

0.51-
R-14

THE

BALTIMORE LITERARY

AND

RELIGIOUS MAGAZINE,

For 1841.

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

Ye should earnestly contend for the faith which was once delivered unto the saints.—JUDE 3.

VOL. VII.



Baltimore:
PRINTED BY RICHARD J. MATCHETT,
Corner of Gay and Lombard streets.
.....
1841.

CONTENTS OF THE VOLUME.

JANUARY.

	PAGE
Speech of Robert J. Breckinridge, delivered in the Court-House yard at Lexington, Ky., on the 12th day of Oct. 1840, in Reply to the "Speech of Robert Wickliffe, delivered in the Court-House in Lexington, on the 10th day of August, 1840, upon the occasion of resigning his seat as Senator from the County of Fayette." And in defence of his personal character, his political principles, and his religious connexions. More particularly in regard to the questions of the power of the Legislature on the subject of Slavery, of the Importation of Slaves, of Abolitionism, of British influence, of Religious Liberty, etc.,	1
Molinism, No. I.—Molinism is in substance Pelagianism,	34
Margaritæ Romanæ.—The First Dive, Revolution in the Maryland Hospital.	37
—Progress in public sentiment,	39
The Gospel Mystery of Sanctification, —By Rev. Wm. Marshall—Abridged.—No. VII.,	42
☞ Notices, Receipts, Accounts, &c.,	45

FEBRUARY.

Proceedings against William Lloyd Garrison, for a Libel,	49
Molinism, No. II.—The palliatives and correctives of Molinism resorted to by the Jesuits in their disputes with theologians.	66
The Works of W. Chillingworth, A. M.—First American, from the twelfth English edition, complete in one volume. With Life, by Birch.—Philadelphia: published by Herman Hooker, for Robert Davis, MDCCLX., pp. 764—royal 8vo.,	70
The Gospel Mystery of Sanctification, —By Rev. Wm. Marshall—Abridged.—No. VIII.,	72
Politics,	76
The Present State and Duty of the Church	78
The late Appeal of the American Tract Society,	83
A Letter addressed to the Members of the "Harrisburg Presbytery," on the subject of their "Pastoral Letter to the churches under their care;" by John P. Carter,	85
☞ Notices, Receipts, Accounts, &c.,	94

MARCH.

The First Disciple of Luther, Frederick Myconius,	97
Semi-German, Greek: Mr. Engles's Greek Testament,	111
Margaritæ Romanæ.—The 2d Dive,	117
Molinism, No. III.—The Scientia Media and the doctrine of Congruism.—The doctrines of the Scientia Media and Congruism were invented to disguise Pelagianism.—Origin of the introduction of Pelagian opinions into the Society of the Jesuits,	120
Review of the Pamphlet of Samuel Annan, M. D., by the Visitation of God, Physician at the Alms House	120

and Ruling Elder in the Third Presbyterian church, Baltimore,	125
The Gospel Mystery of Sanctification, —By Rev. Wm. Marshall—Abridged.—No. IX.,	136
☞ Notices, Receipts, Accounts, &c.,	141

APRIL.

A Calm Discussion of the Lawfulness, Scripturalness, and Expediency of Ecclesiastical Boards,	145
Molinism, No. IV.—It is extremely probable that the system of the Jesuits was already formed at the time of the decree of 1558.—The bulls of Pius V., and Gregory XIII., against Baius,	162
The Right of Ruling Elders in the Presbyterian Church to lay on hands, in all Presbyterial Ordinations,	169
Incestuous Marriages.—Opinions of Martin Luther,	172
Foreign Labours in the Abolition Controversy, No. VIII.—Glasgow Discussion—Fifth Night—Mr. Thompson's charges against the Churches of America—Friday, June 17th, 1836,	173
Thoughts on the Conversion of the World,	183
The Deacon: An Inquiry into the Nature, Duties and Exercise of the office of the deacon, in the Christian Church. By James M. Willson, A. M., Phila.,	189
Papism in the XIX. Century in the United States. Being select Contributions to the Papal Controversy, during 1835—40. By Robert J. Breckinridge,	191
☞ Notices, Receipts, Accounts, &c.,	192
EXTRA.—Letter to Robert Wickliffe, Esq., of Lex. Ky., Preliminary to a Defence against his second Speech of 1840,	i

MAY.

In memory of the Rev. James A. Peabody, late Financial Secretary of the Board of Education of the Presbyterian church,	183
Molinism, No. V.—Lessius and Hamelius, Jesuits, censured by the Doctors of Louvain and Doway, and the conduct of the Court of Rome relative thereto.—Molina's Book.—In what respects it contains novelties.—And how far his doctrine is similar to that of Pelagius.—The commotion caused in Spain by the publication of Molina's book.—The conduct of the Jesuit Henriques, in relation to it—Pope Clement VIII. imposes silence upon both parties,	201
What has become of the Slaves of the late John Randolph?	207
Family Religion,	209
Action of the Presbytery of Louisville, in the case of the Rev'd Mr. Huber,	210
Popish Notions respecting the Holy Scriptures,	214
The Gospel Mystery of Sanctification.—By Rev. Wm. Marshall—Abridged.—No. X.	216
Necrology.—William Henry Harrison,	223
The Africans of the Amistad,	227
Popery and Temperance in Baltimore.—Catholicity of Catholicism,	229
Oxford Divinity and Romanism compared and Identified,	232
☞ Notices,	240

OCT 21 1844
 HERTZBERG BINDERY
 1000

JUNE.		PAGE
Abolition Leaders—Foreign and Domestic—Wardlaw—Birney—Garrison—Thompson—The World's Convention, . . .	241	
American Popery, with the mask off, . . .	249	
Molinism, No. VI.—The effects of the conduct of the Court of Rome in relation to the disputes between the Jesuits and Dominicans.—The Congregations de auxiliiis under Clement VIII., . . .	250	
The Unity of the Church, No. I., . . .	255	
Rev'd Mr. J. C. Harrison's withdrawal from the Presbyterian Church, . . .	267	
Suppression of the Order of Jesuits in Spain, . . .	270	
Sketches and Recollections from my Note Book, No. IX., . . .	271	
The Gospel Mystery of Sanctification.—By Rev. Wm. Marshall—Abridged.—No. XI., (Concluded,) . . .	275	
Musings at the close of 1840, . . .	280	
"Preach the Gospel to every creature," Matt. xvi. 15, . . .	282	
⊗-Notices, Receipts, Accounts, &c. . .	286	
JULY.		
Molinism, No. VII.—Congregations de auxiliiis under Paul V.—The different conduct of the Jesuits and Dominicans after the suppression of the judgment of Paul V.—The effect of the Papal Policy upon the Thomists, . . .	289	
Sketches and Recollections from my Note Book, No. X., . . .	299	
Foreign Labours in the Abolition Controversy, No. IX.—Glasgow Discussion—Fifth Night, concluded—Refutation of Mr. Thompson's charges against the churches of America, . . .	302	
Letter of the Rev. John Wesley, on Popery, Letter from one of the Scotch people, to the Right Hon. Lord Brougham and Vaux, on the opinions expressed by his Lordship in the Aucterarder case, . . .	319	
Papal Principles exemplified, in Persecuting Bible-Annotations, and an Exposure of the Jesuitism of Mr. Troy, Primate of Ireland, denying his own recommendation of the same, No. I., . . .	331	
The late Lord Ellenborough, . . .	335	
⊗-Notices, Receipts, Accounts, &c., . . .	336	
AUGUST.		
Biographical Notice of Jonathan Dickinson, The True Churchman. Being a Demonstration, that those Essential Articles of Christianity, the doctrines of Predestination, and the Sovereign Free Grace of God—are confirmed, not only by the Sacred Scriptures, and the Rules of Right Reason; but also by the approved Doctrines of the Church of England. In two Sermons, preached at Elizabeth-Town—in New Jersey. By Jonathan Dickinson, A. M.—Pastor of a Church of Christ at Elizabeth-Town. Sermon one—Being a Vindication of the Doctrine of Predestination, . . .	339	
Psychology;—or a View of the Human Soul: including Anthropology.—By Frederick A. Rauch.—New York, M. W. Dodd, 1840, . . .	348	
Molinism, No. VIII.—Some notices of Port Royal.—Jansenius, and the character of his book—and Controversies of which it was the occasion, . . .	358	
Sketches and Recollections from my Note Book, No. XI., . . .	367	
Lord Brougham's Speech in the House of Lords, upon the Slave Trade, . . .	371	
A Roman Catholic Bishop removed from this Country and Imprisoned by the Pope, in the Inquisition at Rome, . . .	376	
Papal Principles exemplified, in Persecuting Bible-Annotations, No. II.—A further account of the Roman Catholic Bible, published in 1816, at Dublin, . . .	379	
⊗-Notices, Receipts, Accounts, &c., . . .	384	
SEPTEMBER.		
The True Churchman. By Jonathan Dickinson, A. M.—Pastor of a Church of Christ at Elizabeth-Town. Sermon two—Being a Vindication of the Sovereign Free Grace of God, . . .	385	
Molinism, No. IX.—The five propositions taken before the Court of Rome—Different views of the French Bishops—The conduct of the Court of Rome in the matter—The Bull of Innocent X., dated, 1 June, 1553, condemning these propositions, . . .	393	
The Unity of the Church, No. II., . . .	400	
Sermon on the Death of William Henry Harrison, late President of the United States of America—By Rev. Jacob F. Price, A. M., pastor of the Presbyterian Church of Pisgah, . . .	414	
Brief Notice of the late Rev. Dr. John Breckinridge, . . .	428	
Resolutions of the Second Presbyterian Church of Baltimore, in relation to the late Dr. John Breckinridge, . . .	431	
Extract from the Minutes of the American Whig Society, August 18th, 1841, . . .	431	
⊗-Notices, Receipts, Accounts, &c., . . .	432	
OCTOBER.		
Critical Remarks on John xii. 23, 31, 32; and xvi. 8-11, . . .	433	
Molinism, No. X.—The Port Royalists offer to sign the Formula—distinguishing, however, the fact from the doctrine; and binding themselves to observe a respectful silence as to the fact.—This course not satisfactory to their opponents.—Violence offered to the Monastery, . . .	440	
Speech of Rev. W. L. Breckinridge, in vindication of his principles and conduct against the aspersions of the Rev'd Mr. Taylor, . . .	447	
A Serious Review of "a Calm Discussion of the Lawfulness, Scripturalness, and Expediency of Ecclesiastical Boards?"—Part First.—Ecclesiastical Boards necessary, and the proposed scheme offered by the objectors, altogether untenable and insufficient, . . .	457	
Papal Principles exemplified, in Persecuting Bible Annotations, and an exposure of the Jesuitism of Mr. Troy, Primate of Ireland, No. III., . . .	467	
Necrology.—John Breckinridge, . . .	475	
NOVEMBER AND DECEMBER.		
The Second Defence of Robert J. Breckinridge, against the Calumnies of Robert Wickliffe; being a Reply to his printed Speech of November 9, 1840, . . .	481	
Camp-Meeting at Pisgah, Woodford County, Ky., . . .	545	
Molinism, No. XI.—The Doctrinal Errors of the Jesuits, the source of gross immoralities, . . .	551	
Indulgencia Plenaria.—Translated from the Despertador of Rio de Janeiro, of April 8, 1841, . . .	555	
Papal Supremacy, . . .	567	
A Serious Review of "a Calm Discussion of the Lawfulness, Scripturalness, and Expediency of Ecclesiastical Boards?"—Part Second.—Ecclesiastical Boards accordant with the Standards of the Presbyterian Church, and therefore Constitutional; . . .	560	
Necrology.—George Carson, . . .	569	
⊗-Notice, . . .	572	

THE
BALTIMORE LITERARY
AND
RELIGIOUS MAGAZINE.

VOL. VII.]

JANUARY, 1841.

[No. 1.

SPEECH OF ROBERT J. BRECKINRIDGE,

Delivered IN THE COURT-HOUSE YARD AT LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY, on the 12th day of October, 1840, IN REPLY to the "Speech of ROBERT WICKLIFFE, Delivered in the Court-House in Lexington, on the 10th day of August, 1840, upon the occasion of resigning his seat as Senator from the County of Fayette." AND IN DEFENCE of his personal character, his political principles and his religious connexions. MORE PARTICULARLY in regard to the questions of the power of the Legislature on the subject of Slavery, of the Importation of Slaves, of Abolitionism, of British Influence, of Religious Liberty, etc.

From the Observer & Reporter, (Lex. Ky.,) of October 7, 1840.

TO THE FREEMEN OF THE COUNTY OF FAYETTE.

MY RESPECTED COUNTRYMEN—Being called, in the providence of God, to visit this my native region, to which I have been for nine years almost a stranger, I have been greatly grieved and astonished to find in wide circulation, the most gross and calumnious attacks upon me by name; and in connexion with my name upon systems of opinion, both political and religious, with which I have been more or less connected; and even upon that branch of the Church of God, in which it is my lot to be a minister. I allude, as you cannot doubt, to the speech of ROBERT WICKLIFFE, Sen, made on the occasion of the defeat of his son in the late general election, and his own consequent resignation of his seat in the State Senate; and more recently printed in pamphlet form.

It is more than ten years since I had the least connexion with political life; and nearly as long since I had any personal intercourse with Mr. Wickliffe. The passions of men, especially of old men, ought to cool, and party bitterness to cease, after so long an interval. It cannot assuage the mortification of defeat, to traduce the dead, the absent, and those who no longer contend. I appear to myself to have a right to speak thus, if for no other reason, at least for this—that when, ten years ago, Mr. Wickliffe, as he still boasts, placed me in circumstances somewhat similar to those in which others have now placed his son, I submitted with composure, and without reproach, insult and slander, to the trials which he now finds it so hard to endure. The dealings of Providence are full of a sure and sacred retribution.

It is, therefore, in no spirit of personal animosity, that, after mature deliberation, extensive conference with my friends, and humble seeking of guidance from above, I have determined to defend myself, my principles, and the great interests involved in the accusations of Mr. Wickliffe; and to repel, in the very spot where they

were made, charges and insinuations against myself, my friends and my church, which are equally false, malicious and injurious. I therefore desire to meet the free men of Fayette county, my old friends and former constituents, at the Court House, on Monday next, the 12th instant, at which time, if God permits, it is my purpose to reply to so much of Mr. Wickliffe's speech, as it may then appear my duty to notice. With great respect,

ROBERT J. BRECKINRIDGE.

From the Observer & Reporter, (Lex. Ky.) of October 10th, 1840.

TO THE FREEMEN OF THE COUNTY OF FAYETTE.

The Rev. ROBERT J. BRECKINRIDGE has addressed a note to you, that he, being called in the providence of God to visit his native land, is actually and in very deed here; and that after extensive conference with friends, and *humble seeking of guidance from above*, he has come to the conclusion, *in no personal animosity*, to defend himself, his friends, and his church, against my charges and insinuations against them, which are equally false, malicious and injurious. Whether the gentleman has sought counsel from above or below, to assist him in concocting this specimen of tirade and vulgarity, I shall not descend to enquire. But notwithstanding the reverend gentleman strongly intimates that he is advised from above to make the threatened attack, be assured, fellow-citizens, that I will meet him on the spot where he makes it, not to hurl back upon him his gross, vulgar abuse, but to satisfy both you and him, that his visions from above, of which he speaks, are from another quarter.

I trust, therefore, that you, my neighbors and fellow-countrymen, will on that day also hear me; and if consequences which none can foretell, shall follow the reverend gentleman's renewed war upon me, in relation to the slaves of the country, *in proper person*, you will bear in mind that he again begins it. I beg all to read what I have said. I beg you all to remember the manner in which I introduced the gentleman's name, and whether one word of abuse or reproach was or is uttered. I simply read his publications from the newspapers, as I did those of Mr. Green, to show their doctrines on slavery and to connect the Negro Law with their plans for the ultimate emancipation of our slaves; and to prove my reluctance to even discuss the slave question, before slaves and slave-holders, stated that I would not reply to either Mr. Green or Mr. Breckinridge until Mr. Breckinridge forced me to do it, by assailing me in speeches throughout the country. These were, and are facts to which hundreds, and I might say thousands could have testified; and which the reverend gentleman knows well and dare not deny. And yet, he pretends he has been brought here by the providence of God, to repel unfounded slanders; and that his slanderous publication against me shall go uncontradicted, he makes a pretext of calling you together, to insinuate his poison into all the presses of the city, that the mails may carry it, without its antidote, to persons and places where I am unknown.

No, fellow-citizens, this cloak, which the gentleman wears, is not large enough to cover itself. Talk, as he may, of his being here by the providence of God, and his seeking advice from above, he has come here for the very business he is enacting. He learnt that his Negro Bill had driven me from the Senate; that a new election is pending, and lo! he is here as quick as the stages will bring him, and commences a war upon me—all by the advice and providence of God, of course!

But oh, *his church*, his church is slandered, and he will, in the providence of God, defend her. Here is the cloven foot of the whole business. The gentleman reached this place, expecting to see me prostrated and consuming in an atmosphere in which only a church and political salamander could do battle with effect. He finds things all tranquil, and that I have still friends and many too among Presbyterians; and to raise the whole power of that church, to summon its thousands into the field, he becomes a second Peter the Hermit, urging on followers of the Cross, not to seize the Holy Land and the sepulchre of the Lord, but to crush a powerless individual *whose very existence his malignity cannot endure*. Many Presbyterians were present, and among them several Divines of that persuasion, none of whom excepted to one word I uttered, that I have ever heard of. And who am I, and what church is it that the gentleman promises to rescue from my

slanders? Have ever I been the enemy of Presbyterians, or Presbyterians (the gentleman always excepted) my enemies? It is the church of every human-creature connected with me in blood in the State, who are professing Christians, even in my own household. Although a member of a different church myself, I have ever sustained to that church and many of its eminent and pious clergy the best relations; and have in the support I give religion, always placed it upon the same footing, in my contributions, with my own church. Is it likely then that I should insinuate, much less say aught against that church? Certainly not, and if a word or sentence fell from me, inadvertently, that would seem to indicate a want of respect for it, none would be more deeply afflicted for it than myself.

Since the malignant appeal made by the gentleman, I have carefully reflected on my speech as delivered, and my written speech; and I am unable to perceive any thing out of which malignity itself can torture an attack on the Presbyterians; and I shall be greatly deceived if the gentleman is able to turn the Presbyterians or the freemen of the county of Fayette upon me, either for any thing uttered in that speech or for any other act of my life. If he ever does, it will not be by his humble seeking of guidance from above, but thro' malign seeking and guidance from below. How terrible is this man of God, who is here by his providence, and who, under his guidance, announces his determination to annihilate *me!* Yet, my countrymen, I quail not. How impious is this *mere man, this mere being*, to announce to you that he is here by the providence of God, and moved by his guidance in the war he wages upon me. What Christian, that feels the goodness and greatness of God, can read the boasting of this clerical cavalier, without shuddering at the impiety of the *crusader*. The gentleman who now announces himself, is not *he* who was once seen in places in Lexington and Frankfort where others sometimes are now seen. No. He comes bearing to you the counsels of God—a viceregent from heaven, charged with my utter ruin and desolation. But this boaster, fellow-citizens, will find, on Monday next, that *he is a mere man*, and among the same people he left in 1830—that he is just *Robert J. Breckinridge*, not much better than he used to be, and not a whit better than he should be, or I am much deceived.

ROBERT WICKLIFFE.

SPEECH, & C.

It is impossible, my countrymen, friends, and old constituents, that you can be more surprised than I am, at finding myself again in the midst of political agitations; again compelled to appear at the bar of the people. Ten years of absolute withdrawal from all political strife—even from the exercise of the right of suffrage; ten years of ardent and incessant devotion to other and very different pursuits; ten years of absence from this beautiful region, my native and too-well beloved country—have rendered me as unqualified, as I am painfully averse to the high duties of this occasion.

And yet, there is no spot so fit as this; no subject on which I am more willing to be tried; no man so appropriate as he who accuses me. Here I drew my first breath, and lived in your midst for the first thirty years of my life; and amidst this vast assembly of freemen, there is not one who is not familiar with my life and character. Here you have tried, trusted and honored me; here I have rendered back those trusts and accounted for the exercise of those powers again and again confided to me. And it is most meet that on this very spot, thus precious to me, I should repel the accusations which have been here made against me; against my honored friends, not excepting even the dead; against my political life and religious principles; yea, even against the church of the living God. Accusations most fit to be brought by the only personal or political enemy in all the West, nay, in all the world, whose hate and bitterness

4

have lived unbroken through ten years of separation from me ; accusations, which I will prove not only to be utterly without truth, in the sense intended by him who makes them, but far truer, in every evil sense, of him than of me ; or failing to do so, I will agree that you may execrate me as much as I now think every upright man should condemn him.

There arose about ten years ago, two causes of open quarrel between myself and ROBERT WICKLIFFE, Sen.; the one purely personal, the other political. In regard to the former, I will say but a word. Mr. Wickliffe was the retained attorney of the administrators of my late honored father, and subsequently of the trustee of that estate, my late brother, Joseph Cabell Breckinridge. For a long course of years ending about 1824, I had nothing to do with any of those transactions ; but about that time becoming trustee myself, I had much intercourse with Mr. W. in the relations stated above, till about the year 1830 or '31, when my duty as trustee for others, obliged me, in my opinion, to come to an open rupture with him. Of the nature and results of that unreconciled difficulty, I will add only two remarks : The *first* is, that there exists a written correspondence between him and myself in regard to it, which he has often spoken of publishing, and which I hereby challenge him to lay before the public, if he has the firmness to do so. The *second* is, that the whole subject is matter of general notoriety to the elder members of the Lexington Bar, and to them I refer all who desire to be informed in regard to it. My only reason for mentioning the matter at present, is to show our whole relations, and put an end to false and secret whisperings, industriously circulated in my absence.

My political difficulties with Mr. Wickliffe were all public. I was elected to the Legislature of the State from this county, and that in a manner most honorable to any man, and especially to a very young man—four times in succession, viz : in the month of August, 1825, '6, '7, and '8. After the sessions of 1826, I published a circular to the voters of the county, which you will find in the newspapers of the day, and declined being a candidate again. But I was forced by the urgency of my friends upon the canvass ; and was, as I have said, again elected one of your representatives in 1827 and 1828. In 1829 I again declined public life ; and by reason of the feebleness of my health, was allowed to remain in private life. But in 1830, I was again brought before the public as a candidate for a seat in the House of Representatives. During the winter of 1829-'30, while I was not in the public service, Mr. Wickliffe, who was then Senator from Fayette, caused a bill of a most important character to be passed through the Legislature, altering the whole system of the county in regard to the public high-ways. When I became a candidate in 1830, there were three subjects of particular interest which agitated the public mind, viz : 1st, This Road Bill : 2d, the Sabbath mail question, as it was called : 3d, one aspect of the question regarding the black race. I will briefly explain the posture of the two first questions, and then more fully enter upon the third, which more immediately demands our present consideration.

The Constitution of Kentucky seemed to me to interpose two insuperable barriers in the way of Mr. Wickliffe's famous road bill: 1st. As it had required all laws to be *general and uniform*, whereas this was part of a system which made a separate province of every county in the commonwealth; and 2d, as it had vested expressly in the county courts the very powers—and they were enormous—conferred by this bill, on certain elective officers. It also appeared to me, that sound policy and a just regard to the rights, especially of small proprietors, required the rejection of the bill. And as you all remember, it was rejected by as decided an expression of public sentiment as was ever made in the county; less than one hundred, I believe less than fifty votes having been cast for it, in a constituency approaching three thousand. It does not perhaps become me to say, that this extraordinary fate of a very favorite measure, did not tend to mollify a temper always arrogant; nor that the evident effects of the proposed act, upon the vast landed and slave property of its author, may not have aided his other purposes in impelling him, while still a Senator, to enter the canvass publicly against me; nor do I care to examine too minutely his allegations then urged to justify his attacks, and now, repeated, to explain them, that too little reverence was shown by me and the county, for his labors and opinions. Much allowance is to be made for human weakness; and I have observed that men of a certain class, are unable to comprehend how it is that riches, after they obtain them, do not command from others that awful reverence which they extended to them, when themselves were poor.

The question of the Sunday mail, was the second of those agitated in 1830. It had no conceivable relation to the county canvass; the laws of Kentucky were adequate and were not objected to, in regard to the general subject of the Sabbath; and the particular object was one altogether of general politics. Mr. Wickliffe's present opinions, judging from the speech which has required this notice at my hands, are most decided against all '*inquisitors*,' and even all '*inquisition*,' as he is pleased to speak—into the sentiments of young gentlemen aspiring to office; even when the particular subject is of direct and pressing urgency. He thought differently in 1830; and so did I. It was alike to me, whether the questions put were meant for good or ill, were put by friends or opponents. I tried to think aright, and was ever ready to think aloud. Called to avow my sentiments, I stated frankly that I believed the Sabbath day to be of divine and perpetual obligation; that as one of the people, I was desirous that every public servant of every grade should have liberty to rest on that day; and that as a public man, I should always recognise the paramount obligation of the law of God. You remember the cry of Church and State; you remember the accusations against the Presbyterian Church, now renewed in another form by this gentleman; you remember the clamor of infidels, the prejudices of the men of the world, the opposition of a large body of Christians even, who deny that the Sabbath has any obligation for us. I leave to Mr. Wickliffe the task of explaining the origin and object of that '*inquisition*'—and regret that he is so little able to bear injuries, which he is so great a master in inflicting.

For my own part, I am obliged to say, that I look back with entire satisfaction upon my course and principles in regard to this subject, and am but the more confirmed by subsequent experience and reflection, that nothing can justify any species of concealment in a public man, and nothing compensate a people for a plain violation of the laws of God.*

*! After the delivery of this speech, indeed after an edition of 4000 copies of it had been struck off, by the friends of its author, in Lexington, Ky., he laid his hands on the paper printed below, which is taken from the "*Kentucky Reporter*," of June 19, 1830. It was originally published in the very midst of the canvass to which this part of the speech refers; and the careful reader can not fail to discover, from it—how accurately and fairly the events of 1830 are repeated in the text of the present speech.

BRÆDALBANE, June 8th, 1830.

I observe in the Gazette of the 4th inst., the two following interrogatories addressed personally to me:

"1. Are you opposed to Sabbath mails, and if so, did you sign a petition praying for their stoppage?"

2. Are you the author of the numbers in the Reporter, in favor of emancipating the slaves?"

I have no motives for concealing my opinions on any subject from any person who may feel an interest in knowing them. I only ask that they may receive a fair consideration, and that no man will attribute to any sentiments of mine, consequences which grow out of his own prejudices and erroneous reasoning, and which are renounced by me. To secure these results in the present case, it is necessary for me to enter somewhat into detail.

1. I believe there is a God: that the Bible is his revealed will, by which all men are bound to regulate their conduct: that the moral law, called the ten commandments, is of universal obligation upon all men: that the command to keep holy the Sabbath day is as obligatory as any other, prohibiting all secular business on that day, except only works of necessity and mercy. The national government has no power to enforce the observance of that day on the people of this nation: but on the other hand, it ought not to abolish it. The eleventh section of the act of Congress of 1810, requiring that "*post-masters shall on every day of the week keep open their post-offices for the delivery of letters, packets, and papers, at all reasonable hours,*" does in my opinion attempt to abolish the Sabbath day to the extent of the whole post-office establishment of the United States. On that account that section ought to be amended, and I did in the year 1829, as a free citizen of this nation, petition Congress to have it amended. The section quoted above is an anomaly in our legislation. The Sabbath is recognised in the federal constitution; the Supreme Court is directed by law to suspend its session on that day; both Houses of Congress, the Departments of State, Treasury, War and Navy are closed on that day; the Constitution and laws of Kentucky recognise the religious obligation of that day; every other State in the Union has enacted laws to the same effect: and for the first thirty-five years of our existence as a free people, no such law as that objected to existed in this nation. The charge that these opinions favor a union of church and state, must therefore be brought against the God of Heaven, the patriots of the revolution, the federal government for more than the first and best half of its existence, and against every State Legislature in the Union. Such a charge would be absurd: no American desires a union of civil and ecclesiastical power. I would consider such a union subversive of the purity of religion, and the freedom of the state.

The post-office establishment is a national affair. Every thing relating to it is under the exclusive power of Congress. The legislature of this State has not the least authority over any part of the subject. They only interfere by instructions to our Senators in Congress; which instructions they have no power to enforce, and which are obeyed or disobeyed just as it happens to suit the persons instructed. I do not seek any such aid to my opinions; nor would I be willing to see it

I come now to the third and most important question. In 1830, as in 1840, Mr. Wickliffe charges upon his opponents the sin of agitating the question of negro slavery. But how stand the facts? At the present moment, does not the agitation arise from an attempt on his part to force the repeal of an existing law? Is there any attempt in any quarter to take any step in advance? On the contrary, is not the whole effort of his opponents directed to the single point of maintaining the settled policy of the State since 1798; while it is he, who is striving to make a retrograde movement by the repeal of the act of 1833? So it was precisely in 1830. He commenced the agitation in 1830, by the publication of a violent circular to his constituents, in reply to which the numbers on which he has arraigned me, and after which the essays on which he has attacked the late Judge GREEN, of Lincoln, were all written. If there be evil in such agitations, he chiefly, if not alone, is really responsible. But in point of fact there have always been diversities of opinion on the whole subject of negro slavery, in this commonwealth. They existed in 1793, they existed in 1798, they have existed ever since, and they still exist in all their force. Nay, new opinions, making the whole subject more and more complex, have sprung up of late years on opposite extremes of the question, some of which this gentleman has himself most ardently embraced. The Joggmas of the Abolitionists, which he now charges me with propagating, bad as they are, are not more novel in the West, than those of Mr. Calhoun and his heated and clumsy disciple now under consideration. In 1798 slavery was engrafted on the present constitution by no great majority, and after a most violent conflict. The event which perhaps decided the destinies of Kentucky at that era, was the Bryant Station Convention; which, it is notorious, was not committed to Mr. Wickliffe's present theory of the abstract excellence of slavery and his present plans for its eternal duration in this commonwealth. George Nicholas, of whom he speaks so much, was a wise and patriotic man; but there is no proof that he

given on the other side. If I were a member of the legislature of Kentucky, I would vote against every kind of instruction on the subject.

2. From the nature of the second interrogatory, I suppose the person putting it never read the essays to which he alludes. I am the author of a series of numbers lately published in the Reporter, entitled "Hints on Slavery," and signed B. But I deny that they inculcate the doctrine which may be inferred from the question asked me. The public men of this State are divided in their opinion as to the extent of the power of our legislature over the subject of slavery. Those numbers discuss the constitutional question, and were written to prove, that although the legislature has no power to liberate slaves without the consent of their owners, or first paying for them, yet they have the power to provide for their prospective emancipation. The secondary object was to prevent the call of a convention, by showing that it was not necessary in relation to that subject. It is not necessary that I should enter farther into the discussion of a subject upon which my sentiments are already before the public.

I will in turn propound a question to those who are disposed to oppose my election on these grounds. If it should hereafter be related of me, he was a man rejected by a religious people for believing that the Sabbath day should be kept holy — by a republican community for believing that domestic slavery was a great political evil — whose children will blush at the recital?

RO. J. BRECKINRIDGE.

held the opinions attributed to him by Mr. Wickliffe; and if there were such proof, it is notorious that he was not placed on the Bryant Station ticket, and that he was not a member of the Convention of 1798. John Breckinridge was the leader of the Bryant Station ticket: * he was the drafter of the present constitution; and in connexion with Caleb Wallace, framed the important article on the subject of slavery; an article, which contains no extreme opinion, but is full of wisdom, humanity and political forecast; an article which I have always cordially approved, and done my best to prevent its alteration; and which singly and by itself, would have conferred on its author the character of a profound and patriotic statesman. For my own part, it is perfectly well known, that I adhered to that party in Kentucky politics which opposed all

* [] The author of this speech, in looking over the papers of his father, the late JOHN BRECKINRIDGE, has found amongst other things of interest in regard to the early politics of Ky., the paper (in the hand writing of that distinguished patriot) which is printed below. The original is sent to DR. ELISHA WAREFIELD of Lex., Ky., for the satisfaction of any, who may have doubts as to its genuineness.

It will be observed, that at least *four* subjects of intense interest, besides that of slavery, occupied the attention of the *Bryant Station* Convention; a Convention which was formed by delegates from the militia companies and the *religious societies* of the county of Fayette; and which nominated the State Convention ticket for that county, which was elected in 1798. In regard to the question of slavery as before that *Bryant Station* Convention, or rather '*Committee*'—as they called it in those days; it is perfectly obvious from these resolutions and from abundant proof besides—that the whole question turned on *compensation or no compensation*; and never and to no degree, on the grounds upon which Mr. Wickliffe has endeavored to place it. The successful candidates from Fayette in 1798, only insisted on *compensation*, in case of general emancipation; and the majority of the Convention of 1798–9, held precisely the same opinions and engrafted them into the constitution of the State; opinions which are as remote as the poles, from those entertained by Mr. W. at present, and attributed by him to the statesmen of '98.

