this vast number of monks was no burthen to society, because they laboured with their hands. But independently of the diminution which society suffered, what was the product of their labour? Willow baskets, matts, and other fabrics, which in a well regulated state are assigned for the employment of females, and the infirm. But was this all the benefit which society received from tens of thousands of men, who after having destroyed the better part of their strength in self imposed sufferings, gave to society only the feeble remnant of it. But is not temperance commendable? No doubt it is; but austerity is not temperance. Every man is bound to preserve in vigour his faculties so far as it is in his power. He owes it to society, as well as to himself to do so. Nay it is his religious duty. Every institution which is destructive of this end, is bad in itself. Apply this principle to the extenuated macerated, ghostly monks whose imaginations, kindled by fastings, filled their minds with fantoms and spectres which in truth are the demons we read of in monkish legends.* A poor recompence this, for renouncing the society of men and women in civilized, useful and productive life. These observations are to be understood as generally applicable: for indiscriminate, sweeping censures are usually unjust. Monks and monasteries have no

Honoratus.—RUTILIUS CLAUDIUS NUMANTINUS was by birth a Gaul.—He was a man of consular dignity—a prefect of the city of Rome, and *Magister officiorum*. He wrote *de reditu suo sive Itinerarii libros 2*. Amstoted. 1687. in 12mo. *Sed odium in iis spirat religionis Judaicae juxta atque Christianae*. SIDONIUS APOLLINARIS was also a Gaul, and a leader in the war against the Goths. Afterwards he was a bishop at Clermont in Auvergne. (Obit A. D. 482.) His *Epistolae* and *Carmina* are extant. (Ed. Paris 1652.)

* LEGENDS are the lives of saints—so called because (*legendae erant*) they were to be read in the lessons at matins and in the refectories. The fabulous character of these performances is well known, but it is not perhaps generally known that many of them, as some suppose, were in their origin merely *jeux d' esprit*. Valerio Agostino—a bishop of Verona and a cardinal in the 16th century avers this to have been their origin, in his book *de Rhetorica Christiana*, translated into French, by the Abbè Duquart. (Paris 1750, in 12mo.) The bishop says (and it is but just to explain the origin of them consistently with innocent intention, as far as we can—) it was the practice to exercise the *religious* by requiring of them amplifications (in latin) upon the martyrdom of the saints. This exercise gave them liberty to represent the persecutors and the persecuted as talking and acting according to their individual taste, or views of probability. Hence they composed, in the form of history, pieces which were nothing more than their own fictions embellished to their fancy. The more ingenious of these literary efforts were preserved in the monasteries, and after a lapse of time, were found in the libraries of the monasteries, and their origin and real character perhaps, not being known, they were treated as real histories, and required to be read for the edification of the monks. But this explanation will not suit all cases; Simon Metaphrastes, a Greek author of the 9th century, gave the world lives of saints—for each day in the year, some of which, Bellarmin admits, he wrote, as he supposed they *might have been*, in fact. Jerome says in his preface to the Book of Esther, that the vulgate edition of this book, as it was read in his time, was full of additions, *Quem librum (scilicet Esther) editio vulgata lacinosus hinc inde verborum finibus trahit addens ea quae extempore dici potuerant et audiri sicut solitum est scolariis disciplinis sumpto themate excogitare quibus verbis uti potuit qui injuriam possus vel qui injuriam fecit.*

Jerome says that he translated the book *de Archiris Hebraeorum*. The way in which he accounts for the corruption of the common text, falls in with the explanation of Valerio. Still there can be little doubt, that many of the legends are the fruit of a morbid imagination, and others of fraud. (*Newton on the Prophecies, Dessert 23, No. V.*)

doubt done some good. See the Observations of Hallam Middle Ages chap. IX. Part 1. p. 466. 7. Harpers Ed. 1837.

XLV. Syria and Palestine were scarcely less fecund of monks than Egypt. The institution extended by degrees,—provinces were filled with monasteries, with this difference however, that in approaching the west the rigour of monastic rules was somewhat relaxed. Physical causes produced the relaxation. Sulpicius Severus (*Dial. l. de vit. mart. p. 65.*) says the western monks could not follow in the steps of those of Egypt and Syria, except at a great distance, and that, what would have been gormondizing in Greece was only the supply of necessity in Gaul. *Nam edacitas in Graecis gula et in Gallis natura.*

XLVI. Every age has its favourite dogmas, or if you please, its dominant folly. Thus in the church we see prevailing in succession, the austerities and continence of the first monks—zeal for relics—the fury of pilgrimages—then the crusades, mendicity disciplines and other cruel or fantastic practices which are sure indications of extravagance. Scarcely were monks instituted before they held the first rank in public esteem, and consequently received recompence and honours in profusion. In the 4th and 5th centuries it was quite common to select bishops from the monasteries, and this practice contributed not a little to extend the practice of celibacy. It was natural that men who owed their consideration to their celibacy should use their influence to honour and extend it. Eustathius bishop of Sebast is an example.—Socrates, (*l. II. c. 43.*) and Sozomen (*l. III. c. 14. l. IV. 24.*) tell us that this personage, continuing to lead a monastic life after his elevation to the Episcopacy, established a community of monks who were apparently his chief ecclesiastics—that he forbade them to marry, and also forbade them the use of certain meats,—that he continued to declaim against marriage, and went so far as to separate wives from their husbands. He forbade that prayer should be offered in the house of married persons—also the receiving of the benediction and communion of a priest who lived with his wife. The adjoining provinces resisted this indiscreet zeal. The council of Gangra (Metropolis of Paphlagonia in Asia Minor.) was held upon the subject in 377, and Eustathius was deposed. This vain scruple subsisted in the time of Gregory Nazianzen; for he censures those who would not receive baptism from a married priest (*Orat 40.*) if he did not live separately from his wife; but in some satirical verses against the bishops of his own time, he says positively, that many of them were married, who did not think themselves bound to such a privation. Continence however was the indispensable obligation of those who lived in monasteries. Yet until the time of St. Basil at least, this engagement of monks was voluntary. (*Can. 19. Ad. Amphil.*) It is not less probable that priests were bound by a vow before this time, and a decree of Valentinian (which forbid ecclesiastics, and *continentes* (that is monks) to go into the houses of widows, and female orphans to obtain legacies,) implies that they were not. A distinction between ecclesiastics and monks was made in the same way by the 3d council of Carthage. But if continence had been obligatory upon the clergy, would monks have been distinguished

from them by the word *continents*? It is true, this distinction by degrees disappeared, and we see no more of it after the 5th century.

XLVII. We come now to another epoch. In 385 Pope Siricius being consulted by the bishops of Taragon and Gallia Narbonensis, answered by a decretal, in which he declares, that if, thereafter, a bishop, priest or deacon, should not observe celibacy, he must not expect pardon; because the wounds which could not be cured by other means, must be cut out with the knife.—The language of this pope, if compared with the modest tone of St. Paul, presents a striking contrast of style, and proves that the speech of the church, and the conduct of its ministers, had greatly changed. The same decretal fixes the age and the degrees necessary to reach the priesthood. It orders that those who are devoted from infancy to the service of the church, should be baptised before the age of puberty and put into the rank of readers—that if they reach the age of thirty, without reproach, having been married only once, and not having married a widow, they may be made during the time, acolytes and sub-deacons, and that afterwards, they may be promoted to the diaconate, if they are judged worthy, and if they engage to observe celibacy,—that five years afterwards, they may be promoted to the priesthood, and at the end of ten years become bishops. This discipline, probably, prevailed at that time in Italy, but though more austere than that of the east, is much less so, than it became afterwards, because it postponed the vow of celibacy until the age of thirty. Innocent I (inaugurated A. D. 402, died A. D. 417) a few years afterwards confirmed this decree of Siricius; and St. Leo (who died 461) endeavoured to extend the obligation of continence to sub-deacons, but this was not effectually done till the next century, and then it was affected by councils. At first the penalty for violating this rule, was suspension from the functions of their orders during life: but Justinian the emperor, (Leg. 1. 5. de Epis. et Cleric) declared their children illegitimate and incapable of succeeding to their estates, or receiving legacies—afterwards the course was to annul their marriages, and put the parties in penance. Finally the offending ecclesiastic was subjected to corporal punishment. (See Newton on the Prophecies, Dissert. 23. VI.)

XLVIII. But the discipline was not uniform. In one diocess the sub-deacons were bound to continence, in another not; (See Fleury Ecc. His. and Thom. Discip. Eccles.) in one, the clerks might marry—in another it was a crime. Some councils made laws to separate the husband from his wife, after his ordination—others allowed them to live together. In some places where the vow of celibacy was in repute, the penalties annexed to its violation varied. These diversities are the certain marks of a new institution, established by degrees, and not without opposition: add to this, it was confined to the west, and flourished only under the shadow of papal authority. In the east the liberty of the early Christians continued to subsist. Six general councils were held in the east, none of which made any law against the marriage of priests; and to these we should look for the sense of the church, rather than to provincial synods or councils. Father Cellier himself admits, that notwith-

standing the efforts of the patriarch Cyril, celibacy was not established in Egypt during his time. It may be said, that Synesius under the predecessor of Cyril, refused the episcopacy, protesting that he would never consent to separate from his wife, and saying that the most cherished of his vows, was to have a numerous family of children. Still he *was elected*, and his election *was confirmed*; which proves that there was no rule requiring celibacy, or that it was easily relaxed. Theophilus perhaps had endeavoured to establish the rule, and his influence was feared, and his conduct towards Nestorius and Chrysostom proves that he was very capable of violence. Socrates, a historian of the 5th century, says "it is true that in Thessaly in Macedonia, an ecclesiastic was deposed, who lived with his wife after his ordination," but he gives it as a new custom, which he ascribed to Heliodorus, bishop of Trica, and the author of the Loves of Theogene and Chariclea. We should scarcely have expected so great rigour from the author of a Romance. "But in the east" says Socrates, "the priests and bishops abstain from their wives if they please; not being obliged to do so, by any law, or any necessity; for there are among them many bishops, who have had, since they were elevated to that dignity, legitimate children." (Hist. Eccl. L. V. c. 22.)

XLIX. It is certain then, that until about the middle of the 5th century, there was no general rule of this sort; so that a priest or deacon, who in Italy or in some of the provinces of Greece or Gaul was bound to continence, might get free from the obligation by going to another province, or at least by removing his residence in anticipation of his ordination. Now what sort of virtue is that which is circumscribed by territories, mountains and rivers; which changes its nature with the latitude? What are we to think of such a virtue, which besides being local was not thought of for centuries? If it is important to salvation, how unjust it was not to prescribe it to all, during all times? If it was superfluous, what tyranny to impose it upon a part? It should be remembered that up to this time no schism had divided the church: general councils were frequently held: why did they not establish this point, as well as other points of doctrine and discipline? Such as the time of Easter, the translation of bishops from one see to another—the powers of Metropolitans &c.? Did these councils fear disputes? That consideration did not deter them in the affair of Nestorius and Eutiches, which divided the whole east; but suppose they *did* fear, and suppose it to have been the fear of contest, disputes &c., which prevented their action on this matter,—that would only prove a preference for the peace of the church, to the establishment of an institution not founded in scripture, and which was contrary to the former discipline of the church—it would evince the sense of the church to be, that celibacy ought not to be forced upon the clergy by a canon.

L. The reader will find a summary of the whole matter in Duarenus. (*de sacris Ecclesiae ministeriis ac beneficiis lib. 4. cap. 8 and 9.*) This author refers for his proofs to the 5th of the apostolical canons—the councils of Gangra, and Nice,—to the historian Sozamin and the story of Paphnutius, before mentioned. He tells us that

Justinian in Novel 3, commends Epiphanius because he descended from priests. He says that Harmenopolus when treating of the law which forbids priests to marry, uses the word ἀκρίβειας—περὶ ἀκρίβειας, νόμος περὶ κληρικῶν, that is concerning the vigour of the law passed concerning priests, *quandoquidem legislator θεομαχίην ut puto, et cum natura pergnare ipsi videtur.* (since the legislator seems as I think, to fight against God and with nature itself, &c.) He refers also to the 22d and 6th and 123d of the Novels of Justinian;—to Jerome, in *Jovin*, and several pagan authors. The authors of this law, (says Duarenus,) feared that the onerous duties of marriage would impede the exercise of ecclesiastical functions, and not without reason, for says Plautus *negotium habere qui volet, navem et mulierem, haec duo sibi, comparato*: but the reader must pursue the examination for himself, if he desires further information upon the origin of this institution, and the motives and means by which it was established. We now proceed to suggest some considerations connected with the facts which have been stated.