The paper now published, is endorsed, in the hand writing of its author—thus: "*A Declaration to be made by Convention Candidates. Dec'r, 1798.*"

"Whereas, the only true and honest objects of a Convention unquestionably are, the better to secure the rights, privileges, and property of the citizens, and not to impair or destroy them.

Resolved, that no man ought to be voted for as a member to that Convention without his first making the following declaration: viz:

I do declare that in case I am elected to the Convention,

1st. I will be decidedly opposed to an emancipation of the Slaves, either immediate or gradual, without paying to the owners thereof, their full value in money, previous to such emancipation.

2dly. That I will be decidedly opposed to any attempt to expunge the compact with Virg'a, from our Constitution; but will use every endeavour to retain said compact unimpaired as a part of the Constitution.

3dly. That I will be decidedly opposed to abolishing the Senate; but will agree to such alterations in the present organization of that body, as the wisdom of the Convention may point out; but which will not go to its destruction or to render it useless as a branch of the legislature.

4thly. I will be decidedly opposed to a representation by counties; but will cling to a representation by numbers under proper regulations, considering it as the corner stone of civil liberty.

5thly. I will be decidedly opposed to every attempt which may be made to destroy the independency of the Judiciary; or to encroach on those powers which ought properly and exclusively to be lodged with them."

change in the government; which believed the powers conferred by the existing constitution to be perfectly ample for every purpose of good; and which, with unbroken constancy, has maintained its position amid all the changes of opinion of the last half century, in defiance of the opposite and equally false accusations, made by ignorant and malevolent men, sometimes of advocating modern abolitionism and sometimes of favoring eternal slavery.

Under the existing constitution, this party, of which I have just spoken, has supposed that slavery might be terminated in perfect accordance with its spirit and provisions, in various modes. Two modes are expressly recognized on the face of the instrument, viz: 1st, By the consent of the owners, and 2d, By payment on the part of the State. It is manifest that, by a system of moderate and sustained police regulations, the same end might be ultimately accomplished, without infringing the title of the owner more than has been done by multitudes of laws from the foundation of the government. It is also obvious, that the question of the importation of slaves into the State, is a most important one in relation to the whole subject; for while those who even desire to see slavery made eternal, as Mr. Wickliffe now does, might wisely intend at the same time to keep it within manageable bounds; those who desired that it should not be eternal, would also naturally wish to keep it in a like condition: and the most dreadful of all abolitionists may justly be considered those who should endeavor to overwhelm the country and the whites, by a horrible and irresistible merchandise in which our liberties and lives might be bartered off for slaves. It is equally clear that the question of the *post nati* is one of the first importance, in regard to the whole subject, whether physically or politically considered; and that if decided in a certain way, it would afford a method, at once sure and safe, to make the most just and gradual solution of the case. It is these two questions of slave importation and the *post nati*, which more particularly occasioned the agitations of 1830 and 1840; the latter bringing down the wrath of Mr. Wickliffe upon me at that time, and both stirring up his present fury.

My essays in 1830, were written, as I have said, in reply to an official circular of Mr. Wickliffe; I have also mentioned the series by John Green—and there was a third series about the same period, written by that learned and virtuous man, George Clark. His articles were numerous, and were signed C.; those of Judge Green extended only to four or five numbers, and were signed *Philo C.*; my own were seven in number, and were signed B. Mr. Wickliffe appears to have quoted indiscriminately from all these, and attributed to me all the matter out of them all, on which he could lay his hands, that seemed likely to serve his turn. Of the seven numbers which I wrote, the three first were devoted to a review of so much of Mr. Wickliffe's circular as related to the subject of slavery; the two next, to a discussion of the power of the Legislature over the unborn issue of female slaves; and the two last, to an attempt to prove that a prudent system of emancipation did not necessarily involve as a consequence, a permanent and considerable free black population. These essays have been very carefully

examined by me within a few days; and I must say that their principles, temper, and aim so commend themselves to my mind, that I should cordially rejoice to see a copy of them placed in the hands of every voter in the commonwealth. The constitutional argument, which seems to have given my accuser most uneasiness, neither he nor his friends have ever attempted to meet, and I humbly conceive they cannot meet it; and yet it is so clear and simple, and whether good or bad, is so plain, that it is difficult to believe the abusive misrepresentations of it to be sincere. The point of it is this: The constitution comprehends under the single word 'slaves,' the total interest of the owner protected by it; and allows his total interest, whatever it may be, to be taken and paid for by the State. Now, if the possibility that a female will have children, is such an interest that it vests in the master, then it is such an interest, as by the force of the terms, the State can pay for and control. If it is not such an interest, then there is no question the State can control it without pay. So that either way, the power of the State over the *post nati* is complete; according to one construction with pay, to the other without it. Let it, however, be borne in mind, that I am not now proving my opinions to be correct, so much as proving what they really were; for the adversary with whom I deal, does not attempt to disprove them, but with characteristic cunning, first misrepresents them, and then traduces their author. Before closing this statement, I will read two short extracts from these essays; the first from the first number, and the second constituting the closing paragraph of the series. The first of these will clearly show, contrary to his repeated assertions, that those essays were written in no spirit of unkindness to him—indeed, before any difficulty existed between us, and while we were on terms of friendship; the second will show how faithfully I have now described their general character and object;

"The paper from which the foregoing analysis is taken, is addressed "to the freemen of the county of Fayette," and published in the Reporter of February 11th, signed R. Wickliffe. It has been my object to give a fair, indeed an ample abstract of the argument, and that as far as my limits would permit, in the words of the author. I think he will not complain of injustice on that score; or if any has been inadvertently done him, he has some reason to know that there are very few persons who would deal with his errors more lightly, or receive the truths he would utter, with the increased favor derived from high personal consideration, more readily than myself." *Extract from No. 1 of Hints on Slavery—Kentucky Reporter, April 21, 1830.*

* * * * *

"I have endeavored to look at this subject merely as a political speculation, relinquishing every advantage which might have been derived from other and most cogent aspects. If those who agree with me, think that in doing this I have failed of doing justice to our cause, I appeal to their candor when I say, that if failing in every point, I shall have pointed the way in which some abler hand may vindicate the constitutional power for which I contend, I shall have achieved more for this cause, which I contend is that of my country's glory, than many who have preceded me. To those who differ from me, on the other hand, I have given the best pledge of the depth of my convictions of our common interest and duty, by presenting such views only as they will admit are legitimate, and canvassing the matter in that aspect only, on which they have been taught to repose as impregnable." *Extract from No. 7, of Hints on Slavery—Kentucky Reporter, June 9, 1830.*

Upon the case as now set forth, I was a candidate in 1830, and my present accuser, as he now boasts, met and triumphed over me; or as he sometimes states, was himself arraigned and acquitted. His *acquittal* may be questioned, as he presented no personal issue, but held on to office, while I ran fair'y before the people. His *triumph* seems still more doubtful, if the fate of his road bill be duly considered. The result of the canvass of 1830, seems least of all to afford him any just ground of self-congratulation, especially as expounded by that of 1840; whether we consider the principles involved, or the personal results. It is true, I did not succeed; but it is also true, I failed in a manner which I trust is characteristically different from that of the gentleman; and I must confess I take an honest pride in comparing my address declining the canvass in 1830, with his atrocious manifesto resigning his seat in 1840.* The gentleman complains wofully, of what he classically calls "the game of the three pluck one," played against this son in 1840. But he should not allow himself to forget, that in 1830 the game set on foot against me, was a game of *seven* pluck one; and that the kind of sport which offends him so dreadfully now, did then so delectably amuse him, that he struck in himself, a hearty volunteer; being the eighth, but of the seven, as the Scripture hath it. Nor should it grieve him to recall that in those days gentlemen could differ in Kentucky without flying at each other's throats. I remem-

*From the *Kentucky Reporter*, of August 4, 1830.

TO THE VOTERS OF FAYETTE COUNTY.

It is now clear that if I can be elected at all, it must be by the votes of those who would prefer being represented by other men. Such a result, even, if it could occur, would leave me no other alternative than to resign a seat to which I had been called by the reluctant suffrages of my fellow-citizens. There is but one open and manly way of avoiding so painful an occurrence.

I consider my political career among you at an end. Persons of other views and principles may stoop to conciliate their enemies by means that are revolting to me, or bow down before your excited prejudices in a manner that I will not submit to. If my principles have overthrown me, I count it no shame to suffer in such a cause. They are true and necessary to your existence as a free people; and if God be not provoked to leave you to the government of your own blinded passions, they will surely prevail.

Between me and the county at large there remain no accounts to settle. They have heretofore lent me their support in a manner most grateful to my feelings, and I have repaid it by serving them faithfully if not wisely. If I have erred, I have been chastised. May you not find in the end that you have paid for the lesson more than it was worth.

From those who have sought by every means to injure me, I seek no redress. Their day of accounting will come by and bye. And when it does come, they may take my experience as conclusive of the truth, that the strong conviction of suffering wrongfully in a sacred cause, can alone enable us to bear with composure the desertion of our friends, the traduction of our good name, and the overthrow of cherished hopes of doing good.

I entered into no private arrangements with any body when I became a candidate. I have entered into none preparatory to declining the canvass. I thought the county desired my services, and they were offered to them. I now think they do not, and that offer is withdrawn. I am under no obligation to any public man; nor has any of them presumed to interfere with my private determinations. You have my most anxious wishes for your prosperity.

RO. J. BRECKINRIDGE.

August 3, 1830.

ber on that canvass of 1830, not counting the gentleman himself, who might gain and could not lose, nor another gentleman who declined a poll early in the canvass—there were my friend Mr. Waller Bullock, my neighbor Major Matthews Flournoy, and Mr. Nathan Payne, on one general side of politics, according to old party lines; and on the other, my friends Major Wilson, Dr. Innes, and Mr. John Curd, besides Mr. Bledsoe, of the upper end of the county; and as far as I ever knew, my relations with these gentlemen remained unaltered. The case of Mr. Curd is somewhat remarkable, as he was successful both in 1830 and in 1840, once by and once against the efforts of Mr. Wickliffe. And as an eminent proof of what I assert, I may mention what is known to the whole county, that that lamented and true hearted gentleman, Charlton Hunt, late Mayor of your city, and myself, were twice if not three times opposing candidates, whilst we were not only confidential friends, but partners in the practice of the law. But now it seems times are greatly changed, and to oppose Mr. Wickliffe is so mortal an offence, as to be past forgiveness; indeed, incapable of being committed by any but the worst sort of offenders. This speech of his avows or contemplates throughout, two great and undeniable truths: 1st. That every man who opposes him, no matter at what time or for what reason, is in fact an abolitionist at heart; and 2d, That all such ought to be put down by violence! The first is the common sentiment of the speech; the latter he insinuates every where, and towards its close avows. For, says he, after traducing through many pages some of the best men whom this land, fruitful in virtue, has produced; and after caricaturing principles, old as the country and precious as its liberties—“*I therefore forwarn you as you value your property, your domestic peace and your country's peace, to crush, while you have the power, the monster in its embryo.*” And lest this were not plain enough, he adds, “*Wherever you see a man stirring up the spirit of emancipation in the country, treat him as if he is an enemy to the country, as dangerous to your peace and the safety of your families.*” (Speech, p. 35.) Now, remembering that, in the estimation of Mr. Wickliffe, it is abolitionism to argue for a naked power in the government even over the unborn, and still more dreadful abolitionism to refuse to repeal laws which obstruct the importation of slaves; it is very clear what such passages mean. Men are crushed by violence; *public enemies* are shot down; *private* ones sometimes assassinated. Mr. Wickliffe is a man advanced in life; he is a lawyer, and he has a very large stake in the country; he is, moreover, a father and a grand-father. He has despised all these relations and ties to utter these and similar intemperate and wicked sentiments; sentiments alike derogatory to him as a magistrate, a citizen, and a patriot. In obedience to such sentiments, printed in his speech, insinuated in his card in answer to my call of this meeting, and repeated, as I learn, in a speech at Chilesburg on the day before yesterday; personal violence has been threatened, and men have come to this meeting armed, to prevent my delivering this address. My friends, I denounce in the name of liberty and of the laws, such horrible sentiments; I denounce the man who dares to utter them. I tell him and I tell all, we are

still free ; we were so born—so will we die. Our fathers have purchased for us with their blood, this land which we possess ; with our blood will we defend it and our rights together. The spirit of lawless violence is abhorrent to the State, to its character, to its people. They are madmen who shall first attempt to practice it ; and whoever may be the last victims, such can hardly fail to be the first.

Before leaving the subject of these essays of 1830, I will read a few extracts from the speech of Mr. Wickliffe, by which it will be seen he has not only most needlessly dragged back these by-gone events upon the public stage, but that he has most unfairly mis-stated my opinions, as the ground-work of those accusations, which I am here to repel.

He says on page 3 of his speech, "all I ask of you is to bear in mind that I have not raised the controversy concerning our slave property either now or heretofore." I have proved that the facts are just the reverse in both cases.

Again, on the same page, "As to one of these charges, that of checking the emancipators in their efforts to free our slaves, it is just ten years since I was put on my trial for the same offence, by the late Honorable John Green and the now Reverend Robert J. Breckinridge," &c. I have already shown, that he was put on no trial, that he held on to office, that he commenced the discussion, and that no attempt was made by me to "free our slaves."

On page 4, "they not only poured in upon my devoted head their talented effusions through the papers of Lexington, but throughout the State, every paper in the service of the conspiracy formed against slave-holders were brought to bear upon me. One of the most talented and popular of the clique, the now reverend gentleman just mentioned, after discharging his numbers through the Reporter and Commonwealth, took the field against me." The conspiracy was a reply to Mr. Wickliffe's circular ; its object was a better understanding of our existing constitution ; its mode of action was calm and temperate argument ; and my taking the field against him, was his volunteering in the canvass to make stump speeches against me, without having the manliness to resign his own office.

Again, on page 17-18, after one of his numerous philippics against *his friend*, John Green—a friend whose greatest weakness was that he trusted this man—a friend whom his great personal regard would not permit him to answer till death had sealed the eloquent lips, and the sod covered the great and manly heart of that upright and able man ; he thus discourses concerning the absent preacher, whom he couples in his courageous denunciations, with a dead Judge. "His friend and co-worker in abolishing negro slavery, Mr. Breckinridge, resumed the subject before his becoming a candidate to represent you in the General Assembly. That gentleman, after severely criticising my address on the movements of abolition, to my constituents, lays down two propositions as undeniable. The first is, that God has created all men free and equal, and no power on earth can make an unborn child a slave ; hence that all negro children are by the laws of God and nature, born

free. The second is, the constitution of Kentucky does not apply to any but slaves existing at its date, and therefore masters have no authority derivable from the constitution over slaves born since the constitution was made. This is, to be sure, doing what that gentleman declared he intended to do, striking at the root of the evil. He boldly denies the power of the State to make the child of a slave, a slave for life, but admits that the Legislature has the same power to make them servants for years, that it has to make the children of white women servants for years. He therefore recommends that this State at once adopt what is now the English plan for Jamaica, that is, the *apprentice* system, and thus put an end to slavery. These frightful doctrines were not only published in the prints of the day, as you see, but maintained with all the power of eloquence and feeling, by that justly celebrated orator upon the rostrum throughout the canvass." * * * * "I was heard—and feeble as I was when encountered by the great champion of abolition and universal emancipation, your votes sustained me."

I feel greatly at a loss, my respected countrymen, how to treat these remarkable statements. Mr. Wickliffe is a man somewhat in years, and I am by profession and by principle a man of peace; it becomes us both, therefore, as we are not responsible in any personal manner for the fairness of our statements, to make them with a most scrupulous exactness. There is indeed a kind of modern *benefit of clergy*, which is as opposite as possible to what passed once under that phrase; for its present signification seems to be, the falsehood and abuse which every base braggart in the land, and every vile calumniator, may heap with impunity upon men who will not chastise them; and so those hearts in which malignity and cowardice dwell together, may find thus a kind of vicarious relief. I have had my share of this *modern benefit of clergy*; and well know how to value and how to endure it. But in sober seriousness, does Mr. Wickliffe really believe these statements? Does he really believe he was a candidate for any office or got your votes in 1830? Is it possible to suppose he believed his own words, when he said, I had advised you from the rostrum to establish the Jamaica system of apprenticeship; that I had pressed on you the immediate adoption of this system in 1830; that I had denied before you all power in the State to hold slaves for life; that I had put the power over whites and blacks under the constitution on the same footing; or that I had taught that the constitution applied only to slaves in existence at its date? Is it possible for human credulity to go so far, as that he could have believed himself when he uttered these several propositions—each and every one of which is not only false—but all the people in Fayette county have personal and perfect knowledge that they are so; which are not only not contained in any writing of mine, but which are each and all, utterly at war with the whole tenor of my publications for more than twenty years? Luckily for me, it is not difficult to show in the most precise terms, what were my opinions in 1830; and I submit to you, without comment, and in contrast with the opinions attributed to me, the summary which closes the constitutional argument, in the numbers so often alluded to. It is taken from the end of the 5th No. of *Hints on Slavery—Kentucky Reporter*, May 19, 1830:

“I cannot doubt, then, that I am authorised to give the following interpretation to the debated clause of the constitution, as embracing its plain meaning and fulfilling its intent:

1. The General Assembly of Kentucky can never emancipate any slaves gradually, contingently, or in any case whatever; except, first, with the owner's consent, or secondly, having previously paid for them a fair price in money.

2. The General Assembly is bound to pass laws for the emancipation of slaves with the consent of their owners; and has full power to pass laws for their emancipation without their consent, by first paying for them; having power also to collect the necessary funds to pay for them, by general taxation on all things subject thereto, or by special taxation on slaves only.

3. The General Assembly has full power before the birth of those persons who by our constitution and laws can be held in slavery, so to modify existing laws as to allow them to remain as they are born—free.

4. It follows, that the General Assembly has full power so to modify existing laws, as to allow the condition of slavery to attach at birth to those who can be slaves, only in a qualified or limited manner; that is, to provide for the gradual prospective emancipation of the descendants of female slaves.”

It is due to candor to admit that one of the foregoing allegations of Mr. Wickliffe does contain, what is true in a certain sense. I have never indeed said nor thought that slaves are born free, in view of our laws; but only that the constitution did, and that the laws might recognise, that in the eyes of God and of reason, slavery was of human, not of divine origin; that it was a municipal, not a natural relation. But as he charges, I did venture to insinuate, that men are indeed born free. I have to confess, that even in those essays of 1830, I have allowed myself the great license of saying, “I think it clear that one unborn can in no sense be a slave; and such I do not doubt, is the doctrine of our constitution.” * * * “The light of reason, history, and philosophy—the voice of nature and religion—the spirit of God himself, proclaims that the being he created in his own image, he must have created free.” (No. 5, *Hints on Slavery—Kentucky Reporter*, May 19, 1830.) In these unhappy opinions, it is true, I have the sanction of an obscure man, of whom Mr. Wickliffe may possibly never have heard—named Thomas Jefferson; and of an instrument of no repute, which may have escaped his learned researches, called the Declaration of American Independence; and of that undistinguished mass of simple rebels, too insignificant to have attracted his attention, called the Continental Congress. But alas! such supports as these can avail but little to solace the heart of him, whose political opinions have failed to command the approving smiles of the illustrious “Duke of the Town Fork.”

This detail is indeed tedious, and the exposure which it involves is painful to me. But I have endured for ten years, every species of misrepresentation and abuse from this individual, and it is high time to arrest his career. I will therefore read two extracts more in regard to the affairs of 1830. On page 35, he speaks thus: “Mr. Breckinridge complains that the acts prohibiting the importation of slaves, then in force, need amendment, and demands the passage of a law that shall not only stop importation, but free the slaves at once,” &c. Again, on page 36, “Mr. Breckinridge in 1830 taunts us by saying we look around and speak in whispers when we converse of negro slavery. But he told us the worst must be told.

He told the worst, and in less than two years, more arsons, rapes and murders were committed by slaves, than in twenty years preceding his telling the worst." Fellow-citizens, I will put a strong restraint upon my feelings, and abstain from hurling back with indignant scorn, the foul and false accusations of this hoary slanderer. I flatly deny, and challenge him to prove, that the numbers of 1830, contain any such things as are here alleged, except only a complaint that the laws against the importation of slaves were violated with impunity. I deny, and challenge proof, that they contain any thing giving even a colorable pretext for such horrible accusations. I defy him to produce the least particle of proof, that any crime has been committed by any slave, at any time, or in any land, by reason of words uttered or printed, or by reason of principles asserted or insinuated by me, or by those who have held my general views on the subject under discussion; and in default of such proof, clear and positive proof, to warrant such charges, I invoke against him the condemnation of every honest man. Nay, so far I am from being guilty, and so far is he himself from being innocent, that none of you can have forgotten how, when in 1830, a most frightful outrage was committed by a negro slave, on the person of a white female in this county, (the only case of rape, of this horrid description, which occurred about that time, and therefore beyond doubt one of the cases alluded to by him,) this very man took money to screen that very culprit, whose crimes he now charges on me; he endeavored to blacken the character of a virtuous and orphan girl to save the wretch he defended from the gallows; he pledged his personal character for the innocence of a convict, whose indubitable guilt he now asserts as a means of heaping infamy on me; yea, he pursued throughout that dreadful affair such a course as to bring down on himself the general indignation of the people—basing his conduct all the while upon the ground that what he now asserts to be true, in order to ruin me, was then indubitably and outrageously false! Oh! shame, shame upon such a man! Human speech is inadequate to set him forth!

I am now done with the direct question of the difficulties of 1830; and I confidently appeal to all candid men for their judgment on those events. Whether my opinions were true or false, whether my conduct was wise or inconsiderate, nothing can be more clear than that Mr. Wickliffe has needlessly dragged me before the public, and then shamefully misrepresented me. I will now proceed to the question in 1840.

So far as slavery was mixed up with the discussions of 1830, the question related to the *post nati*, and was essentially a question of organic power. In 1840 the question is changed; it is now one of high State policy, as it regards the importation and accumulation of slaves in the State. It is an attempt to change the settled policy of Kentucky: to separate her from the policy of the central slave states, and to fix her firmly to that of the Southern states; to cut her loose from Maryland, Virginia, Tennessee and Missouri, and make her a satellite of South Carolina, a fauxbourg of the lower Mississippi; to take, in short, in advance a mighty step in advance against the white race, and in favor of eternal slavery. Now, as in 1830, the

cry of agitation and abolition is raised. Then, it was determined by this cry, to force the slave interest beyond the power of the constitution itself; now, to enlarge it beyond the possibility of future control. In both cases, I have the honor of being singled out as one of those who must be destroyed, before the country can be undone; and in both cases, Mr. Wickliffe presides over plans and opinions incompatible alike with your glory and your prosperity.

The law of 1815, prohibiting the importation of slaves, was passed ten years before I was a member of the Legislature of Kentucky, and while I was yet a boy. It would seem impossible that I could be held responsible for it. The act of 1833 was passed five years after my retirement from the Legislature, and sometime after I had ceased to be a resident of the State. For this law also, it seems impossible to hold me responsible. And yet I believe no law was passed between 1815 and 1833 on the subject to which both of these relate; and I am confident none such passed while I was a member of the Legislature of the State. Still, as you will see, I am made responsible to the full extent of the whole subject; and in connexion with many of the best men of my generation, have been held up to popular indignation, and had brute force invoked against me.

I confess I have always desired to see slavery in Kentucky kept within manageable bounds; and therefore would have aided cordially in preventing the importation of slaves, by all proper means allowed under the constitution. It is said by the enemies of the present law, that it is unconstitutional. I observe, however, that many of the ablest lawyers and statesmen of Kentucky voted for it; and it is known to have passed both houses, by unusual majorities, (56 to 32 in the House of Representatives, and 23 to 12 in the Senate;) and that, after the public mind had maturely considered the subject for several years. Let it be remembered, moreover, that if this objection has any weight, it is useless to agitate the country about the act, for in that case, it is merely void and a dead letter; and surely the proper and constituted tribunals, the courts of justice, are far more suitable for the decision of that question, than muster grounds and public meetings; and sworn, and incorruptible judges, better umpires in regard to it, than passionate demagogues rendered furious by defeat, or heated partizans stimulated by personal interests. I am not now a citizen of Kentucky; but I am deeply and personally interested in all that affects her prosperity; for I am myself a Fayette farmer, having in your midst the chief part of my worldly possessions. If added to this, my profound interest in her happiness and renown may entitle me to plead before her with the freedom of a son, and yet the hesitation of a stranger; I would implore you to sustain the decision you have already rendered, and not permit yourselves to be seduced or terrified into a repeal of this act. I utter these petitions in no spirit of faction; for all men know I am entirely withdrawn from party politics. Nor have I any reference to the gentlemen more directly opposed to each other in the late canvass; for the successful one (Mr. C. M. Clay,) with whom I agree in sentiment, and whose manliness must win every noble heart, is not known to me, even by

eye-sight; and the other, (Mr. Robert Wickliffe, Jun.,) is, by his mother, my kinsman, and has my best wishes that the uncommon advantages which he possesses and has enjoyed, may fit him for real greatness and true success. But I thus plead, because this law appears to me to embody a moral sentiment as well as a political principle, of the very highest purity, truth and importance; because its continuance on the statute book will prevent Kentucky from being made a kind of entrepot for those execrable wretches, who carry on the domestic slave trade as a branch of public commerce; and because its influence, though silent and perhaps not considerable, yet throws the force of time for the white and not for the black race, for liberty and not for slavery.

My business, however, is more immediately my own defence; and as I am distinctly and repeatedly charged by Mr. Wickliffe, with being one of the authors, if not the chief author of this act; and as the act itself is described by him as the very essence of abolitionism, it is necessary that I should set distinctly before you, in the first place, his accusations; and then, in dreadful contrast, the real facts of the case. If the result does not fill you with amazement, then I am a stranger to your character, and ignorant of the force of truth.

Speaking of this law of February 2, 1833, Mr. Wickliffe says: "And here I might defy *any lawyer or sensible man* living, to put his hand on his heart and say that the constitution is not *plainly, obviously and palpably violated.*" (Speech, p. 9.) And yet *fifty-six* members of the House of Representatives and *twenty-three* members of the Senate, being sworn, voted for this act. And amongst these lawyers who were no lawyers, and these men who had no sense, thus voting; were *Judges* Owsley, Clark (afterwards Governor of the State,) Simpson, Green and Woolley; and *lawyers* Crittenden, Anderson, T. F. Marshall, John White, Southgate, Butler, Guthrie, Thompson, Thornton, and Ewing!

On page 10 he says of this same law, "My crime, my constituents, has been, that I have discovered this *abolition trap*, and that I have, without waking up the cupidity of that portion of the profession that are always seen busiest and boldest when a negro is a party, or a grog-shop or a brothel is to be defended—attempted to spring its triggers and deprive those harpies of their booty." *Abolition, grog-shops and brothels*, sound curiously in connexion with the names I have just read. Again, on page 11, he calls it "*this most iniquitous and inhuman law.*" And lower down on the same page, he demands, "Sirs, do you expect that Carolina will ever make the Road (Charleston and Ohio Rail-Road,) while *this abolition tinder-box* disgraces your Statute Book?" Again, on page 17, "Hear the *authors of the law.*" [Here Mr. Wickliffe read from the Reporter, extracts from sundry publications made by the late J. Green, Esq. and the Rev. Robert J. Breckinridge, to show the origin and object of the law."] Again on page 18, he calls the law "*this abolition flag.*" Again on page 19, he calls it "a statute on which your intestine enemies are aiding the British in the dreadful conflict she is bringing you into with your slaves." Again on page 21, he says, "the bill *was intended to be, and is an implement in*

the hands of the abolitionists, to carry out their views in relation to our slave property; and their views I verily believe to be identical with, and entirely regulated by the British Cabinet." Again on page 23, "I have connected this act with abolition; I have connected it with the letters and plans of both Green and Breckinridge, as detailed in their numbers now before you; I have proved its unconstitutionality and shown that it is in all its details, injurious to the whole State, but particularly oppressive to my constituents, and ruinous to the growth and prosperity of the city of Lexington. I have sought, I have voted for its repeal, and demand your approbation or condemnation of the act." Again on page 24, he says, "the bill" is "*both unjust and unconstitutional.*" Again on page 25, "This law not only strikes at the root of the rights of masters, but at the very well being of our city." And a little lower down, "wipe from the statute book of the State this law that *not only injures but disgraces the State.*" And on the same page, he calls it "*a scourge and a curse to the country.*" On the same page, he says this law "degrades" the judge; on page 26, that it "*makes the attorney a very wretch;*" and on page 27, that "when the judge shall duly swear his attorney *into the service of the abolitionists, and submit their act to the grand jury.*" Again on page 35, "I have not only shown you that *its object and effect* is emancipation, but the publications of both Mr. Green and Mr. Breckinridge; *the authors of the act, nail the present agitators to the counter.*"

Such is a summary of Mr. Wickliffe's statements in regard to this act of 1833; and surely, if these are correct, the bill is most infamous, and I should richly deserve your contempt and abhorrence. The distinct charge of abolitionism I will notice separately, by and by. The character of the bill itself, you will presently see, it is not necessary for me at least, to defend; however deeply others may be implicated in it. But I may be permitted to remark, in the first place, that the relations long subsisting between Mr. Wickliffe and myself, would obviously suggest to an honorable mind, the propriety of peculiar caution in his statements concerning me; a propriety so fortified by my absence and my profession, that lasting infamy should justly attach to him, if he knowingly or even recklessly violate truth, in such grave and dishonoring charges. I will take leave to remind you, in the second place, that Mr. Wickliffe was your Senator when this execrable bill passed into a law; and that, by his own showing, the great importance of the subject and his own immense and long standing debt of gratitude to you, peculiarly required, what indeed his clear and ordinary duty enjoined, to-wit: ~~that~~ that he should watch the progress of the bill, know its contents, and defeat it if he could. According to his own judgment, rendered against the gentlemen returned this year for the county (p. 26 of his speech,) ignorance or neglect of duty is conclusive against a public servant; and therefore what he says to excuse himself, by reason of absence, inattention, hurrying bills through, end of the session &c. &c., would constitute no defence, if it were even true; which, unhappily, the Journals of the Senate prove it is not.

But I will not dally with your patience, nor with the subject. The proof against this public accuser is clear, precise, positive and overwhelming. He was your Senator (*Senate Journal*, 1832, p. 3). He was chairman of the committee of Courts of Justice (p. 10); the very committee to which this bill and subject naturally belonged. On the thirty-first day of the session, William Owsley, late Judge of the Court of Appeals of Kentucky and as pure a patriot as the commonwealth contains, and then a member of the Senate, and in the absence of Mr. Wickliffe, chairman of the committee of Courts of Justice; moved for and obtained leave to bring in "*A Bill to amend the law, prohibiting the importation of slaves into this State,*" Mr. Wickliffe himself being present, as the Journal shows, at the same sitting, both before and after the leave was given, and doubtless at the moment, (p. 172, 3 and 4.) This leave was referred to Owsley, Thornton and Guthrie, the three ablest lawyers perhaps in the Senate, the worst of them a better and wiser man than Mr. Wickliffe, and all members of the committee of Courts of Justice, (p. 10 and p. 173.) Four days after this, Judge Owsley reported the bill, which was read the first time and ordered to be read the second time; Mr. Wickliffe, as the Journal shows, being present at the same sitting, both immediately before and immediately after this vote was taken, and therefore, by the most violent presumption, at the very time—(p. 205 and 6.) Four days more elapsed, and the bill was read the second time, and referred to a committee of the whole House—Mr. Wickliffe being present—(p. 231.) Three days afterwards, the Senate took up this bill in committee of the whole, acted on it, had it referred back, took the *yeas and nays*, first on an amendment, and then on the third reading of the bill; when it was ordered to be engrossed by 24 to 7. Mr. Wickliffe seems to have been absent from this sitting—(pp. 225 and 6.) The day after this, viz., on the 15th of January, 1833, the bill was *passed* by a vote of 23 to 12; and the *yeas and nays* being called, Mr. Wickliffe was present, and—my countrymen, how shall I say it?—How can you believe it?—Mr. Wickliffe was present, and—oh, baseness!—VOTED FOR THE BILL!!!—(p. 366.)*

*[] The following letter, as its date will show, was written nearly two weeks after this speech was delivered. It was written to C. M. CLAY, Esq., of Lex., Ky., in reply to one from him; and has been extensively published in the Kentucky newspapers. It is taken from the "*Paris Citizen*," of Nov. 6. It is hardly necessary to say, that JUDGE OWSLEY, is one of the most distinguished and honest men in Kentucky; and altogether needless to remark on the triumphant vindication of the author of this speech, and the overwhelming condemnation of the conduct of Mr. Wickliffe, which this letter, if it stood absolutely alone, would furnish.

FRANKFORT, Oct. 24, 1840.

Dear Sir:—I am in receipt of your letter of the 22nd inst., in which you request my answer to the following questions: "Do I consider the law of 1832-3, to prevent the importation of slaves, constitutional? Who was the author of that bill? What connection, if any, had it with "*abolition*?" Did Robert Wickliffe of Fayette, vote for it? Am I still of opinion that the law exercises a favorable influence upon the peace and prosperity of the Commonwealth of Kentucky?"

Mr. Wickliffe and myself, were both members of the Senate when that law was enacted. I drafted the original bill, reported it to the Senate, and finally voted for its passage. Mr. Wickliffe also voted for its passage. If I had entertained any

In an honorable mind, death is preferable to disgrace. Oh! my countrymen, what could language utter; that to a heart not callous to shame, could add to the sting which these naked facts ought to inflict? Here is this man, when sworn and bound by the highest obligations, deliberately performing the most solemn official acts; and then, when in the lapse of years his opinions change or his acts are forgotten—in the popular assemblies and by the press, denying, blackening these acts—that by a remote chain of causes, he may fasten them on the dead, the innocent, and the absent, and thereby ruin them! Here is this man, shut up to this alternative, that if he served you faithfully in 1833, he is now by his own showing a fanatic, an agitator, and a slanderer; or if he is to be credited now, he was then every vile and wicked thing, which he has labored so thoroughly to his own undoing, that he might fasten on me! Oh! how just and how terrible is God! How sacred, how retributive is his glorious providence!

I will now pass to the general question of Abolition; which, it is the principal object of the speech, as of all the present efforts of this individual, to fix upon all who stand in his way, and upon all whom, from motives of private interest or personal hate, he desires to make odious. For you must observe that while he denounces *his dead friend*, Judge Green, and myself by name, his direct charges reach every man who may have voted for, or who may now support, the particular measure he may at any time attack; and his insinuations extend to all who may favor any principle or plan upon the whole subject, that comes short of approving slavery as abstractly good, of giving eternal fixedness to its existence, and of increasing illimitably its extent.

On the 17th page of the speech he thus discourses; "But gentlemen say they are no abolitionists—they are indignant at the charge. But what is an abolitionist? One who intends to abolish

serious doubts as to its constitutionality or policy, I should not have acted the part I did in regard to the bill. But believing as I then did, that it was constitutional, and if passed into a law, would exercise a favorable influence over the prosperity of this State, I gave the bill my hearty support. My opinion has undergone no change since, either as to its policy or constitutionality. The attention of the Legislature was not, by the introduction of that bill, called for the first time, to the subject of prohibiting the importation of slaves. At the preceding session, a bill was brought before the House of Representatives, the exact phraseology of which I cannot now from recollection repeat, but in substance, contained a provision declaring all slaves should be free, that might thereafter be brought to this State contrary to, or in violation of its provisions. The policy and constitutionality of that bill were elaborately discussed, and on a test vote it was rejected I think by a very small majority. Some of the supporters of that bill, were desirous again to bring it before the Legislature, at the session of 1832-3. I was consulted on the subject, and conceiving the object of the friends of the bill might be as effectually attained by a bill differently worded, I prepared the one which was introduced into the Senate by me, and which, after undergoing some amendments in the details, passed into a law by large majorities in both houses. If the bill had any connection with 'abolition,' I was then, as I am now, incapable of discovering it. I had the opportunity of knowing the sentiments and feelings of most of the supporters of each bill, and I am sure they contemplated no such connection.

With sentiments of high personal regard, I am, Sir, Yours,

WM. OWSELY.

negro slavery by an immediate or a slow process, by a direct attack upon the tenure of slavery, or by an indirect mode." Now this definition is so radically vicious, that it contains in itself, the very proof and measure of its own absurdity; for *immediate* emancipation is the mother principle of abolition, while gradual and remote results are its very bane; denial of all title and tenure in slaves, is its watch-word, while *indirect modes* are the objects of its scorn. But this definition, expounded by other portions of this speech, is as insidious as it is absurd. They who are abolitionists are to be put down by violence; to be considered as public enemies; treated as conspirators against the peace and safety of your families; hunted down as the instigators of arson, rape and murder. Now we learn who these horrible wretches and conspirators are. Now we understand, that whoever *intends* that a day shall ever come in the distant future, when true, real and general freedom shall dwell amongst the children of men, and cover the earth with peace and blessedness—that man is a traitor. Now we comprehend, that whoever has in purpose, that laws most wise and needful in other respects, or a policy most beneficent on general grounds; whoever *even intends* that such laws and such a policy shall, *even directly*, operate the most remote restraint upon '*negro slavery*,' any where or under any circumstances, or throw the slightest contingent influence against '*the tenure of slavery*'—that man also is a traitor. Here is our warrant in the definition of this tried statesman; here the exhortation to action in his impassioned harangue; here the victims pointed out, with slow and steady accuracy. It only remains to strike the blow. Let that blow fall first, as is most meet, on the worthiest head. *Ashland* is in sight; its illustrious occupant may be standing in your midst, more striking in his grand simplicity, the first citizen of the republic, than he could have been, clothed with the ensigns of its first magistracy. Behold the example of his life, devoted to liberty; listen to the long, unaltered, unwavering testimony of his principles, constant for freedom; hear his voice, unterrified and unseduced, on the most memorable occasion, and in the most august of all assemblies—"God, who knows my heart, knows that I love liberty, and ardently desire the freedom of the human race; but I desire the freedom of my own country above all other countries, that of my own race before all other races." Now rush upon him; now crush him. We who partake his principles, will not shrink from his doom. I, for one, desire to live no longer, than while I may profess such principles; nor do I care to die more gloriously, than in testimony of their truth.

But I will suppose for the present, that this definition is true and just; and I undertake to prove by it, that my accuser is more obnoxious to the charge of abolition, than I am. I am fully aware, that his universal mode of enforcing every subject by whatever arguments or assertions may seem to favor his particular object, without any regard to their truth or soundness, leads him into the dilemma of perpetual self-contradiction. But it gives him also this advantage, that on every subject of which he treats, he has opposite statements and principles under which he takes refuge, as necessity requires. At one of our Indian treaties, that of Tellico if my

memory is correct, that fine old soldier, the late Governor Shelby, had waited several days for a noted chief who promised to attend the treaty; when becoming impatient at the delay, he demanded of another chief, if he knew the cause of his absence. "No," replied the wise and upright savage; "but I know he can't come here; for he who has two tongues, can talk to but one man at a time." So he who has two tongues, should never talk on more than one subject at a time, nor upon the same subject more than once; if he does otherwise, he must take the responsibility of his double tongue, and reconcile his talk as he best may.

In Mr. Wickliffe's famous circular of 1830, which I have already mentioned as the original cause of all the agitations of that period, he thus expresses himself: "I am here asked, do you wish to render slavery perpetual? I answer, *No!*" Well, my friends, I also answer, '*No!*' And here at least our principles agree.

Again in the same document, he thus discourses: "Providence will no doubt in time, point out the means of effecting the liberation of the slaves." I also cordially embrace this opinion. And here again he is at least as obnoxious as myself, to his own definition.

Still farther, he adds the following solemn pledge: "I will therefore, at all times aid in whatever will tend to effect the emancipation of the whole slave population gradually." But in the name of common sense, does not his definition of 1840 brand his pledge of 1830 as ultra-abolitionism? The more particularly, when you remember that the pledge was expressly made for all the slave States; for he says in the sentence immediately preceding the words quoted, of every and any "means of effecting the liberation of the slaves," that "to be effectual, it must be general in all the states." Now this pledge goes far beyond any thing I have ever bound myself to; indeed, far beyond my constitutional principles; and proves him a far more unscrupulous abolitionist than I. For I have considered the subject one of such delicacy and difficulty, that I have been cautious of pledges—select as to means—hostile to many things "*that will tend to effect the emancipation*" of slaves. Nay, more; I am thoroughly persuaded that we have no right to interfere in the proposed manner, "in all the states;" that the peace and dignity of states forbid such interference; and that a very large part of the evils of modern abolitionism flow from a mode of procedure in perfect accordance with this extraordinary pledge, and in such direct hostility to all my own principles and views, that I will pledge myself to resist it forever and to the uttermost.

If you look now to the 16th page of the speech to which I am replying, you find these words: "I have many slaves, and have liberated many, because they were good slaves," &c. It is true, he makes a confession of his great error in having done this mad act, and says it was amongst "*the errors of earlier life.*" Mr. Wickliffe and I differ a little here. He had many slaves, I few; he counting by hundreds, I hardly by scores. He liberated many—all I suppose that were good, as that is the motive assigned; I only a few, but as all I had were good enough to be free, I had as good a reason as he. He regrets what he did; I did nothing hastily, and therefore have no reason to repent of what I have done. In sober seri-

ousness, he seems to have committed the capital fact in the case, and to have been caught in the very manner!

But he has not done himself full justice. They who will take the trouble to examine the records in the office of the Clerk of the County, will find this gentleman bound by deed of record, under his seal and sign manual, to a third party, securing in the most full and ample manner the power in others to emancipate his own slaves (how many I know not,) and divesting himself of all power to prevent it. I do not condemn this act; I regret the necessity of referring to it; since at least one person whom I reverence and love, is connected with it, and that in a manner worthy of the highest praise. But it goes far beyond any act of mine, in fastening the charge of abolitionism, under our present definition.

I do beseech you to consider this summary. Here is a man defining an abolitionist to be "*one who intends to abolish slavery,*" or to "*attack the tenure of slavery*" in any way whatever, or to the slightest degree; and who villifies all who are involved in the wide compass of such terms. And yet the same man appears at your bar, declaring himself opposed to perpetual slavery; asserting his conviction that God also is opposed to it; pledging himself to aid, *at all times, in all things, that will even tend* to emancipate the whole slave population of the nation, so that it be done gradually; himself absolutely a practical emancipator of "*many slaves;*" and bound by a deed signed when he was above fifty years of age (in the year 1827,) to emancipate—no one knows how many more! How immense is the benefit of having no memory, and two tongues!

There is, however, my countrymen, as you all I presume, know, another kind of thing widely different from that I have been considering, which passes under the generic term *abolition*. This term has become technical, and has a meaning as fixed and definite as the terms *man, whig, democrat*, or any other that defines a race, or a class. And it is as unfair for this accuser of mankind, to use this term in an equivocal and general sense, that he may hold up all men who are not as much in love with slavery as he *now is*—as the followers of Garrison, Thompson, Birney and the like; as it would be ridiculous for him to describe an animal with seven heads and ten horns, and then say he meant man. As to this *real* abolitionism, this modern monster that has so agitated the world for the last few years; all who know any thing of my life, opinions and labors, know that I have been from the origin of this sect, steadily and uninterruptedly amongst the most open and decided of its opponents. It is no doubt true, that heated and ignorant men, who do not discriminate, or who will not examine; may have confounded my general devotion to the liberties of mankind, and my particular labors for this unfortunate black race, with the dogmas and plans of modern abolition. It is also undeniable, that while the abolitionists themselves have constantly accused me of holding pro-slavery opinions, and advocating pro-slavery interests; the bitterness of personal and sectarian enmity has made itself manifest, during long and excited ecclesiastical difficulties, in charges of modern abolitionism, levelled at my head. But these wanton, absurd and contradictory accusations have seemed more worthy of pity or scorn, than of any regular

defence. For above twenty years, my opinions have undergone no change on the great questions touching slavery and the black race generally. Those opinions have been freely, constantly uttered, when the occasion required it; thousands and tens of thousands in both hemispheres have heard and read them; they are just as notorious as my own existence, just as distinct and defined as my name or person.

This true, real and odious abolitionism; this thing which, notwithstanding his definition, Mr. Wickliffe constantly means and perpetually labors to fasten on his intended victims, I will now briefly and clearly explain; and show you, past doubt, that here also, and in the worst sense of the worst possible abolitionism, my accuser is more obnoxious than I am, to his own charges!

The abolitionism of Garrison, Thompson, Birney and the like, asserts as its fundamental truth, the absolute and universal sinfulness of slavery, and the consequent duty of universal, *immediate* emancipation. I utterly deny, and have constantly combated this proposition. I presume Mr. Wickliffe also rejects it. Here then we stand on common ground.

The second great, general foundation of modern abolitionism, is the claim of all political and civil rights and privileges for the blacks in the countries where they dwell; and a most violent enmity to all schemes for the removal of any of them, by colonization or otherwise. Against all this, I have written, spoken, printed and acted from the moment that party was organized. Against a *part* of it, I doubt not Mr. Wickliffe is also clear; and to that extent we agree again. But he is a *cold*, and I a very *warm*, friend of African colonization; he would prevent and I would encourage, the emigration of the black race from Kentucky; and to the whole extent of this difference, he is with, and I against Garrison, Thompson, Birney and abolition.

The third principle of modern abolitionism, which, united with the two foregoing, makes up the elemental form of the heresy, is the doctrine of *amalgamation*. Against this horrid doctrine, I have fought without intermission. For it, Mr. Wickliffe is deliberately and fully committed. In 1830, I say of amalgamation, that it is "*a base, spurious, degraded mixture, hardly less revolting*" than revolution, or the extermination of the slaves. (See Number 7, *Hints on Slavery*—Kentucky Reporter, June 9, 1830.) At the same period Mr. Wickliffe proposes to abolish slavery by a mode, which will "*in time, efface the distinctive mark of color, until the chain of slavery is worn out and not broken by sudden and convulsive measures.*" (See *Circular, signed R. Wickliffe*—Kentucky Reporter, February 17, 1830. See also, his speech, page 19, near the bottom, where the same doctrine is squinted at.) Now there are but three possible modes by which to "*efface the distinctive marks of color.*" The *first* is, by the blacks getting white: which is, I apprehend, not very likely to happen, and is, moreover, contrary to Mr. Wickliffe's definition, which is strenuous only for "*negro slavery.*" The *second* mode is, that the whites should turn negroes; and in that case, perhaps, slaves to boot; a consummation which, I humbly trust, God will forever avert. The *third* and only remaining mode that is pos-

sible, is, that whites and blacks should all become mulattoes, which is the necessary result of amalgamation; and the grand climax proposed by Mr. Wickliffe, as the end of all his labors and plans, the result of all his philosophy and statesmanship! Truly a most notable scheme! And singularly comforting to a race of white freemen!

For my part, I go for the white man, without a cross. I go against Mr. Wickliffe and against the abolitionists; and boldly assert, that, however hostile he or they may be on certain points, they are far more harmonious in their general principles and schemes, than either party is with me. They who will read the speech I am combatting, with the knowledge of these facts fresh in their minds, will perceive at once the secret bond of sympathy, and the true source of Mr. Wickliffe's repeated and exalted praises of Mr. James G. Birney, the abolition candidate for the Presidency of the United States, who was reviling his country in England, while his eulogist was proclaiming his virtues to you!

The most extraordinary part, perhaps, of all this unparalleled speech of Mr. Wickliffe, is that in which he endeavors to convince you that I have been acting under an English influence and conspiring with the crown, ministry and people of Britain, to compass the disgrace and ruin of my country. It is difficult to decide whether charges of this kind exhibit more strikingly, the ignorance or malignity of him who makes them. The slightest general knowledge of my life and opinions, is proof incontestible, that I have been educated in principles the most irreconcilable to all forms of government that are not absolutely popular and free; that I have ardently and constantly pressed upon my countrymen opinions touching the glory, the independence, the nationality and the renown of our mighty republic, which might be liable to the accusation of being extreme, but never to that of being servile; and that, as it regards any foreign influence, England has been the very last of all, with whom I, or any with whom I have acted, either in politics or religion, would have conspired for our own and our country's infamy. Descended from ancestors who were driven out by English intolerance; partaking the most ardent whig blood of the revolution; born of one of the leaders of the democratic party of 1798; imbued from earliest childhood with every principle of republican liberty; trained in a religious faith persecuted by England, and now a minister of a church that has suffered more from her than from all quarters besides—I find myself publicly accused of holding principles and pursuing objects identical with those of the British crown, and of doing all this under and by virtue of British influence! Such accusations, springing from an ignorance so impassive as not to be sensible that it is exposing itself to the pity and scorn of all enlightened men; or from a malignity so blind, as to disregard even that appearance of truth, which public decency requires—would, under ordinary circumstances, need no reply. But connected with the existing question of negro slavery, and made in a formal manner, by a responsible accuser, in print, on an important occasion, and in connexion with transactions of great local interest; it has appeared to me proper, that they should not be passed over. And,

thanks to the goodness of that overruling Providence, the doctrine of whose special intervention this gentleman is not ashamed, though professing Christianity, publicly to deride—I am able to meet them, so far as they are specific, with an overwhelming refutation, in the naked facts of the case.

In the year 1836 I found myself in England, a delegate from the church to which I belong, not to the Kirk of Scotland, as this individual asserts; but to the *Congregational Union* of England and Wales; on a mission having no other object but to promote Christian fellowship and mutual good will amongst the people of God, and greater general interest in the conversion of the world. Whatever may have been the apparently well grounded hopes of doing good, by such an exchange of delegates, between the churches of the old world and those of the new—exchanges long resorted to by most of the Christian denominations, and still retained by many of them—my own opinion, formed on careful examination, was finally settled against the practice, under existing circumstances; and on my return to America, I strongly advised its discontinuance, and the General Assembly of my church concurred in judgment with me, and formally broke up the plan, in the year 1838.

I found on my arrival in England, a state of great excitement in the public mind on the general subject of negro slavery; an excitement which extended to slavery in America, and had become a matter of great and constant annoyance to every American in England who did not hold the opinions and partake of the passions of that party in America, headed by Garrison, Birney, Tappan, and such men. George Thompson had been to the United States, and had then recently returned to England. At the moment I arrived in that country, he was engaged in a public outcry against Drs. Reed, Matheson, Cox and Hobie, the two former Congregationalists, the two latter Baptists; who, having come as delegates from their respective denominations in England to some of the churches of this country, and returned home not thorough-bred abolitionists—were publicly and vehemently attacked by George Thompson, for countenancing, as he said, slavery in America.

I landed in England on the 21st day of April, 1836, and in less than sixty days, I was engaged in a public debate with this same George Thompson, in defence of my home, my brethren and my countrymen. On the 13th, 14th, 15th, 16th and 17th days of June, 1836, in the very spot where *that* accuser had been accustomed to rave at will, or to triumph easily over all opposition—as now, this day, on the very theatre where *this* accuser has too long reviled good men with impunity—I met him in the fortress of his strength, and hurled back upon him, as I hurl back this day, his sophistry and malice; and stripped him, as I have done his fellow, this day, of every pretext of humanity, patriotism, and truth. And yet, fellow-citizens, the battle of that day was a very different affair from this. It is one thing to stand in health and strength and fervent conviction of conscious truth and rectitude, in the midst of the playmates of childhood, and the tried friends of life; and it is quite another thing to face a whole nation, prejudiced against your cause; to have in that cause itself the necessity to make distinctions, ex-

ceptions and reserves; to be weak in body and bound down under sufferings. I call God to witness, that if ever I did an act of intrepid nationality, or stout-hearted devotion to my country and my friends, that was the act. And it was an act left in no uncertain record, that men might err concerning it. I hold in my hand one copy of three large British impressions of that Glasgow debate; and I know that tens of thousands of copies of it have been circulated throughout the United States; several thousands, through the newspapers of this very state. I also hold in my hand, a printed copy of my letter to Dr. Wardlaw, of Glasgow, who presided on the occasion of that debate, written from Paris, in France, in consequence of certain acts of his in regard to the discussion; a letter, which the present occasion justifies me in remembering, was received with enthusiasm by the whole American people, and distributed by hundreds of thousands through the whole American press. Proof and explanation of acts like these, beyond the mere recital of the facts, must be not only superfluous, but would be the height of affectation.

But, rejoins Mr. Wickliffe, there are more recent facts. There are, my friends; and they are conclusive for me, and against him. The "*World's Anti-Slavery Convention*," as it is most ridiculously called—a convention of about three hundred Englishmen, some half dozen Frenchmen, and a score or two of Americans of no repute, did indeed meet in London, a few months ago, and "play fantastic tricks before high heaven." But my relation to the convention was simply this: that I was denounced in its open sessions, in such terms of unmeasured bitterness and contumely, as Englishmen alone know how to use; and that abuse carefully re-printed in all the abolition journals of the United States. Nay, after the convention had adjourned, Garrison and Thompson met in Glasgow, on my old battle ground; and gallant and manly as Mr. Wickliffe himself, and just a fortnight before his own attack upon me, in this court-house, they poured out the phials of their wrath upon me there, while he was distilling his venom here: and to make the scene complete, my old *correspondent*, Dr. Wardlaw, presided on the occasion, and broke a four year's silence, after my letter of 1836, by a volley of false, personal accusation. I hold in my hand *The Glasgow Chronicle*, of July 29, 1840, giving an account of the meeting, and establishing the facts I have stated. I also hold in my hand, *The London Patriot*, of July 28th, 1840, containing a full account of a great meeting in the Town Hall at Birmingham, England, on the 24th of July last; at which Mr. Wickliffe's particular friend, the abolition candidate for the Presidency, whom he so pointedly eulogises, and of whom he says "*I have ever felt indignant at the reproaches cast upon Birney*," (Speech, p. 22;—) at this meeting, I say, this "*honest man, and pious Christian*," regaled and delighted some two or three thousand Englishmen with a recital of the weaknesses, follies and crimes of this country, and of the faithlessness and hypocrisy of her churches! I observe that the Methodist and Presbyterian communions come in for a very liberal share of his malevolence; and this perhaps may be one cause of the tender interest which Mr. Wickliffe feels in him, as you will more

clearly perceive, by and by. But whatever may be the ground of this curious attachment of the disciple of Mr. Calhoun to the disciple of Mr. Garrison, of the eternal pro-slavery man to the immediate abolitionist; I crave your peculiar attention to the remarkable fact, that Birney the abolitionist traducing his country, is taken into the bosom of this patriot pro-slavery man; while I, defending my country and denouncing abolitionism, am marked out as a public enemy, worthy only of the tender mercies of Judge Lynch! But after all, it is not to be marvelled at, that he who lives absolutely for himself, should abhor the silent but living rebuke of their conduct, who try to live for their country and their generation. And for my part, I prefer the glory even of a failure, in the course I have marked out and tried to pursue; to the most perfect success in raking together slaves and land titles, in obstructing the permanent improvement of the country by selfish contests for right of way for my slaves, in vexatious attempts to have them clad by the public, by pleading the statute of limitations, and in projects to turn my neighbors out of doors on pretended titles and legal quibbles.

But Mr. Wickliffe has extended this allegation of English influence so far, as apparently to intend to cover every man and every enterprise not perfectly according with his own views, on the subject of negro slavery; views which are as novel as they are extreme, and which never were, and I trust in God never will be, embraced by the body of the people in the slave holding states. He has gone so far as to make an open attack, as the basis of this alleged foreign influence, on certain branches of the churches of Jesus Christ; and especially on the Presbyterian people of this country. In the array of his most "unerring proofs," as he is pleased to call his insensate tirades, he speaks as follows: "Her (viz., England's) first emmissaries in America, in furtherance of this plan, *came through the church of Scotland, recommended to the churches of the same faith in America.* These emmissaries sowed the seeds of abolitionism in that church, which took such root that the church itself has been rent in twain by it. Many of the General Assembly of that church are believed at first to have become infected greatly with the plans of universal emancipation, and Kentucky was selected as the slave state where operations should begin. Shortly before or about the time of Mr. Green's effort to pass the bill under consideration, the Synod of Danville, as the prints of the times will show, had under consideration certain resolutions declaring the evils of slavery and strongly recommending the ultimate abolition of it in Kentucky, especially among the whole body of Presbyterians." (Speech, p. 20.) On the preceding page, he had named particularly these "*first emmissaries to America,*" saying "She (England) has sent her Thompsons to the North, and her Martineaus to the South."

Before remarking on these statements, it is necessary to rectify a little, both their chronology and their history. The authors of the bill, if Mr. Wickliffe is to be credited, had laid their plans and even done their mischief as early as the year 1830; nay, in connexion with one portion of the remarks quoted above, their author says: "I speak from a period of *more than twelve years memory.*" But it is notorious to all, who draw their facts from their memory and not

from their imagination, that Thompson came to the United States about the beginning of the year 1835; and that the visit of Miss Martineau to this country was subsequent to that of Mr. Thompson. Yet these were the "first emissaries," and the mischief was already done above five years! "The Greek of all this," to use one of Mr. Wickliffe's classical phrases, is as follows: when Judge Green and myself are to be held responsible for the act of 1833, it is necessary to refer that act to an influence preceding its passage, and connected with us; and in this state of the argument, our doings in 1830 are declared to have caused the passage of the law three years after. But when it becomes necessary in another stage of the argument, to connect us and the act, with an English influence, then Thompson and Martineau, in 1835 and 1837, became the infectors of Green and myself, and induced us to do, what we had finished from five to seven years before; and through us oblige the Legislature of Kentucky to pass a bill that had already been a law for three or four years! Capital logic!

The *history* of Mr. Wickliffe is even more imperfect than his *chronology*. These "first emissaries to America," says he, "came through the church of Scotland," and they came to the Presbyterians. Each of these assertions separately and unitedly, are jointly and severally untrue. Miss Martineau is an Arian or Unitarian; Mr. Thompson, if a member of any church, is an Independent; neither of them ever came on any mission to the Presbyterian church; neither of them has any connexion with the church of Scotland; the church of Scotland never sent any delegate at any time to the General Assembly of the Presbyterian church in the United States, nor the latter to the former; nor was the church of Scotland or the Presbyterian church of the United States, at any time liable to the charge of forming or attempting any plan to favor abolitionism, such as that held by Miss Martineau and Mr. Thompson. I distinctly assert these facts, as notorious and incontrovertible; and I defy this reviler of God's people to gainsay one of them. I do indeed understand that this gentleman, who is far more learned in land-law than in ecclesiastical history, attempts to sustain his allegation in one point, by saying that in England, all who are not of the established Episcopal church, are called members of the church of Scotland; and the inference is, that Thompson the Independent, and Martineau the Unitarian, may therefore be truly said to be sent on a mission from the established Presbyterian church of Scotland, to the orthodox Presbyterian body of the United States! Most admirable logic, learning and truth!

He speaks of the schism of the Presbyterian church in the United States; and if the argument is of any avail to his present purpose, the facts, as usual, ought to be the very opposite of what they are, in some important respects. It is true, a schism has occurred in the Presbyterian church—unhappy in its character, and deeply to be deplored in the necessity which produced it. It is also true, that while that schism was produced by difference in important and fundamental points of doctrine and polity, yet the question of abolitionism was so far mixed with it, that nearly the entire mass of abolitionists that had found their way into that church, sloughed off

with the schism itself. Now, to make Mr. Wickliffe's statement of the case and use of the facts appropriate to his charges against me and my church, it ought to be true, that I acted for and with that party that was abolitionist; that the Synod of Kentucky was of that party and portion; and that the General Assembly was left in their hands. But all the facts are precisely the other way; and I am accused by the abolitionists of having been the chief agent in dividing my church, on account of my alleged pro-slavery preferences; and also accused by Mr. Wickliffe of having divided it by my abolitionism! The truth is, that the whole history of this unhappy schism and of my connexion with it, furnishes the clearest possible refutation of Mr. Wickliffe's accusations against me and my brethren; offers the best guaranty to the whole nation, of the principles and spirit of the church; and challenges the admiration of mankind, to those venerable institutions around which the rampant spirit of modern fanaticism raved in vain, and before which it received its first signal overthrow.

In this attack on the Presbyterian neighbors and constituents of Mr. Wickliffe, which I have every reason to believe was far more violent in the spoken than in the printed speech, there are peculiar circumstances of insult and aggravation. One, for example, is, that of all the political friends of this individual, none, to the extent of their numbers and whenever their principles would permit them, have been more constant, more efficient—may I not almost say less disposed to be scrupulous, than these very persons whom he has now singled out for destruction. Another is, that in the very canvass, in which the failure of his son, (a failure which is attributable, I presume, almost entirely to the father's imprudent interference and violent counsels,) has produced all the extraordinary scenes which have followed; these very Presbyterians, with cordial and remarkable unanimity supported that son! A third and characteristic one is, that other Christian denominations, as the Methodists, for example, which were united with us in the *spoken* denunciation, are entirely omitted from the *printed* speech; a piece of unmanly cunning, unworthy of any good cause, and equally insulting to those it would spare, as to those it would destroy.

But the grand objection to this procedure of Mr. Wickliffe lies to the thing itself. Supposing that his general facts had been true, and not false; supposing that his inferences had been just, and not unfounded; supposing that he had himself, not been a member of another church and therefore bound to condemn with the more caution, and supposing that church had not been one that has too often and too ardently persecuted us, when it had the power; supposing this Presbyterian church—a church unpolluted for three hundred years, except by its own blood—had been less remarkably the friend of order, of knowledge and of the general advancement of society, and therefore less obviously not liable to be the butt of his extraordinary ignorance;—still, the procedure itself is most dangerous to liberty, and utterly intolerable in a free state. The whole proceedings of the Presbyterian church are public and open to all mankind; and all her authority, which is purely moral, is restrained, without exception, to those who voluntarily and by prefer-

ence enter into her communion; and society has, in these two facts, a certain and enduring guaranty. But it is going a long step beyond the wholesome control of public sentiment, for political demagogues to discuss the churches on the hustings for party purposes, and revile the people of God for their faith and practice, as a solace to their own disappointed ambition. The right to worship God is the most precious of all rights; the privilege of belief, and of an innocent life, answering to that belief, is the very first of all privileges. Or if these sacred liberties can be questioned at all, the constitution of the country, the spirit of all our institutions, the peace of society, and the highest policy of the state, demand that this audacious inquisition shall not pollute the purity of our popular elections, nor be instituted in the primary assemblies of the people. Let this example be but faithfully followed out, and the religious liberties of the country are at an end, and with them all other freedom. Let the mob loose first on Presbyterians, and the *suppressed* Methodists will follow next; and then in succession all whose right to hold any opinion on any subject, shall be considered by Mr. Wickliffe incompatible with his right to hold his slaves; or by any other equally enlightened and candid patriot, incompatible with his pretensions on any other subject. I warn you of your danger; I denounce this unprecedented outrage; I call upon every sober minded man, of all shades of opinion, to set his face against this beginning of evils, the end of which no man can foresee. For, take my word for it, such attempts will be resisted with unflinching courage; and they who may triumph by the violence here recommended, will learn at last, how unfounded were their conjectures, that the people do not understand or will not vindicate their rights.

There is a personal question of no great importance, which, however, I do not feel authorised to omit entirely, to which I ask your attention for a single moment. I had said in my little note of the 7th inst., calling this meeting, that I had come unexpectedly to Kentucky; or, as I there expressed it, that I had, "*in the providence of God,*" visited this "my native region." In replying to this, Mr. Wickliffe in his published address of the 10th inst., has allowed himself to ridicule the notion that God's providence superintended my conduct, and to deny the fact intended to be asserted. From a column and more of very offensive remarks, I select a few sentences: "Talk as he may of his being here by the providence of God and his seeking advice (*guidance*, not advice, was the word I used,) from above, he has come here for the very business he is enacting. He learnt that his negro bill had driven me from the Senate; that a new election is pending, and lo! he is here as quick as the stages will bring him, and commences a war upon me—all by the advice and providence of God, of course." There is much more of the same character. Now, fellow-citizens, I am not aware that I should be to blame, if the thing were just as he states it; but unfortunately, all he says is untrue, and I defy him to prove one particle of it. My being here is purely providential, or if he pleases, accidental; and all the benefits he will take from this discussion, are his, without any procurement of mine. I had an appointment to deliver a discourse before the literary societies of Jefferson Col-

lege near Pittsburgh, in Pa., on the 24th of last month; an appointment which I was prevented from fulfilling a year ago, by domestic afflictions, and which was renewed this year at great personal inconvenience, on account of the kind and partial importunity of the young gentlemen of the College. After agreeing to come so far on the way towards Kentucky, the manager of my estate in this county, a man well known to many of you, and whom, having known from his youth and long employed, I may safely call an honest man and my friend—informed me that my affairs required my particular examination and advice; which he sought, and in reply received for answer, that under all the circumstances, I would immediately visit the West. I care not to confess to you my friends, that the ties of filial gratitude to an aged parent dwelling amongst you; that the graves of my kindred; that the honors which have been conferred on me here; that the friends I love, and the objects I have cherished—all, all fill my heart and my eyes, at the remembrance of my country, and make me perhaps too ready to revisit it. Alas! that at each return I should find the number of those most ready to forgive this, perhaps unmanly tenderness, more and more reduced, not only by the stroke of death, but by the operation of those causes whose force Mr. Wickliffe, is striving so madly, to augment. I ought also to say, that my having in my possession at the present moment, books and papers which belong so directly to this discussion, and whose presence will, I fear, increase Mr. Wickliffe's hatred of the doctrine of a special providence, needs but a word. For the last six years I have been connected with the periodical press of the country, and with a monthly journal, which, if Mr. Wickliffe had read, he would certainly have had more knowledge and perhaps better principles. Deeming it my duty to prepare an article for the pages of my own work, in reply to the accusations of the '*World's Convention*' people in England, and upon the general subject of that meeting; but not having leisure to do it before leaving Baltimore, I threw the material for it into my trunk, and found when I got here, what I have often found before; that the opposite extremes of opinion not only resemble each other far more than is generally supposed, but are often beaten down by the very same weapons.