LI. Had the church any authority to prohibit marriage? What is the church? The Roman Catholics tell us that it is the society of the faithful, entrusted with the custody and the interpretation of revealed truths. Be it so, the church has no power by virtue of its guardianship and right of exposition to *add* to revelation. It would be absurd to suppose that any new truth can be added: for if the new truth, or added truth be necessary to salvation, then the object of the mission of our Saviour and of his apostles, was not accomplished upon the completion of the canon of scripture. But to say this would be impious. Besides, as these new truths were added in succession, are those lost who never had knowledge of them? Or have the revealed truths of the Bible acquired in progress an efficacy which they did not at first possess? To say this, would be absurd. Yet St. Thomas (*Secund Saecund Q. 1. et 7.*) and many other Catholics maintain that articles of faith may be multiplied in progression. This is not a question of rites and ceremonies. It is not a question touching the sanctity of the priestly character, unless marriage is incompatible with holiness. But the Bible does not teach this, nor do facts prove that the most holy men are to be found among the un-married. St. Peter was married, and also others of the apostles. Is the priesthood of the Catholic church more holy than the apostles were? But the occupations of the priestly office require celibacy: this is another pretence: but how is the fact? The argument is equally applicable to the civil magistracy. In fact the clergy have as many intervals of leisure as other classes of men. Go to Rome, and test the assertion, by observations on the employments of all orders of the clergy. Nay, go any where, and you may verify the assertion, by facts you will find this order of men with even more leisure on their hands than they can conveniently dispose of. The most laborious life is usually the most virtuous life, and the question is, how the intervals of leisure in the life of an ecclesiastic can be best filled—Is there any thing in the decency, the gravity—the domestic cares and virtuous toils of a father of a family unbecoming a clergyman? But the clergy should be learned. This is another pretext for celibacy. *Cicero, rogatus*

ab Hircio ut, post repudium Terentiae, sororem ejus duceret, omnino facere supersedit; dicens non posse se uxori et philosophiae pariter operam dare. And Plautus says, *negotium habere qui volet, navem et mulierem, haec duo sibi, comparato.* These are some of the proofs alleged by Duarenus. Well, let Cicero and Plautus pass for what they are worth. We will admit that the cares of family require a considerable portion of time; do they not ordinarily leave enough for the acquisition of the knowledge necessary for a pastor? at least for the acquirement of as much as most of our Catholic priests possess? Are we to suppose that the actual acquirements of the Catholic clergy cannot be purchased at a less expense than celibacy? Is this order of clergy in general, more learned in useful things than the Protestant clergy? We do not mean to underrate any body. No doubt many of the Catholic clergy are learned men. But it is said celibacy makes the ministry more respectable. Superstition may distort the judgment, so as to make a thing seem to be what it is not. Men may be taught, that marriage is dishonourable, and that celibacy only is respectable. But the judgment or opinions of persons biased by education or motives of policy, or otherwise, are no evidence of truth. In the first ages of Christianity, the clergy were not less respectable nor less respected than they are now. St. Peter though married, deserved as much the respect of Christians as pope Siricius or Gregory VII. Justin (1, Apol. c. 4.) has a passage to the following effect: "If we should all put ourselves to death, we should be the cause that none would be born to be instructed in the divine doctrine, and even so far as in our power, we should put an end to the human race; in which we should act contrary to the divine will." These reasons apply to celibacy as forcibly as to suicide. Can we suppose that Justin Martyr was of the opinion that celibacy was more respectable than that condition of life which is a pre-requisite to the fulfilment of an important purpose of God?

LII. Besides; the right, or the liberty of marriage is by the law of nature: and no human power can divest or destroy that right. Human laws may regulate the exercise of our faculties, but not destroy them, except for offences which deserve death as a punishment. While men preserve their innocence, they may enjoy the rights annexed by nature to their species. It is as great injustice to forbid them, to perpetuate themselves by successive generations, as it would be to deny them the right to feed or clothe themselves. Why should the physical faculty of reproduction be subjected to absolute prohibition by law, more than the other faculties of men? Can it be extinguished by mere volition? It may be said that this faculty is not like those which are essential to the preservation of the life of the individual. Be it so; yet the destruction of it diminishes the happiness of the individual, deprives him of the pleasures of domestic life, and so far therefore is an unnecessary, and an unnatural interference with his happiness and usefulness. The race has an interest in this property of human nature, more than in any other of the powers and faculties of men. It may be said to belong in some sense to future races, and therefore the restraint of it is, a more heinous offence against the laws of nature,

than restraints which spend their whole force upon the existing generation or society of men. We mean of course, such restraint as the law of celibacy imposes, not that which confines it within the limits of lawful marriage.

LIII. After all, what is gained by such restraints? Chastity does not consist merely in the exterior control of the body. It resides in the heart,—in the will, (Math. v, 28.) and if we recur to matters of fact, the celibacy of the Romish priesthood has not made their imagination or desires more pure than those of married men. Take for example their Casuists. It may be asserted that no books can be found, in which the licentiousness of the passions has been allowed in imagination a more unrestrained indulgence.

LIV. But it will be said, the church may with justice impose the vow or engagement of celibacy upon the priesthood, because she constrains no one to incur it.—She only adds her consent to an act which is entirely free—she only concurs in the zeal of one who binds himself, and merely compels him to persevere in the condition which appears to him advantageous.—Under the Old Testament dispensation, there were a variety of vows allowed or practiced; such as vows of the first fruits—of the tithes of the flock and other temporal goods.—Another vow was that of the Nazarite, but this vow imposed no painful practice, nor was it contrary to the interests of society. We also find some examples of vows in the Old Testament, the object of which might be good in itself, but the terms or conditions of them were unlawful:—such were the vows of Jephtha and Saul. We find others which were unlawful in their object—such as that of those Jews who bound themselves not eat till they had slain Paul. But we find nothing in the Old Testament nor indeed in all antiquity similar to the vows of celibacy—chastity, &c. under consideration. Even the vows of the Brachmans, Samaneans and Pythagoreans were merely voluntary ties—transitory acts. The feeble changing purpose of man was not made for perpetual chains; (we refer not now to those great doctrines and duties which God has revealed for the regeneration of men.) It may be said that a vow is the very means to fix the inconstancy of men; but is this to be done by imposing restraints upon the body, while the desires are left at large?—is it to be accomplished by arraying the tendencies of nature in opposition to our duties? Admit however the use of vows for the accomplishment of laudable purposes; what is the utility of the vows of celibacy, poverty, obedience and so on, taken by the Roman Catholic monks and ecclesiastics? Do not the duties of men flow from a much higher and purer source than any such vows? To do good to those around us, to practice every virtue as we have opportunity—to humble ourselves before God, and give Him our worship and gratitude, are duties which are altogether independent of any vow, and they are duties to which the vows under consideration do not extend. Further, we ask the reader to designate a single virtue which does not chiefly, if not wholly depend upon an obligation paramount to any vow; and then let him show if he can how the addition of human legislation to the divine command can lay us under a higher obligation to practice that virtue. Yet suppose, as

we have said, that vows may be made to secure the accomplishment of virtuous, useful purposes, it remains still to be shown, that the monastic vows are lawful. Learn the object and use of these vows, by reading the monastic rules in all their details. How indifferent and even puerile are many of the practices which are thus secured!

Virtue itself is degraded in such company. Reason is led astray or stifled by them. Duties are surcharged with frivolous, fantastical precepts, which serve only to show the despotism of monastic chiefs. History tells us of a monk, who at the command of his superior scrupulously watered a dry stick during several years, as if it were a living plant; and this is a faithful image of the real occupations of monks, and of that regularity which by them is considered the chief virtue of cloisters. The vow of obedience, in truth, is nothing less than the solemn renunciation of reason, and of the exercise of the mental endowments; and can it be right to renounce as useless, that which God has given us to enlighten and guide us? Suppose the tenants of a cloister faithfully to observe the vow of obedience; what are they but automata beings reduced to mechanical movements, whose existence, so to speak, is in the mind of their superior. These monastic rules are in truth the art of making men passive instruments, or as the rules themselves express it, a mere staff in the hand of another. This kind of docility, or obedience to authority has no pattern except in the instinct of the brute creation, and we should hardly look in that quarter for our models of perfection.

The vow of poverty admits of similar reflections. If riches bring temptations, so do indigence and mendicity. But this vow is illusory. The folly and the superstition of men have made it the surest and speediest means of abundance, without subjecting its possessors to toil in its acquisition.

As to the vow of chastity, enough perhaps has already been said; but the subject is not exhausted. A single remark only however will be added in this place. The Canonists tell us that it is not lawful to vow that which is not in our power, and that a vow becomes null, as soon as either a physical or moral necessity prevents its accomplishment. Test the vow of celibacy and chastity by this rule. Bear in mind also the precepts of Paul in 1, Cor. vii. May not men as well vow that they will not be subject to the desires and infirmities of human nature? May they not with equal propriety vow, that they will not be sick, or if sick, that they will abstain from the remedies which God has appointed for their cure? Barbeyrac says that those who exalt the sanctity of continence, can either forego marriage easily, or they cannot. In the first case there can be no great merit in it—the latter is the predicament of those to whom St. Paul expressly advises marriage, because he says *melius est nubere quam uri*.

LV. The reader will now judge whether these vows were not at first the invention of superstition and imbecility, although afterwards they were confirmed by motives of policy. It has been shown, to some extent at least, that there are evils inherent in the very institution of celibacy; and Jerome, who was an ultra partizan of the

system, (*in epist. ad Eustochiam,*) gives proof enough of its demoralizing tendency in practical effects among professed virgins. But in his day it was not universally established among the clergy. *Quasi non hodie quoque plurimi sacerdotes habeunt matrimonia* (*Adv. Jovin l. I.*) No profane institution was ever so prolific in scandals—none ever invaded at so many points the rights of civil society. If it be said that a good institution may be abused, it is granted; but it is denied that an institution, which in the first place is not necessary, and which in the second place leads, one may say inevitably, to the commission of atrocious crimes, such as Jerome in the epistle referred to mentions, and whose tendency to such results is proven by the experience of fifteen centuries, is a good institution. No matter if it does produce some good results, if the evils which it produces are more numerous, the interests of society require its suppression. But are we sure that the institution of celibacy produces any good? Is chastity less pure because it is continually voluntary? To argue upon the principles of the partizans of celibacy, is it not equally meritorious, daily, hourly, every moment to renew the sacrifice, as it is to make it at once for the whole life, and after that to yield to the constraint of necessity? If we suppose virginity to be agreeable to God, the greater part of those who have persevered in it, would doubtless have been faithful, if they had been left to the freedom of their will; and the worst that could have happened is, that perhaps now and then, one, becoming weary of the burden would have exchanged it for a lawful, honourable marriage; and instead of a pure virgin would have become a chaste wife, and venerable mother, and would have transmitted her virtues to a new family. It is not perceived that there would have been any great evil in this. On the other hand, thousands have fallen victims to their vow—and they have fallen by force of physical temperament, merely because virtue had no legitimate refuge to offer them.

Jerome gives also a picture of the habits of many monks which is not more commendatory of the system. Augustin (*Serm. 21. ad frat in Erem,*) and many other of the fathers speak of the disorderly practices of those called Sarabaites. The same disorders prevailed among the secular clergy. It has been intimated that Chrysostom brought against himself a violent persecution for having attempted the reformation of the clergy of Constantinople. In fine Jerome himself says in the letter referred to, that many persons sought the office of deacon and priest in order that they might see females with more freedom. *Sunt quidem, de mei ordinis hominibus loquor,—qui ideo presbiterium et diaconatum ambiunt, ut mulieres licentius videant.*

LVI. As it would naturally be supposed, the establishment of involuntary celibacy met with opposition. Jovinian first attacked the *ultra* partisans of continence. He was followed by Vigilantius and many others. The authority of Jovinian was the more impressive, because having been a monk himself, he passed his early years in the greatest austerities, and although he changed his views, he was never married. Pope Siricius pronounced his condemnation, (*Anno. 390*) and (in 412) he was banished by a law of Honorius to *Buŕua*, an island of *Dalmatia*. The writings of Jovinian were suppress-

ed. We have only the writings of those who attempted to refute him. Jerome wrote a treatise expressly for that purpose. Ambrose and Augustin attacked his principles in their works upon Virginity, and no wonder he fell under such powerful adversaries. These three saints contributed to fix a large portion of the creed of the Latin Church. The celebrity of these authors is very far from being justified by their writings on this topic. The reader is desired to turn to the first book of Jerome against Jovinian, and to his epistle ad Eustochiam. He will find in these performances little besides forced interpretations of Paul,—allegories drawn one can hardly tell how, and which we are astonished to see converted into proofs—mysticisms destitute of all sort of plausibility, and many more abusive epithets than arguments.—As a specimen of his argumentation the reader may take the following: After having advanced the proposition that Virginity is natural, that marriage is only a consequence and an effect of man's disobedience, he advances one proof only, which he regards as triumphant, viz: that marriage *produces virgin children*. But where does the worthy author find his authority for casting this slur upon marriage? Surely not in the book of Genesis, because he himself says afterwards that to assign the sin of Adam as the origin of marriage is to treat it, as being itself an evil.

Then as to his method of interpreting Paul, the following is a specimen. When the apostle exhorts to "pray without ceasing," St. Jerome concludes that one must necessarily remain a virgin (unmarried) in order to perform this duty, for he must cease to pray, if he would discharge the obligations of marriage. Jerome might as well have argued that men must not eat or drink, because these operations are so many interruptions of prayer.

St. Ambrose is an expositor of equal merit. Thus he grounds the necessity of the continence of a bishop upon this, viz: that Paul speaking of a bishop, does not say that he *ought to beget children*, but only that he *ought to have obedient children*. *Habentem enim dixit, filios, non facientem*. It is hardly necessary to say that St. Ambrose might have accounted for the turn of the apostle's expression on the score of his modesty: at least he ought to have known that Paul would not have been content with an ambiguous expression, if he had intended to forbid the marriage of bishops. All these fathers* insist greatly upon the purity of virginity, and

* The fathers as they have been surnamed (although not by themselves,) among many considerable excellencies have some faults. It has been truly said of them, that they are much more worthy of credit as witnesses than as interpreters. Still among their faults, we cannot accuse them of exalting themselves above the scripture. Augustine in the 3d chap. of his book concerning the unity of the church says, *et auferantur ergo illa de medio, quae adversus nos invicem non ex divinis canonicis libris sed aliunde recitamus*—and again in chap. 15, *Sunt certe libri Dominici quorum auctoritati utrique consentimus, utrique servimus. Ibi quaeramus Ecclesiam—ibi discutiamus causam nostram*. And again in his book 2d chap. 9. concerning the Christian doctrine. *In his quae aperte positae sunt in scriptura inveniuntur illa omnia quae continent fidem moresque vivendi*. The same author says of Cyprian, book 2. ch. 32, against Crescentius *Literas Cypriani, non ut canonicas habeo, sed eas ex Canonicis considero: et quod in eis Divinarum scripturarum auctoritati congruit cum laude ejus accipio; Quod autem non congruit, cum pace ejus, respicio—Quibus addo presbyterum velis notis Hieronymum ut omittam eos qui nondum dormierunt*. All we ask, is, that the fathers may be tried by this rule.—Ignatius said, (*Ep. to Philip*) that to fast on Saturday or Sunday, is to be the murderer of Christ. Justin Martyr believed that God at the beginning gave the Sun to be worshipped. (ΤΟΥ ΗΛΙΟΥ ὁ θεός εἰσέβησεν)

the defilement which those contract who marry. But passing over the question what is purity, and the distinction between physical and moral purity, to maintain that the soul is defiled by satisfying in the way of God's appointment and with moderation, those necessities of our being, which, if they are not the most essential to the individual, are so to the species, is, to say the least of it, making too much of the opinions of men: and however loudly the defenders of this system may profess their reverence for religion, it is a bad way of giving honour to the Great Author of it, to find with such apparent facility, defects and contradictions in his work. In opposition to these fathers may be cited the sentiments of *Titus of Bostra*, one of the most enlightened of the fathers of the 3d century, and who combatted with most effect the errors of the Manicheans.

LVII. The sum of what has been said is this: celibacy was not an institution of the Old Testament; so far from it, sterility was regarded as an opprobrium.—God in the New Testament cannot be supposed to contradict the Old, at least we have no right to say so in this particular without evident proofs that he has done so—inasmuch as no institution can be more repugnant to nature and reason. But no such proofs exist in the New Testament; the gospel does not establish it, nor can it be proven by apostolical tradition; the discipline of the first age of the church was contrary, and the apostles themselves were almost all married. It has also been shown that this system probably originated with the new Platonicians and was adopted by the church either directly from them or mediately through some of the early heretics. It has been remarked also, that the practice of celibacy, also macerations and other austerities,

πρῶτον ἕκ τῶ πρῶτον ἔσται) Athenagoras was of the opinion, that second marriages were only a decent sort of adultery. (γὰρ ὁ δευτέρως εὐπρεπὴς ἔστι μοιχία) Origen thought that the devils will be saved. Clement of Alexandria thought the Greeks might be saved by philosophy. Arnobius—that God is not the creator of souls, and that the souls of the wicked will be annihilated. Ireneus—that souls separated from the body have hands and feet. Justin was a Chiliast—Tertullian a Montanist—Cyprian an Anabaptist—Chrysostom admitted that Paul had indeed allowed second marriages, but he said that such a marriage *secundum veritatis rationem, vere fornicatio est*, so that Paul in his judgment, spoke against reason and truth. But this sentiment of Chrysostom is approved by the Roman Catholic Church, and inserted among her decrees and canons. (*Can. 31 Qu. 1, Canon Hac ratione.*) Augustine (*Hy pognost. 5 infra medium*) asks, *Quomodo vitam regni coelestis promittis parvulis non veratis ex aqua et spiritu sancto—non cibatis carne neque potatis sanguine*, are we to infer from this, that in his opinion the eucharist should be administered in both species to little children? Jerome's enmity to marriage is almost insufferable. His language is not always even modest. He says, (*lib. 1. Cont. Jov.*) *Puto quod et nuptiarum finis mors est; fructus autem sanctificationis qui vel ad virginitatem vel ad continentiam pertinet, vita aeterna.* And in lib 1. adversus Jov. this extraordinary interrogation occurs, *Cur portas veretrum O Paule?* We are surprised at such extravagancies. And others might be selected from his epistle *ad Geroniam viduam de monagamia*. Still we do not despise the fathers. *Quod in eis Divinarum Scripturarum auctoritate congruit cum laude eorum accipio; Quod autem non congruit; cum pace, eorum respuo.* This was Augustine's rule. But to exalt them above the scripture, is blasphemy. God asks not for the testimony of men. John v: 34.—To prove that God created the world or that Christ died for our sins, by Ireneus or Jerome, is to invalidate the truth of God under pretext of defending it. It is an old stratagem of Satan. Yet pope Nicholas (in *Distinct. 19.* at the canon *Si Romanorum*) says *Si vetus novumque testamentum sunt recipienda non quod codici canonum ex toto habeantur annexa, sed quod de his recipiendis Sancti papae Innocenti prolata videatur esse sententia.* And again (in *Distinct. 19.* at the canon *In canonicis*) we have the following—*Inter canonicas scripturas Decretales Epistolae connumerantur.* But blessed be God our holy religion does not rest upon the authority of men.

were introduced into the church at the time when these heretical sects began to appear, and that these austerities were in harmony with their doctrines in other respects, although they were repugnant entirely to the simple doctrines of primitive Christianity.—It has also been remarked that when the church changed in this respect, many priests and bishops continued to live in marriage—that *Siricius* was the first pope who thought of enjoining celibacy by a law. We may add in this place as a fact, that the decretal epistles of the popes prior to *Siricius*, are not deemed by Roman Catholics to be authentic; at least they are doubted. But it has been shown, we think, that *Siricius* had no power to make such a law, and the law therefore is null—that the church itself never made such a law, inasmuch as the council of Nice formally opposed it, and the succeeding general councils, so down to the sixth maintained silence upon the subject.—In fine, we have proven as we think, that such a law is incompatible with the true spirit of religion—that it is contrary to the law of nature—that such a law ought never to have been made, and that from its origin it has been a prolific source of scandals. This last proposition will now be more fully shown, by the history of the institution from the time of Gregory VII.

Project of a Great Protestant Journal in Paris.

IMPORTANT PROTESTANT MOVEMENT IN FRANCE.

THE following papers will speak for themselves. We need hardly solicit for them the attention of the reader.

What gives peculiar interest to the subject they involve is, that there are more reasons than it is proper to state, for conjecturing that their author is the same with one of the most striking, bold, and popular anonymous writers of the present age,—on French affairs. What a thrill passes through the breast at the thought of O. P. Q.—editing in Paris the great PROTESTANT JOURNAL, of the continent of Europe!

Who on this side the water—feels enough interested in this noble undertaking to lend a helping hand to it? We will cheerfully, yea joyfully be the means of communication for all such; and offer ourselves as agents to receive and forward the necessary subscriptions and contributions; according to the terms of the Prospectus herewith published.—

Will not the press of the United States give wide currency to the Prospectus of *L' Europe Protestante*?—

Paris, 95, Rue Richelieu, March 9th, 1838.

MY DEAR SIR:—

Perhaps you will recollect, that when you visited France, you did me the favor of passing with me a few hours at Auteuil. Those

hours I recollect with pleasure—and have since read with great satisfaction the pamphlet you wrote, and a copy of which you left for me, on the slavery question.

Well then, this is my introduction to you—and my apology for addressing to you to-day a very long letter on a matter of vast importance not only to the old world, but likewise to the new. Your position in the American churches has also led to this application: and you will perceive on reading the document annexed, that I am about to plead with you for the cause of *Protestantism* in *Europe*. That cause (American as you are) requires your aid—and I am very much mistaken indeed, if that help shall be withheld.

You will perceive that it is proposed to establish at **PARIS** a monthly publication, in the French, and hereafter also in the German language, to be entitled **L' EUROPE PROTESTANTE**.

You will perceive that it is to consist of two parts, 1st *polemical* in the best sense of the word, and 2d, of a miscellaneous or magazine part, in which will be embodied all the Christian intelligence, at present no where collected, from all parts of the world—but especially from Europe.

Protestantism is ignorant of herself. Her varied churches are strangers the one to the other. This reciprocal and deplorable ignorance exists all over Europe. The United States of America are not better off. They see us from too great a distance to judge us with accuracy—and we in our turn know better what is the credit of your banks, than what is the organization or what the faith of your thousand churches.

And if Protestantism be ignorant of herself, much more is she unknown by the Roman Catholics. She is calumniated by the Romish priests, disfigured by controversies, and thus judged badly and falsely of by those who are submitted to the yoke of Rome. This remark is universal in its application—and astonishing instances may be cited, of the ignorance in which the Catholics exist, as to the doctrines and principles of Protestantism; for it is not at all rare to hear even well instructed Catholics in France ask, whether we Protestants, believe in Jesus Christ, and whether our Bible is the same as theirs?

In like manner the greatest ignorance prevails in the Protestant churches on all questions of organization and discipline—and we do not hesitate to state, that the interior administration of the Reformed church in France is completely unknown in England.

This state of things leads to two great evils. *First*, the most generous efforts of the friends of vital godliness, and therefore of true Protestantism are often without result, in consequence of a want of union and of common effort. And *second*, the progress of Protestantism is much less rapid than it would be were the Protestant churches more united, and were they marching at least against infidelity and popery, with a common banner, and for a common end.

In *France* it is certain, that multitudes of persons weary of believing nothing, and with adoring nothing worthy of their love or adoration, are wishing to belong to some religion, to some faith, to some church;—and as they will not belong to the Romish church

for their reason refuses to adopt its errors and superstitions, they look to Protestantism—and yet there is no one great Protestant organ in all Europe to reply in a loud and intelligible voice,—“This is our faith—this is the Christian Protestant creed.”