And now, my countrymen, this painful but imperative duty is performed. I thank you for your kind and patient hearing, and leave my cause with confidence in your hands. I had no thought of being called before you again after so long an interval; and it is, if possible, still less likely that I shall ever again take part in one of your popular assemblies. If God had so willed, it had been my happiness to have lived and labored amongst you; to have mingled my dust with yours; and to have cast the lot of my children in the same heritage with yours. Wherever I live or wherever I die, I shall live and die a true Kentuckian. With me, the first of all appellations is *Christian*, after that *Gentleman*, and then *Kentuckian*! The foundations of society in this unparalleled region, were laid by hands dear to me, as they can be to you; and throughout the whole history of the commonwealth, there is not one scene of glory, one monument of success, one proof of advancement, one

evidence of greatness, one day of trial, with which my kindred and my friends have not been associated ; so that your fame is precious to my heart, as the warm currents that gush through it. The fields of battle where our fathers have fought, I know them all. Every green hillock over which your flocks graze, dwells in my memory ; and the running streams along which your noble boys stray, are clear and fresh in my imagination and my heart, as when my youthful feet traversed them, when your land was almost a wilderness. And am I the man to conspire against a land and a people like this ? Are you the judges, who are expected to convict me ? No, my friends, no. Not a blade of grass on your luxuriant fields, shall wither forever, if it stands till some act of mine brings danger or shame nigh to your habitations. No, my friends, no. May God bless you and yours, with his richest benedictions, to the thousandth generation ; yea, may he forgive, even those who have sought to do me this great damage, of robbing me of your good will. Yea, even him, whom, in the defence of my character, my principles and my hopes ; I have been obliged to consider—nay, have been obliged—contemning his threats and trampling his accusations under my feet—to prove, a faithless public servant and a dishonored gentleman ; even him, slanderer as he is, may God forgive, as I freely do, this day.

[For the Baltimore Literary and Religious Magazine.]

M O L I N I S M .

No. I.

MOLINISM, is a term of considerable celebrity among the Romanists. It was originally applied to the system of religious doctrine which was taught by *Molina*, a Jesuit of Portugal. It was afterwards extended, to signify a certain determinate system of doctrine which was advocated by the society of Jesuits generally, and which they explained independently of the book of *Molina*. In order to acquire a knowledge of this system and the method by which it was introduced, the reader should consult *Molina's Book of Concord*—the *History of the Congregations de Auxiliis*—the *History of the Formulary of Pope Alexander VII.*—*Pascal's Letters to a Provincial*, or, as they are usually called, the *Provincial Letters*—the bull *Unigenitus*, and the publications (especially those of the clergy of France) occasioned by that Bull. In general, however, Molinism may be described as a certain doctrine concerning grace and predestination. In regard to grace, the Molinists maintained that grace is given to all men—to those who do well, and to those who do wickedly, but some men are pleased to make a good use of the grace given them, and other men are not ; so that the difference between those who do well, and those who do wickedly, arises, not from grace, but from the will of man. In other words, God gives grace to men to enable them to do good ; but He does not give the good use of grace, or the grace of good use. Whenever a man has either a duty to fulfil, or a temptation to overcome,

grace is given to him, but this grace never secures the accomplishment of the duty or the overcoming of the temptation. It still belongs to the man himself to annex or join to the grace given him the performance of the required duty, or the victory over the instant temptation. To express this doctrine in the terms of scholastic theology: no grace is efficacious by itself, (*per se et ab intrinseco efficac.*) but men always have *sufficient* grace to which their free will either gives or refuses to give effect. Grace, according to this doctrine, is not *by itself* efficacious; that is, it does not work in men a good will, or by itself cause men to have a good will; but it is *sufficient*; that is, it puts men in a condition *to will* that which is good, and to that end gives them a *power* which they can use according to their pleasure.

It follows from this doctrine that a man's salvation depends upon himself and not upon God. In fact *that* is a part of the doctrine. To deny it, is to alter the system in an essential point. This will appear more clearly from the doctrine of predestination as contained in this system: which may be briefly stated thus: God predestinates, that is, determines to give eternal glory to a certain number of men, because he foresees that it will please them to make a good use of his grace: and he determines to condemn the others because he foresees that it will not please them to use his grace for the doing of good and the avoiding of evil. It is indifferent to God according to this doctrine which of the two classes make a good use of his grace. If he has any will, or any desire that men should avail themselves of the grace which he gives them, that will or desire respects all equally. Thus; He desires not righteousness, holiness and eternal glory any more in respect to the one class than to the other; but simply resolves to give eternal glory to those who shall do well, and to punish those who shall do wickedly. Such is predestination according to that system of doctrine called *Molinism*. It teaches in fact that predestination does not depend upon God, but upon man, because it teaches that it depends upon men whether they shall be among those who are predestinated to eternal glory, or in the ranks of the reprobate. It represents God rather as a spectator of the event, than as the author of the difference.

To pursue this matter a little further. A man who desires to secure his own salvation, has but three things to consider. (1.) Grace. (2.) The good use of grace. (3.) The reward which will be given him upon the good use of grace. Of two of these things every man (according to this system) is sure, viz., he is sure that he will have grace, and he is sure that God will reward him if he makes good use of the grace given him. The only thing remaining to be known then, is, whether or not he will make a good use of the grace which will be given him, and according to this doctrine, it depends upon the man himself, and not upon God to determine this question, viz., whether he will make good use of grace or abuse it.—Of course the man must look to himself and not to God for the proper improvement of the grace given him; every thing depends on the good use of grace; and let a man but secure that to himself, he has secured every thing; all must agree, that he who makes a good use of the grace which God gives him is a true servant of

God, and the true servants of God will never want any really good thing. All things are theirs. Of course the good use of grace secures heaven and eternal life. The good use of grace, is in fact godliness, which has the promise of the life that now is, and of that which is to come.

The consequences of this doctrine are of vast importance and extent; for it is most obvious that the good use of grace comprehends the whole of the Christian life:—every good work,—every good desire,—every act of prayer,—every consent of the will which can contribute in any way to salvation: and this *good use* depends upon man and not upon God.

I. *Molinism is in substance Pelagianism.*

The Jesuits did not invent this doctrine. It came from the Pelagians: but from the time of Molina, they have given it their support. In their disputes with theologians, they have, it is true, enveloped the doctrines of grace and predestination in a labyrinth of subtleties, for the purpose of showing differences between their system and that of the Pelagians, when in substance and truth none exist. But although they disguise their system in this way, and sometimes even soften the grosser features of it, the common people comprehend nothing of this portion of their system. They do not even understand the terms by which it is expressed. While on the other hand, the substance of their system is perfectly comprehensible by the common mind.—To open this matter a little further: the Jesuits make use of the terms *natural* and *supernatural*; *predestination to grace* and *to glory*; of *pre-uniting* and *co-operating grace*—*gratia excitans, operans, preveniens, adjuvans, co-operans, comitans; gratia sufficiens pure talis et ut efficaci opposita, quæ dat quidem posse operari sed non ipsum operari, ex defectu nempe voluntatis illam habentis non autem ex ipsius auxilii defectu.* They have also their *scientia media*; but of this part of their system the unlettered believer comprehends nothing. Thus much however he does learn from this system, that his salvation is absolutely and entirely in his own hands—that he is the sovereign arbitrator of it—that God does not determine the matter for him, but leaves it to his own decision.

The Pelagians as well as the Molinists, admitted into their system, grace of different kinds; but they denied that God gave men grace which caused them *to will* and *to do*, and in this, both Pelagians and Molinists differ from the doctrine of Augustine. The grace which Pelagians admitted, came in aid of man's power, but it gave not either the will or the action, and the grace admitted by the Molinists had these two characters, and although in other respects there be differences between the systems, they are too subtle for the apprehension of the common mind. That portion of both systems which is within the reach of the common mind, has sometimes been stated thus: God gives succour to man in order to aid him to do good and to eschew evil. He gives power to do the one and to avoid the other. This power is the effect of the succour which God gives, and it is wholly a gift of God or a grace.—As to the question whether a man will make use of this grace or power (—of this succour or help to do good—) that depends upon the man's free will, and is left to himself, according to the Pelagians;

and the common people conceive the same idea from the system of the Molinists. A striking proof of the substantial identity of these systems is, that both Pelagians and Molinists employ precisely the same proofs, the same reasonings, and the same objections. Both are embarrassed by the same passages of Scripture. Both pervert certain passages of Scripture in the same way.

[To be continued.]

MARGARITÆ ROMANÆ.

The First Dive.

I. Bishop Burnet says in his *Letters*, (let. 5,) that he saw a picture in one of the popish churches at Wormes, in which a windmill is represented, with the virgin Mary throwing Christ into the hopper, and he comes out at the eye of the mill all in wafers, which some priests take up to give the people.

II. Mr. Addison has translated a very godly sermon of St. Anthony, the famous marine saint, which was publicly sold at Padua. It had been preached to a devout audience of *fishes*, who attended very seriously to it, and behaved with great reverence and devotion.

III. It is recorded in the life of St. Margaret, that the devil having swallowed her down into his belly, he burst with her; on which account her legend is to be read to lying in women.

IV. No less than 500 bales of bulls were taken on board a Spanish gallion, by a British privateer in 1709. Sixteen reams making a bale, the whole number was computed to amount to 3,840,000. What a sorrowful end of so much *indulgence*, to fall into the hands of heretics!

V. A brief for making a new saint costs 100,000 crowns. A consecrated *Pallium*, (the white stuff band worn over the shoulders of papal prelates) for an English archbishop, formerly cost at Rome, 1200 pounds sterling; being for the stuff about *ten shillings*, and for the pope's blessing, we suppose, all the rest. In the year 1250, Walter Gray, archbishop of York, paid 10,000 pounds for that ornament, without which he did not dare to exercise any function of his office. According to the present value of money as compared with its value then, say at ten for one, and five dollars to the pound sterling, he paid not far from half a million of dollars, for a piece of woolen a few feet long and a few inches wide. Pretty high prices at Rome, and need for brisk merchandise, on the part of the bishops, to see their own again.

VI. *Baptist Spagnoli*, called Mantuan from his country, a Carmelite, and six times vicar general, speaks thus,

Si quid Roma dabit, nugas dabit, accipit aurum,

Verba dat, hue Romæ nunc sola pecunia regnat.

VII. "Rejoice, mother Rome," said the *abbot of Usperg*, "for cataracts of earthly treasures are opened to thee, and rivers of money flow into thee in copious fulness. Rejoice over the iniquities of the children of men, for a price is paid thee for all these evils. Re-

joice in the discords which burst from the infernal abyss, since you are enriched by them. Rejoice in thy work, thou joyous one, who hast conquered the world not by thy religion, but by the iniquity of man. Men are subdued into thee, not by their devotion, nor by the force of conviction, but by the perpetration of their multiplied enormities, which thou, for a set price, dost adjust." (*Cron. Abbas Usperg.*)

VIII. Urban V. by others called VI., was the first pope who used the *triple crown*, called the *tiara*, and used by all his successors, in order to show that the vicar of Christ is possessed of a three-fold power, viz: the *pontifical*, *imperial*, and *royal*. It is singular the Scriptures should predict, that one peculiarity of Antichrist should be, that *three kingdoms* should be destroyed to make one for him; and that he to confirm his own guilt, and put a brand on his own forehead, should make a thing unheard of before, viz: a *triple crown*, and put it on his head! The *Abbe de Choisy* in his *Histoire de Philippe de Valois*, gives a somewhat different account of the matter. We repeat it: "The popes at first used a simple cap like that used by the priests of Cybele, but pope Hormisdas in 514 put on this cap, the gold crown which the emperor of Constantinople had given to *Clovis*, king of France, and which he sent to St. John Lateran. Boniface VIII. elected in 1294, added a *second* crown to the *Tiara*, on the occasion of his quarrel with *Phillippe the fair*, in regard to the temporal power of the pope; in order to mark the double authority, (*temporal and spiritual*), which he claimed. Finally, John XXII. (or XXIII. as classed by Platina, counting John VIII. the female pope,) about the year 1328 added the *third* crown, on the occasion of his obstinate refusal to recognise the emperor Louis of Bavaria."

IX. Speaking of John VIII. *Papess* of Rome, *Platina* in his *Lives of the Popes*, calls John VIII. the CVI. pope, and places *her* between Leo IV. and Benedict III. It is very remarkable, that if *she* was not John VIII. there was no John VIII.; and not less so that all the popes named John, from IX. to XXIII., are *doubly* classed by the papal historians, according as *Joan*, is admitted or not. *Platina* asserts, that John VIII. was a *woman*; that she obtained the papacy by magic; that the choice of her was unanimous; that she being pope, became pregnant by one of her servants; and that the time of her delivery being come, as she was going to the church of the Lateran, between the Colloseum and the church of St. Clement, she had her child and died in the street, after reigning two years, one month, and four days. Let the reader consult *Platina*, who was a good papist, a protegee of several cardinals and popes, and died of the plague at Rome in the year 1481, two years before the birth of Martin Luther.

X. Speaking of the aforesaid John XXII. or if John VIII. alias *Joan*, be counted, John XXIII.; during his life, he used to throw copper medals and coins to the Roman populace, saying *silver and gold have I none, but such as I have I give you*. When he died, treasure to the amount of *twenty eight millions of ducats of gold* was found in his coffers. (*Memoirs de Polnitz, tom. ii. p. 246.*)

XI. Boniface VIII. opposed the election of Albert, son of Rodolph, to be king of the Romans, asserting that he was himself both

pope and king. At the jubilee in 1300, (which he first established,) he sometimes appeared in the pontifical, sometimes in the imperial costume, with crown, sword and sceptre, and took for his device, *Ecce duo gladii*. (*Dupin Bibliothéque, tom. xi. p. 4.*)

XII. Julius II. in his war with France, threw aside the mitre and put on the helmet. Passing over the Tiber, he threw the *keys* into the stream, and called for *St. Paul's sword*. (*Gilbert. Dacher.*)

XIII. *Charles the Bold* had the empire conferred on him by John IX. (if you count *Joan*, if not John VIII.,) upon condition of his conceding to the See of Rome the right of appointing emperors; of his renouncing the principality of Rome and the adjoining states, of agreeing to use the papal instead of the imperial reign as the mode of counting time, and taking an oath to hold the empire as a benefice from the pope. "From that time," adds *Mezeray*, "the popes pretended that it belonged to them to confer the empire, and that they should not be called emperors who were not crowned by them."

REVOLUTION IN THE MARYLAND HOSPITAL.—PROGRESS IN
PUBLIC SENTIMENT.

The *Sisters of Charity* have left the Maryland Hospital. That charity of the diocese of Baltimore, is extinct, so far as Mr. Eccleston and Pope Gregory XVI. are concerned; and the Archbishop must rectify his Directory for 1840.

We had the pleasure of hearing a minister of Jesus Christ preach the gospel of his grace, the other Sabbath afternoon, in the very establishment in which *Priest Gildea* so long reigned; perhaps in the very apartment in which he sung mass for years. And the poor inmates, who had spent so many silent and solitary Sabbaths, have now the glad tidings of salvation proclaimed to them stately; and join in the social and public worship of that great physician of souls, who alone can effectually minister to a mind diseased, and heal the wounded and broken spirit.

This fact is full of interest. We record it with gratitude as a signal proof of the progress of public sentiment; and as a manifest token of the blessing of God, on the cause of public liberty and protestant Christianity. This important institution, belonging to the protestant commonwealth of Maryland, and the only one of the kind for the reception and treatment of the insane; capable of containing, when in full operation, a hundred and fifty patients; has been for years a *papal* institution, and is so recorded in the Almanac of the Archbishop. It is papal no longer. It is again open to all. It is no longer a mass-house; no longer a general receptacle for travelling or straggling priests and nuns; no longer a sectarian institution for the private purposes of a superstition, and the public advancement of a false creed; it is no longer the Pope's, nor the Archbishop's, nor Dr. Deluol's, nor Priest Gildea's.—But it is again the Hospital of the State of Maryland, for the reception and treatment of the insane; open to all; managed for the good

of society; used only for the comfort and cure of the unfortunate deranged.

This, it must be confessed, is worthy of being called a *revolution*; and though it is happily accomplished by peaceful means and inures more especially to the benefit of a small class of unfortunate persons; yet it is not the less worthy of remembrance on those accounts; especially as the dignity of the state, and the self-respect of society were both involved in the matter. We hope soon to record a revolution at the City and County Alms House, which will be number two; and another at the City Infirmary, which will be number three. The first victory by public sentiment is won: the next will be easier; and each one in succession easier still. We do not despair of seeing the prisons for women, thrown open by public authority; nor even of hearing the gospel preached in the Cathedral.—(See 1 Cor. xv. 58.)

We will tell the story of this revolution as we have heard it; not intending to perpetrate a libel on any body; and hoping that Mr. Pitts at least will not prosecute us if we do, as he has appeared again on a protestant platform, in advocacy of a *protestant* orphan school.

The public supposed all along that the services of the *Sisters of Charity* at the Hospital, were gratuitous; and our public press has kept up this delusion, by constant puffs; deluded perhaps itself, or possibly acting on the modern principle, that any thing (that is not too protestant) may be printed, if paid for; a most sweet and facile mode of making money out of the evil passions of society, and propagating for pay, what is rejected from principle. But it now turns out, that this was all a delusion; that the public paid a full price for the services of these charitable sisters; and that Priest Deluol, who hired them to the Hospital, (by what right we know not,) received some five or six dollars per month for each sister; which probably made a total of seven or eight hundred dollars a year, paid by the state to this priest, for the *gratuitous* services of these poor nuns. These facts open a very wide field of speculation, on many parts of this subject; and we commend them to the serious reflections of the community.

When the good sisters, got themselves well located in their new quarters; and had turned off every protestant employed about the establishment; and filled every nook and corner, capable of holding an *attache*, with a stout papist; and their own personal wants and claims began to be cared for. It was necessary to have some mode of going to mass in bad weather. *Presto*—the State of Maryland paid for an establishment and hired a man to keep and drive it. But then it was discovered, that the good of the institution required the Sisters to stay there, when the good of their souls required them to be at mass some where else. *Presto encore*—the State of Maryland fitted up a mass-house in the Hospital. Then it was discovered that these expenses and fixtures were useless without a priest. *Presto encore*—Priest Gildea became confessor in the establishment. After this, it was discovered that Priest Gildea could not be expected to work for nothing; and therefore, the state of Maryland must, as they say in the west, “fork up,” once more. But here there

was a difficulty; for, *first*, it would sound rather odd when the accounts should come to light, to hear them read, *so much for the salary of Priest Gildea, as confessor to nuns, paid by the state*; and *secondly*, there was an old orthodox Friend, or Quaker, on the Board, who had qualms of conscience about paying religious teachers. So they beat the bush, and beat a gentleman who shall be nameless around the stump; and appropriated, as a bonus to the nuns, for good conduct, the sum asked for as an appropriation to Priest Gildea! And now behold, the whole affair arranged; the Hospital set down in the Archbishop's tally, as his charity; and every vestige of protestantism ready to vanish from this papal den, supported by the public purse.

Now at this point our story divides itself. There are two modes of accounting for the revolution, which ended the dynasty of the nuns. We will state both.

Jeshurun waxed fat and kicked. So, as some say, did the nuns. They interfered with the management of the Hospital in all possible ways; they were hired for nurses—but became mistresses; they ruled every thing—and not always either wisely or moderately. Finally they usurped not only the moral but even the medical treatment of the patients. In this state of the affair, Dr. Fisher, the resident physician, complained to Dr. Stuart, the consulting physician, president of the Board, &c. &c.; and the result was, that Dr. Fisher and not the nuns—left the establishment. Then Dr. Starr came in; and after a few months laid a written memorial before the Board, and left the place. On this, the Board and the nuns came to a parley; negotiated, dissolved, parted company; and Dr. Fisher returned to the establishment. This is the public talk of the town; and it is we believe true; but there is more true besides, and leads to the second story.

We happen to know something about the doings of these worthy sisters. Several persons came to us with statements, that we did not choose to hear alone. Some, we made repeat them in the presence of witnesses; some, we made reduce them to writing; some, we sent to the officers of justice; to all we said, go before the grand jury;—they must redress you;—we can't. After these things, and and about these times, the nuns and the Board quarreled and parted.

We blame the Board only for putting and keeping these nuns there; not for their personal acts while there. But we do confess, we are not without suspicion that the nuns would not have been so ready to evacuate the establishment, had things been a little different. They may have been most excellent, most innocent; traduced by former inmates, as well as by the Board which turned them out of it. We don't say; nor, if we may add with all civility, do we care. If they had been the best nuns that ever were—and that we fear is none of the best—they had no business there; and the public is heartily glad they are there no longer.

We should leave a wrong impression on the mind of the reader, if we allowed him to suppose that we attach any great merit to those who have turned out the nuns; or that any body supposes this act was done on account of the protestant feelings of those who did it. Not at all. The public sentiment demanded the act;

one way or other the thing was inevitable; and the general joy at its occurrence, leads a confiding community to place the matter on a more elevated ground than it deserves. The thing is done; that is good, and we ought not to look too narrowly after the motives of good conduct. But public sentiment did the thing; and it will do more and greater things besides.

This community is a protestant community; this commonwealth is a protestant commonwealth. These sentences contain the essence of every reform demanded, here, against papism. They are words too long forgotten. Their potency begins at length to be felt.

[Continued from page 509, of Vol. VI.]

THE GOSPEL MYSTERY OF SANCTIFICATION,

By the Rev. Wm. Marshall.—Abridged.

No. VII.

ASSERTION VII.—*We are not to imagine that our hearts and lives must be changed in any measure from sin to holiness, before we may safely venture to trust in Christ for the sure enjoyment of himself and his salvation.*

WE are naturally so prone to ground our salvation upon our own works, that if we cannot make them procuring conditions and causes of our salvation by Christ, we shall at least endeavor to make them necessary preparatives to fit us for receiving Christ by faith. Men are easily persuaded that this is not at all contrary to salvation by free grace, because all that is ascribed to our works or good qualifications, is only that they put us in a fit posture for receiving Christ. It seems to be a slighting and despising of the justice and holiness of God and Christ, to dare to approach them while polluted with sin,—much more to endeavor to receive Christ into the heart while it is unreformed. Many that behold with terror the filth of their own hearts are kept off from coming immediately to Christ by such imaginations, and Satan strongly maintains and increases them by his suggestions,—they delay the saving act of faith because they are not yet duly qualified for it.

Against this notion, I offer the following:

1st. It is pernicious to the practice of holiness, and our whole salvation. By it we are left to labor in vain for holiness in our natural state, and out of Christ. While we endeavor to prepare our way to Christ by holy qualifications, we do rather fill it up with stumbling blocks and deep pits, whereby our souls are hindered from ever attaining to salvation by Christ.

2d. No change from sin to holiness, either in our hearts or lives, before our receiving Christ by faith, is at all necessary or required by the word of God. Christ would have the vilest sinners come to him without delaying to make themselves fit. Paul said to the wicked jailor, believe, and thou shalt be saved, although he had newly attempted wilful self-murder. Those converted on the day

of Pentecost had need of delay, if any have, for they were polluted with the murder of Jesus, but Peter bade them believe at once. Christ commands his servants to go out quickly into the high ways and compel them to come in, without any delay.—Matt. xxii. 10—Luke xiv. 23. Christ would have us believe on him that justifieth the ungodly,—therefore he does require us to be godly before we believe; Rom. iv. 5. He comes as a physician to the sick, and does not expect us to recover our health before we apply to him; Matt. ix. 12. The worst sinners are fitly prepared for the design of the gospel, which is to show forth the exceeding riches of his grace, pardoning our sins and saving us freely; Eph. ii. 5, 7. He loved us in our pollution so as to die for us, and much more will he love us in it, so as to receive us when we come to him for the purchased salvation. He hath given full satisfaction to the justice of God for sinners, that they might have all holiness and salvation by fellowship with him through faith, therefore it is a despising the saving grace, merit and fulness of Christ if we endeavor to make ourselves holy before we receive Christ.

3d. Those that receive Christ with an unfeigned faith, shall never want a *wedding garment* to adorn them in the sight of God. Faith itself is very precious to him, and is most holy; 1 Peter i. 2. God loveth it because it giveth the glory of our salvation to the free grace of God in Christ; Rom. iv. 16; it contains in it a hearty love to Christ as the Saviour, and a hungering and thirsting for his salvation. "The Father himself loveth them because they love Christ and believe that he came from God; John xiv. 27.

For more full satisfaction to those who lie under terrible apprehensions of their sinfulness and the work of God, and dare not venture to trust steadfastly on Christ, until they can find in themselves some change from sin to holiness. I will mention some things they would find in themselves, and show that they are the fruits or consequences of faith, and cannot rationally be expected before we trust in Christ.

They think they must repent before they believe, because it is said, except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish; Luke xiii. 3; and because Christ places repentance before faith, repent and believe the gospel; Mark i. 25. But we are to know that Christ requires repentance as the end to be aimed at, and faith as the only means of attaining to it,—the end is first in intention and the means first in practice, and both are absolutely necessary to salvation. For what is repentance but a hearty turning from sin to God and his service? And what way is there to turn to God but through Christ? And how can we come to Christ but by faith? Faith must go before repentance as the instrument afforded us by the grace of God for the effectual performance of it. Repentance is indeed a duty which sinners naturally owe to God, but the great question is, how shall sinners be able to perform it. The way to repent, is to begin with believing. Therefore the great doctrine of John in his baptism of repentance was that they should believe on him that should come after him, that is, on Christ Jesus: Acts xix. 4.

Regeneration is also necessary to salvation, therefore many would find themselves *born again*, before they trust on Christ. But what

is regeneration? It is a new begetting or creating us in Christ, 1 Cor. iv. 15; Eph. iii. 10. Now faith is the uniting grace whereby Christ dwelleth in us, and we in him; therefore it is the first grace wrought in regeneration, and the means of all the rest—when you truly believe, then you are regenerated. Those that receive Christ by believing, and those only, are the sons of God, which are not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God; John i. 12, 13.

They account it necessary to receive Christ as their Lord and Lawgiver by a sincere resignation of themselves to his government, and a resolution to obey his law before they receive him as a Saviour. Such a receiving of Christ as Lord, is made the great act of saving faith,—without which the faith whereby we trust on Christ for salvation, is presumption. They think Christ will bestow salvation on none that do not first yield subjection to his kingly authority; Luke xix. 27. Certainly he will save none who do not obey him, but they are brought to this holy resignation and purpose of obedience, by receiving the salvation of Christ. We should have been bound to yield ourselves his servants, if Christ had not come, but we knew we could perform nothing holily except be first made us partakers of his salvation, and that we shall never obey him as a Lawgiver until we receive him as a Saviour. He is a saving Lord; trust on him, therefore, to save you from the guilt and power of sin, and to give you a new disposition; then the love of Christ will constrain you to resign yourself heartily to live to him that died for you; 2 Cor. v. 14.

It seemeth evident to some, that there are certain good works necessary to be done, before we can safely trust on Christ, because our Saviour teaches that if we forgive not men their trespasses, neither will our heavenly Father forgive us; Matt. vi. 12, 15. In answer, this is sufficient to prove that forgiving others and restitution according to our ability, are very closely joined with the forgiveness of sins, and are very necessary to fit us for prayer and sacramental applications of pardoning grace to ourselves. A living faith cannot be without these fruits, and therefore we cannot pray and partake of the sacraments without them, yet if we strive to do either of these things before trusting in Christ, we shall do them slavishly and not holily and acceptably. Our forgiving others, will not be accompanied with any hearty love to them as to ourselves, for the sake of God. If you would forgive others so as heartily to love them again, you must first by faith in Christ apprehend the love and mercy of God toward yourselves, and then you will be able to be kind, tender-hearted, forgiving one another, even as God for Christ's sake hath forgiven you; Eph. iv. 32. The readiness of Zacheus to make restitution followed upon a discovery of Christ's love to him, and his joyfully receiving Christ into his house, was fruit whereby he evidenced the truth of that faith, which already was wrought in him.

Others are desponding because they would have love to God's salvation, first.—They should act faith, and the apprehension of God's love to their soul, would sweetly constrain to love God and all his service. "We love God, because he first loved us;" 1 John

iv. 19. We cannot be beforehand with him, in love. To love him, we must perceive his love towards us—that love which the law requires, must flow from faith unfeigned; 1 Tim. i. 5. Others would first be free from raging lusts,—but the way to be rid of them is by faith which purifieth the heart and worketh by love. Some would be free from carelessness and slighting the wrath of God.—This can only be done by believing, for people grow careless by despairing, and for their own quiet, will endeavor to slight evils which they have no hope to prevent. True humiliation for sin, is the fruit of faith, for on our believing we shall remember our own evil ways and our doings that were not good, and shall loathe ourselves; Ezek. xxxvi. 31. We shall then willingly renounce our own righteousness that we may win Christ; Phil. iii. 7, 8; but beggars will make the most of their rags till they be furnished with better clothes, and cripples will not cast away their crutches till they have a better support.

Godly sorrow for sin is wrought by believing the pardoning love of God, as a pardon will sooner draw tears from a stubborn malefactor than a halter will. The belief of God's accepting grace, is a necessary means to bring us to an ingenuous confession of sin.—If you would freely confess, believe first that God is faithful and just to forgive your faults.—If you would pray to God and praise him with lively affections, you must first believe that God will hear you and will for Christ's sake give you what is best; John xvi. 23, 24.

If, then, you ask what shall we do that we may work the works of God—that is, get any saving qualifications,—Jesus replies: *This is the work of God, that ye believe on him whom he hath sent.*

NOTICES, RECEIPTS, ACCOUNTS, ANSWERS TO LETTERS, &c.

Nov. 21—Dec. 21, 1840.—*New Subscribers.*—Dr. Richard Trenchard, Turner's Creek, Kent Co., Md., \$2,50, for 1841: Magazine to be left for him, at the counting house of R. D. Burns, Bowley's wharf, Baltimore.—E. L. Parker, name added from Jan'y, '41, paid our printer \$2,50 for the year, and Magazine to be left at the N. E. corner of Eutaw and Market sts., Balt.—Society of Enquiry, Jefferson College, Canonsburg, Pa., by order of Rev. Dr. Brown, from Jan. '41.—Rev. J. H. Gray of Eutaw, Ala. \$2,50, for 1841, and name added from Jan., '41; by order of Mr. J. H. Dearing, of Tuscaloosa. We find an old memorandum, to send the back vols., 1—5. to Rev. Mr. Hawkins of Tuscaloosa, and the same to Rev. Wm. A. Scott; and will be glad to comply with the request contained in the letter of Mr. Dearing, if an opportunity to Mobile offers; but the better plan is, for some friend to call on us for the books; which, by the way, are nearly all gone.—P. M. Denmark, Madison Co. Tenn. \$2,50, for 1841, for James Johnson, whose name is added from January.