That *Protestant Europe*—and above all *Christian Protestant Europe* should be so long in vindicating her rights, and erecting citadels for her defence—or rather so long in gathering up her forces in the presence of her old enemy, is as much to be wondered at, as regretted; especially when we reflect on what it has done single handed, and when we know what we have derived from it. For to the reformation we are indebted every way, whether as a code or a creed. Take away its purity of faith, and we leave its purity of reason. Take away its pedestal of reason, and we have its still brighter faith. If in protesting against darkness forever being a decree, it had no other merit than that of our intellectual emancipation—if the reformation was simply the rock out of which gushed the mind of the middle ages, it would still command our gratitude and honor. But when we see it overthrow ignorance of all kinds—when we see it continuing its mission of illumination and truth over the earth—we cannot but ask, why should not Christianized Europe show how this Christianity has so advanced her—and how all the real progress of the three last centuries is due to “*Protestant Europe*.”

But how is this to be effected? By the establishment of a central organ in the centre of Europe in the French and hereafter also in the German language, and to be entitled “*L'EUROPE PROTESTANTE*,” which shall address itself to *all* who are *not* Christians, as to *all* who are *not* Protestants—and be supported by all who are.

To establish this work, it is necessary to make a *LOAN* from the *Christian* public of France, America, and England, to be *REPAID* out of the profits of the work, the establishment of which requires that about 2,000*l* should be sunk in making the magazine widely known and read, before it can begin to repay the money so to be invested. When it shall be well known in Europe, its success is certain—but still this requires time and money, and whilst France and England have assisted, and will help us, it has been thought right and wise to make an appeal to the sincere, wealthy, and Christian Protestants in America. The sums which are subscribed are to be repaid out of the profits of the work—and after that repayment, all future clear profits are to be divided among the Christian Protestant institutions of Europe. The subscriptions to the loan vary from 4 to 50 dollars, and even much higher. Those who subscribe 20 dollars will receive the work *gratuitously* until repaid the sums so subscribed. Amongst many distinguished men who have come forward, are the *Rev'd Thomas Hartwell Horne*, author of the *introduction* to the Old and New Testament—The *Rev'd Prebendary Townsend*, author of the *Agreement of the Old and New Testament in Chronological order*—and the *Rev'd Edward Beckirstith*, author of the *Harmony of the Four Gospels*.

To you, then, my dear sir, I make this application, because I feel your well desire to aid us in this most important matter. *Doctor Bunting* the secretary of the Wesleyan Missionary Society, has

written to *Doctor Bangs* very strongly in favor of the measure, and I have likewise addressed a letter to *Doctor Fisk*.

I hope that the American Presbyterians will aid us in this work—and let them not forget that we shall in our turn be most useful to all the American Christian Societies, in making known throughout all the *old* world, the glorious efforts making in the *new*.

Our kind, and most excellent, and useful friend *Mr. Baird*, conveys this letter for me to America—and he will add his testimony to the importance of this work to the cause of true religion in all parts of Europe.

And assuring you of the interest we all take in the efforts of yourself and of all Christian Protestants in America,

I have the honour and pleasure to remain,

Very truly and faithfully yours :

JOHN WILKS.

Rev'd R. J. Breckinridge, Baltimore.

PROTESTANT EUROPE.

THE gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ is, throughout, a bright and glorious display of God's love to sinful men, and wherever it truly shines in the hearts of men, it dispels the darkness of error, idolatry, and sin, and brings us to know and love God, and to delight in doing his holy and gracious will. It is the design of God's love that ultimately all the earth should enjoy the benefit of this light; for God will have all men to be saved, and to come to the knowledge of the truth. And we have seen, in the history of the Church of Christ, a gradual progress of this design from the first days of Christianity. More especially was this manifested when it pleased God to communicate the revival and full light of these precious truths at the REFORMATION.

Three centuries have, however, now passed away since that clearer light of truth was given, and what has been its progress? There has been a considerable diffusion of its beneficial influence through the extended regions of the United States, and through the Colonies of Great Britain, and those of other Protestant countries. Modern missions have also enlarged its boundaries both in the east and the west, the north and the south, and amidst innumerable isles of the ocean—and these facts present many causes of joy and thankfulness.

But its state in its birthplace, Europe, has not corresponded to the hopes that its earliest success might have raised. Various causes occasioned this. It was established in the presence of a powerful, constant, and persevering enemy. The Protestant Churches themselves soon became disunited. One part of these Churches have fallen into fundamental heresy; other parts have become cold, dead, and indifferent, while formally right in doctrine; and other parts have been divided on subordinate matters in doctrine or discipline, and been in danger of forgetting their common union and their common enemy. Thus, the stubbornness of evil has been afresh displayed, and new occasion given for seeking those riches of divine grace, which are at length to triumph over the sin of man. God has, in these past centuries, been teaching the Reformed

Churches many important lessons, and among others, the great evil of their present disunited state. While Rome, in its professed outward unity and subjection to one head, though with but little real spiritual unity, has had special advantages for its efforts against Protestants, and is now reaping those advantages, Protestants are beginning to see the necessity for a closer and Christian union. It is a fact, that since the death of Louis XIV (1715,) the Church of Rome was never in so advantageous a position as it is to-day. In *France*, it holds the keys of all the great and small seminaries, closed by it in spite of the University. It has for it the law of primary instruction, and nearly all the schools; and the number of communicants has certainly trebled in the Roman Catholic Churches of Paris since 1830. In *England*, it has now its seats in parliament, and every one is aware of the supremacy it is labouring to obtain in Ireland. In *Holland*, there were never so many Romish churches and priests as at present. In *Belgium*, it is sovereign—and it has nearly all the schools beneath its yoke. In *Piedmont*, it has lately renewed a Draconian code against the Protestants of the Vandois Vallies. In *Austria*, at the instigation of the Jesuits, it has ordained whole masses of the Protestant population to emigrate to Protestant countries. In the *Rhemish Provinces*, the Protestant Government of Prussia is being daily attacked by the Romish priests. In *Geneva*, it is gaining ground. Here and there in Germany it is leading back to those countries of the Reformation the dangerous and obnoxious Jesuits;—and certainly the moment has arrived to cry—“*To your tents, O Israel!*”

To promote the Protestant Christian union, so much desired, is the object now brought before the Protestant Churches. It is the last prayer of our divine Lord with the Apostles, “Neither pray I for these alone, but for those also which shall believe on me through their word: that they all may be one as thou Father art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us, that the world may believe that thou hast sent me.” How rich, how full, how truly benevolent and glorious such an object! and how certain its attainment after this prayer thus poured out for it!

In promoting this oneness of the Church, it is first important to see and understand its real character, as a oneness of mind and heart with the holy will and love of our Heavenly Father. There is an outward visible unity, and there is an inward spiritual unity. We see both combined in the days of the primitive church under the first effusion of the Holy Ghost. The visible unity is however chiefly material either as a means towards, or as a manifestation of that completed and inward unity, nothing less than which our Lord in his love designs to give to his church.

The perfect unity of the Christian church did not long continue. Even in the primitive church an outward unity was witnessed without the perfected and inward spiritual unity. The visible church at length became so leavened with this corruption, that the whole lump was corrupt, and its outward union mainly produced bondage, will worship, and idolatry.

At the reformation these evils of the visible unity were greater than the benefits. In this situation it pleased God, having accom-

plished his gracious purposes in one form, again to interfere for the good of his Church, and by the bright revival of divine truth, drawn fresh from its pure sources, the Holy Scriptures, to expel the growing darkness of multiplied errors, and break in pieces for a season that outward unity which was no longer beneficial to men. The great doctrine of the word of God, salvation by grace through faith unto holiness, was proclaimed abroad—multitudes with one heart and one mind glorified God in obeying his truth, and yielded themselves to God under its holy and heavenly influence, filling their hearts with supreme love to God and unfeigned love to all men.

But the elements of this real unity which subsists among the true followers of Christ, and especially in the Protestant churches, have yet to be fully manifested and combined in one public and common organ. How little do the Protestant Churches yet know of each other! This reciprocal and deplorable ignorance not only separates English and French Protestants from the remains of Protestantism in Poland, from the colonies of Protestantism in Russia, from the poor flocks of the Reformed Churches in Transylvania, and from the beginnings of Protestantism in Italy. No: this ignorance exists still nearer at home. The Protestant clergy and communities of England, France, Germany, Switzerland, and Holland, have no common bond or point of union, and are mutually ignorant of each other. The present state of Protestantism may be compared to those immense hotels in Paris, where a vast many families, though living under the same roof, and retiring to their apartments by the same courtyard, are yet so much strangers to each other, that births, marriages, and funerals succeed in the same hotel, and pass the same court with rapidity, none paying attention to the joys or sorrows of his neighbour.

It is then designed to set up an organ of communication with each other, under the title of

L'EUROPE PROTESTANTE.

The Committee residing in Paris as a central station for communicating with all the Protestant Churches, would distinctly avow the principles which they hold. By *Protestant truth* they mean that large body of doctrinal truth comprehended in the creeds of the primitive Church, and the harmony of confessions of the Protestant Churches. They believe in the love of God the Father to a sinful world; in the grace of God the Son, who gave himself a ransom for all; and in the regenerating power of God the Holy Spirit, who sanctifies the people of God. In *Protestant principles* they comprehend the certainty and sufficiency of God's word, as held by the Reformed Churches—the living spirit of Christianity opposed to a lifeless form—its pure worship to idolatrous worship—its Christian liberty equally opposed to libertinism and superstitious bondage—and the duty of personal judgment, faith, and obedience, opposed to indifference of creeds on the one hand, and vicarious faith and slavish prostration of understanding on the other. Their object would be to be Protestant against all papal and infidel errors, and truly Catholic in spirit, but *not* latitudinarian. And in

these great objects, and in this vast field of divine truth, they invite the aid and co-operation of their fellow Christians.

"*L' Europe Protestante*" will consist of two parts: first, of temperate logical and Christian discussions, and treatises on the great principles of Protestantism; and, second, of a *Magazine* portion of the work, in which will be recorded, from month to month, the state of Protestantism in all the Protestant Churches and countries of this vast Continent. The Christian pastors of the various churches on the continent will be invited to become correspondents of this portion of the Journal, which will likewise publish monthly accounts of the proceedings of the English and American as well as Continental Bible, Missionary, Christian Knowledge, Tract, School, Peace, and Temperance Societies. All the Christian Protestant Pastors in Paris, whether French, German, English, or American, will meet monthly at the offices of the work, to suggest improvements or alterations, and to examine with the Committee, the prospects of this Christian undertaking.

At a period of the history of the Church of Christ, like the present, when Rome is making such vast efforts for the spread of its influence, and for the propagation of its superstitions and errors, it has appeared desirable that Protestantism in Europe should at least be as active as Romanism: *not* indeed attempting or desiring to persecute or provoke, but to establish a rallying point at Paris for all Christian Protestants in Europe, and an organ which shall narrate their proceedings—and keep the rest of the Protestant world acquainted with their varied operations.

With respect to the first portion of the work, it will *not* be devoted to the discussion of points of doctrine or discipline, on which the members of the Church of Christ are divided—but in presenting to the world at large the great principles of Christianity and true Protestantism, and in combatting with temper and moderation, the deplorable errors of the Church of Rome.

This work, then, will be addressed: first, to the *Infidel* portion of Europe, as it will contain defences of Christianity against infidel objections and attacks; second, to the *Roman Catholic* portion of Europe, as it will examine and refute the errors of Romanism: and, third, to the *Christian Protestant* portion of Europe, as it will be the organ which shall hereafter express their hopes, joys, fears, successes and sorrows.

To establish this work, it is necessary to make a *LOAN* from the Christian public of France, England, and America, to be re-paid out of the *profits* of the work, the establishment of which requires that 2,000*l.* sterling should be sunk in making the *Magazine* widely known and read, before it can begin to repay the money so to be invested. When it shall be well known in Europe, there can be no sort of doubt as to its success, since it addresses itself not to one portion, but to all the members of the great Protestant family. Still this will take time and money, and whilst the French Protestants are doing, and will do their best to aid us in this work, it has been thought right and wise to make an appeal to the sincere, wealthy and Christian Protestants of Great Britain and America.

The sums which are subscribed towards the required capital are

to be repaid out of the profits of the work, and after that repayment all future clear profits are to be divided amongst the Christian Protestant Institutions of Europe. This is not a mercantile operation, but a Christian work.

The subscriptions to the loan already vary from 1*l.* to 3*l.* 5*l.* 10*l.* 15*l.* 20*l.* and 40*l.*; and all subscriptions can be transmitted by post, by cheques on London or English country bankers, by provincial or bank notes, or by drafts or bills on Paris.

This work is undertaken with a deep sense of its many difficulties, as well as of its great importance. May Christians unite every where in prayer that that gracious God and Saviour, who would have his children to be one, may abundantly prosper this humble effort for that blessed end.

Subscriptions towards the loan should be transmitted to MONSIEUR WILKES, "*L'Europe Protestante*," reu Richelieu, N. 95, à Paris.

Paris, March 1838. 95, Rue Richelieu.

SUBSTANCE OF DOCTRINE.

THAT extraordinary personage "PROF. E. MITCHELL OF N. C."—has written a disquisition on "*Substance of doctrine*;"—which with singular appropriateness he has addressed to the REV'D DR. HILL of Va. and published in the Newspaper of Mr. CONVERSE, at Richmond.

He attempts to make out, that nothing in religion can be believed otherwise than "*for substance*;" and then confirms this, by showing that even we old school folks, do no more—perhaps few of us—so much. We by no means intend, that this is all, or even a clearly written part of the disquisition; but only that it is what may be painfully educed from a very confused mass of types, thrown at the subject,—as the probable design of the writer.

But what ever there may be of the strange in the thesis, is utterly put to nought by the mode of proof and illustration.

For example; the points, amongst others, of the inspiration of scripture and the integrity of the text, and those of the creation of the world out of nothing, and in the space of six days—are pretty plainly handled, considering who does it. And to confirm his leading idea, he boldly asserts that no man can believe that the scriptures, as we have them, are the word of God—except "*for substance*;" that is, as we gather his sense, that the *words* are not God's at all; and that the ideas are so, only substantially. To this he adds—that the creation of the world, that now is, out of nothing—can be believed only "*for substance*;" seeing that, in fact, we have every reason to know, it was not created of nothing—but of the fragments of a pre-existing world; it being very questionable, as we glean his meaning, whether a world could be created of nothing, and very sure this world was not so created. Then he intimates —

that the fact that God made the world in six days, can surely be believed only "*for substance*;" since there are such innumerable and indisputable proofs, that the thing happened entirely otherwise: all which is abundantly evident to every philosopher—and is indeed an indisputable canon of the noble sciences, which the *Prof.* forgot his ordination vow out of love to.—

In all seriousness, what is the Presbyterian church to witness next?—Here is an ordained minister, uttering anti-scriptural, and even atheistical opinions, by wholesale—addressed to a leading divine—through a widely circulated newspaper calling itself religious—and in advocacy of a party, styling itself—*par-excellence*, Christian;—and yet not a whisper is heard from either of those quarters, repudiating such vile and audacious trash! Is there no discipline in the church of North Carolina? Does the Rev'd Mr. Mitchell in truth belong to one of our Presbyteries?—

Let it be remembered that it is from an accredited defender of the Semi-Pelagian party that this precious sample is taken. The opinions are those, of one of its most voluminous writers;—of one of its councillors, ranking, *in a certain quarter*, with, if not above CHANCELLOR KENT himself!—

PRIEST GILDEA AND THE ODD-FELLOWS.

WE will avouch Mr. Gildea for as *odd a fellow* himself, as any he can find amongst those who have appropriated that singular cognomen to themselves. And it may be the *oddity* of all the beligerents that has been the remote cause of the feud now raging between the Priest, and the "Independent Order of Odd-Fellows"—as we think these "*odd fellows*"—call themselves, oddly enough. We have heard that two of a trade could not agree; and why should not *oddities*, be subject to the unhappy law, that according to tradition, controls all similarities?—

We mean no sort of disrespect to any order, red or white—odd or even—independent or otherwise. If individuals choose to unite for social, charitable, literary, political, or religious purposes,—either or all, or any other, we have nothing to say. It is the era of combination. And from the convention of "American woman," met to prove that there is no difference between white and black—up to the convention of European sovereigns met to regulate the affairs of the world,—we have for our parts, no idea of becoming victims of the great combination movements of the age. We know something of these matters; have been members of divers and sundry associations of many names and many kinds; have been above our merits honoured by multitudes of them;—and at no distant period, have been actually a selected spokesman of a gathering of seamstresses, and still more recently have received a very pointed compliment from a society of grave-diggers.—Let no "*fellow*" therefore, however "*odd*," suppose we mean any thing but honor and courtesy to him and his order.

Indeed we rather take for granted, that whoever quarrels with Mr. Gildea—is for that time at least—not “odd” at all. For of all the men we have ever encountered, he has the largest amount of “modest assurance,” and the smallest share of what usually conciliates politeness, and makes human intercourse, possible, not to say profitable.

He is the modest and civil gentleman, who, about four years ago, rudely and violently interrupted divine worship in the Lecture Room attached to the Second Presbyterian Church in this city; and therefor, escaped fine and imprisonment, only through the forbearance of those, whom he grossly and audaciously insulted.

He is the good Samaritan, who was Confessor at the Nunnery in Aisquith Street, when the extraordinary events so often referred to in our pages, occurred there several years ago; and who, if he had a spark of shame, would never, till that matter was satisfactorily explained, have ventured to draw the public attention towards himself.

He is in short the pastor at St. James Chapel—on Gallows hill (*ominous conjuncture*)—about whom and whose proceedings, so many “odd” stories, have been flying about the town for the last three or four years.

The present affair which occupies so large a portion of his paternal meditations, and about which he and the Odd-Fellows have appeared several times in the city newspapers, stands nearly as follows. A very respectable physician of this city, (Dr. DUNAN)—in his last illness, was offered and gratefully received the kind and fraternal aid, which his associates of the order of Odd-Fellows, usually tender to a member (which he had been for many years) in his circumstances. Things stood thus, until Dr. D. paid the last debt of nature. Then it suddenly came to light, (as it now appears on the authority of Priest Gildea)—that Dr. Dunan, had just before his death—voluntarily renounced the Order—and being reconciled to the Papal Church in which he was born—died, by Priest Gildea’s fixing up, in that full security, and assurance of heaven, which could never have been his portion, if he remained, either *out* of the church, or *in* the Order.—The Odd-Fellows, took it into their heads to doubt the veracity of Priest Gildea; and after mature examination of the whole affair, chose rather to believe the man himself when alive, and his wife and friends after he was dead,—than to believe Priest Gildea; whereupon they added to what they had done before, the usual contribution to the family of a deceased member. This was too much for the priest; and so he has taken to print in proper person; and to sustain his veracity and character reveals what he considers the secrets of a man’s dying confession. The Order is out too; and as far as we know, the public faith, and public sentiment are both decidedly against the priest.

The priests will not allow any of their deluded followers to take any oaths or obligations, the full scope of which is not subject to their control; nor to have any secrets of any kind, not divulged to them in the confessional; nor to mingle in any associations, where any influence not subject in its turn to them, could be exerted over them. The papist must be the slave of the priest; and therefore he

shall contract no obligation, be united by no tie, keep no secret, swear no oath, with the Order of Odd-Fellows. This he shall not do—and be a good papist.

But on the other hand, this Order must be a sad affair, and Priest Gildea must be more than a prophet, if his principles be true and well founded. Here is a respectable man on his death bed; he is united to the Odd-Fellows—and that alone will carry him to hell; then the *Odd-Fellows*, must be very *bad fellows*. But Priest Gildea cuts him loose from the Odd-Fellows, and by the one slice, cuts all the sin out of him: then Priest Gildea is a grand hand at wholesale purgation,—and might do himself, as well as the world around him, a service, by taking an occasional cut, *nearer home*.

But after all, what if the Odd-Fellows are right, as to matter of fact? What if Dr. Dunan, really died an Odd-Fellow—and Priest Gildea has first deluded him, and then slandered his memory? What ought we to think of a pretended minister of religion, who should use his office only to deceive the dying—and employ its authority only to wrong the dead? Beware Mr. Priest;—there is a limit to human credulity.—

THE CONFLAGRATION AT PETERSBURGH.

Who killed Cock Robin? I says the Sparrow, with my bow and arrow. Who saw him die? I says the Fly, with my little eye. Who caught his blood? I says the Fish, in my wide blue dish.—Moral. We are the butchered Cock Robin; Mr. *Converse* is the murdering Sparrow; Mr. *Hutchinson* the innocent accessory Fly; and Mr. *Shore* the bloody minded Fish.—“Wo to the hands that shed such costly blood”!!! (*Mark Anthony*.)

Mr. Leavitt of the *Emancipator* says, we ought long ago to have taken notice of the fact that we were burnt at Petersburg. Contrary-wise, we rather doubt, whether even now, it were not better to avoid all contact with folks, whose only arguments are curses, whose moral instruments are chumps of fire, and whose clear-sighted wisdom just suffices, to confound, with Sancho Panza—HAWK and HANDSAW,—because they both begin with the letter H.—But moreover, the said editor has intimated, that if we shrink from our own defence, he will take up the cudgels for us; seeing that, although we well deserve to be burnt, Mr. Shore and Mr. Hutchinson, deserve it as well or better; and although they burnt us “for substance”—justly, if the burning had only been related to the proper sins, yet really we were burnt for a good work—he being judge.—Surely we can have no objection to Mr. Leavitt and Mr. Shore, settling all these affairs, to their mutual satisfaction. There is a new school abolitionist, and a new school pro-slavery man; we are the antipodes of both, in all these points: and we have reason to know from a hundred sources, that after all, new-schoolism, is a thousand times more powerful in its affinities, than any

opposing aspects of the slavery question are in their repulsions. We saw Mr. EDWARD BEECHER of Illinois, the prince of abolitionists, and Mr. ELIPHA WHITE of South Carolina, the king of pro-slavery men—meet the other day, casually, on a steam boat, as both went on to the General Assembly. Thought we, here is trouble; here will be shyness, and distance, at least. One of these men says the other is the most prodigious sinner on earth—and the other returns the compliment by a ten fold abuse. They came, at once together: and our alarm augmented; for said we, can fire and water coalesce? They clung to each other all day; alas, thought we, they are circumventing each other; they are laying plans for mutual damage. They two, and none others, got into the same carriage at Philadelphia and drove rapidly off: oh! said we, they are gone to destroy each other;—and great was our astonishment, to find both unscathed, the following week. Observe the conclusion; the pro-slavery man from Carolina, staid where damage could be done to the truth by agitating the slavery question—and there did all he could to rend the church on it. The Illinois abolitionist went where damage could be done to the truth by preventing the agitation of the slavery question—and then did all he could towards the rending of the church by hushing up the slavery question, in the Abolition Assembly!—These intimates, had one bond of union, stronger than all opposing repugnancies.—*They are both new school men!*—So also, are Mr. Leavitt, of the Emancipator, and Mr. Shore of Petersburg, or to go to the fountain head at once, Mr. Converse of the Telegraph; and no more conflagrations will take place, nor any more ink be shed about them, than are just necessary to help the New School party.

The Petersburg conflagration took place, simply as a new school party movement. All the zeal of Mr. Howard of Georgia, and Mr. White of Carolina, and Mr. Converse of Virginia, in favour of slavery, is mere froth and pretence. Their true and real design is to do mischief to the old school party in the Presbyterian Church. We have many facts in regard to these worthies; and shall proceed at this time, to expose such proceedings of as many of them as are needful to illucidate the Petersburg affair.

Mr. Shore, the post master at Petersburg, is a hot tempered, empty headed new-school man; devoted to the new opinions as far as he understands them, and to Mr. Converse, as their chief advocate in Virginia.