Payments.—Rev. Dr. J. Gosman, Cayuga Co., N. Y., \$2,50, for 1840, and the back numbers from Jan'y to Sept., when his name was added, delivered to Rev'd J. H. Redington, who paid for him.—Rev'd J. H. Redington, of Moscow, N. Y., \$2,50, for 1841.—Rev. R. S. Bell, Front Royal, Va. \$2,50, for '40.—Rev'd Wm. M. Atkinson, Winchester, Va., \$3,50, which pays to the end of '41.—By the hands of Col. Wm. Skillinger, of Cincinnati, \$33,28; to be credited as follows: \$2 to Capt. J. C. Culbert-

son, (for 1838, he refused in Jan'y, '39; owes us \$1 still, see terms); \$8,50 for James Johnston, for 1833, '9, and '40; \$8,50 to George C. Miller, for the same three years; \$6 to Rev'd Dr. J. L. Wilson, (which, if our books are correct, pays to the end of '40, and leaves a credit of 50 cents to his account); the remaining \$3,23, to the credit of Col. Skilling himself, (which appears to pay for him to Jan'y '41, and leave him credited with 78 cents.) We are obliged by this remittance, and by the friendly letter of Col. S. There are several gentlemen in Cincinnati, who received our Magazine for several years, and stopped it without ever paying any thing; they would oblige us by returning, to our agent, or, *post paid*, to us, the *complete* sets, which we take for granted, are of no value to them, or they would have paid for them.—Rev'd Dr. M. Brown, Canonsburg, Pa., \$5, for 1840 and '41.—Samuel Bickley, Balt., \$2,50, for 1840.—Rev. R. B. McMullen, Clinton, Ala., \$2,50, by the hands of J. H. Dearing, of Tuscaloosa, which is \$4,50 paid by him, and his subscription began with Jan'y, '39.—Rev'd George Marshall, Bethel, Pa., \$5, for '40 and '41: also an order to send the back Vols. 1—5; which we will try to do as directed; but would advise that some friend call on us for them; and that pretty soon, for they are running low. We feel greatly obliged and encouraged, in our arduous work, by such letters as that of brother M.; and will try to deserve his good opinion.—P. M. Denmark, Madison Co., Tenn. \$2 50, for '40, for Rev'd A. Vancourt.—Rev. J. D. Matthews, of Norfolk, Va., \$5, for 1840 and '41

Discontinuances, Changes, &c. &c.—E. L. Mathes, Old Salem, Tenn. \$5, in full, and discontinued.—Col. Henry C. Payne, Fayette Co., Ky., Magazine for Nov. returned through the P. O.; sent from July, 1838, say 2 1-2 years, at \$2,50 per year, \$6,25, which can be paid to our agent in Lexington; or the whole returned to him; they are worth to us, the full subscription price.—Direction of Rev'd J. H. Bacock changed from Lynchburg to Amherst C. H., Va., we send the numbers for Feb'y and April, '39, without charge; but have none left for Jan'y and March of that year.—The May and June Nos. of 1839 re-sent to Messrs. T. D. Day and J. J. Day, New Orleans.—The name of Mr. Colt, Ruling Elder of the First Presbyterian church, Brooklyn, N. Y., was added to our list in Nov. 1837, by order of the late Sam'l Boyd of that city; and the work has been regularly sent to him for three years. Recently the P. M. returned us the Nos. for Oct. and Nov. '40, endorsed thus: "*Mr. Colt does not want these books, he refuses to take them out of the office. A. Heyeman, P. M., J. G. Stevenson, apt.*" Mr. Colt will be pleased either to pay us \$9,00 for three years deferred subscription, according to our printed terms, or else return, *post paid*, the complete sets of the Magazine received by him since Nov. 1837.—Rev'd Alexander B. McCorcle, discontinued, per P. M. Greenville, Va.—E. Gilman, Washington City, discontinued at the end of 1840.—P. M. Salem, Faquier Co., Va., for Mrs. C. M. Morgan, discontinued after Dec. 1840; paid in full a year ago.—Thomas F. Swim, direction changed to Rocheport, Boon Co., Mo. (and postage charged).—Mr. Charles Taylor, Montgomery Co., Va., per R. Craig, Esq'r, \$6,50, in full, and discontinued.

IN THE 12mo, minion Bible, stereotyped by the *American Bible Society*, imprint of 1831; there is a most singular misprint, in James iv. 9, last word of the verse, is printed "*happiness*,"—whereas it should be "*heaviness*!"

WE WOULD respectfully but earnestly suggest to the accomplished editor (*J. P. Engles, A. M.*), and the enterprising publishers (H. Perkins, Phila., and Perkins and Marvin, Boston); to be more exact, in their next edition of the *Greek New Testament, in the use of the letter Sigma*. In the edition before us, that of 1839, our eye is constantly displeased by the use of ϵ , instead of σ , in the middle of words; a use utterly offensive and improper.

There are five examples of this impropriety in the first chapter of 1 Timothy; two occur in the 9th verse of the 3d chapter; and they are common in the edition. It is on many accounts a very handsome edition; and the work should be encouraged by American scholars and divines. A cheaper edition for beginners in the Greek language, is needed. We hope to see the miserable catch-pennies for beginners banished from our schools; and the Testament restored to its ancient place. And then perhaps, the *Minora* and *Majora*, and such like, will also give place to books which may be read with the hope of getting knowledge as well as learning Greek; books to be really read, and not to be for an empty show of scholarship, by babbling scraps of treatises and names of the venerable fathers of antiquity. It is wonderful how our schools and colleges allow themselves to bolster up this miserable quackery; which is a sort of epidemic of the age—in regard to the ancient languages.

INDIVIDUALS who have received this work for years together and then ‘*refused*’—would oblige us nearly as much by returning to us, free of postage, the entire vols. they have received, as by paying us the subscription price of them. *Broken sets*, are of no use to us; and to *make us pay postage on broken sets*, is a very poor return for months and years of effort on our part to entertain and instruct the authors of such acts. To subscribe for a work is a perfectly free act; as it regards our work, most peculiarly so. To take it for years, when sent, even if it had not been ordered, involves in law and conscience a clear obligation to pay for it, if that is required; and, at least, to treat the proprietors with civility in breaking up the connexion. If we were disposed, we have much to complain of, often times on these scores; and are sometimes half resolved to begin. At present all we say is this;—*those who have received our Magazine and wish to receive it no longer, when they have resolved to ‘REFUSE’ without paying arrears, are requested at least to return us our work—complete, and free of postage.* The back volumes are out of print; and we have orders which we cannot supply, for that which those who have received it for nothing, sometimes despise. Are we understood?

THE LUTHERAN OBSERVER of December 4, 1840, in an editorial signed K., and prefixed “HYPER—ORTHODOXY,” speaks of the decision of what it calls “*The Old School Presbytery of Louisville*,” in the case of the *Rev’d Joseph Huber*; in a manner hardly respectful to the feelings, or proceedings of a sister church, and sadly in the tone of our *New School* journals. Amongst other things, K. says, “As the Bible no where, *either directly or by implication*, prohibits a woman from marrying the husband of her aunt,” &c. This is a very strong expression of opinion, upon a subject in regard to which the great bulk of the churches of God in all ages, and the great mass of all Christian nations in all time, have expressed a diametrically opposite conviction; and is, moreover, a sentiment for which we believe, nothing can be found in the way of support, in any creed of any orthodox church; but the flat contrary in many. If we might be so bold, as to express a judgment in such a case, we respectfully say, that JOHN SELDEN—*nomen venerabile*, has clearly demonstrated such a marriage to be incestuous; and that *Mr. Dwight*, has lately done the same service to the public. We refer to his little book, entitled “*The Hebrew Wife*”—which can be had of DAVID OWEN, 2½ North Gay street. This is also the title of the great *Selden’s* Treatise to which we refer; (see his folio works, edition of 1726, Vol. II., folio 520—859, *Uxor Ebraica. seu de Nuptiis et Divortiiis*, &c.) We would in the mean time ask our neighbor and friend, to examine carefully LEVITICUS xx. 20, and xviii. 14. In both places there appears to us, to be a *direct* prohibition to a man to marry his uncle’s wife; and this seems at least “*by implication*” to prohibit “a woman from marrying the husband of her aunt.” The husband of an aunt is surely the

same to a woman, as the wife of an uncle is to a man. The subject of incestuous marriage, is one of fearful import; since God more than intimates, that the destruction of the world by the flood, and the cutting off of the nations before Israel, were both judicial inflictions, in part at least, for this very crime. In our day, by reason of papal and infidel influences, those marriages once considered incestuous, are greatly multiplied; and we sincerely hope, a more earnest and thorough consideration of the matter, may be entered upon by Christian people.—We were not surprised that the Pelagian newspaper at Philadelphia, should commit itself at once and to the full, on the wrong side of this, as of most other questions. But we are surprised and pained to see its views reiterated, by a paper so respectable as the *Lutheran Observer*. A heavy responsibility rests upon the church of God on this subject. Let her look to it.

THE SOUTHERN CHRONICLE, a large and able weekly political sheet printed at Columbia, S. C., in its number for Nov. 26, 1840, says: "The recent political contest, and the important part which that Jesuitical demagogue, Bishop ENGLAND, has taken in it, has awakened, we believe, a spirit of inquiry which cannot be satisfied short of a thorough examination of the pretensions of this sect to an exclusively religious character. Entertaining the opinions we do, we shall therefore at our leisure, devote a portion of our paper to this subject." This is the *third* important political paper that has opened its columns, to this discussion; and we hope and doubt not that every paper of this kind in America, will be obliged, at last, to do the same thing. The era of the *servility* of the press to the priests, is *past*; that of its *silence* is *passing*; and, if we mistake not, the general discussion of papism is inevitable. Let us have light brother printers; quit yourselves like men; examine for yourselves, decide according to truth, and fearlessly avow your opinions.

IN AN EDITORIAL in the "*Journal of the American Temperance Union*," for December, 1840—headed, "*Wine for the Communion*;" we observe the following amongst sentences, of a like kind: "The first apprehension, general among ministers and Christians, that the movements on the subject would drive the fruit of the vine from the communion and result in the substitution of water," &c. &c. And the object of the article seems to be, to urge the impropriety of using fermented wine in the Lord's Supper; under the covert pretext of a notice, that Mr. Somebody, has boiled and clarified something, which has no latent alcohol in it.—As to the notion that "Ministers and Christians" ever had an "apprehension general among" them, that the church of God would lend itself to the insane folly of giving up the cup in the Eucharist—much less that of substituting water; we can only say, this is the first information we ever had of the existence of such an apprehension. We do indeed know that many shining lights, in "N. England Theology"—and amongst the rest, Pr. Stuart of Andover; have taken most absurd and unscriptural grounds on this subject. And we also know, that this Temperance Union, has audaciously undertaken, more than once, in its '*Journal*;' to meddle with a subject about which it has nothing to do, and apparently is as ignorant as it is audacious. What has a committee of a temperance society to do with the order of God's house? What does Mr. Delavan know about the interpretation of the Hebrew and Greek Scriptures; seeing he can hardly write English; and is withal so prudent and sagacious, that he publicly proposed to the abolitionists to print thousands of copies of a tract, so full of lies and folly, that it was afterwards publicly given up by their society? It is a great misfortune that these people can't learn their due place and work; and let things alone about which they have no call to meddle, except their vanity and ignorant presumption.—The temperance reform has no danger greater, than the folly of such advocates.

THE
BALTIMORE LITERARY
AND
RELIGIOUS MAGAZINE.

VOL. VII.]

FEBRUARY, 1841.

[No. 2.

[For the Baltimore Literary and Religious Magazine.]

PROCEEDINGS AGAINST WILLIAM LLOYD GARRISON, FOR A LIBEL.

MUCH clamor has been made, and some sympathy excited among well-meaning persons, by William Lloyd Garrison, editor of the *Liberator*, on account of his conviction, in a Court of this city for libelling Francis Todd of Newburyport, Massachusetts.

Aware of the advantage to any cause, of the martyrdom of its advocates, he has contrived to represent this transaction as persecution by slave holders, for his intemperate and misguided course on the subject of slavery; and his exposure and punishment having occurred in a state still affected with the evils of involuntary servitude, among a large portion of its population, a gloss of probability has attached to his statements on this subject, both at home and abroad.

To dissipate this, among the many delusions which have been caused by this man, the following documents have been collected. They show conclusively, that, so far from there having been a combination among slave holders to oppress him, there were very few individuals who possessed a slave, either on the grand jury which presented him for trial, or that by whose verdict he was found guilty; and that every member of either pannel, excepting one, was opposed to the system of slavery, and sincerely desired its extermination. One juror alone has qualified the expression of his disapprobation of slavery, but in a manner which clearly proves he is not its advocate.

With such evidence before us, it may not be necessary to advert farther to the merits of Garrison's case.—But in fact, he would have been convicted of this libel in the city of Boston itself, and by a jury of his most zealous co-operators, if they were just and honorable men. His publication left nothing for inference and innuendo. It avowed his determination to "cover" Mr. Todd "with thick infamy," and in pursuance of that object promulgated statements utterly destitute of the slightest foundation in truth, in relation to a transaction which, as it took place at his very door, the most careless inquiry must have supplied him with the correct details.

A gentleman from Louisiana had purchased for removal to the South, a number of slaves, whose owners were unable to retain them longer in their possession, and who, under ordinary circumstances, would probably have been subjected to the distress of separation. To remove these persons to their future abode, Mr. Todd's ship was chartered without his knowledge, and every arrangement made to promote their comfort on the passage. They came on board the vessel willingly and without any compulsion, and appeared to be quite satisfied, and on good terms with their new owner.—Suitable clothing, excellent food, tea, coffee, sugar, and the like, were provided for them under the immediate superintendence of one of the most respectable members of this community, than whom, no one ranks higher as a merchant and a gentleman. Not a manacle or fetter was on board; not even an instance of the slightest compulsion occurred. Yet Garrison, with the avowed intent of covering the distant proprietor of the ship "with thick infamy," deliberately represented these people as torn from their homes, chained, and in short condemned to horrors scarce exceeded by those of the middle passage. Could an honest jury hesitate about the character of such a transaction, whatever might be their opinion of Garrison's general course, or of the system he sought to overturn? They could not; the libel was false and malicious, and upon their oaths they said so; and the law attached, and the judge apportioned the penalty.

The following documents exhibit the facts in the case.

On the 20th of November, 1829, the following article appeared in a newspaper, printed in Baltimore, edited and published by Benjamin Lundy and William Lloyd Garrison, called "*Genius of Universal Emancipation*."

"BLACK LIST.

Horrible News—Domestic and Foreign.

The Ship Francis.

This ship, as I mentioned in our last number, sailed a few weeks since from this port, with a cargo of slaves, for the New Orleans market. I do not repeat the fact because it is a rare instance of domestic piracy or because the case was attended with extraordinary circumstances; for the horrible traffic is briskly carried on, and the transportation was effected in the ordinary manner. I merely wish to illustrate New England humanity and morality. I am resolved to cover with thick infamy all who are concerned in this nefarious business.

I have stated that the ship Francis sails from my native place, Newburyport (Massachusetts,) is commanded by a Yankee captain, and owned by a townsman, named, FRANCIS TODD.

Of Captain Nicholas Brown I should have expected better conduct. It is no worse to fit out piratical cruisers, or to engage in the foreign slave trade, than to pursue a similar trade along our own coasts; and the men who have the wickedness to participate therein, for the purpose of heaping up wealth should be ~~SENTENCED TO SOLITARY CONFINEMENT FOR LIFE,~~ ~~and~~ they are the enemies of their own species—high-way robbers and murderers; and

their final doom will be, unless they speedily repent, *to occupy the lowest depths of perdition*. I know that our laws make a distinction in this matter. I know that the man who is allowed to freight his vessels with slaves at home, for a distant market, would be thought worthy of death if he should take a similar freight on the coast of Africa, but I know, too, that this distinction is absurd, and at war with the common sense of mankind, and that God and good men regard it with abhorrence.

I recollect that it was always a mystery in Newburyport, how Mr. Todd contrived to make profitable voyages to New Orleans and other places, when other merchants, with as fair an opportunity to make money, and sending at the same ports, at the same time, invariably made fewer successful speculations. The mystery seems to be unravelled. Any man can gather up riches, if he does not care by what means they are obtained.

The Francis carried off *seventy-five slaves* chained in a narrow space between decks. Captain Brown originally intended to take *one hundred and fifty* of these unfortunate creatures; but another hard-hearted ship master underbid him in the price of passage for the remaining moiety. Captain B. we believe is a *Mason*. Where was his charity or brotherly kindness. I respectfully request the editor of the Newburyport Herald to copy this article, or publish a statement of facts contained herein—not for the purpose of giving information to Mr. Todd, for I shall send him a copy of this number, but in order to enlighten the public mind in that quarter.

G.”

At the succeeding February term of Baltimore City Court, the grand jury presented this publication as a “gross and malicious libel.” The record of the proceedings of the Court thereon are hereto subjoined.

Baltimore City Court, February term, 1830. }
State of Maryland. City of Baltimore to wit. }

The Jurors of the State of Maryland for the body of the City of Baltimore, do on their oaths present, that Benjamin Lundy, late of the city aforesaid, yeoman; and William Lloyd Garrison also late of the city aforesaid, yeoman, contriving and unlawfully, wickedly and maliciously, intending to hurt, injure and vilify one Francis Todd, and to deprive him of his good name, fame and reputation, and to bring him into great contempt, scandal, infamy and disgrace, on the twentieth day of November, in the year eighteen hundred and twenty-nine, with force and arms at the city aforesaid, unlawfully, wickedly, and maliciously did print and publish, and cause and procure to be printed and published in a certain newspaper, then and there entitled the “Genius of Universal Emancipation,” a certain communication under the head of “Black List.” “Horrible News—Domestic and Foreign,” and to which communication the letter “G.” was then and there appended as and for a signature, and which letter referred to some person to the jurors aforesaid unknown, of and concerning the said Francis Todd, and of and concerning him the said Francis Todd (amongst others) engaged in the transportation of slaves from the port of Baltimore to the port of

New Orleans (being therefore to be regarded and considered as an enemy to his own species, a high-way robber and a murderer) and which said communication then and there contained the false, scandalous and malicious matter and libel following, that is to say, "The ship Francis. This ship, as I" (meaning the said person referred to by the said letter G.) "mentioned in our last number, sailed a few weeks since from this port" (meaning the port of Baltimore) "with a cargo of slaves for the New Orleans market. I" (still meaning the said person referred to by the said letter G.) "do not repeat the fact because it is a rare instance of domestic piracy, or because the case was attended with extraordinary circumstances, for the horrible traffic is briskly carried on, and the transportation was effected in the ordinary manner. I" (still meaning the said person referred to by the said letter G.) "merely wish to illustrate New England humanity and morality. I" (again meaning the said person referred to by the said letter G.) "am resolved to cover with thick infamy all" (meaning amongst others the said Francis Todd) "who were concerned in the nefarious business" (thereby meaning the transportation of slaves from the port of Baltimore to the port of New Orleans) "I" (again meaning the said person referred to by the said letter G.) "have stated that the ship Francis sails from my native place, Newburyport (Massachusetts) is commanded by a Yankee captain and owned by a townsman named Francis Todd. Of Captain Nicholas Brown I" (still meaning the said person referred to by the said letter G.) "should have expected better conduct. It is no worse to fit out piratical cruisers, or to engage in the foreign slave trade, than to pursue a similar trade along our own coasts, and the men who have the wickedness" (meaning that the said Francis Todd amongst others had the wickedness) "to participate therein for the purpose of heaping up wealth, should be sentenced to solitary confinement for life, and they (meaning the men who had the wickedness to participate in the transportation of slaves along our own coast, and amongst them including the said Francis Todd) "are the enemies of their own species, high-way robbers, and murderers," (meaning that the said Francis Todd was to be regarded as a highway robber and murderer) "and their final doom will be, unless they speedily repent, to occupy the lowest depths of perdition,"—to the great scandal, damage and disgrace of the said Francis Todd, to the evil example of all others in like manner offending, and against the peace, government and dignity of the State.

(Signed)

THOMAS JENNINGS and R. W. GILL,

Deputies of the Attorney General
of Maryland, for Baltimore City.

To which indictment the said William Lloyd Garrison pleaded not guilty, and issue.

March 1st, 1833.—Jury sworn, to wit, Benjamin Hutchins, Henry Dukehart, Samuel Wilson, Joseph T. Ford, Richard Bradshaw, Samuel Jarrett, James C. Magauran, William S. Parker, Thomas E. Palmer, George Waggoner, Townsend Scott, and Thomas Bond.—Verdict, Guilty.

Motion in arrest of judgment and motion for judgment for traverser *non obstante veredicto*, filed.

April 3d, 1833.—The motions are all overruled and judgment on the verdict.

April 17.—Fine, \$50 and costs.—Costs, \$18,15. On payment of which traverser to be discharged.

Traverser committed, Sheriff present, afterwards fine and fees paid Sheriff.

In testimony that the foregoing indictment is a true copy from the original, and that the entries immediately following the same are truly taken from the Docket of Proceedings of Baltimore City Court at the above mentioned term,



I hereunto subscribe my name and affix the seal of said Court, this third day of September, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and thirty three.

WM. M. MEDCALFE, *Clk. Balt. City Court.*

The members of the grand jury who found the bill against Garrison at February term, 1830, were—Hugh W. Evans, James Piper, James B. Stansbury, John H. Barney, Jacob Daley, Joseph Shane, Joseph K. Stapleton, William Chalmers, Philip Littig, Rezin Wight, Daniel Conn, James P. Heath, Leonard Pouder, Arthur Mitchell, Joseph Jamison, Philip Uhler, John King, Harmanus Alricks, James Hindes, James R. Williams, Daniel Metzger.

To learn the views of them on the subject of slavery, in order to ascertain whether any prejudice could have existed in their minds against Garrison, from their being owners of slaves, the following questions were severally addressed to them, and their respective answers are hereto subjoined, viz.:

Interrogatories.

1st. Were you a member of the grand jury at the February term, 1830, when an indictment was found against William Lloyd Garrison for a libel on Francis Todd?

2d. Were you a slave-holder at that time, or not—If you were, how many slaves did you own?

3d. What are your views of Slavery. Are you opposed to it or not?

4th. Will you have any objection to give your answer on oath?
H. W. EVANS, foreman, answers to the 1st interrogatory, and says, "I was."

To the 2d. "I held then and now hold one female slave."

To the 3d. "I think slavery a great evil."

To the 4th. "I have none."

JAMES PIPER answers to the 1st interrogatory, and says, "I was a member of the grand jury at the time alluded to."

To the 2d. "I was not a slave-holder."

To the 3d. "I am opposed to slavery."

To the 4th. "I have no objection to answer as proposed."

JAMES B. STANSBURY answers to the 1st interrogatory, and says, "I was a member of the grand jury of Baltimore City Court at February term, 1830, when an indictment was found against William Lloyd Garrison for a libel on Francis Todd."

To the 2d. "At that time I owned one female slave."

To the 3d. "I am entirely opposed to slavery, and would consider it a great blessing to our country if there was not a slave in it."

JOHN H. BARNEY answers to the 1st interrogatory, and says, "I was a member of the grand jury of Baltimore City Court at the February term, 1830, when an indictment was found against William Lloyd Garrison for a libel on Francis Todd."

To the 2d. "I was not a slave-holder at that time, nor do I ever mean to be."

To the 3d. "I am opposed to holding slaves on any terms."

To the 4th. "I am not disposed to make oath on this subject."

JACOB DALBY answers to the 1st interrogatory, and says, "I was a member of the grand jury at the time and on the occasion referred to."

To the 2d. "I had one boy at that time, I have none now, and think I never will."

To the 3d. "I am opposed to slavery and think it a great evil."

To the 4th. "I have no objection."

JOSEPH SHANE, to the 1st interrogatory, answers and says, "I was a member of the grand jury at the term above stated."

To the 2d. "I was no slave-holder at the above stated term, neither was I a slave-holder before or since."

To the 3d. "I always was opposed to slavery, and conscientiously believe the principle to be wrong."

To the 4th. "I sincerely and solemnly declare and affirm, that my answers to the above interrogatories are my sentiments and the facts in the case to which they refer."

JOSEPH K. STAPLETON, to the 1st, answers and says, "I was a member, &c."

To the 2d. "I was not a slave-holder."

To the 3d. "I am and through life have opposed slavery."

To the 4th. "I have no objection."

WILLIAM CHALMERS, to the 1st, answers and says, "I was a member of the grand jury, &c."

To the 2d. "I was not."

To the 3d. "I am opposed to slavery in a certain degree."

To the 4th. "I have no objection,"

REZIN WIGHT, to the 1st, answers and says, "I was a member, &c."

To the 2d. "I owned a girl for a term of years, she is now free."

To the 3d. "I am opposed to slavery in toto."

To the 4th. "I have no objection."

DANIEL CONN, to the 1st, answers and says, "I was a member, &c."

To the 2d. "I was a slave-holder, I owned one slave."

To the 3d. "I am opposed to the principle of slavery."

To the 4th. "I will not."

JAMES P. HEATH, to the 1st, answers and says, "Yes."

To the 2d. "I was not then nor am I now a slave-holder."

To the 3d. "I am opposed to slavery."

To the 4th. "No, I have no objection."

LEONARD POWDER, deceased.

ARTHUR MITCHELL, to the 1st, answers and says, "I was a member of the grand jury at the term above stated.

To the 2d. "I was not a slave-holder at that time, nor at any other time of my life."

To the 3d. "As to slavery, I have and do still believe it to be one of the greatest evils in the world."

"The above answers are my sentiments on the above subjects."

JOSEPH JAMISON, to the interrogatories answers and says,

1st, 2d, and 3d. { "I was not, never was, and never will own one."
"I am and always have been opposed to slavery
and consider it as a crying sin and disgrace
to the country.

4th. "None at all, I am ready and willing at any time to do so."

PHILIP UHLER, to the 1st answers and says, "I was a juror but not present when that Bill was found."

To the 2d. "I was not a slave-holder."

To the 3d. "I am opposed to slavery."

To the 4th. "I have no objection."

JOHN KING, to the 1st, answers and says, "I was a member, &c."

To the 2d. "I was not nor am I now."

To the 3d. "I am opposed to slavery."

To the 4th. "I have none if necessary."

HARMANUS ALRICKS. No answer has been received from him.

JAMES HINDES, to the 1st interrogatory answers and says, "I was."

To the 2d. "I was not a slave-holder then, nor am I now."

To the 3d. "I am decidedly opposed to slavery."

To the 4th. "I have no objection."

JAMES R. WILLIAMS, to the 1st, answers and says, "I was a member of said grand jury."

To the 2d. "I was not a slave-holder."

To the 3d. "I am a decided opponent to slavery."

To the 4th. "I have no objections to give my answers on oath."

DANIEL METZGER, to the 1st, answers and says, "I was."

To the 2d. "I was not a slave-holder at that time."

To the 3d. "I am opposed to slavery, and always have been."

To the 4th. "I have no objection."

Of the above named members of the grand jury who indicted W. L. Garrison, it appears that only four of them were slave-holders at that time, each owning one. They unanimately, and in the strongest and most decisive terms, express their conviction that slavery is a great national and moral evil.

The members of the petit jury who, tried William L. Garrison upon the indictment, and found a verdict of guilty against him, were,

1, Benjamin Hutchins; 2, Henry Dukehart; 3, Samuel Wilson; 4, Joseph T. Ford; 5, Richard Bradshaw; 6, Samuel Jarrett; 7, James C. Magauran; 8, William S. Parker; 9, Thomas E. Palmer; 10, George Waggoner; 11, Townsend Scott; 12, Thomas Bond.

The subjoined affidavits will show their opinions of the subject, and their views of slavery.

1st. Benjamin Hutchins, removed.

2d. Henry Dukehart's affidavit.

State of Maryland, City of Baltimore, viz.:

This is to certify that the undersigned was a member of the jury which tried William Lloyd Garrison in the Baltimore City (or Criminal) Court upon an indictment for a libel on Francis Todd, of Newburyport, Massachusetts, for which libel the said Garrison was found guilty by the unanimous verdict of the jury. I further certify, that I am opposed to slavery, in proof of which I manumitted a slave to whom I was entitled, by inheritance, immediately upon my being invested with legal authority to do so. Given under my hand and seal, at the City of Baltimore and State aforesaid, on this nineteenth day of September, in the year of our Lord, 1833.

HENRY DUKEHART, 

Sworn and subscribed before me, Wm. A. SCHEFFER.

3 and 11. We were on the jury in Baltimore City Court at what is called February term, 1830, and tried a libel case in which Francis Todd of Newburyport in Massachusetts, was plaintiff, and a person by the name of William Lloyd Garrison said then to be of Baltimore, defendant, it was a libel of an aggravated and malignant character, and the jury unanimously found him guilty.—We are and always have been principled against slavery.

SAMUEL WILSON.

TOWNSEND SCOTT.

Balt., 9 mo. 20, 1833.

Affirmed to before GEORGE S. EICHELBERGER.

4th. Joseph T. Ford's affidavit.

Baltimore, State of Maryland, September 17th, 1833.

I hereby certify that I was on the jury of Baltimore Criminal Court in February term, 1830, when William Lloyd Garrison was found guilty of a libel on Francis Todd of the town of Newburyport in the state of Massachusetts.—The libel was wantonly gross and evidently malignant. So much so, that the jury found no difficulty in promptly deciding that *he*, Garrison, merited the punishment, provided by law, for such cases.

I furthermore certify that I am not now, and was not then, a holder or owner of slaves; and will add, that I do most sincerely desire to see the day when slavery shall cease in all the world.

JOSEPH T. FORD.

Sworn to before GEO. S. EICHELBERGER.

5th. Richard Bradshaw's affidavit.

I was on the jury in Baltimore Criminal Court at February term, 1830, who found William Lloyd Garrison guilty of a libel against Francis Todd; we were unanimous in the opinion, that the libel was of a malevolent character. I never bought or sold or owned a slave.—I am decidedly opposed to slavery.

RICHARD BRADSHAW.

Sworn before Wm. A. SCHEFFER.

6th. Samuel Jarrett's deposition.

I was on the jury in Baltimore City or Criminal Court at February term, 1830.—William L. Garrison was found guilty of a libel against Francis Todd. I am opposed to slavery and never owned a slave.

Baltimore, 16th September, 1835.

SAMUEL JARRETT.

Sworn before JOSEPH SHANE.

7th. Elizabeth Magauran's deposition.

State of Maryland, City of Baltimore, Oct.—Be it remembered and it is hereby certified that on this second day of October, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and thirty-three, personally appeared Mrs. Elizabeth Magauran before me the subscriber, one of the State of Maryland's justices of the peace in and for the City of Baltimore, and made oath that her late husband James C. Magauran, who was one of the jurors on the trial of William Lloyd Garrison for a libel on Mr. Todd of Massachusetts, in the Criminal Court of Baltimore, in February, 1830, as she believes, at that time owned one negro only who is since deceased.

Witness my hand on the day and year aforesaid,

JAMES BLAIR,

Justice of the Peace for the City of Baltimore.

8th. William S. Parker's affidavit.

Balto. County, sst. Be it known that I was summoned by the sheriff of Baltimore county, to serve on the jury at the February term of the City Court, in the year 1830, and that I was on the panel when a certain William Lloyd Garrison was arraigned for a libel.—Francis Todd, merchant of Newburyport, was complainant.—The evidence unfolded to the jury a malevolent intention, and they promptly and unanimously found him guilty.—I never owned a slave, and am and always have been opposed to slavery in all its forms and features.

WILLIAM S. PARKER.

Sworn before JOSEPH SHANE.

9th. Thomas E. Palmer's affidavit.

I, Thomas E. Palmer, of the City of Baltimore, in the State of Maryland and United States of America, merchant, do solemnly swear upon the Holy Evangelists of Almighty God, that I was a juryman of Baltimore City Court for February term, 1830, and was upon the panel which tried the case of libel wherein Francis Todd was plaintiff and William Lloyd Garrison defendant; and by whom the said Garrison was found guilty of the charges that were then brought against him.—I do further swear that the only slave in which I ever was pecuniarily interested, was a female slave, who became upon the death of a relative, the joint property of myself and several other heirs, and that during the short time that she was held by us as a slave, no profit or emolument whatever, accrued to me, or, as I verily believe, to either of us, for her services; and that she is now and has for a long time been free.—I do further swear, that I am opposed to slavery, and am, and always have been ready to aid, as far as it may be in my power, in any plausible means

that may be devised to exterminate that evil from the soil of my country.

THOS. E. PALMER.

Sworn to before T. SHEPPARD.

10th. George Waggoner's affidavit.

In Baltimore City Court, at February term, 1830, I was on the panel which found William Lloyd Garrison guilty of a libel on Francis Todd of New England; the libel was gross and malignant.—I own one black girl, I never sold a slave, my black girl has one child.

GEORGE WAGGONER.

Sworn to before NATH'L KNIGHT.

12th. Thomas Bond's affidavit.

I was on the jury in 1830, in Baltimore City Court, chief justice Brice presided, William L. Garrison was convicted of a libel against Francis Todd of Newburyport.—I never owned a slave.

THOS. BOND.

Sworn to before WM. A. SCHEFFER.

The following letter was written by the honourable chief justice of Baltimore City Court.

BALTIMORE, 20th MAY, 1834.

DR. SIR,—I have carefully looked over the papers which you put in my hands a few days since, and now return them to you, I think they cannot fail to answer the object in view.

The best proof I can give of the sincerity of my professions of being friendly to the emancipation of slaves, is, my own acts; by reference to the records of Baltimore County Court, it will be found that about twelve or fifteen years since, I manumitted four valuable men, and one woman, with three or four children—and as counsel and otherwise aided many others in obtaining their freedom.—As relates to the trial of Garrison for a libel which was had before the City Court, I think it only necessary to state, that Mr. Mitchell, Mr. Garrison's counsel, preferred submitting the whole case, both as to the law as well as the facts—to the decision of the jury.—The Court had no other agency in the matter, than to order the verdict to be recorded, and pronounce the judgment.—A new trial was moved for, on grounds not deemed sufficient, and was therefore refused.