Mr. Converse, writes to Mr. Shore, an urgent letter, saying that the Baltimore Literary and Religious Magazine, was exerting a dreadful influence, against the new school; that it must at all rates be put down: and that the shortest and most effectual way to do this, was to raise the cry of abolitionism, against the senior editor of it; a cry which the then existing circumstances, gave these unscrupulous men, a very slight key to whistle on.—Mr. Converse therefore laid the conspiracy; opened upon us, in his columns; got the renegade abolitionist Yale of Richmond, to advertise us;—and wrote to Mr. Shore the post master of Petersburg, to get up an operation there. Mr. Converse writes a very singular hand: Mr. Shore permitted those who knew his writing to see parts of

the letter—hiding the name; and so, while engaged in traducing honest men—betrayed his wicked and mean spirited prompter. In this way, the facts transpired; and they have reached us through four or five unimpeachable sources. Whenever the East Hanover Presbytery will arraign Mr. Converse, for his vast and countless iniquities (a procedure due to God and man)—we will, if notified, attend his trial, and prove these facts upon him.

While Mr. Converse assailed us in Richmond; and Yale and Wyatt advertised us in his paper, as we believe by his procurement, like a stray horse; and "Prof. E. M. of N. C."—broke out on us, from the bowels of geology, where he had lain dormant for years, (or for aught we can tell, for ages)—; and Mr. Eliakim Phelps and the Philadelphia Observer, and Mr. Brainard, yelled in chorus from Philadelphia; and Mr. Johnson and the Evangelist (aided by Samuel *Lugens* Cox D. D.) and Mr. Leavitt and the Emancipator, took up the cry from New York; and two travelling vagabonds, one calling himself Lyon, and the other preferring to flee the country as an abolition spy, rather than give his name, came down and quartered in our very city to sell abusive and heretical books from New Haven, to our own congregation under a forged recommendation, (as to one of them)—from us;—about the same period, and as a part of the general conspiracy, Mr. Shore commenced operations at Petersburg. He goes to his pastor, Mr. Hutchinson, *who professes to be an old school man*, and gets liberty to write us an insolent and false letter; then he gets, surreptitiously, from Genl. Pegram, an opinion against certain articles written by another hand, and expressly dissented from by us; then gathers a few boys, and still fewer men, in the streets, of Petersburg, and with papal barbarism, warring against knowledge, makes a bonfire, of one number of our magazine; writes to Mr. Converse, who of course was quite astonished at the news, a very pointed notice, of the "*very interesting affair*," and then closed up his agency, by getting as many papers of all kinds, Baptist, Political &c. &c., as he could, to publish his grand work, with the grand account of it.—After reading this paragraph, we request Mr. Shore to read Proverbs XI. 21. He will there see why his diligent obedience of Mr. Converse led only to his own exposure; and why we, the innocent and ignorant subject of their wicked combinations, were only the more promoted in the love and confidence of God's dear people, by the schemes so extensively contrived for our ruin.

As it regards Mr. Hutchinson, we have little to add, to what we have said in our March No.—He says he is an orthodox man. We hope he thinks he is.—But after a good deal of inquiry, we are unable to find one act of his during the last eight eventful months,—that would not have become a new-school man, as well or better than a sound and true hearted Presbyterian.—We have read his long, childish, and abusive reply to our article—and deem it now, as we did at first, "a most lame and impotent conclusion"—of a most extraordinary procedure.—The facts stand as before. He allowed a new school member of his church, instigated by the most virulent and malignant enemy of sound men, and sound doctrines in all Va.,—to dictate to him a course, rude, offensive and

injurious to an old acquaintance who had manifested towards him, a contrary spirit, more than he seems willing to remember;—and who, hated for his devotion to the truth, was to be ruined, by his aid—at the very moment when, his good name was of more value to the cause, Mr. Hutchinson professed to love, that it ever was before, or perhaps ever will be again. All this Mr. H. did on a pretext utterly unfounded in fact and in form. We have however no disposition to wound or injure him; the more especially, under circumstances in which we have some reason to suppose, that a forbearance, not practiced towards us, may be of some advantage to him.

In regard to this most vile conspiracy, which set itself for our ruin, —thanks be God, its whole authors are exposed in their own guile —and their web of deceit broken to pieces.—We had no idea of such a deep seated iniquity, being bound up in the hearts of men calling themselves Protestants, and Christians; and pretending to preach and write, and labour for a God, whose very essence as a moral being, is rectitude.—We went, simply, honestly and zealously forward with our work, in the great controversy through which we have passed; and God has not only given us and our cause, abundant success—but has brought his and our enemies to signal shame, and made their very duplicity, one great means of their discomfiture. For will Mr. Shore with all his zeal for slavery, unite with Dr. Beman and Edward Beecher, and Mr. Cleveland and a whole gang of the wildest abolitionists, in forming a new sect, to protect “southern institutions”! Ah Mr. Shore, you moved too quick; you were far too smart.—And will Mr. Converse, unite with the Evangelist, and the Emancipator, and the negro Cornish with his “*Coloured American*,” and that whole band of “sound and eminent divines” he is wont to prate about; and those voluntary hoards he is used so to laud—whose very agents and missionaries, are to so great an extent openly committed to Garrison and his compeers;—will Mr. Converse dare to make a confederacy with these, sworn friends of “*southern institutions*?” Poor Mr. Converse, is in a corner: and the chief result of his conspiracy against us, has been that he has inextricably involved his party and hopelessly exposed himself, on the very question he tried to ruin us on.—And the Philadelphia Observer too,—that ecclesiastical Jack-Daw, full of all garrulity and obscenity—even it is dumb on the *great* question, at the very moment—when it ought to speak out loudly and clearly! Come Mr. Phelps. Come Mr. Brainard. Speak out. “*Which King Bezonian?*”

We will be allowed, in the honest pride of a heart, void of intentional concealment, and of a conscience free of offence on the great and agitating question of the coloured race—to refer to our own course, and especially our course, *since our conflagration*, in contrast, with that of our enemies and slanderers.

Have we been silent; have we turned and twisted about; have we with a double-tongue, talked only to one man at a time—talking differently to all?—On the contrary, in the Convention of the Orthodox at Philadelphia; by our course in the General Assembly; in speeches before hundreds yea thousands, delivered at the earn-

est solicitations of men of all shades of moderate opinions, before the Colonization Society of Pennsylvania;—in the capital of Maryland—in the hall of the Senate,—and at the urgent request of the Society of the state; publicly, boldly, and unreservedly, every where—since as before *our conflagration*, upon this, as upon all other subjects, we have laid open our heart and mind, to our fellow men. Of the speeches above referred to—one has already passed through above twenty thousand impressions, in five or six different shapes, within two months.—Gentlemen, allow us at least this method of serving you. Permit us to commend to your imitation a line of conduct, which, if you can understand—and follow it, may, by the force of habit, enable you at last to act with integrity towards the public—with rectitude towards your friends, and with candour towards your enemies. So acting, you may possibly command success; and will, at all events, escape exposure and contempt. And however others may regard you,—you will no longer be obliged, in your calm and sober moments, to despise yourselves.

THE DEGRADING TENDENCY OF THE PAPAL SYSTEM.

THE following is a part of a private letter, from one of our oldest, earliest and most valued friend. We rely on his kindness, to excuse our giving publicity, to that which the public stands so greatly in need of—and which nothing but his modesty could for a moment deny to it.

There are two things which impress us forcibly and delightfully in this matter. First, the evidence now furnished, that laymen, politicians, and literary men, of the first rank in the country, begin to take elevated views of the papal controversy—and to make themselves masters of it. Secondly, that our patient, selfdenying, and humble labours in this mighty field—are deemed not unworthy of the commendation of such men.—Thanks be to God—the public attention, is at last awakened—the educated mind of the country deeply excited on this overwhelming subject.

We trust Mr. SHORE and GENERAL PEGRAM will find no treason in the last paragraph of the letter; and if Messrs. YALE and WYATT happen to see it, we beseech them to send for Mr. CONVERSE, and take advice before reading it.—To the respected writer of it, we only say, we publish it as frankly, as we did the essays which it condemns. And however deeply he and the writer of those papers may differ from each other—or either of them from us—we are perfectly assured, that if only such men as they both are, were staked on the opposite sides of that agitating and dangerous con-

troversy, the country would be far safer,—the question far more likely to be wisely and temperately solved—and those who occupy middle ground be far more candidly construed, than at present.

* * * * * I have been much gratified by the general scope and conduct of your magazine : and was particularly pleased with your “*Memoranda of Foreign Travel*,” and your admirable letter to Dr. Wardlaw. I sympathise fully with you in the uncompromising hostility, with which you expose the absurdities—(in doctrine, faith, ceremonies and rites) of the Catholic Church. To my mind all mere ceremonies in religion are worthless and out of place ; and all superstitions whether religious or otherwise, tend to degrade the intellect. But the Catholic faith, is truly a stupendous structure of disgusting superstitious unmeaning ceremonies, and gross Idolatry, disguised under the name of religion ;—a cunningly devised *system of human ambition*, (more artful and potent, than that form of it which has cheated mankind out of their political rights,)—by which a few cunning men, under the saintly manners and vestments of a priesthood have contrived to elevate themselves to wealth, and boundless power ; and in the same degree have degraded the great mass belonging to their faith, to the most abject and slavish subjection to them, in all things, involving the practice of their religion.

The idolatry and nonsense of many of their doctrines and ceremonies, you have from time to time successfully exposed. But the tendency of their religion to *degrade* the *people* at the footstool of the priesthood,—in its character of an *artful scheme of human ambition*, is a weak point in their system, against which, as far as I have observed, you have as yet directed, but few of your attacks.

If you inquire what it is, to which I now particularly allude :—I reply, to the whole machinery of their system, as it is seen and felt, in its *operation upon the people*. 1st. In the orders and degrees, which the priesthood have created for their distinction and importance ; together with the dignities, attributes, and imposing titles, which they have arrogated to themselves as a *privileged order* : and next, in the numerous devices, which they have adopted, to keep the people in an *abject dependence* upon them ; and the *slavish attitudes* which they have prescribed to the people, whether in approaching their persons, or receiving at their hands, the offices of religion ;—in none of which particulars have they any authority, in the practice of the apostles, or the testimony of the scriptures, so far as I can discover.

The Catholic religion is to my view, little else than the device of a crafty few, called a priesthood, to rule over the unsuspecting many called the people :—and the fundamental principle in their tactics, is, for the priests to make themselves every thing, and the people, nothing. To this end they have their *Pope*,—with the pompous, (if not impious) title of “*His Holiness* ;” next their *Arch-Bishop*,—with his title of “*Holy Father*” or “*Father in God*” ;—next their *Bishop*,—with his title of “*Right Reverend*” ;—next their *Priest*, with his title of “*Father*” or “*Rev'd Father*” ;—next their *Arch-Deacon* with I don't know what title ; next their *Deacon*,

and lastly their poor *Curate* to do the drudgery; and at the foot of all, stand the *People*, the gaping laymen, wondering at the grandeur and holiness, and superiority of those exalted beings who are elevated so many ranks and degrees above them.—This is the first movement of that priesthood, in bringing into action their potent tactics of worldly ambition.

Having by this imposing array of titles and degrees, established a suitable distinction between themselves and the laymen of their faith; and having claimed for themselves, the attributes of infallibility and holiness; the power of remitting and retaining sins, and conferring the Holy Ghost,—by which the people are impressed with a suitable awe of their power, and a dutiful reverence for their characters, and are made to feel the immense distance between a priest and a laymen;—their next movement is, to impose upon the people such *observances* and *ceremonies*, in approaching their sacred persons, and receiving at their hands the ordinances of the church, as will tend, not only to make manifest this *degraded relationship*, but will perpetuate and make it ever familiar to their minds, and (by connecting it with their religious duties) cause it to be easily submitted to, by their feelings.

Trace the developement of the scheme, and see how adroitly this is done. "His Holiness" the Pope is to be approached by all true and faithful Catholics in the abject attitude of *bended knees*, in which posture, he condescends to them a kiss of his great toe. The Arch-Bishop, Bishop, and Cardinal (I believe) in receiving from the Pope their commissions to preach the gospel, must receive it, respectfully *kneeling at his feet*. The Priest, Arch-Deacon, Deacon, and Curate, must receive, in like manner, from their Bishop, their ordination, and commission, also reverently *kneeling at his feet*. So much from the clergy by way of setting the example: now for their sheep, the people.—If a devout, or superstitious Catholic seeks a blessing of his priest or his bishop, he must receive it respectfully *kneeling at his feet*. If he passes through the ceremony of confirmation, it is required to be done reverently *kneeling at the feet of his bishop*. If he makes confession of his sins, he must do it respectfully *kneeling at the feet of his priest*. If he desires to partake of the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, he is required to receive it, devoutly *kneeling before his bishop* or his priest. Or if he seeks absolution or remission of his sins, it must be received like all the rest of the ceremonies and rites which the priesthood have prescribed, humbly *kneeling at their feet*.

Now the real motive, which prompts all this prostration of one man, before his priest, who is after all, in the eye of God, nothing more than his fellow man and equal,—is carefully disguised, or kept out of view; and the practice is recommended under the plausible representation of its marking humility to God. But these examples (and they are only a few out of the many which might be adduced) will suffice to show the craftiness of their designs in degrading the people, and elevating themselves in a corresponding degree. It is needless to say that there can be discovered no authority in the scriptures, (the authority of "the early Fathers" I don't admit) for either the *abject attitudes* which they impose upon

the people in the performance of these several rites, or for those lofty *pretensions* to superiority and rank, which the clergy have invested themselves with.

The next movement prompted by the skilful generalship of the Catholic priesthood, is a scheme by which to *confirm* and *strengthen* the *power and influence* which they have thus acquired. This is done by multiplying the occasions, for the exercise of that power:—in order that the people might be kept in the constant and daily *dependence* upon them for the necessary offices of the confessional and otherwise—as well as, for those frequent ministrations in their church, whilst travelling through the wearisome observances of their cumbrous ritual. To this end, they have bedecked their religion with many of the cast off rags of the Jewish ceremonial; and have not scrupled to borrow largely, from the superstitions, of pagan Rome. They have established a form of worship, in which ceremony is piled upon ceremony, and rite upon rite:—in which feast days, follow fast days;—and each saint has his day, and almost every day, has its saint. From the cradle to the grave, through all stages, of infancy, youth, manhood, and age, from the crossing of the baby with holy water at baptism, to the giving of extreme unction, and blessing the grave clothes at the last hour, the Catholic priesthood have contrived to introduce some ceremony or rite, which makes their services indispensable, to every true “son of the church.” What with their seven sacraments, and fifty other superstitious notions, each requiring some *prescribed form* of observance, and in most of which it is contrived that the people should be exhibited *kneeling reverently* before them;—and what with their feast, fast, and saints’ days,—their Advent, Christmas, Lent, Good Friday, Easter and what not;—their St. Andrew’s, St. John’s, St. Patrick’s, St. Talvand’s, and their all other saints’ days, to the end of the alphabet; with the particular doings and prayers, prescribed and provided for each saint, and occasion,—the zealous Catholic (provided he be ambitious of being considered a staunch churchman)—will find that his liturgy will give him almost constant employment, and make him a *helpless dependant* upon the priesthood, for their saintly services.

Now the combined effect of these several measures (which aim not, at the promotion of true religion; but have the worldly grandeur and influence of the clergy, for their motive,) which are so skilfully dovetailed into each other, as to form a compact *system* of priestly domination over the people; in which each part of the scheme supports all the rest,—the combined effect I say, is just such as so artfully contrived a scheme is calculated to produce:—and that is, an arrogant and lordly bearing of the priesthood towards their flocks on the one hand;—and on the other, a slavish awe, accompanied by a species of idolatrous reverence, on the part of the people towards their clergy; and particularly to that portion of them, who have been elevated by several degrees above the laity, and are known, in the phraseology of that church, as the “higher clergy.” You have no doubt witnessed the trembling awe and profound obeisance with which a Catholic commoner approaches his bishop or Arch-bishop, either in private intercourse, or

whilst receiving at his hands the rites of his church. It partakes in nothing, of that *confiding ease*, and friendly *equality*, which Christ appears to have established among his disciples, as a brotherhood: but presents rather the spectacle, of some degraded one, who appears to consider himself a servant, in the presence of his master;—the “bated breath humbleness” of an inferior, in the presence of some holier, some higher being. Can however, any other feelings than these be generated, under a system of priestly tactics so artfully contrived, and so constantly exercised;—as it must be constantly exercised, upon every deluded being, who seeks to have the character of a zealous member of the church? Can it be otherwise with children, or the ignorant:—or even with those, who though intelligent, have nevertheless been accustomed from early youth, to witness or practice, the ceremonies and rites, prescribed by that church?—and which on that account (from early habit,) cease to strike them, as unmeaning superstitions, or disgusting mummeries, but as something *which is religion itself*? Take a devout Catholic from either of these classes, and follow him through the practice of the ritual, which the clergy of his faith have prescribed for his devout observance: then consider the part which the priest plays, both in their public worship, and in their private guardianship, as “keepers of his conscience,” and now what must be the idea impressed upon his mind, of the honor and majesty of the clergy of his church. He does not know,—perhaps does not inquire into, the reasons or meaning of the ceremonies, which he is called upon to practise;—(and perhaps if he did, he would fail to understand them, since if there be any meaning in many of them, it is so occult or far-fetched, as to need the explanation of one of the initiated, to make them intelligible)—but he sees and knows one thing for certain; and that is, that matters are so arranged, that the priests are the monarchs, and the people the subjects in that worship; (or as it strikes other people, the priests are the showmen, and the congregation the puppets;—) that at the wave of the priest’s hand, the whole assembly (for so it has been arranged by his brethren of the clergy) are *down upon their knees*:—that at the wave of his hand again, or by the tinkling of a little bell, they are *up again upon their feet*:—That by a set form of prayer, uttered by him over a bit of bread, or a cup of wine, lo! a miracle, the bread is converted into flesh, and the wine into blood,—which he administers like a superior being, to the abject people, who must receive it *kneeling at his feet*.

But if the priest be so holy and exalted a being, who can do these and many other like things, and at whose bidding the people are so often brought upon their knees before him,—how much more holy and exalted must be the “Right Reverend Bishop”: at whose feet even the Priest, (as well as the people) must sometimes kneel; and from whose palms, provided they will bend the knees *reverently*, and have his hands laid upon their heads, virtues can proceed, which the priest, is not great enough to communicate; such I believe, as the pardon and remission of *all* sins, dispensation from certain known duties, the conferring the Holy Ghost, and other similar high, and God-like attributes.

In the contemplation of these things, the respect and devotion, with which the zealous Catholic is inspired, towards his Priest, mounts up into a sort of trembling reverence, and holy awe, towards his Bishop. But the Arch-Bishop is higher than the Bishop!—and behold, the Pope!—who sits high and exalted above all; to whom Arch-Bishops and Cardinals, Bishops, Priests and Deacons must all *kneel*, as inferior in rank, grade and grace! What then must the common layman do, or think;—the *worm*, in the tactics of the priesthood, in the presence of his spiritual guardian, and saviour upon earth! What do?—why fall upon his knees, and think it an honour, to kiss his great toe! What think?—why precisely, what the ambitious tactics of that crafty priesthood has prepared for him to think, and believe:—to wit: that the pope is the “Head of the Holy Catholic Church,” which he is called upon to believe in;—that he is the genuine successor of St. Peter;—that he is infallible; that he has the keys of heaven;—the power to bind and to loose;—to excommunicate and sink an offender into hell; or if it so please him, to open the doors of heaven, with the keys aforesaid, and send a faithful son of the church to the blessings of paradise.

It is by a scheme such as this, that the Catholic clergy have established for themselves an influence over the professors of that faith, which is probably greater, than that which has been exercised by any body of men over the multitude, in any other age of the world. And until their Rubric be examined and exposed, in the light, in which it strikes me,—as the *scheme of a crafty priesthood to promote their temporal power and influence* over mankind, and not to subserve the purposes of true religion as they would have the world to believe;—and until this fact is brought to the understandings of their deluded followers, it appears to me that the very stronghold of their power will have been left unassailed, and no real impression can be made upon their *followers*,—upon whom chiefly, and not upon Protestants, it is most needed.

I have been drawn by the subject, without originally intending it, into the sin of writing you an unmercifully long letter. But it is a subject upon which I have supposed you feel much interest. There is another topic which we of the south take a lively interest in; and on which, as it has sometimes had a place in your journal (and I am sorry that it has) I had intended to offer a remark or two. But I shall forbear now to do so for want of room. I need not say that I allude to the subject of the abolition of slavery. During the publication of certain essays under the signature of Presbyterian, your magazine ceased to be, (what it was before, and has been since) a welcome and refreshing visitor to my family. There was in those essays so much of that *cant*, and *ignorance* of our *institutions* and *perversion* of *scripture*, which characterizes every thing that comes from the school of new-light Perfectionists, that they were calculated to do no good, but much evil, in the disgust and indignation which they excited. It was therefore a source of real regret to me, as well as to your other friends in this region, that you allowed those essays to find a place among your pages. The writer was wasting his strength when he was labouring to prove

that slavery was *sinful*: and he must obliterate the Bible, (both the Old and New Testaments,) before he can deprive us of the *fact*, (not the supposition, or argument, or sophistry) that it was a condition of the human race, *established by God himself*;—that it was universal in the world, before the appearance of Christ, and *not prohibited* by God;—that it was universal in the world during the presence of Christ and *he did not prohibit it*; that it surrounded the inspired Apostles, and they *did not prohibit it*; nay, they *sanc-tioned* it, because they gave advice to the early Christians how it was to be *regulated*, so that it might *not be abused*. I have not room for a word more. But trust you will believe me, with all the kindness and friendship, of ancient feelings,

Most truly your's,

May 25th, 1838.

[For the Baltimore Literary and Religious Magazine.]

BALTIMORE IN ITS INFANCY.

It is a very natural and laudable curiosity, which prompts men to inquire into the early history of nations, states and cities, and it is instructive to trace the progress of early settlements, and to discover the means by which they were raised from small beginnings to great prosperity.—Perhaps among the cities of modern date, few or none have grown more rapidly, or acquired a higher degree of respectability—nor are there any people who can look back with a prouder satisfaction to the history of their origin than these of Baltimore.—Its foundation was not laid in conquest or rapine, but in the pure principles of justice, peace and freedom—the men who first settled it were distinguished for their intelligence, enterprise, and love of religion—and it is remarkable to what an advanced age many of them attained. Although Maryland was a Catholic colony, yet Baltimore was at first settled in a great measure by Protestants.

It appears that Mr. Abraham Clarke, a shipwright, was amongst the first settlers on the north side of the Patapsco river, and that Mr. Charles Gorsuch, of the society of friends, took up and patented 50 acres of land on *Whetstone Point*, the purchase money being 4s. sterling; the quit rent 4s. per annum, and alienations 4s. per 100 acres, payable in specie, tobacco or produce.

The next land taken up was the glade or bottom on each side of Hartford Run, 1663, by Mr. Alexander Mountenay for 200 acres, and called Mountenay's Neck. In 1668 Mr. Thomas Cole took up 550 acres, called Cole's Harbour, extending westerly from Mountenay's land, across the north side of the river one mile, and divided nearly into two equal parts by the stream afterwards called *Jones's Falls*.

David Jones who gave his name to the stream, is believed to have been the first settler, having his residence on the north side of it, near the head of tide water, at the place now known as French street—this was in 1682.

Cole's Harbour came into the possession of James Todd, who was stepson to Jones—164 acres of it to John Hurst, an inn-keeper—and the remainder of it to Charles Carroll Esq., agent of the proprietary. In 1711 Mr. Carroll sold 31 acres of his part of Cole's Harbour, with a mill seat, to Jonathan Hanson, millwright, who erected the mill of which the remains are yet standing, near the N. W. intersection of Holliday and Bath streets.

In 1726 Mr. Edward Fell, a merchant from Lancashire, of the society of friends, took out an escheat warrant and surveyed Cole's Harbour, and Todd's Range, and purchased the right to it of John Gorsuch; but the sons of Mr. Carroll, then deceased, entered a caveat and prevented a new grant.