I am, very respectfully, your ob't serv't.

N. BRICE.

The trial of William Lloyd Garrison in Baltimore County Court, October term, 1830. Honourable chief justice Archer, presiding.

The members of the jury on the above trial who found a verdict of guilty, were:

1, Daniel W. Crocker; 2, Samuel D. Walker; 3, William H. Beatty; 4, John Franciscus; 5, George McDowell; 6, George A. V. Spreckelsen; 7, Stewart Brown; 8, George A. Hughes; 9, Andrew Crawford; 10, Robert Hewett, removed; 11, James W. Collins; 12, John Walsh.

The following affidavits were made, on oath, before some magistrates, by such of the above named jurors as were living and within reach, to show that in making up their verdict, they were uninfluenced by considerations distinct from the merits of the case then before them.

1. Daniel W. Crocker.

I, Daniel W. Crocker, late of the City of Baltimore, was foreman of the jury in the case of Francis Todd vs. W. L. Garrison, October term, 1830, and after the most full and satisfactory evidence, was of the opinion, in common with the other jurors, (who were men of high respectability) that defendant was guilty of a malicious and atrocious libel, meriting the exaction of the damages laid by the plaintiff, but under the belief that such a verdict (\$5000) would, from the known poverty of defendant, be tantamount to releasing him from payment, gave a verdict of \$1000.—*I was not a slave holder.*—I am and ever have been opposed to slavery on principle, and heartily desire the speedy termination of the institution of slavery, but believe the course taken and still pursued by said defendant, calculated to protract its duration, and endanger the stability of the Union.

Philadelphia, Feb'y 24, 1834.

D. W. CROCKER.

Sworn to before S. BADGER, Alderman.

2. Samuel D. Walker.

I was on the panel in Baltimore County Court, October term, 1830, when William L. Garrison was on trial for a libel case, in which Francis Todd of Newburyport, Mass., was plaintiff. My recollection of the case is, that the jury were generally, if not unanimously, of the opinion that the damages claimed, 5000 dollars, did not exceed the injury of character inflicted by said libel, but understanding that Garrison's means were inadequate, they awarded but 1000 dollars.—I have owned but one slave, whom I manumitted previous to the trial.—I never sold a slave.—I am now and always was opposed to slavery, and deplore its existence in the United States.

SAML. D. WALKER.

Sworn to before HENRY BRICE.

3. William H. Beatty.

I was on the panel in Baltimore County Court, October term, 1830, when William L. Garrison was tried on a libel case in which Francis Todd was plaintiff.

My recollection is, that the jury was of opinion, that the libel was so aggravated a case, that the amount of damages claimed by the plaintiff, would have been awarded, but it having been made known to the jury, that Garrison was unable to pay, it was thought that the majesty of the law would be duly honoured by awarding damages \$1000.—I have never purchased or sold any slaves, and own but two, by inheritance, a woman and her child.—The woman has not rendered me any service, to my recollection, for the last seven years, and her entire earnings are enjoyed by herself and her child.—I have offered to emancipate her several years ago.

provided she would leave the country and go to Liberia.—She now enjoys all the privileges of free persons of colour. My offer to emancipate, is a manifestation of my desire that slavery should be abolished in this country, provided coloured persons would have a habitation of their own, where they could enjoy all the rights of freedom.

W. H. BEATTY.

Sworn to before JAMES BLAIR.

4. John Franciscus.

Personally appeared before me, the subscriber, one of the justices of the peace, for the City of Baltimore, John Franciscus, one of the jurors in Baltimore County Court, on the trial of the case of Francis Todd against William L. Garrison, in October, 1830, who made oath, that the jury were unanimous in the verdict rendered to the Court—and that the fine imposed on Garrison for the libel, as proved, would probably have been greater had he been able to pay it, as several jurors were of opinion that heavier damages should be awarded, deponent also swears that he possesses but one slave, a family servant, and that he never has sold a slave, and that he is not friendly to slavery. Sworn to before

HENRY BRICE.

5. George McDowell.

Baltimore City, ss.—Before me, a justice of the peace for the city aforesaid, George McDowell, Esq'r, made oath on the Holy Evangelical of Almighty God, that he was on the jury that tried Wm. L. Garrison in Baltimore County Court, October term, 1830, for a libel on Francis Todd, and that he was satisfied the damages found by the jury were moderate. Furthermore, that he was then, and still is the owner of one female slave, whom he would willingly manumit, if her feeble health did not forbid it, and that he is opposed to slavery.

GEO. MCDOWELL.

Sworn and subscribed before me, JAS. B. LATIMER!

6. George A. V. Spreckelsen.

I was on the jury of Baltimore County Court during the October term of 1830, at which time William L. Garrison was found guilty of a libel uttered by him against Francis Todd of Newburyport, Massachusetts, the damages were laid by Mr. Todd, at five thousand dollars, which was, as well as my memory serves, considered to be by no means too heavy for the offences charged against said Garrison,—but in consideration of his want of means, the jury decided that a verdict of one thousand dollars damages, would sustain the majesty of the law.

I owned one slave at that time, and have since purchased three others to save them from being sold to New Orleans.

I dislike the principle of slavery, and would give my cheerful cooperation in any suitable means to eradicate this evil from the state.—I never have sold a slave or disposed of one in any way.

GEO. A. V. SPRECKEISEN.

Sworn to before NATH'L KNIGHT.

7. Stewart Brown.

State of Maryland, City of Baltimore, ss.—Be it remembered, and it is hereby certified, that on the 6th of February, 1834, per-

sonally appeared before me, a justice of the peace, J. Harman Brown, son of the late Stewart Brown, Esq'r, of the city of Baltimore, and made oath on the Holy Evangely of Almighty God, that he is informed, and verily believes, that his said father was one of the jurors empaneled to try a case of libel in Baltimore County Court, in which William Lloyd Garrison was defendant, that he, the said J. Harman Brown, knows that his father, the late Stewart Brown, was not a slave-holder or the owner of any slave, and that he verily believes, that the said Stewart Brown, in his life-time, disapproved the whole system of slavery. Sworn to before
JACOB WALSH.

8. George A. Hughes.

In the Baltimore County Court, October term, 1830, I was a member of the panel that tried William L. Garrison for a libel on Francis Todd, the damage was laid at \$1000 under the belief that Garrison was poor.—I have owned but one slave, and that one I manumitted. I never sold a slave, and I am decidedly opposed to slavery.
GEORGE A. HUGHES.

Sworn to before WILLIAM WARFIELD.

9. Andrew Crawford.

I was acquainted with the late A. Crawford from his early years ; we were boys together in Ireland ; I am certain he never owned a slave.
JNO. HENDERSON.

Baltimore, February 4, 1834.

Sworn and subscribed to before JAS. B. LATIMER.

10. Robert Hewitt.

The following is an extract of a letter written by Robert Hewitt.

Washington City, D. C., March 17, 1834.

SIR :—I have received your letter of the 12th ultimo, in which you state "that it has been represented, that W. L. Garrison was tried by a jury deeply interested in slaves and slavery, and that their verdict was predicated in a partiality for the system of slavery."—So far as this statement applies to me as ope of that jury, it is entirely untrue, as I have never owned a slave for life, and not until the past year, have I owned one for a short term of years."

11. James W. Collins.

I was empanelled and acted on the jury that tried a libel case between Francis Todd and Wm. L. Garrison, in Baltimore County Court, October term, 1830. We found a verdict in favour of the plaintiff, Francis Todd ; damages, one thousand dollars.—I was not then, nor am I now a slave-holder.

Balt., Jan. 5, 1834.

JAMES W. COLLINS.

Sworn and subscribed to before me, JAS. B. LATIMER.

12. John Walsh.

I was on the jury in Baltimore County Court, at October term, 1830, when Wm. L. Garrison was tried for a libel on Francis Todd, the jury were generally of opinion that the verdict should be for the

amount of damages claimed, but from the inability of the defendant to pay, it was rendered for one thousand dollars.—I have owned three slaves, one of whom I had manumitted previously to that time, and the other two I have manumitted since.—I never sold a slave, and am decidedly opposed to slavery.

Baltimore, February 4, 1834.

JOHN WALSH.

Sworn to before JOSEPH SHANE.

The jurors above named, appear to have been at the time of the trial in the County Court, possessors of 10 slaves among them, but most of them under such circumstances as go fully to corroborate their testimony against slavery.

The following letter was written by the honourable chief justice of Baltimore County Court.

Baltimore, May 21st, 1834.

MY DEAR SIR.—Among the papers you present to me, I perceive it stated that Wm. L. Garrison has complained of his being the victim of persecution in Maryland, and charges his prosecution and conviction to the prejudices of slave-holding judges and jurors.—With regard to any proceedings which may have prevailed against him in the City Court, a tribunal exclusively of criminal jurisdiction, I know nothing, except what I have heard, and as I have seen from the papers which you have presented to me. It would therefore, not become me to speak of that proceeding; and you have very properly sought information from a more authentic quarter.

The case, however, of *Todd vs. Garrison*, was tried before me.—It was a civil action for a libel—The cause of the plaintiff was, according to my recollection, fully made out by the evidence, and I was entirely satisfied with the verdict.

In the amount of that verdict I had no instrumentality whatever, and I need not say to any one acquainted with the practice of the civil tribunals of Maryland, that I gave to the jury not the most distant idea of my views of the aggravated character of the case.—It is not our practice to charge the juries, nor was any thing of the kind done upon that occasion.—I can assure you, sir, that I have at no time of my life entertained prejudices of even the slightest character, against the enemies of slavery; on the contrary, I may boast that I number among my best and most cherished friends, those who practically and theoretically advocate emancipation, and I hope I may be permitted to say to you, that while practising at the bar, I have attended to the application of many slaves who have claimed manumission, and that upon a single occasion, I obtained a judgment of the Court for the manumission of, I think, more than thirty negroes, without fee or reward.—I refer to the case of the negroes of James Phillips, who relied for their freedom upon an alleged nuncupative will.

I have the honour to be, with great respect and esteem,

Your ob't serv't.

STEVENSON ARCHER.

The following is the deposition of Captain Nicholas Brown, in the foregoing case of *Todd vs. Garrison*.

Baltimore, 9 September, 1830.

1st. About the middle of the month of September, 1829, I, Nicholas Brown, citizen of Newburyport, state of Massachusetts, came on to this city from the state of Massachusetts, to take charge of the American ship *Francis* of Newburyport, and belonging to Mr. Francis Todd, merchant of the latter place, the said ship being consigned for freight, or otherwise, to his agent, a merchant of this city.

2d. That in the month of October following, Mr. Todd's agent and myself engaged and obligated ourselves to carry to New Orleans, on board the *Francis*, from seventy-five to one hundred black people, for account and risk of Mr. Wm. Milligan, a very respectable planter on the banks of the Mississippi.

3d. That we made the above engagements without consulting the owner of the ship, neither could he have known if his ship was to carry slaves or not, till about ready for sea. That his agent and myself were the only legal agents at this place for the *Francis*; and of course her owner, Mr. F. Todd, was bound to fulfil the contract made by us, his agents; notwithstanding any objection that he might have to his ship carrying slaves.

4th. That I sailed from the port of Baltimore with said ship about the 20th of October, having no slaves on board, and proceeded down the bay as far as Calvert County, where I received on board, agreeably to contract, eighty-eight black passengers; that they were all brought up together in families, on two estates, say parents, sons, daughters, uncles, aunts, and cousins, &c.,—and that they were all perfectly willing to come on board and join the ship, nor was any force required to compel them, having a perfect understanding with their new master, Mr. Milligan, who was present at the time, that they were not to be sold again at New Orleans, but that they were all intended for one estate.

That Mr. Todd's agent and myself provided for them on board the ship previous to her leaving Baltimore, even the best of provisions to feed them on their passage, in addition to which, by request of Mr. Milligan, the agent put on board, expressly for their use, coffee, tea, sugar, molasses, whiskey, &c. &c., with every kind of convenience for using the same, and clothing of every description, to make them comfortable, which was dealt out to them day after day on the passage at my discretion.—That they all expressed much satisfaction of their treatment while on board the ship; that they had the perfect liberty of her, and that they all conducted themselves very well indeed, and needed not chains or other confinement, neither was any one chained or otherways confined; they often told me while on the passage, that they had much reason to rejoice that they were all on board together, that they for some time past had been aware that their former masters were deeply in debt, and they were attached and would be sold to satisfy the demands of those who had out executions—and that their greatest fears had been, that they should be separated, but now

they had the promise of Mr. Milligan, their new master, that they should all live together, and they were happy.

5th. That after I took them on board, I returned up the bay as far as Annapolis, where they were all examined by an officer of the customs, and regularly cleared out from that port for New Orleans.

6th. That about the middle of November, I landed them all in good health and spirits on the very plantation for which they were intended, and belonging to their owner, seventeen miles below the city of New Orleans.

7th. That I visited the plantation some time after, and they all appeared contented with their new servitude, and gave me many thanks for the kind treatment which they received on board my ship.

8th. That their quarters on board the ship were very large and *not narrow*, that all of them had good comfortable sleeping places or berths, and well provided with blankets, &c., and that the ship's hatches were never closed on them for any other purpose than to protect them from rough and wet weather, and make them comfortable.

And finally, from the very high opinion I have of the honor and integrity of Mr. W. Milligan, their new master and owner, together with other circumstances attending the whole business, I, with the truest consideration do consider this my act, in carrying these people away as one of the best of my life;—at least I have the satisfaction to know from the mouths of these people, that their hearts were not destitute of true gratitude towards me when I last saw them.

Let it be remembered that I was not the cause of their bondage, but have relieved their distresses in some degree, by carrying them to a climate much more congenial to their nature, and a firm belief that they are now much better provided for, than they were when I first saw them; I therefore feel that it is a charitable act, after the order, as well as the duty of man or a mason.

NICHOLAS BROWN.

Mr. Francis Todd and myself were brought up together at Newburyport, from childhood, and I have known both him and his business up to this time.—I never knew him to carry slaves in any of his vessels, and I verily and conscientiously believe he never had a slave or slaves carried in any vessel of his to any part of the world, except in the solitary instance of the ship Francis as aforesaid, and I know he never owned a slave in his life.

NICHOLAS BROWN.

RECAPITULATION.

Slaves held by the Grand Jury,	4
“ “ “ “ City Court Jury,	3
“ “ “ “ County “ “	10
	<hr/>
Total,	17
Total number of jurymen,	44

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, }
STATE OF MARYLAND, } to wit.

I, JAMES B. LATIMER, Notary Public, by letters patent under the great seal of the State of Maryland, commissioned and duly qualified, residing in the city of Baltimore in the state aforesaid, do hereby certify, attest and make known, that I have carefully compared the record of proceedings of Baltimore City Court, which is hereto annexed, with the certified copy of said proceedings, and found the same to be a true copy thereof; and I further certify that I have carefully compared the certificates and affidavits of the following named persons with the original certificates and affidavits produced before me, and found the same to be true copies.

Henry Dukehart's, Samuel Wilson's, Townsend Scott's, Joseph T. Ford's, Richard Bradshaw's, Samuel Jarrett's, Mrs. Elizabeth Magauran's, William S. Parker's, Thomas E. Palmer's, George Waggoner's, Thomas Bond's, Daniel W. Crocker's, Samuel D. Walker's, William H. Beatty's, John Franciscus's, George McDowell's, George A. V. Spreckelsen's, J. Harman Brown's, George A. Hughes's, John Henderson's, James W. Collins's, John Walsh's. And I also further certify, that I compared the extract of a letter which is hereto annexed, from Robert Hewitt, with the original of which it purports to be a copy, and found the same to be a true copy—and that the copies of letters from the honourable Nicholas Brice, chief justice of Baltimore City Court, and the honourable Stevenson Archer, chief justice of Baltimore County Court, are true copies of the original letters produced before me.

IN TESTIMONY WHEREOF, I, the said Notary, have hereunto set my hand and affixed my seal notarial, on this sixteenth day of July, one thousand eight hundred and thirty-four.



JAS. B. LATIMER,
Notary Public.

☞ The editors of this Magazine deem it proper to say, that the foregoing article is contributed by one of the oldest, and most respectable citizens of Baltimore; one who has been long known in this city, for his benevolence, integrity and sagacity; and who has bestowed more time, labour and money, in aiding every really wise and benevolent scheme for improving the condition and bettering the prospects of the coloured race in Maryland, than any man in it. But why should we conceal his name? And who is there in this community, but himself—that would not honor any good deed but the more, because MOSES SHEPPARD did it?

We have known for a number of years, of the existence of these terrible documents. Indeed nothing, but the personal forbearance of the senior editor of this Magazine, at whose disposal they have been several times put, prevented him from making them public, long ago. But it appears to us, that the time of forbearance, to the desperate, unscrupulous and abandoned wretch who is so thoroughly exposed by them,—is past; and that it is a duty we

owe to society, to strip him of the last pretext of having suffered for truth's sake, or of having been persecuted by slave-holders; and to present him in his true, real and original complexion before mankind. A more thorough and absolute work can hardly be conceived—than these documents exhibit.

[Continued from page 37.]

MOLINISM

No. II.

II. *The palliatives and correctives of Molinism resorted to by the Jesuits in their disputes with theologians.*

THE Society of the Jesuits endeavored to establish *Molinism* as before described, and such as the common mind conceived it to be; but when treating the subject as theologians, they joined to it palliatives, and often even correctives, which somewhat diminished its progress. In their systems of theology they affect to speak of the errors of Pelagius with as unqualified denunciation, as if their own system were at bottom identical with that of Augustine or Thomas. To attain the disguise at which they aim, they make great use of what they call the state of *pure nature* and of the *scientia media*. These doctrines or branches of their system are fruitful sources of a sort of language quite unintelligible to the common mind, and they form a refuge to which the Jesuits always retreat when closely pressed by their opponents. It is not easy to comprehend what they understand by the state of *pure nature*, and the *scientia media*.

It is impossible, however, to acquire exact notions of the sentiments of the Jesuits upon the doctrines of predestination and grace, without knowing something of this part of their system. According to the views of the primitive church, and of Protestant theologians, the soul of man is something simple in its nature, having its relations to one end. Its desires are after eternal happiness, which consists in the vision and enjoyment of God; a consequence of this view is, that there is but one complete order of duties, which also have respect to this end. And so of the rest. But according to the system under consideration, man is, so to speak, double—and there are two sorts of ends—two sorts of rewards—two sorts of duties; virtues are double—sins are of two sorts—punishments of two sorts—aids or succours are of two sorts—all forming two complete orders, each different in its kind, and each essentially independent of the other. The one is called the *natural order*, and the other the *supernatural order*. The *end* of the supernatural order is to see God face to face. The *end* of the natural order is *natural felicity*, which a man may enjoy eternally. Corresponding with these ends, there are, they say, *natural duties* and *supernatural duties*—*natural virtues* and *supernatural virtues*; sins which belong to the natural order, and sins which belong to the supernatural order. There is, for example, a natural temperance and a supernatural temperance—a natural prudence and a

supernatural prudence, and so of the other virtues. They go so far even as to establish a faith, hope and love of God which is natural, and a faith, hope and love which is supernatural. Such distinctions are very common in the books of the Jesuit theologians. But a question has been raised whether the state of *pure nature* is possible; that is to say, whether the natural state can be separated from the supernatural. Can it be, that God has created or should create any man in the natural state only? That is, without any reference to a supernatural end? If so, then in order to be blameless, such a man would have need only of the natural virtues and he would be bound to fulfil only the duties of the natural order. The Jesuits maintain that all this is possible. They maintain that we are at the same time in the two orders—that we have relation to the natural order, because in fact the natural state of man is, to be in that order; and we are also in the supernatural order because it pleased God in creating Adam to raise him to that order, and because it pleased the Lord Jesus Christ to re-establish us in that order, notwithstanding the sin of Adam. So we have two ends to which we can and ought to tend, and two sorts of duties to fulfil. Of this last point, the Jesuits make great use, in their system of morals. Also it follows from this two-fold condition, or condition with a double aspect, that we may sin in two manners,—that God gives us aid or help of two sorts, *to wit*, natural aid or help, to enable us to fulfil *naturally* our duties, and supernatural aid or help to which especially they give the name of *grace*, which aids us to accomplish *supernaturally* our duties.

The fathers (as they are called) knew nothing of the system, (see iv. column of the Hexaples, vii. part, sect. v. §. 1.), nor did the Jesuits invent it, but the Scolastics; and the object of the invention was to elude the decisions of the ancient church by which they professed to be bound. The fathers, and especially Augustine and his disciples taught expressly, that a man cannot fulfil the commandments of God, nor even do any good thing without grace, and that God is not under obligation to give grace to any man. If we believe this, we must also believe that man depends upon God to prevent him from sinning. So far as he lives without sinning, he owes it to God's preventing grace; but this grace is not *due* to him, and God may at his sovereign pleasure, either grant or withhold it. Such a view of Divine truth tends to produce humility in man, and to constrain him to seek God's assistance. Nothing can be more directly opposed to Pelagianism than this doctrine. There were two methods of getting rid of it—one was to oppose openly the belief of the church and the authority of its early pastors: the other was, adroitly to elude and pervert their decisions or doctrinal opinions. This last course was adopted by the Pelagian Scolastics.

The fathers had taught, for example, that a man cannot, without the grace of God, keep the commandments. Upon this proposition they engrafted a distinction. Thus the Scolastics distinguished two sorts of precepts, and two sorts of duties, *viz.*, natural precepts and duties, and supernatural precepts and duties. Although the fathers never make any such distinction, still it was used as a key to explain their expressions, and to pervert the sense of them.

Thus when they say that a man cannot, without the grace of God, keep his commandments, the Scholastic interpreters tell us that the sentiment is perfectly true if understood of precepts of the supernatural order, but false if understood of precepts of the natural order. A man cannot love God without grace. This is true, say they, when affirmed of *supernatural* love, but false if affirmed of a *natural* love. Thus the fathers who intended to teach that man could not be any thing but a sinner without grace, are by force of this distinction, made to teach nothing more than this, *viz.*, that a man cannot without grace, fulfil his duties in a certain *sublime* manner, though he can fulfil them in a way which is natural to him.

The effect of this distinction was to revive Pelagianism. The decision of the church on that dispute is, by this system, frittered away. Grace, according to Augustine, is not a debt due to the sinner, but this doctrine, when subjected to this distinction, means no more than that God is not obliged to give supernatural graces, but then he could not impose upon man supernatural duties, which in effect, is the same as the Pelagian maxim, that God owes or is under obligation to give grace proportionate to the duties which he imposes; in other words, that God is obliged to put man in such a condition that he shall always hold his own lot or destiny in his own hands, so that in the last resort, man shall depend solely on himself. God always gives, according to the Pelagians, *natural succour* to men, and it depends on them alone, to make a good use of it. If God imposes supernatural duties, then he will give supernatural succour to perform them. He may indeed, say they, withhold supernatural succour from men, and in that respect when it is given, it is said to be gratuitous, but then in withholding supernatural succour, he at the same time forbears to impose supernatural duties, thereby leaving men subject only to natural duties, for the performance of which they always have the necessary succour.

The fault of this system does not consist in the mere use of the terms *natural* and *supernatural*, but in making two complete orders of duties, virtues, graces, &c. &c., so distinguished from each other, that the one does not enter into or make a part of the other.—A distinction which, when carried out, establishes two eternal states, eternally separated, to which the duties of one order conduct those who fulfil them—while those who fulfil the other order of duties are destined to, and ultimately arrive at the other place; and each remain fixed eternally in the place to which they tend.

One error of this system consists in denying that men need the grace of God, (*i. e.*, supernatural aid,) to fulfil acceptably to him, that class of duties which these theologians denominate *natural*; whereas the truth is, that supernatural grace is absolutely necessary to heal the nature of man, corrupted as it is *wholly* by sin. Man's nature is fallen from its original integrity. The mere *privation* or *absence* of grace leaves it in a state of deformity. The grace of God alone, can restore the beauty of holiness and purity to the soul. It would be much more correct to understand the word *natural*, to signify that with which man is born, and by *supernatural*, those graces which make men fulfil their duties, which heal or which

begin the work of healing their corrupted nature. But such a sense of these terms is inconsistent with the theory of the two states of man subsisting distinctly at the same time. Some theologians in the Roman Catholic church, have adopted this distinction of two orders of duties, and two sorts of ends, but they differ from those already referred to in this, *to wit*: they maintain that God is sovereign, and acts as such in respect to each of these orders or classes—that he causes good to be done when he pleases and by whom he pleases. But the distinction on this view, is not only useless, but it creates embarrassment. Besides, it has often led the way to dangerous opinions, upon the subject of Christian morals. The opinion, that there is an order of duties *merely or purely natural*, tends to the opinion, that a man is not bound to refer all his actions to God, according to the maxim of Paul, “whether ye eat or drink or whatsoever ye do, do all to the glory of God.” Such an opinion acted upon, is a breach of the great law of supreme love to God. A man resolved to act always in obedience to this law of love, has no need of this system: indeed it is an absurdity thus to divide a man into two parts, and nothing but the interests of a system, *essentially* at variance with the truth, can lead any one to adopt it. This system serves the Jesuits, chiefly in two branches of their system, *viz.*, that of *morals* and the doctrine of *grace*. In respect to the former, it serves to limit very much the precept which requires men to love God. There are, they say, a great many occasions upon which a man is not bound to propose to himself any other end, except that of the *natural order*. Among these occasions they find it convenient to enumerate every thing pleasurable, not excepting even sensual pleasure; because in the pursuit of pleasure, men follow what in this system is termed, their natural destination; and it is sufficient, according to their view, for men at certain times to elevate themselves to their supernatural end, to which also they are destined. This system enables them also to treat as innocent, the most corrupt propensities of men. Their casuists have even defended all the emotions and desires of concupiscence. The Jesuits, by force of this system, elude the most formal texts of Scripture. Grace is necessary to do good, they admit, but that is true only, say they, of the supernatural order. God is under no obligation to give grace—he may withhold it; but they hold that this doctrine is admissible only when God does not require duties of the *supernatural order*. Of course a man can without grace make himself blameless,—he may even do things truly praiseworthy, but those things belong to the natural order.

[To be continued.]

THE WORKS OF W. CHILLINGWORTH, A. M.,

Containing his book entitled, *The Religion of Protestants a safe way to Salvation, together with his Sermons, Letters, Discourses, Controversies, &c. &c.*—First American, from the twelfth English edition, complete in one volume. With Life, by Birch.—PHILADELPHIA: published by Herman Hooker, for ROBERT DAVIES. MDCCCL., pp. 764—royal 8vo.

WE are indebted for a copy of this beautiful edition of the works of this great logician and champion of the freedom of human thought, to our friend Mr. Davies; who has not now for the first time, laid the Christian public under great obligations, by bringing back to their notice and within their reach, the literary treasures of past generations.

The readers of this periodical will remember, that one of our literary friends, several years ago contributed two or three articles to our pages, on the writings of Chillingworth. We shall be happy if those articles shall have awakened an interest in the public mind and excited a curiosity to see and examine a work, which has been so much praised—especially by that class of Protestants which adopts the prelatical form of church government.

The writings of Chillingworth appear to us, to possess a merit of a peculiar kind—which though not, in our judgment, of the highest order, is always available in our controversy with Rome, and is rather more so than common at the present moment. Chillingworth conducted his controversy with Romanism on the *outworks*, not in the heart of the citadel; and that too, not so much as a matter of learning, as a 'trick at fence,' in acute argumentation. This is not a work, in our opinion, to interest the conscience, or to be available to a mind, tossed by the deeper intricacies of the controversy. It is not a work to make *Christians*. Comparing it with the works of other champions of Protestantism, it is as remote as possible from the manner and matter of Luther, Calvin, and the great original reformers; who waged the battle with Rome, on the basis of the soul's eternal interests, directly staked. Neither is it like the direct, irresistible argumentation of Usher or Tillotson. It has nothing approaching the glorious force and majesty of *John Milton*. Nor yet has it the strong sense of Jurieu or Mornay or Rivet. Nor the immense learning of Daille, Selden, Illiricus, or Salmasius. It is more like the manner of Bayle; though more formal, and less vivid and learned. By the way, we venture to say that the "*Critique Generale de l'Histoire du Calvinism de Maimbourg*"—is by far the most irresistible assault ever made on Papism, in the way of minute learning, intense vivacity, and irresistible pungency. It makes 354 folio pages, and will be found in the '*Oeuvres Diverses de Pierre Bayle*,' tom. ii., edition printed at Hague, MDCCXXV.

Chillingworth is pre-eminently a *logician*; and this volume is a complete demolition of the pretensions of Rome, by showing that they are, one and all, utterly illogical. Other men have more learn-

edly disproved the assertions on which Rome rests her claims; others again have more directly met and overwhelmed her in argument; and still others have more convincingly shown the errors, delusions, corruptions and dangers of Rome. But Chillingworth has *foiled* her; he has shown that logic is utterly her enemy throughout; and that even with a very moderate share of learning, any acute man is an over-match for the best furnished defender of the papacy. This is a great matter; and we incline to think that few books could be read by a certain class of persons, (educated, thoughtful, somewhat indifferent, perhaps a good deal unsettled) than this very book. It is a book written against Rome, on her own selected and favourite grounds of discussion; and, it is hardly going too far to say, the reader of it will find nearly every argument used by educated Papists to advance or to defend their religion, or to confound or convince uninstructed Protestants, fully stated and utterly demolished. We have heard whole orations of fustian and assertion, in reply to which we could have read out of Chillingworth the arguments used, stated in a much clearer and stronger way against us, and then hashed up into mince-meat. We earnestly recommend this book to '†, (*dagger*) JOHN, BISHOP, &c.,' that he may at least learn to state his own case in the best manner—clearly, neatly—and with less of rigmarole and balderdash.

There is one reflection which we ought not to omit; and it is calculated at once to humble human pride, and to show clearly that the great interests of mankind and of the soul, are not promoted in the best manner, nor in the highest degree, by this out-post mode of warfare with Rome. Chillingworth, with all his acuteness, seems never to have arrived at the root at that matter which he defended with such exquisite tact; and with all his logic, could not fix his own convictions, clearly and steadfastly. He was first a Protestant, then a Papist and perhaps a Jesuit, then a Protestant again, and then again subject to suspicion as to what he really was: and it must be owned, that the reasons and grounds assigned by himself, for all his changes, are hardly such as to command the respect of a serious man. As a Protestant he was also variable in his opinions and course, and by no means fixed in his views of fundamental truth; now refusing subscription to the articles of the church of England, and then receiving promotion and subscribing; now apparently almost an Arian, and then again professing to be orthodox. Notwithstanding his defence of Protestant freedom against Rome; he was in religion the follower of the bloody bigot *Laud*, and in politics the adherent of that unhappy tyrant *Charles I.* *Francis Cheynell*, Fellow of Merton College, printed in 1644, a book called '*Chillingworthi-Novissima*,' which shows plainly enough, that many of his cotemporaries, who were stauncher Protestants, and better friends of freedom, and more decided Christians than himself—had small confidence in him.

For us, the thing we need is his logic; and let his life and opinions have been as they may—here is a monument to his name, which must forever place it by the side of the greatest and most acute masters in that nice and recondite art.—It is pleasing to reflect, that its influence is for the truth.

The publication of a work of this magnitude, and especially the rapid circulation which we are glad to learn it is likely to enjoy—afford very clear proofs of the great and growing interest which the papal controversy is exciting in the public mind. The pioneers in this work have had many difficulties to encounter; but they have done valiantly; God has owned them; and they seem to have made great and effectual progress. The almost immediate circulation of a thousand copies of *Chillingworth*, is clear evidence of a deep curiosity and interest on the subject. Who can conjecture, what increase those volumes will give to the feelings which demanded their publication, and greedily devoured their contents? We shall see great things; and that speedily.

[Continued from page 45.]

THE GOSPEL MYSTERY OF SANCTIFICATION,

By the Rev. Wm. Marshall.—Abridged.

No. VIII.

ASSERTION VIII.—*True holiness of heart and life hath its due order where God hath placed it—that is, after union with Christ, justification and the gift of the Holy Ghost. It is not, therefore, to be expected, but in that order,—and in that order it is earnestly to be sought as a very necessary part of our salvation.*

HOLINESS consists not in the grace or act of faith, which though it be a saving gift of Christ, is a means precedent to the reception of Christ and his salvation, as well as a part of that salvation, but holiness consists in conformity to the moral law, to which we are naturally bound to render obedience, even if there had been no gospel, or any such duty as faith.

In this assertion, three things are contained, which are very necessary to guide us to the attainment of this great end, and therefore worthy of our attention.