It is probable that the first church in this parish, or perhaps in the county, was in Patapsco Neck on or adjoining Mr. Patridge's land, near Bear Creek; though it is certain that the Quakers had meetings at Mr. John Giles's, who was one of them, and as early as 1720 purchased Upton Court, being the land on Whetstone Point, between the town and Ferry Branch. So early as 1676 Mr. Jeremiah Eaton devised 500 acres of land for the first protestant minister settled in the county, which was in 1719 confirmed to the rector of St. John's parish, in which the land was situated, and his successors. The grant was of more value, as in the same year, Charles Lord Baltimore, succeeding his father Cecilius, suspended the grants upon condition of emigration, and soon after affixed the price or consideration money, at 200 wt. tobacco per 100 acres. It is known that there were three or four Protestant Episcopal Churches in the province at the time Mr. Eaton made the above donation.

In 1723 the Revd. Mr. Tibbs, Col. John Dorsey, Messrs. John Israel, Wm. Hamilton, Thomas Tolley, John Stokes, and Thomas Sheredine, were appointed visiters of the county school.

In 1726 the bounds of St. Paul's parish were fixed, at which time the Revd. Mr. Joseph Hooper was rector, and perhaps the first settled minister of the parish.—In 1729 an act of assembly was passed, entitled "an act for erecting a town on the north side of Patapsco, in Baltimore county, and for laying out into lots, 60 acres of land in and about the place where one John Flemming now lives."—Mr. Flemming's house stood, it is supposed, near the dwelling of the late Gen. Stricker, in Charles street.

On the 12th January 1730, the new town of Baltimore was surveyed, and *Long street*, now Baltimore street, laid off 132 perches to Forest street, now Charles street—The town on the east of the Falls was called Jones's town, and afterwards Old town.

In 1744 St. Paul's church was finished, the Revd. Mr. Joseph Hooper was rector—he was succeeded by the Revd. Mr. Benedict Bourdillon.

In 1740 Edward Fotterral built on the N. W. corner of Calvert and Chatham streets, the first brick house without a *hip roof* in the town, having imported the bricks &c. from Ireland. He also built the mill at Madison street; but returning to his native country during the war, his property was confiscated.

In 1761 Mr. Melchor Keener, a German, arrived from Pennsylv-

vania and erected the house in North Gay street, which bears the initials of his name—for an inn.

In 1765 Messrs. Stevenson, Smith, Lyon, Buchanan, Sterrett, Spear and Plowman, erected a church on East, now Fayette street, where the First Presbyterian church now stands, and chose Dr. Patrick Alison their pastor, having three years before erected a small place of worship near Gay street, on the spot where Christ Church now stands.

In 1770 Messrs. McNabb and others erected a part of St. Peter's chapel on Saratoga street,—but they had no settled priest until the arrival of the Rev. Mr. Charles Sewall ten years after.

In 1773 the followers of John Wesley erected a church in Strawberry alley, and next year another in Lovely lane; the preachers were considered laymen until after the revolution.

From the commendable zeal displayed by the different denominations of Christians in providing suitable places for public worship, it was natural to expect from them a high standard of morals—and accordingly the following historical fact will forever remain a monument to the integrity of the merchants of Baltimore—namely, that out of 56 debtors to British Merchants and Manufacturers, there were but four or five who paid their debts in depreciated money, and these were actuated more by feelings of patriotism than a desire to avoid payment, and actually afterwards did pay the full amount, without the intervention of the courts of justice.

For these and many other interesting facts, we are indebted to the indefatigable researches of the venerable Thomas W. Griffith, Esq., who has just closed his earthly career, at an advanced age.

J.

DECREE OF 1837 AGAINST INFANT SCHOOLS.

The Congregation of the Supreme Inquisition have addressed the following circular to all the bishops of the States of the church. We copy it from the Italian journals.

Will *Lord ECCLESTON*, tell us whether, this decree is in force in his Archiepiscopal diocese, which embraces, we believe, only this insignificant continent?

Can *Lord ENGLAND*, Inquisitor General for the Pope's Realm of North America, inform us, whether the copy we publish, corresponds with the one filed in his office?

Is it too much to ask of *Lord PURCELL* of the west, to be instructed in his princely sentiments, on this subject, as soon as he and his Princely grace of VIENNA, shall have settled the question of common schools?

“ Most Illustrious and Reverend Lord :

The Supreme Congregation knew that exertions were making to introduce into the Pontifical States the Schools called ‘ Free Schools,’ or *Salles d' Asyle*, for children of both sexes; and that books containing a little form of instructions had been printed and circulated, which are not edited in that truly catholic spirit which ought to preside in the formation of the first ideas of the mind, and the first feelings of the heart.

My colleagues, the eminent Inquisitors General having given attention to this interesting subject, have thought that it would be a thing full of danger, to say nothing more, to permit the introduction of the said Infant Schools in the Pontifical States. They have therefore thought proper to forbid them, and to communicate this determination to all the Bishops. This step has been fully approved by His Holiness. Your most holy and reverend Lordship, in case any persons shall endeavor to establish in your diocese, schools on the plan of Infant Schools, will employ all your zeal and care to prevent their formation.

I respectfully kiss the hands of your Lordship, and remain, your most devoted servant,

† CARDINAL ODESCHALCHI.

Rome, August 10, 1837.

THE MYSTERY OF JESUITISM.

No. IV.

A list, of many dangerous propositions taken out of the Casuists, and particularly, out of the first Tome, in folio, of the moral theology of ESCOBAR, a JESUIT, printed at Lyons, and dedicated to the General of the Jesuits.

I. That all probable opinions are equally safe in point of conscience. Whence it must needs follow, that, when some Casuists affirm a thing to be lawful, and others hold that it is not, it is not to be doubted but that it is lawful, and that all the world may, without any sin, follow such an opinion. *Escobar, Theol. Mor. Tom. 1. l. 2. Sect. 1. c. 2. p. 34.*

II. That it is lawful to consult several doctors, till such time as that we meet with some one that answers us according to a probable opinion that speaks favourably on our side. *Escobar. Theol. Mor. Tom. 1. l. 2. Sect. 2. c. 6. Probl. 7. p. 39.*

III. That kings may impose a tribute as just, according to a probable opinion, and that the people may refuse to pay it, as being unjust, according to another probable opinion. *Escobar. Theol. Mor. Tom. 1. l. 2. Sect. 2. c. 6. Probl. 18. p. 43.*

IV. That clergy-men are not subject to secular princes, and that they are not obliged to any obedience to the laws, even though those laws are not any way contrary to the state ecclesiastical. *Escobar. Tr. 1. Ex. 1. c. 5. N. 34. and sequent.*

V. That a man proscribed and out-lawed by a temporal prince may not be killed out of his territories, but that he who is proscribed by the pope may be killed in any part of the world, because his jurisdiction extends over all. *Escobar. Moral. Theol. tr. 1. Exam. 7. c. 3. Praxis. ex. Doctoribus. Societatis.*

VI. That the laws which inflict penalties on those that shall do certain actions, are not obligatory in point of conscience, even though the matter be of great importance. *Escobar, Theol. Moral. Tom. 1. l. 5. Sect. 2. c. 17. probl. 26. p. 164.*

VII. That a judge, as well superiour, as inferiour, may give sentence according to one probable opinion, quitting another opinion that is more probable. In like manner, that a physician may prescribe a thing that is less likely to cure his patient, instead of that which he conceives he may with more probability and safety administer. *Escobar. Theol. Moral. Tom. 1. l. 2. Sect. 2. c. 6. probl. 14. p. 42.*

VIII. That, considering justice simply in itself, a judge may lawfully take a sum of money to give sentence for which of the parties he pleases, when both have equal right. *Escobar. Mor. Theol. tr. 3. Exam. 2. c. 6. Praxis. ex. Societ. Jesu. Doctoribus.*

IX. That, in civil contracts, he who had externally obliged himself either by word or writing, and who had not at the same time any intention to be internally obliged, is not in conscience engaged to performance, and may secretly take back again that which he had sold, restoring the price he had received. *Escobar. Theol. Moral. Tom. 1. l. 10. Sect. 2. c. 16. probl. 20. p. 462.*

X. That according to a probable opinion, deciding that a tax imposed upon Merchandise is not just, it is lawful for a man to use false weights to gain the more; and that if he be charged with so doing, he may deny it by oath, making use of equivocal expressions, when he is brought upon interrogatories before a judge. *Escobar, Moral. Theol. tr. 1. Exam. 3. c. 7. Praxis ex Societ. Jes. Doctor.*

XI. That a Son who lives in the house with his Father, may exact a certain recompence for the services he does him, and in case he do not give him any, he may with a safe conscience steal from his Father. *Escobar, Theol. Moral. tr. 3. Exam. 9. c. 4. Praxis. ex Societ. Jesu Doctoribus.*

XII. That a man does not become irregular, that is to say, incapable of ecclesiastical administrations, for having procured and been the occasion of an abortion, if he be in any doubt whether the fruit of the womb were quick. *Escobar, Moral. Theol. tr. 4. Exam. 6. c. 5. Praxis ex Societ. Jes. Doctor.*

XIII. That an Ecclesiastic surprised in adultery, if he kill the woman's husband whom he hath abused, in his own defence, is not for that irregular. *Escobar, Theol. Moral. tr. 4. Exam. 6. c. 5. Praxis ex Societ. Jes. Doctor.]*

XIV. That it is not Simony for a man to give mony to another, to the end he might employ his interest with the patron of a living, to procure the said living for him. *Escobar, Theol. Moral. tr. 6. Exam. 2. c. 6. Praxis ex Societ. Jes. Doctor.*

XV. That a dispensation is in force, though the cause, upon allegation whereof it was obtained, be absolutely ceased. For instance, when a man hath obtained a dispensation, not to say over his Breviary by reason of some inconvenience, it may be to his sight, he shall not be obliged to do it, when that inconvenience is removed. *Escobar, Moral. Theol. tr. 1. Ex. 16. c. 4. Praxis ex Doctoribus Societ. Jes.*

XVI. That it is not so much as a venial sin to make use of a dispensation procured without any legal cause alledged. *Escobar, Moral. Theol. tr. 1. Ex. 16. c. 4. Praxis. doct. Societ. Jes.*

XVII. That where the Pope simply enjoyns men to give alms, to gain indulgencies, it is sufficient if a man give but a half-peny. *Escobar, Moral. Theol. tr. 7. Ex. 5. c. 8. Praxis ex Societ. Jes. Doctor.*

XVIII. That works that are good in themselves, but are sins, and those mortal, by reason of the evil end whereto they are referred, are sufficient, in order to the gaining of indulgencies. *Escobar, Mor. Theol. tr. 7. Ex 5. Praxis ex Societ. Jes. Doctor.*

XIX. That a priviledge is good and authentick, though it be obtained by discovering but some part of the truth, and in such manner that it had not obtained, if there had been an absolute discovery made of the Truth. *Escobar, Theol. Mor. Tom. 1. l. 6. Sect. 2. c. 10. Probl. 6. p. 187.*

XX. That it is lawful upon occasion of some great fear, to make use of dissimulation in the administration of the Sacraments, as for a man to make as if he consecrated, by pronouncing the words without intention. *Escobar, Theol. Mor. Tom. 1. l. 1. Sect. 2. c. 7. Probl. 26. p. 27.*

XXI. That by virtue of the Bull called *Cruciata*, a man may be dispensed of the vow he had made, or oath he had taken, not to commit fornication or any other sin; though a man cannot be dispensed of an oath he had taken about any concernment of his neighbour. *Escobar, tr. 1. Exam. 17. n. 144. Idem, Theol. Mor. tom. 1. l. 7. Sect. 1. n. 245.*

XXII. That a man, who hath the reputation to be extreamly given to Women, does not commit any mortal sin in soliciting a Woman to condescend to his desires, when he does not intend to put his design in execution. *Escobar, Moral. Theol. tr. 1. Exam. 8. c. 3. Praxis ex Societ. Jes. doctor.*

XXIII. That a person, having played the Fortune-teller through an express invocation of the Devil, is not obliged in his confession to discover any further than that he hath answered a question proposed to him, or told one's fortune. *Escobar, Theol. Mor. tom. 1. l. 3. Sect. 2. c. 10. Probl. 52. p. 102.*

XXIV. That it is no mortal sin to preach, principally out of a consideration of vain glory, or for mony. *Escobar, Moral. Theol. tr. 6. Exam. 7. c. 7. Praxis. p. 954.*