1st. It is matter of high concern to be acquainted with the due place and order, wherein God hath settled the practice of holiness in the plan of salvation, and a great point of Christian wisdom to seek it only in that order. The benefits of the covenant of grace have an orderly dependence on one another, as links of the same golden chain, though several of them and a title to them all, are given to us at the same time. Enough has been said already, to show in what order God brings us to the obedience of the moral law. He maketh us first to be in Christ by faith, as branches of the vine, that we may bring forth much fruit; John xv. 4, 5. He first purgeth our consciences from dead works by justification that we may serve the living God; Heb. x. 14. He maketh us first to live in the Spirit and then to walk in the Spirit; Gal. v. 25. This is directly contrary to the method of the law, but the gospel is designed to enable us to obey the law.

2d. We are to look upon holiness as a very necessary part of that salvation, which is received by faith in Christ. Some are so drench-

ed in a covenant of works that they accuse us of making works needless to salvation, because we do not consider them as conditions necessary to procure, or preparations necessary to receive Christ. Others think because salvation is by faith, that obedience is not at all necessary to salvation, and we are only bound in gratitude to obey. And some are so given up to delusion, that they account it a blessing purchased by Christ, to be able to make no conscience of habitually breaking the law. One cause of these contrary errors is that many imagine nothing else to be meant by salvation but deliverance from hell, and enjoyment of heaven by happiness. Hence they conclude that if good works are a means precedent to our being glorified, they must also be to our whole salvation, and that if they be not a means precedent to our being saved, they cannot be indispensable to our being glorified. But though salvation be often taken in the scripture by way of eminence for its perfection in heavenly glory, yet according to its full and proper signification, we understand it to be *all that freedom from our natural, corrupt state and all those holy enjoyments we receive from Christ, either in this world by faith, or in the world to come*; Ezek. xxxvi. 29; Titus iii. 5. Christ was called Jesus, that is, Saviour, because he saved his people from their sins; Matt. i. 21. Can we rationally doubt, seeing we were by nature dead in sins, whether it be any proper part of our salvation to be quickened, to live to God, to be renewed in holiness and righteousness after the image of God, and to be freed from vile dishonorable slavery to Satan and our own lusts,—to walk by the Spirit, and bring forth the fruits of the Spirit?—And what is this but holiness in heart and life? We conclude, then, that holiness is necessary to salvation, not only as a means to the end, but by a nobler kind of necessity, *as part of the end itself*. Though we are not saved by good works as procuring causes, we are saved *to good works* as fruits and effects of saving grace, “which God hath prepared that we should walk in them;” Eph. ii. 10. It is indeed one part of our salvation to be freed from the bondage of the covenant of works, but the end of this is not that we may have liberty to sin, (for that is the worst slavery,) but that we may fulfil the royal law of liberty; Gal. v. 13; Rom. vii. 6. Holiness is such a part of our salvation as is necessary to make us meet to be partakers of the inheritance of the saints in light, for without holiness no man shall see the Lord; Heb. xii. 14.

3d. Holiness of heart and life is to be sought for, earnestly by faith, as a very necessary part of salvation. Many under the gospel, harden their hearts in sin, by trusting on Christ for forgiveness of sin and deliverance from everlasting torments, while they have no desire to be freed from the service of sin. The way to oppose this pernicious error, is to show that none do or can truly trust on Christ for salvation, who do not trust on him for holiness; neither do they desire salvation, if they do not desire to be made holy and righteous. If ever God give you salvation, holiness will be one part of it,—if Christ wash you not from the filth of sin, you have no part in him; John xiii. 8. True gospel faith maketh us come to Christ with a thirsty appetite, that we may drink of living water, even of the sanctifying Spirit; John vii. 37, 38, and to cry out

earnestly to him to save us, not only from hell but from sin.—Teach us to do thy will, thy Spirit is good; Ps. cxliii. 10. Turn thou me and I shall be turned; Jer. xxxi. 18. Create in me a clean heart and renew a right spirit within me; Ps. li. 10. This is the way whereby the doctrine of salvation doth necessitate us to holiness of life, by constraining us to seek for it by faith in Christ, as a substantial part of that salvation, which is freely given us by Christ.

ASSERTION IX.—*It is only by the comforts of the gospel, revealing a just God and a Saviour, that God works in us to will and do.*

Many suppose that the only effectual way to secure obedience to the law of God, is to ground all our comforts on the performance of it, and that the contrary doctrine strengthens the hands of the wicked, by prophesying peace to them when there is no peace. Therefore they will advise men not to be solicitous and hasty about getting comfort, but that they should rather exercise themselves to the performance of duty, and they tell them that so doing, their condition will be safe and happy at last, though they never enjoy any comfort of salvation as long as they live.

We must, however, first receive the comforts of the gospel, in order that we may be able sincerely to obey the law. God comforteth his people on every side; Ps. lxxi. 21, both before and after the performance of duty, but the greatest consolations are after duty. I do not speak of any peace in a natural, sinful state, but the comforts spoken of, can only be received by rejecting those false confidences by which men harden themselves in sin, and not without that effectual working of the Spirit, whereby we are renewed to holiness. These comforts are given in and with the new holy nature, which immediately produces holy practice,—and they are no other than comforts of those spiritual benefits by which our new state and nature is produced, and of which it is constituted and made up, as the comforts of redemption, justification, adoption, the gift of the Spirit, and the like. *Neither do I intend any transport or ravishment of joy and delight, but only such manner of comfort as naturally strengthens us in some measure against the oppression of fear, grief, and despair,* which we are liable to be led into, by reason of our natural sinfulness and misery. Having thus explained the assertion, I hope to prove it by the following arguments:

1. Can the glad tidings of the gospel of peace be believed and Christ and his Spirit actually received into the heart without any relief to the soul? Can the salvation of Christ be comfortless, or the bread and water of life without any sweet relish, to those that feed on him with hungry and thirsty appetites? God will not give such benefits as these to those who do not esteem them above the world, and certainly to such the very receiving of them will be comfortable, unless they receive them blindfold, and this they cannot do, because the very giving them opens the eyes and turns from darkness to light, so that he doth see the things that concern his peace, and reap some strengthening and encouraging comfort thereby, to the practice of holiness.

2. Peace, joy, and hope are recommended to us in the scripture as the springs of other holy duties, and fear and oppressing grief are forbidden as hindrances to true religion. "The peace of God shall keep your hearts and minds by Christ Jesus;" Phil. iv. 7. Be not sorry, for the joy of the Lord is your strength; Neh. viii. 10. Every man that hath this hope in him, purifieth himself as he is pure; 1 John iii. 3. Fear hath torment,—he that feareth is not made perfect in love; 1 John iv. 18. This is the reason why Paul doubles the exhortation to rejoice in the Lord alway, as a duty of exceeding weight and necessity; Phil. iv. 4. What are such duties but comfort itself? Can we think that those duties are necessary to our continuance in holy practice, and yet not to the beginning of it, where the work is most difficult, and encouragement most needful? If we would make haste and delay not to keep God's commandments, we must get first a comfortable frame of mind.

3. The usual method of gospel doctrine as it is delivered to us in the holy Scripture, is first to comfort our hearts and thereby to establish us in every good word and work; 2 Thess. ii. 17. In the epistles, the churches are first acquainted with the rich grace of God toward them in Christ, and then they are exhorted to a holy conversation answerable to their privileges,—and so in many particular exhortations to duty, the benefits of the grace of God in Christ are first made use of as arguments and motives to stir up the saints to holy practice. Rom. vi. 11, 14,—viii. 9, 12,—1 Cor. vi. 15, 16,—2 Cor. v. 21,—2 Cor. vi. 8, with vii. 1,—Eph. iv. 32, and v. 1, 2, 8,—Col. iii. 1, 4,—Heb. xiii. 5. Search the Scriptures and you may see with delight that this is the vein running through the gospel exhortations of the New Testament, and the prophetic exhortations of the Old. And if it were needful to write thus to saints who had practised holiness, that they might continue therein, how much more so for beginners?

4. The nature of the duties of the law requires a comfortable state of soul in order to perform them. Can we love God and delight in him above all, while we apprehend that there is no love and mercy in him toward us? What melody will the heart make in praise, if all the perfections for which we praise him will aggravate our misery and not make us happy? What a heartless work it will be to pray to him and to offer ourselves to him, if we cannot hope he will accept of us? Is it possible to free ourselves from disquieting cares, by casting them on him, if we do not know that he careth for us? Can we be patient in affliction and cheerful under persecution, except we have peace with God and rejoice in hope of the glory of God; Rom. v. 1—3. What reason can persuade us to submit to death according to our duty,—if we have no comfort to relieve us against the horrible fear of hell?

5. It is necessary that those who are convinced of the vanity of their former false confidences, and of their exposure to God's wrath, should have a supply of gospel comfort to encourage them to turn from sin to holiness. A fainting, famished person must first have food or a reviving cordial before he can work.

6. Both Scripture and experience show that this is the method whereby God brings his people from sin to holiness. Though they are brought under terrors for a while, that sin may be the more im-bittered, and salvation rendered more precious and acceptable, they are delivered from their terrors by the comforts of God's salvation, that they may be fitted for holiness. Generally, a holy life begins with comfort, and is maintained by it. Hos. xi. 4; Ps. xxvi. 3—cxix. 166; Acts ii. 41; 1 Thess. i. 4—6; Acts xiii. 48; 2 Cor. v. 14, 5. I dare appeal to the experience of any that obey God out of a hearty love,—were they brought to give up themselves to serve God, without comfortable apprehensions of the love of God towards them? There are no such politics in the new birth.

POLITICS.

Of all subjects of human contemplation, religion is undoubtedly the most important; and next to it is politics. Not that miserable passion for office, nor those vile attempts to gain it, nor that execrable method of using it, which constitute the sum of what too many understand by politics. But that true and enlarged knowledge of the rights, duties, and wants of man in a social state; that deep and intelligent devotion to the principles and methods by which his social happiness and glory may be in the highest degree advanced.

As every human being has a direct and an eternal interest in fully understanding and cordially embracing the doctrines, the precepts, and the consolations of true religion; seeing that every one, is an immortal subject of the government of God; so on principles exactly analogous, every individual belonging to a particular commonwealth, has the highest and the most enduring of all temporal interests in the perfection of its government, the purity of its laws, the fidelity of its functionaries and the consequent general freedom, peace, prosperity, and security of the community.

In our happy and free country, these high considerations, which attach to man universally considered as the subject of political relations, and still more forcibly when viewed as the member of a particular society—are most of all clear and important; for here, the rights and duties of citizenship are made as extensive by our civil ordinances, as by the law of nature itself—and so the prosperity of the state becomes a personal care of every individual man.

It is the glorious distinction of an American citizen to be obliged by a perfect obligation commanded by the law, and enforced by morality; to perform, for the good of his country, those high, practical duties, which in all other lands, are to the bulk of mankind prohibited by the power of the state, or allowed merely as subjects of philosophical enquiry. Our laws are all written laws, made and administered by our own representatives. We have no *rulers*; if we refuse to choose public *servants*, there is an end of the government; and if we choose those who are corrupt or incompetent, there is an end of public felicity. The *ballot box* is the ultimate analysis of all public force, with us. Every voter who appears at it,

exercises his portion of that authority from which the practical operations of society all proceed; and as he does this, wisely or illy, purely or corruptly, he is responsible to his country, to his conscience, and to God, for all the issues of his high act of sovereignty.

It becomes us all, then, to remember who and what we are; to act as they should, who perform the most peculiar and august of all public functions, in the face of an enslaved world; and to perform that function as those should who have in fact but a single end, by how many ways soever we may seek it; the glory, namely, the happiness and the prosperity of our beloved country.

The great and general political excitements which ordinarily pervade society, are not to be wondered at, and but for the bitterness which mingles with them, are hardly to be regretted. For they are amongst the surest evidences of the deep interest which the people take in public affairs, and therefore amongst the clearest proofs of the safety of our institutions, as well as amongst the strongest guarantees of our permanent prosperity. That they are indeed altogether to be expected under great and agitating circumstances, more especially when extraordinary means are used to give force and emphasis to those circumstances; must be obvious to every reflecting mind.

It is those means, that especially need to be jealously watched. Great parties seeking power, and others striving to retain it; the most eloquent men of the age, on one side and the other, constantly stirring up the hearts of the people, in their great assemblies; ardent and diligent political writers on both sides, filling the public mind with every argument and proof favourable to their cause; the widely diffused and too often unscrupulous periodical press, shaping every fact into a barbed arrow, and sharpening every reason to the keenest edge; the ceaseless commotions of daily electioneering and nightly canvassing; the ward meetings, the pot houses, the muster grounds; the lies, the revilings, the forgeries; the bribing, the treating, the bargaining; is it surprising that society is in commotion?

The great leviathan, thus drawn and driven, thus pricked and tormented, thus seduced and confounded, thus excited and enraged, tosses and bellows and beats the mighty waters with his sublime agitations. Happy will it be for us, if we but know the point of endurance beyond which it is no longer safe to torment him; and have the wisdom and moderation not to venture beyond it.—Happy for the world, if we can but show it, that even the excesses of liberty are more healthful than the stagnation of political servitude; its very commotions safer, than the torpor of slavery.

[For the Baltimore Literary and Religious Magazine.]

THE PRESENT STATE AND DUTY OF THE CHURCH.

By the church, I do not mean alone that branch of the church to which I belong, but the whole evangelical church of Christ. Two things, we think, must be obvious to every person of reflection:—

I. That there are, both in Europe and America, at least four distinct branches of the church, which are, in the estimation of God, but one church, one family, all united to one head, and that head is Christ. We were all originally of a "wild olive tree," but we have been grafted in among them, partaking of the root and fatness of the olive tree. We are all scions from the same parent stock of common depravity, but being united to Christ as the branch is to the vine, we bring forth much fruit. The fruit is the *same*, though of somewhat different flavour and hue and size, still the same. It is "glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, good will toward men."

It must be obvious to every intelligent member of the church, that the time has come when Christian churches are no longer to be hostile to each other, or kept asunder by those thin partitions which we keep, and party-spirit have built up between them.—Heretofore good men have stood aloof from each other, one saying "I am of Apollos and I of Paul," and have forgotten that they are all of Christ. We are not of those who are for demolishing entirely those partitions in the church, which do but accommodate, the great family of Christians, in this state of imperfection, of diversity of powers and habits. We are hopeless as to the eutopian scheme, of throwing all denominations of Christians into one great crucible, fusing them together by some theological alchemy, and pouring them out *a unit*. It cannot be done, except human nature were remodelled, nor is it desirable it should be done, if it were possible. Those partitions in the church, furnished with proper doors of ingress and egress and family intercourse, are as needful in the house of God, as in our ordinary dwellings. As needful as the different branches of the tree is to its growth and fruitfulness. This plan of the universal amalgamation of all denominations, is as much the offspring of bigotry as the veriest exclusion. Therefore the first duty of the church, in order to the conversion of the world, is to learn that it is *one*. *One* in Christ Jesus. *One* Shepherd. *One* fold, though in different compartments.

"Not as though the Word of God had taken none effect. For they are not all Israel who are of Israel." What is the Transcendentalism of Germany but Polytheism or rather Atheism? What is the Socinianism of Boston? Is it Christianity? Who does not see, that whatever it may have been, it is now in full chase after the Transcendentalism of Germany? What is the Taylorism of New Haven, but the bones of Pelagius and Celestin dug up out of their filthy graves, and hawked about the country, not as relics, but as philosophical nostrums wherewith to poison Calvin and murder the truth of God? What is Papist Rome, but the patch work of Pagan Rome, done-up with rites and ceremonies, and relics,

and bones, and splinters of wood, of which the Platos and the Ciceros of antiquity would be ashamed?

Still the *true* church of God is *one*, and the first lesson she is *now* to learn, is that she is one; that she is the glory of earth and joy of heaven.

II. The second lesson the church is to learn, is that the conversion of the world has been committed to her by the Saviour, and that during the nineteenth century she has acknowledged the commitment, and has solemnly pledged herself to do the work, in the shortest time possible. I know there are not wanting those, and some of them honest and true disciples of Christ, who are saying God's time for this great event, has not yet come. "Let us wait God's time." This desire to wait God's time, in all its forms, whether personal or general, is nothing but a deception of "the father of lies," or a quieter for conscience.

Let any person who has marked the events of the last half century, say is not God calling upon the church, and upon every member of the church, to lift up their eyes and behold his hand stretched out over the world, not in wrath, but in mercy and beneficence. Behold the angry passions, if not of man, of nations, kept in check. Why has there been no European war ever since the battle of Waterloo? Can the history of Europe, for the last two hundred years produce a parallel? Who can now kindle the fires of war again in the heart of Europe? Why has all Europe stood silently by and seen Spain for eight or ten years drenched in the blood of civil war? What has kept the blood hounds of Europe in lash? It has been the hand of that God who "maketh the storm a calm, so that the waves thereof are still;" of him who "arose and subdued the wind, and the sea, and there was a great calm." Could this have taken place half a century ago? Why were all the popularity and known war-spirit of President Jackson, unable, a few years ago, to get up a war between these United States and France? It was the work of that "God that hidest thyself, O God of Israel and Saviour," aided by the council of wise and good men. Who does not know that the sceptre of Egypt has long since "departed?" And who does not see that God is about to bring again the "captivity of Egypt," by the hand of Mahomed Ali? who though a Mahomedan, is, inevitably, striking a death blow at the religion of the prophet of Mecca. Who does not see that by Briton, the nation where light and darkness have so long struggled together; the nation which has kindled so many unholy wars in Europe, has in God's inscrutable providence been permitted to wage an unrighteous war with China; which war, however unjustifiable, is in its ultimate tendency to work great good for China and the world. It is to press the Celestial empire, into the great common stream of humanity from which she has always withheld herself. China, with her three or four hundred millions, which has hitherto been as a preternatural production on the family of man, antipodes to the whole world, will, before the present war is ended, and its effects fully developed, be found clothed and in her right mind, at the feet of Jesus, or hailing the coming of the missionaries of the cross. This is to be the work of that God who brings light out of darkness,

and peace out of war. Who does not see that the restoration of the Jesuits, and the attempt to establish the Roman Catholic religion in America, is but a prelude to the death of the whole system. As soon might we see the filthy toad, successfully deposite her spawn in the cool chrystal fountains—the bird of night place her callow brood in some focus of the sun, or the fiend of darkness ascend to heaven and dwell there, as to find the Roman Catholic religion survive half a century in the light and liberty of America. Her grave is now digging, and not by a few hands. And old as I am, I hope to live long enough to sing her requiem. To proceed; who does not see, that the sympathy awakened both in Europe and America, in behalf of benighted Africa, and for the suppression of the slave trade, is ultimately to be crowned with success? From Mr. Buxton's opposition to the American Colonization Society, I should fear his eye, and that of England, was more directed to the securement of the immense trade of Africa, than even the destruction of the slave trade. However that may be, Africa is to be blessed, and in half a century the whole country is to be whelmed in a flood of light and blessedness. And last though not least, who does not see from that fearful spirit towards the aborigines of our own country, first commenced by Mr. Jefferson, that a remnant of that degraded people are to be preserved from utter extinction, and made heirs of glory. In a word, has not the day already dawned, when the nations "shall learn war no more."

Add to all this the fact, that the whole civilized world, seems to be, the most of them, quietly demanding of their rulers, more liberty, and they are obtaining it.—That the two great heresies in religion, Mahomedanism and Popery, those two great blots upon human history, are both in their dotage, and are ready to die.—That the whole human race begin to feel towards each other as though they were one family.—That the extremes of society are approaching each other, age and youth, the rich and the poor, the palace and the cottage. Who is not disposed to say, we live in a day of strange things? It is the Lord's doing, and marvelous in our eyes.

Where shall we look for and find the main-spring of this mighty machine? Is it philosophy? Is it science? Is it the natural course of human things? Certainly none of these. *It is nothing less than the life-giving spirit of Christianity.*

We therefore turn to the church. Is she fully awake? Though partially stirred up, may it not be said, that the wise and the foolish virgins are slumbering together? The voice of the heathen and the civilized world unite in saying, "behold the Bridegroom cometh; go ye out unto him." Is the call responded to by the whole church? Is it not true that thousands and tens of thousands in our churches, have as yet only learned to say, "thy kingdom come," while they are not lifting so much as a finger in the work? To what is this inactivity to be attributed? I answer, to the plans of the church, and especially to the *system of agencies in raising money*. To the inactivity of the clergy as a body.

The clergy as a body ought to be the pioneers in the Lord's host. To be always in the van. It is their proper place. It is the place desired by every true-hearted son of the church. We presume not

to question the piety and zeal of the first projectors of the plan of *agencies*. Such men are the salt of the earth,—nor do we question their wisdom, for they are the light of the world. They did, perhaps, the best thing that could have been done at the time. But have time and experience cast no light upon the subject? Because it was indispensable to have agents ten or twenty years ago, is it necessary now? I must be permitted to question the expediency of several things connected with the conversion of the world, as pursued by the American church.

The attempt to convert the world, is the glory of the nineteenth century, and will be considered so when the nineteenth century shall have passed away, “Behold the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world,” was the grandest idea that ever the lips of man pronounced, or the mind of man conceived. It lifts up John far above Isaiah. The language of the church at this time is near of kin to the language of John, and to the work of the Saviour. *We will gospelize the world.* To do this grand work, the whole church must be united. Every individual member of the church must be called upon to bear a part, must be taught that it is not only their duty, but their privilege, to lay at least one little stone in that edifice which God and the church are about to erect. For “the mountain of the Lord’s house shall be established in the top of the mountains, and shall be exalted above the hills; and all nations shall flow unto it.” And shall not all the people build? That the work may prosper, let us in the first place look at the whole plan of agencies to raise money. 1. Is it a wise plan? 2. Is it an economical plan? 3. Can not a better plan be devised? Will the church hear me, while I very briefly endeavour to answer these three questions? 1. It is not a wise plan. It creates a distinct order in the church, not found in the Bible. Agents are neither evangelists, nor teachers, nor pastors. They are beggars. It is true they are beggars of a high and honourable character. They have done a good and holy work, put into their hands by the wisdom of the church, and they ought to be esteemed for their work’s sake. Still it is an unpleasant work, as the experience of every agent has proven. This fact alone proves it not to be of God’s devising. Who esteems it a privilege to be an agent? Who does not esteem it a privilege to preach the gospel? Said John Brown of Hadington, “I would beg my bread all the week to be permitted to preach the gospel on the Sabbath.” Who ever could say this of his agency, considered in itself? Again, this plan destroys for the time being, the parity of the clergy, which is a fundamental principle of Presbyterianism. The agent is superior to the pastor, and not unfrequently breaks up his usefulness. The agent is selected because he is an eloquent pulpit-man, and can declaim.—The pastor has been selected by his people, because he is an humble, plain man, possessing pastoral talents. Can these two men meet once or twice again in the same pulpit without producing unpleasant comparisons in the minds of some weak and good people.

But the great objection to this plan is, that the appeal is not made to the great mass of the church, nor are the majority of the ministers ever made heartily to co-operate; for agents only visit a few wealthy

churches, or those in which some wealthy and benevolent individuals are known to reside. The great masses of the church are never applied to. The widow's mite, upon which rests the Saviour's blessing, is seldom sought after. This is a common cause, and can we expect the blessing of God upon a plan, which, if it does not pour contempt upon the poor, passes them by as unworthy of notice? Who can tell how much is lost for the want of the prayers of the poor, deposited in the treasury of the Lord, along with their few cents. They hear of your agents, but they never see them. Their pastor, though a good man, and desirous to contribute his mite to the conversion of the world, feels himself passed by, forgotten and superseded by the system of agents. Little or nothing is done either by himself or his church. Is this the way the second temple was built? "They which builded on the wall, and they that bear burdens, with those that laded, every one with one of his hands wrought in the work, and with the other held a weapon. For the builders every one had his sword girded by his side—so we laboured in the work." Is this method of agencies the way that the church, the whole church, rich and poor, pastors and people, are to be brought up to the help of the Lord against the mighty?

Our second question is, is this plan of agencies an economical plan? We answer this also in the negative. Much need not be said about it. We have only to enquire, and we shall find that from one fourth to one sixth of all the money collected from the churches is spent in paying agents. We find no fault with the amount of pay these labouring men get, nor with the faithfulness of the men employed. It is the plan, and the plan only, to which we object. I am confident there is a better plan. Better, as it falls in more directly with the Presbyterian form of church government. Better, as it will operate upon the whole church, and upon every minister in our connexion. And ultimately better as to its efficiency. Let the whole of the agency system be forthwith abandoned. Let the Assembly at its next meeting warmly recommend this change to the churches. Let the Synods direct all the Presbyteries within their bounds, immediately to take order that each pastor and session, or sessions where there is no pastor, be formed into a board called the — Board, embracing as many of the objects of the day as each may think proper. And let each board be, by the Presbytery, called strictly to account, semiannually, of faithfulness in this matter, and the work will be done without expense, and ultimately with double the efficiency.

JAMES BLYTHE.
West Hanover, Inda.

[For the Baltimore Literary and Religious Magazine.]

THE LATE APPEAL OF THE AMERICAN TRACT SOCIETY.

IN common, I suppose, with many other brethren, I have lately received a printed address of the Ex. Com. of the A. T. S., dated Oct. 29th, 1840, presenting to the consideration of the Christian public, "*the cause*" of foreign distribution.

This appeal, together with some recent acts of the publishing committee of this Society, has suggested a few reflections, to a brief statement of which, I beg the attention of Presbyterians particularly.

This Society, in the praise-worthy effort to diffuse useful books as well as tracts in this country, has enjoyed an enviable popularity, and met with deserved success among the Christians of nearly all the leading denominations. When it was proposed to distribute similar publications among the heathen and destitute of other countries, the importance of the object called forth a hearty response from many of God's people. But is there not in this enterprise a needless expenditure, and have Presbyterians no good cause for dissatisfaction? are questions to which I believe mature reflection will lead the impartial to affirmative answers.

I believe the public generally, the giving public, suppose that the Society prints in New York, whatever is distributed in foreign lands, as the Bible Society has generally done; but what is the fact? The churches, say, contribute \$25,000. This is distributed ~~in~~ *money* to the various missions of those denominations which unite in the Tract Society, and to benevolent individuals in foreign countries. On looking over the appeal, I find it stated that grants of publications abroad are also made. But still the great object is to send sums of money to be expended in printing, what five men, an Episcopalian, a Dutch Reformed, a *New School* Presbyterian, a Congregationalist and a Baptist approve. Now mark the doings of this great almoner. The Episcopalian denomination and all others, except the *New School* Presbyterians, have independent missionary Boards.* We also have one. What is the gain of contributing our money to the A. T. S. to be distributed to our own missions? Why not send the money to our own Boards, to be by them distributed? But there is more here than meets the eye. Running over the *project* of this wholesale almoner, I find the American Board is to receive between *ten and eleven thousand* of \$25,000 dollars: the Baptist Board, 2600; the Episcopal, 7 or 800, and the Presbyterian 1500. Wonderfully liberal to the Board managed down East! I have no means of knowing what Presbyterians contribute to this great almoner of the churches, but if I am not mistaken our Foreign Missionary Board would be gainer by some two or three thousand dollars, if we avoided the expense of passing our money through the A. T. S., and would give it at once to our own Board. It looks as if one should pay an agent to receive his money and another to pay it over to his creditor, when

*The American Board is *managed* by Congregationalists.

his own servant was ready at the door to convey it directly. The publishing committee lately rejected a tract prepared by one of our missionaries in India, because the Baptist member of the committee objected to the use of the word *baptize*, which occurred in the tract. In short, this whole matter of foreign distribution appears very much a mere glorification affair for the A. T. S. Let this body keep in its proper orbit and we shall ever hail its revolutions with pleasure. In the present aspect, however, we are disposed to object, even under the prospect of maledictions from the only liberal Christians in the land—the New School. S.

Before receiving the foregoing article we had received one of the circulars alluded to; and written what follows. We annex it to our correspondent's thoughts; and commend the whole subject to the serious consideration of the people of God.

The Executive Committee of the American Tract Society, has issued an appeal for funds, especially for *foreign distribution*. Let us say a word to the directors of that Society, so far as regards that portion of the church of God with which we are connected.

There is a wide spread feeling of dissatisfaction in the Presbyterian church in the United States, on account of the influence of this Tract Society's agents and officers, having been long exerted in such a way as to wound the feelings, injure the cause, and hurt the character of the church. This is and has long been *direct* and *indirect*. *Direct*, by the appointment of New School agents, before 1837, who exerted themselves to bolster up the Pelagian party; and since 1837, to creep into churches, as agents, where they would never be otherwise admitted. And this even, in regions where hardly any New School churches existed; for example, the Rev'd J. C. Smith, of the D. C. after helping to make a schism in that Presbytery, came to Baltimore, as general agent for some half dozen states; to which he had been appointed, so far as Maryland was concerned, without any concert with the state Society. The result was, that he got access to *one church*, in the city, and the state Board, on full explanation, with five or six denominations represented, refused to employ him; and yet after this, the Board in New York, persisted to keep him in the field.—But also *indirectly*, have they wounded and alienated the Presbyterian church; by not *knowing her*; by caressing those pretending to be her; by acting, pretendedly a neutral part—which was itself an insult, as ranking the church and a faction on the same level;—and by virtually treating the faction as the church. At this moment *Dr. Thomas McAuley* is the pretended clerical representative of the Presbyterian church, on this Executive Committee; a man who has not been in her communion for several years; and when in it, was no representative of its feelings, wishes, principles, or doctrines.

2. There is a deep feeling of suspicion, as to the wisdom and impartiality of the division and appropriation of these funds for foreign distribution; a feeling, we apprehend, not very likely to be allayed, by the scheme and facts set forth in the appeal which has elicited these observations.

3. There is a sense, that injustice is perpetrated, by means of those great societies, and amongst the rest this one, for the benefit of particular operations. For example, we happen to know, that many churches which favour the *American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions*, very seldom or never make any effort for the Bible cause, the Tract cause, the Temperance, &c. &c.; but devote all their energies to aiding that one Board. Very well. Then that Board comes down for its share, and more than its share, of aid from the Bible, Tract, and other Boards. And the result is, that we who help these general Boards, not only relatively weaken our hands, but strengthen hands that have done so much to bind us in fetters in times past; yea, the more we exert ourselves for these General Boards, the more we augment the undue and unfair pretensions of that Board, whose friends, to so large an extent systematically give nothing to them; and which draws out so immense a share of the whole. We do not say the Tract Committee is otherwise blame-worthy for this, than as they are one of the *occasions* of a proceeding, which the body of the people of God will not endure.—We have felt the present occasion a proper one to say what some body ought to have said long ago; and what the Executive Committee of the American Tract Society and others interested, may rest assured, requires serious consideration, on many accounts.—[Edts.]

A LETTER ADDRESSED TO THE MEMBERS OF THE "HARRISBURG PRESBYTERY," ON THE SUBJECT OF THEIR "*Pastoral Letter to the Churches under their care*;" BY JOHN P. CARTER, PASTOR OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCHES OF TANEY TOWN AND GREENWOOD, CARROLL Co., MD.

GENTLEMEN—Your Pastoral Letter to the churches under your care, having been circulated, not only within your own bounds, but also, in congregations over which, I presume you claim no control; and among individuals, whose circumstances have not led them to enquire particularly into the nature of the late difficulties in the Presbyterian church; it is due to all the interests involved, that your allusions to matters connected with those difficulties, should be explained, and your statement of the difficulties themselves explicitly contradicted. You will, therefore, excuse the liberty I thus take in addressing you, as perhaps, it is the fairest way in which to make a *correct* statement of the subjects discussed in your Pastoral Letter. And, should this communication find its way into any of 'the churches under your care,' you must not take it amiss, but regard it as a return of the *pastoral* favour I have received at your hands.

In the first place, permit me to direct your attention to a remarkable inconsistency by which your pamphlet is characterised. It purports to be a "*Pastoral Letter*." Now from such a title, we would naturally expect something for the edification of your church-

es: an account of the progress of the gospel among you: cautions against errors or evil practices, more or less common among your own people: exhortations to greater fidelity and diligence in the performance of duty; and such like *spiritual food*. But on opening the pamphlet, we find that two-thirds of the whole, or six of nine pages, are occupied with the affairs of another denomination of professing Christians. Concerning whom, among other things, you say they '*have violated their constitution*;'—have been guilty of '*a ruthless exercise of arbitrary power, in trampling upon the dearest rights of man, and in violating the essential principles of eternal justice*' (page 7). But, perhaps, Gentlemen, you intended, in this pamphlet, to set forth your reasons for having withdrawn from the Presbyterian church; in that case, you ought to have entitled it "*A Renunciation of the Presbyterian Church, by the Presbytery of Harrisburg,*" &c. If, however, the facts of the case warranted your making these statements, and bringing these '*railing accusations*;' how great the mercy that you hold no connexion with such men, by which you might be '*involved in the guilt of their act*!' With what gratitude must you congratulate yourselves that you have escaped the society of those "*who have wantonly violated all those fundamental principles of liberty, which are so ardently cherished in the bosoms of American citizens,*" * * * and in whose acts "*the public see that disregard of personal rights, secured by the most solemn compact, which only needs the occasion and the power to subvert our civil and religious liberties, and rear a despotism as arbitrary and as gloomy as any the history of the world presents*"!!! (page 7). And surely nothing could induce you, ever again, to unite with such unprincipled men, with no other safeguard, than the old broken Constitution! But I am drawing conclusions for you too hastily. You do not seem to be so well satisfied in the prospect of a permanent separation from those *guilty* men, for you say, "yet we cannot but hope, from the character which most of those brethren have long sustained, that the time will yet come when this excision will be universally repudiated, and we be again united on the basis of our excellent constitution, and the ancient usages of our venerated church." This conclusion you attempt to evade, however, by premising: "While we thus speak of this measure, we desire you to understand us as referring to the measure itself, and not to the motives and intentions of those who originated, or perpetrated the wrong." (page 7.) Gentlemen, if you, among other *novelties*, have learned the art of considering these *innocent* men, who can, after mature deliberation, propose and perpetrate the act, you have described on the seventh page of your pamphlet; it is more than you can expect of plain, common sense people among 'the churches under your care.' Depend upon it, the false witness which you have borne against those whom you are pleased to call *brethren!* has produced in the minds of all with whom you have influence, the conviction that the guilt of *the measure*, is the guilt of *the men* who originated and executed it. Perhaps your acuteness in distinguishing between the guilt of a man's actions and that of himself in committing those guilty actions, will enable you to perceive the minute difference between your conduct in thus attempting to

destroy the reputation of your brethren, and the conduct of a man related in 2 Samuel xx. ch. 9, 10 verses. As for the re-union, I for one, would rejoice in its prospect; but I trust it will not occur until you 'repudiate' your *new measures*, and return to the '*ancient usages of our venerated church*;' and feel the necessity for a more unequivocal adoption of '*our excellent constitution*,' than merely '*for substance of doctrine*.'

Secondly. Your statements on page 8, are so arranged as to convey the idea, that the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions; the American Education Society; and the American Home Missionary Society, are as Catholic and as deserving the support of the Christian community, as the American Bible Society, the American Sunday School Union, and the American Tract Society. Now this is not true. For while the latter societies are and have been under *evangelical* influence, and their tendencies are to the upholding of our common Christianity; the former societies have been, to a great extent, under the *Semi-Pelagian* influence of a few individuals; for party purposes in general, and for the uprooting of every thing distinctively Presbyterian, in particular. Having in the statement, above alluded to, attempted to raise *your* American Societies to an equal rank with *the* American Societies, you proceed on page 9, thus: "We therefore cannot but deeply regret that our brethren have so far departed from the spirit and usages of our church, as to break up, to a very considerable degree, this Christian fellowship, and rupture those bonds of Christian union by the establishment of separate and sectarian institutions." * * * * "It has produced jealousies and rivalships inconsistent with the gospel of Christ; and it has greatly increased the amount taken from the contributions of the benevolent, for the support of agencies and other expenditures incident to the prosecution of these enterprises." In this you intimate that the Presbyterian church has established separate and sectarian Bible, Tract, and Sunday School Societies, and that we have withdrawn our support from the American Bible, American Tract and Sunday School Union Societies. This, Gentlemen, is also false. You well know that the Presbyterian church has established no such societies; and that her members are as free now as ever, to patronize, according to their ability, the above-named societies. And if you would take the trouble to examine, you would, no doubt, find, *that they actually do it*. The General Assembly has lately established a Board of Publication, not, however, to *supersede* the excellent publications of the American Tract, and American S. S. Union Societies; but in *addition* to them to furnish our people with their own history; and to make them more thoroughly acquainted with the doctrines and order of the church they love, that by the blessing of God, they may no more "be deceived by the sleight of men and cunning craftiness." So far as you allude to the A. B. C. F. M., A. H. M. S., and A. E. S., your statement is true. The Presbyterian churches have to a great measure, withdrawn their aid from those societies, especially the latter two; 1st. Because, from the nature of the organization of those societies the executive officers are not responsible to any ecclesiastical judicatory, for the manner in which they

exercise their trusts. The leading man in the American Home Missionary Society, in 1837, had the controul of \$100,000 per an. and 800 men in his employ; with no other obligation to fidelity than that which binds the cashier of a six-penny savings institution. This power is too enormous to be in the hands of any man on earth. With so much influence, what might he not have accomplished! What but the mercy of God, saved the Presbyterian church from the established domination of a semi-Pelagian Pope? The evil of the American Education Society, was similar. Indeed the two societies co-operated in aiming to accomplish the same general result: the corruption of the doctrine and order of the different denominations, by which they were supported; the one endeavouring to control the judicatories of the churches by the instrumentality of ministers educated, for the purpose, by the other. To such an extent was this actually carried in the Presbyterian church, that in 1836, the influence of the American Board of Commissions for Foreign Missions, prevented the General Assembly from undertaking the great work of Foreign Missions; and ministers connected with the American Home Missionary Society resolutely opposed measures indispensable for the purity of the church. And it had become dangerous to the peace and usefulness of a pastor, to refuse to open, either his house, pocket, or pulpit, to the agents of those societies. Such dangers and such abuses, would have been alone sufficient, to have induced the Assembly of '37 to pass the decisive resolutions, recommending "that those societies should cease to operate within any of our churches."

But again; the Presbyterian church has withdrawn her aid from the societies in question, and established Boards of Foreign Missions, Domestic Missions and Education, because she *conscientiously* believes, that she can thus, most faithfully and efficiently, do the great work required at her hands by her Divine Master. In this, our church claims nothing more than the right to direct her own efforts for the conversion of the world, according to what *she* believes to be the will of the Great Head of the church. And, moreover, the ecclesiastical boards appointed by the General Assembly which represents the whole church, *are responsible*, through that body, to the churches, for the way in which they use the money and influence entrusted to them; so that the acts of those Boards may, at any time, be authoritatively enquired into, and all their operations controuled by those who are appointed to rule in the house of God. Do you not perceive, then, Gentlemen, that in reviling our church for her course, you are denying to your brethren, the sacred right of conscience, and in effect, attempting to persecute them for 'righteousness sake?' In those measures there was nothing inconsistent with the Catholic spirit of the gospel; nothing that may not be safely imitated by every branch of the church of the Redeemer: nay, is it not abundantly manifest, that the great cause of Christ would be more effectually promoted, if *each part* of the visible church would *faithfully* perform *its own* part of the work to be accomplished; and that there would be more true, spiritual and affectionate union among Christians of the different denominations, if each sect would forbearingly accord to all the rest, the

right to do the most good in what way soever appears to them, most agreeable to the word of God. And this was the ground taken by the Assembly of '37, in passing the resolution referred to, which is as follows :

"*Resolved*, That while we desire that no body of Christian men of other denominations should be prevented from choosing their own plans of doing good, and while we claim no right to complain, should they exceed us in energy and zeal ; we believe that facts too familiar to need repetition here, warrant us in affirming that the organization and operations of the so called American Home Missionary, and American Education Societies, and their branches of whatever name, are exceedingly injurious to the peace and purity of the Presbyterian church : we recommend accordingly, that they should cease to operate within any of our churches."

Speaking further of these measures, you state, page 9, among other evils resulting from them : "A number of ministers, during the last year, have relinquished the pastoral office, with all its sacred and endearing relations and solemn responsibilities, to engage as agents to solicit contributions for these recently created societies. These agents cannot do their work for nothing. They and their families must be supported, and the heavy expenses necessarily incurred by travelling constantly through the country, must be defrayed. So that while they are withdrawn from the most important functions of the ministry, a very heavy tax is laid upon the contributions of the benevolent for their support. In our opinion, there exists no reason to justify this large, increased expenditure," &c. Now if this were *true*, it would be a matter with which you would have no concern whatever. If the Presbyterian church improvidently incur unnecessary expenditure; be assured, she would not assess the Harrisburg Presbytery to meet it. She would endeavour to raise the means at home. But the *number* of ministers of whom you speak, ought to have been set down in figures, if you designed not to make a false impression. The whole number of ministers in the Presbyterian church that have resigned the pastoral office in order to become agents, during the past year, so far as I can ascertain, is just one ! Rev'd H. R. Wilson, Sen'r, General Agent of the Board of Publication. But as one minister, the Rev. Dr. J. Breckinridge, resigned his agency during that time, with the view of becoming pastor of a church vacated by a New School minister, the number of agents, during the past year, is therefore, just what it was before. If I am in error, I shall be happy to be corrected. But the choicest part of the paragraph above quoted is that in which you attempt to express disapprobation of the agency system.—What Gentlemen ! *you* disapprove of the multiplication of agents ! Why do you not perceive that in this very pamphlet you are reviling the Presbyterian church because she would no longer endure the pestiferous inundation of her churches by the legion of agents poured forth in ominous fecundity, by *your* national societies ? The matter, however, is easily explained : *you* may have as many agents as you please ; and *no one* must object to their intrusion ; but *we* may not have a single agent to do *our own* work, even when *we* pay him with our own money !

And now let us look at the "excinding act" of the Assembly of '37—"the head and front of our offending." You introduce this subject on page 6, by stating, 1st, The constitutional provisions of our church for the conducting of *judicial* process. You then proceed: "yet, beloved brethren, and it is with pain we revert to the fact, in the face of all these constitutional provisions, and in the exercise of the most arbitrary power, the Assembly of 1837, cut off *en masse*, without warning, without citation, without, in short, any forms of trial, 4 Synods, 28 Presbyteries, 509 ministers, and 57,724 communicants, from the church of God, as far as their act could effect the excision." This act you characterise: "It is questionable whether the history of the church even in the darkest ages, can furnish an example of a more ruthless exercise of arbitrary power, in trampling upon the dearest rights of man, and in violating the essential principles of eternal justice." To say, Gentlemen, that you have wilfully misrepresented this matter, would be harsh language; yet, at the least, those of you, who boast of their "half century labors" in the Presbyterian church must know that it is not a fair statement of the case. To show conclusively that your statement is incorrect, and grossly slanderous of the General Assembly, I here insert the resolution of the Assembly, declaring:

"That the General Assembly has no intention by these resolutions (those passed at the same time by which the four synods were declared to be out of the ecclesiastical connexion of the Presbyterian church in the U. S. A.) to affect in any way the ministerial standing of any of the members of either of said synods, nor to disturb the pastoral relations in any church, nor to interfere with the duties or relations of private Christians in their respective congregations; but only to declare and determine according to the truth and necessity of the case, and by virtue of the full authority existing in it for that purpose, the relation of all said synods, and all their constituent parts to this body, and to the Presbyterian church in the United States."

No one reading this resolution would ever imagine that it relates to the transaction as stated by you, and which you characterise as "violating the essential principles of eternal justice." In the first place, you say the Assembly "cut off 4 Synods, 28 Presbyteries, 509 ministers, and 57,724 communicants," &c. From this, many who will read your Pastoral Letter may readily enough suppose that the Presbyteries, ministers and communicants were 'cut off' from the church *in addition* to the 4 Synods; whereas the 509 ministers together, constituted and were members of the 28 Presbyteries, and the 4 Synods; and the communicants belonged to the churches under the pastoral charge of those ministers. If this form of statement was not intended to deceive, it is at least childish tautology, and ought to have been avoided.

Again, you say that "those Synods, &c., were cut off from the church of God, so far as the act of the Assembly, could effect the excision." This assertion is explicitly contradicted by the resolution of the Assembly quoted above. That resolution clearly admits that the separated synods may be a part of the church of God, whilst it simply declares those synods to be no part of the Presby-

terian church. The separated synods consider themselves a branch of the church of God. And doubtless, you also, believe them to be so; else why did you *voluntarily* leave the Presbyterian church to join them? If, therefore, as you say, to be cut off from the Presbyterian church is to be 'cut off' from the church of God, it follows unavoidably, that you do not belong to the church of God; for Cæsar, at the suggestion, of your party, has pronounced *ours*, and not *yours* to be the true Presbyterian church in the United States of America. But if, as the Assembly admits, you may be a part of the church of God, the obvious conclusion is, that even you do not believe the deceptive statement which yourselves have made.

Further, you object to the manner in which the synods were separated. You have pronounced the Assembly guilty of high-handed tyranny, because they did not cite the Synods to appear in answer to charges; and go through a formal trial, and if found guilty, to excommunicate them, in execution of a *judicial* sentence.—This course, however, was not at all necessary, in the case in question; because, in the expressed judgment of the Assembly, the Synods were not charged with such crimes as would infer the deposition of all the ministers connected with them, and the excommunication of the members of the churches under their care. Had this been the case, then the judicial process you speak of, would have been indispensably necessary. But there was a state of things in those synods, which as to Presbyterianism, were '*gross disorders.*' And the same spirit, subversive of our doctrine and order, was gradually pervading the whole church. Now the question is not, whether those things were right or wrong; nor whether those who held and practised them, were more or less holy than their brethren; but whether such things were *Presbyterian*, and in accordance with "*the ancient usages of our venerated church.*" That such a state of things did actually exist, was not only believed and maintained by the old school party in the Assembly of '37, but also acknowledged by the New School party in their attempt at an amicable division of the church, and by the commissioners of many of those Presbyteries in open Assembly.—"Whereas in the extension of the church over so great a territory, embracing such a variety of people, differences of views in relation to important points of church policy and action, as well as *theological opinion*, are found to exist.

"Now it is believed, a division of this body into two separate bodies, which shall act independently of each other, will be of vital importance to the best interests of the Redeemer's kingdom." (Extract from Minutes of Assembly of '37, part of paper No. 1, of the Com. of the minority, or New School, appointed to treat with the majority's Com. on the division of the church.) From this it is evident that a separation of the two parties, was in the judgment of both, required by the 'best interests of the Redeemer's kingdom.' But, after a long correspondence between the committees, in which the Old School offered an equal division of all the corporate funds of the church, excepting those pertaining to Princeton Seminary, which the Assembly could not lawfully divert from their present

application; and in which, the New School refused to listen to any terms of division, unless the Assembly would dissolve the Presbyterian church, and reorganize two new sects: it was ascertained from their explicit declaration that the New School Committee did not hold themselves nor any one else bound in good faith to adhere to the terms of voluntary separation, which *they themselves* had proposed! (See Minutes of the Assembly of '37, papers No. 4 of minority; and No. 5 of majority, Joint Com. on the state of the church.) The endeavour to divide the church *voluntarily*, being thus frustrated, the Assembly proceeded to pass the resolutions, by which the Synods of the Western Reserve, Utica, Geneva, and Genessee, were "declared to be out of the ecclesiastical connexion of the Presbyterian church of the United States of America, and that they are not in form, nor in fact an integral portion of said church." The reason for separating *those particular Synods*, from the church, was the fact, that they were the seat and source of all the anti-Presbyterian New Schoolism that had troubled the church; their separation from it was therefore indispensable to its peace and purity; and any division, voluntarily or otherwise, would have placed them just where they are. The reason for separating those Synods by a *declarative resolution*, and not by a judicial sentence rendered after a formal trial, according to the Book of Discipline, was, *the peculiar relation which they bore to the Presbyterian church*. They were formed and attached to the church, not as other Synods are, of Presbyteries composed wholly of ministers and ruling elders, bound by the solemn vows of Presbyterian ordination; and whose churches, governed according to the Word of God and the constitution of the Presbyterian church; but they were formed in an *unconstitutional* execution of the "Plan of Union of 1801;" which was an arrangement adopted by the General Assembly of the Presbyterian church and the General Association of Connecticut, (a Congregational body,) for the mutual aid of weak congregations in destitute regions. 'The Plan' permitted a minister of one denomination to serve a congregation belonging to the other, each retaining their original connexion; and it was as impartial as, perhaps, it could be, in securing to each, their peculiar, yet often conflicting, privileges. Nevertheless, difficulties were unavoidable, from the impossibility of governing Congregationalists by Presbyterian laws, which they do not approve, and would not adopt: and from the injustice of depriving a Presbyterian of the benefit of that form of government which he most approves. Yet the plan of union required such things, in certain specified cases. The nature of the 'Plan,' being, therefore equally subversive of Congregationalism, and Presbyterianism, it could not have been designed to operate *permanently*, but only as a *temporary arrangement suited to destitute missionary regions*; nor to be executed beyond *individual ministers or congregations, belonging to Presbyteries constitutionally formed, and already existing*. The Plan did not contemplate the formation of new Presbyteries and Synods, and there was no provision made for that purpose. And there could be no such application of the Plan, without abandoning Presbyterian government, and violating the conditions of the Plan itself. Even on this ground, then, the formation

of the 28 Presbyteries of the 4 separated Synods was null and void, and would have sufficiently justified their separation from the church at any subsequent time. But admitting that the Plan of Union justified the formation of the 28 Presbyteries and the 4 Synods, it then follows that their connexion, as such, with the Presbyterian church, was of the same kind precisely, as that of the churches and ministers of which they were composed. The Plan of Union, however, did not constitute the ministers acting under it, and the churches formed in execution of it, *full members* of the Presbyterian church; it merely permitted them to enjoy *temporarily*, certain privileges of that church. Now, certainly, the power that granted those privileges, was fully competent to *withdraw* them. And could there be stronger ground for the withdrawal, than the fact that the privileges were abused to the detriment of those who granted them? The so called 'excinding act,' was, therefore, not an excision 'from the church of God,' nor a deprivation of Christian ordinances; but *the mere withdrawal of privileges in the Presbyterian church*, from them who not only abused those privileges, but began to question the propriety of tolerating in the church, the orthodoxy of those, from whom their very privileges were obtained! And for this you appear to have conned the vocabulary, for epithets of denunciation; to express the deep abhorrence which that act has aroused in your bosoms.

Your allusion to the "most vexatious litigations," (page 10,) is peculiarly unfortunate. For the New School party, composed of the separated Synods and those, who sympathising with them, had voluntarily forsaken the Presbyterian church, were the *first* to go to law in order to establish your monstrous claim to *all the property*, as being the real Presbyterian church in the United States. And notwithstanding that suit was decided against you, by the highest tribunal in your state, you still refuse the standing offer of the General Assembly, of an equal division of funds, as though you were determined to have all or none; and to be no church at all, if you cannot be "*the Presbyterian church in the United States of America.*" As to the law-suits, if there are more than one, within the bounds of the Harrisburg Presbytery; one of them, it is true, was instituted by the Old School portion of a congregation. But it was done to regain "property where they and their fathers worshipped for the last century, and where repose in hope, the ashes of their pious dead;" and of which they have been deprived by "comparative strangers, some of them having but recently entered the Presbyterian church from foreign denominations."

With reference to the reunion of the New School to the Presbyterian church, to which you several times allude, in your Pastoral Letter, I will say, that to me, it does not appear to be at all necessary to the happiness or prosperity of either party. Large bodies are not the most efficient, especially when composed of heterogeneous materials. And that it is not for edification to have the two parties united, has been demonstrated by painful experience. But the Redeemer's cause will not suffer, if, although separated, we mutually abstain from all strife, save that, whereby to provoke each other to love and good works.

But if, in accordance with your apparent wishes, the New School should again be united to our church, I presume you could not be received in your *organized* capacity; for then it would be impossible to exclude those among you, who hold and preach the ruinous errors of Pelagianism, self-conversion, perfectionism, &c., and whom your connexion has assumed the fearful responsibility of tolerating as *useful* and *good* men. You would doubtless, have to be received *individually*, on personal examination by the different Presbyteries. Any other way would neither be safe nor constitutional. If, then, you are sincere in your desire for a reunion "on the basis of the constitution," permit me to commend to *your own* practice, the exhortation which you have urged upon *your people*; and which forms a pleasing contrast to the preceding paragraphs of your Pastoral: "Towards our brethren, who, as we think, have departed from both the letter and the spirit of our standards, let us ever cherish feelings of Christian kindness. Let us remember that "to err is human," and that it is our duty to cherish the spirit of conciliation as far as is consistent with adherence to fundamental principles. Whether our church shall be united again on the basis of its constitution, God only certainly knows; but let us make it manifest by our conduct, that on our part there shall exist no barrier to such a union. In the mean time, let us carefully avoid every thing that will tend to increase the evils which necessarily grow out of our unfortunate division. Let us not render evil for evil; nor railing for railing; but contrariwise, blessing, knowing that we are thereunto called, that we may inherit a blessing."

With the sincere wish that the Spirit of Him who inspired the concluding sentence, may dwell richly in you, and ever guide you, even according to these words, in all your future intercourse with your brethren,

I remain, &c,

J. P. C.

☞ NOTICES, RECEIPTS, ACCOUNTS, ANSWERS TO LETTERS, &c.

DECEMBER 22, 1840—JANUARY 12, 1841. *New Subscribers.* James A. Sloan, Mount Hill P. O., Abbeville District, S. C., name added from Jan'y, '41, by order of our friend S. Weir, of Columbia.—Rev'd George Marshall, of Bethel ch., near Pittsburgh, Pa., \$10. to pay for Tho's Kiddo, Arthur Morrow, William Espy, and Thomas Adams, new subscribers, for '41; also by his direction name of Charles Martin, Jefferson College, Canonsburg, added. We are extremely obliged by the kindness of brother Marshall; and the suggestion he makes, we will take pleasure in complying with.—"Associate Society of Enquiry," Theological Seminary, Canonsburg, Pa., added from Jan'y '41, and \$2,50 for the year paid by Rev'd Dr. M. Brown, per letter of December 23; who sent us \$5 in the letter, with the order, and directed the other \$2,50 to be credited to him; but as he had already paid in advance for the year 1841, we venture to credit that sum to the other Society of Enquiry (in Jefferson College), for which he was good enough to order this work and direct us to charge him, in his letter of Dec. 3; but, if we have erred, will correct with pleasure. Received at the same time, a pamphlet, which will be carefully examined.—Hugh G. Guthrie, Esq., Fishersville, Augusta Co., Va., name added from Jan'y, '41, and \$2,50 paid, by Rev'd B. M. Smith.—A. G. McIlvain, Petersburg, Va., name added, and \$2,50 for '41,

paid by Mr. J. Dunn.—Thomas Dain, Lexington street, Baltimore.—T. C. W. Hoffeditz, Mercersburg, Pa., name added and \$2,50 paid for '41, by S. S. Middlekauff.

Changes, Discontinuances, &c. Rev'd James Sewell, Augusta, Geo., \$2,50 for 1840, and discontinued.—P. M., Philadelphia, says *William Ritchie* does not call for his copy of the Magazine; we have sent it to him since Jan'y, 1837, four years, nothing paid—now due us \$12.—Rev'd F. K. Nash, Beatties Ford, N. C., \$3, which pays to June, '41; after which discontinued.—American Whig Society, Princeton College, N. J.; the January number returned, refused; had received the work gratis for three or four years.

Payments, &c. Rev'd J. P. Ring, Augusta, Geo., \$2,50, for '40, by the hands of Rev'd J. Sewell.—\$2,50, for '41, for Miss Torrence, of Frederick city, Md.: and \$10 from Rev'd Joseph Smith, of same place to be credited as follows, viz., \$5 to the credit of Dr. A. Ritchie, which pays for two years, from Sept. '39, when he commenced, to Sept. '41; \$2,50 to Mr. Smith himself; and the remaining \$2,50, for Sam'l R. Hogg, which pays till August, '41.—Rev. J. B. Spotswood, of Baltimore Co., Md., \$2,50 for 1840.—Rev'd J. Hendren, Staunton, Va., by the hands of John Breckinridge, Esq., of that place, \$5, which pays till July, '41.—Mr. J. M. C. Bartley, Hempstead, N. H., \$3, which with \$2 paid a year ago, pays for '40 and '41.—Rev'd B. M. Smith, Waynesboro', Va., \$10, of which \$2,50 for Mr. Guthrie, (see new subscribers,) \$2,50 for himself for '41, and \$5 for J. Wayt, Esq., of Waynesboro', for 1840 and '41; the other matters in brother Smith's letter, duly attended to.—P. M., Brownsville, N. C., for Samuel D. Schoolfield, \$5, for '39 and '40, and direction changed from Greensboro' to Brownsville.—Rev'd S. J. P. Anderson, Danville, Va., \$3, by the hands of Mr. J. Dunn, of Petersburg, which pays for '39 and leaves 50 cents to his credit; we are obliged in accepting his kind suggestion through Mr. D.; the remainder of the \$6, inclosed by him (after paying the subscription of Mr. McCl., see new subscribers,) viz., 50 cents put to his credit.—S. S. Middlekauff, Mercersburg, Pa., \$2,50; see also new subscribers; the numbers for October and November, '40, sent a second time as requested, to Mr. Shaull, Middleway, Jefferson Co., Va.

☞ *Special Notice.* On examining our books, we find, that adding together those who discontinued during the year 1840, without ever having paid us any thing, and those who were indebted to us, for five years and upwards, and who seemed resolved never to pay us any thing, and whose names have therefore been erased from our mail book; *the aggregate is about 70 persons, and the sum due us from them, as near as may be to \$1000.* This money, if we had it, would repay our advances for this work, during its existence; and we have not only earned it, but been also obliged to advance it out of our pockets for those who owe it; it seems to us, rather hard to be thus used. This, let it be remembered, covers the 'refused' and 'erased' cases only of 1840; and as we have no doubt, the aggregate of the preceding five years, would be treble as many names, and perhaps an amount of debt greater than the sum stated above. It is not an uncommon thing, for us to hear and see similar statements on the part of the periodical press of this country; and we are sorry to be obliged to say, that, if our experience during six years, may be relied on, there is very much to be reformed in regard to the *patronage* of that important interest—both as regards its *extent* and its *punctuality*. ☞

WE OBSERVE with regret, an editorial statement of the question, in regard to "*Ecclesiastical Boards*," in the Presbyterian of January 2. We are surprised to see that excellent journal confounding "*Ecclesiastical Boards*" and ecclesiastical *control*, as though they were one and the same thing; asserting that it was for the *Boards* specifically, that the orthodox contended in the recent agitations of our church; and insinuating that those who oppose the notion of Boards in the abstract, or call in question the particular Boards that exist, are in fact on New School ground; and moreover that no substitute has been proposed for Boards.—It is manifest, that there are two questions entirely distinct, viz., 1, of Boards; 2, of Paid Agencies, as a general system. Now no man, who knows any thing of the

state of sentiment in the Presbyterian church, doubts, that there is a great and growing anxiety upon both these subjects; and a common feeling in the church, is one of dissatisfaction at the state of our operations. But secondly, there are three totally distinct questions, in regard to the Boards: 1. The abstract one, whether this form is as Scriptural, as Presbyterian, and as efficient as some other form of exercising ecclesiastical supervision; for example, as small Standing Committees: 2. Supposing Boards the best form, quere as to the particular organization and action of the present kind of Boards; 3. Query, as to the location, mode of filling up, mode of action, efficiency, and general state of the operations of those now existing. Now we take leave to say, that in our poor judgment, the whole of these questions are of exceeding great importance; and that it will not do, to settle them with two dashes of the pen,—by assuming the identity of the whole question of ecclesiastical control, with the personal question of the present Boards; and the New Schoolism of any and all who may question existing arrangements. For our part, we confidently assert that after years of trial, nothing adequate is done; we greatly fear things are threatening to go backwards; and we sincerely believe, that on the present plan and method, our church never can be brought up to the measure of its capacity. We think, with deference, we have long ago shown “*a better and more efficacious mode of promoting the interests of the church,*” than by any such boards as these; and moreover, a better mode, even by these, than they have hitherto used.—The church is pondering this whole subject; let her have light.

MR. SMITH, PRELATE of the Protestant Episcopal church in Ky., has published, as *Superintendent of Public Schools*, a most extraordinary and ridiculous fanfaronade; which is running round the newspapers of the nation. There are, says he, but 32,000 children in that state, out of the 140,000 of the proper age to receive an education—who are going to school. Now let us analyze this statement. Suppose four years to be the average number, that children go to school; and allowing 10 years—viz., from the age of five to fifteen years as the time within which their education is obtained; then there should be only 56,000, out of 140,000, at school, at any given moment. But this goes on the supposition, that the four years of education are four consecutive years; which is hardly ever the case with the children of the poor. Suppose, then, they get their four years schooling, in eight years, at the rate of six months in each year; then only 28,000, out of the 140,000, ought to be at school at any given moment. And upon this state of case, the result is, that if 32,000 are found at school, by Mr. Smith, instead of showing a low state of public education, it clearly shows this, viz., that the children of Ky., between five and fifteen years old, go to school for more than six months in each year, for more than eight years. And let the parts of this hypothesis be varied in any fair manner, and the result is the same; and the facts accord with this result of the ‘cyphering.’ For although, in some of the more thinly settled counties, there is no doubt much difficulty in obtaining the advantages of general education; yet, as a people, none value general knowledge more, and few possess more of it. During more than ten years of the life of the writer of these lines, he was deeply and extensively engaged in public and private business in Ky.; and he cannot recollect, above two or three instances in which he met with *native citizens* of Ky., who could not read and write. And he is sure, very few even of the most unlettered of them would have been deluded, by the shallow analogies which have deceived Mr. Smith in the premises; and caused him to make an official statement at once so groundless, and so offensive to the feelings of his adopted state.

THE
BALTIMORE LITERARY
AND
RELIGIOUS MAGAZINE.

VOL. VII.]

MARCH, 1841.

[No. 3.

[For the Baltimore Literary and Religious Magazine.]

THE FIRST DISCIPLE OF LUTHER.

MESSRS. EDITORS:—The following letter of Frederick Myconius, to Paul Eber, will furnish some idea of the miserable darkness in which serious, conscientious persons were involved, in the period immediately prior to the blessed reformation. It also gives us a little further insight into the character of that infamous vender of indulgences, JOHN TETZEL; and how, by the providence of God, Myconius, when a mere youth, was led to pursue such a course as exposed the infamy of this nefarious traffic. The dream which he had, the first night after he entered the Franciscan monastery, all will acknowledge to be remarkable; he firmly believed it to be prophetic, to the end of his life. The reader will exercise his own judgment, on the matter: it is one which fairly admits a diversity of opinion. The most remarkable coincidence between it and facts which occurred seven years afterwards, was, that Luther commenced his opposition to the papacy, when he had not a coadjutor, and Myconius was the first person who declared in favor of his principles. If all inmates of monasteries are as miserable as he describes himself to have been, they must indeed be a kind of hell upon earth, as he several times denominates them. But this wretchedness arose from his conscientiousness, in connexion with the complete darkness of error which surrounded him. Many, no doubt, have their consciences seared as with a hot iron; and let it be remembered, that they to whom the apostle ascribes this searedness of conscience, were such as “forbade to marry, and commanded to abstain from meats.” And the same persons are represented as “speaking lies in hypocrisy.” Nothing has such a tendency to harden the heart, as false doctrines and hypocrisy. What a blessing to the world was the reformation! What a deliverance from more than Egyptian bondage and Egyptian darkness. Before this blessed era, the whole world was enveloped in Cimmerian darkness, and the tyranny of hypocritical priests over the consciences of men, was oppressive beyond conception. It seems scarcely possible that the same universal darkness should again overspread the Christian

world ; yet we must not forget, that men naturally love darkness rather than light ; and that a recurrence of the same causes which extinguished the light of truth in the dark ages, would again involve us in all the horrors of a papist night. And, in that case, superstition would again open her inquisitorial dungeons, and light anew her fires of persecution. Let the whole world be involved in destructive and desolating wars—let Protestantism in Europe, degenerate into Rationalism, or Transcendentalism—let the papacy continue her unremitting efforts to extend her dominion, which is so constituted as to flourish equally in the darkness of ignorance, or of infidelity and heresy—and again, his holiness at Rome, may issue his bulls to be obeyed in the remote east, and far distant west. The zeal of the Jesuits for making proselytes, was never greater than at this moment ; their emissaries are met with in the almost inaccessible valleys of the Kurds, and in the islands of the Pacific. At present, however, England and the United States of America, are the objects to which the attention of the Papal world is directed with intense interest. And the progress made in both these countries, would not have been credited by any one, fifty years ago. But it will be said, America is safe from all danger of persecution, as her constitution guarantees religious liberty. This is a paper defence, and will be disposed of as easily as a paper rampart would be torn by a besieging army—if once they who have the mark of the Beast should prevail as to numbers or political power and influence.

It is hard to say what form of religion enjoys most favor with our men in power, as their views are various. Indifferentism, however, is the thing which numbers most adhere to among our legislators, and high officers who execute the laws. The only competition for favor at the seat of government, is for the office of chaplain to the two houses ; and here the Methodists manifest their ascendancy. But they are only caressed from political motives, on account of their numbers and unity,—the really favourite sects are the Romanists and the Quakers.

SENEX.

The following letter of Frederick Myconius, dated Feb. 21, 1546, was addressed to Paul Eber, and contains a remarkable dream, which he had before the reformation commenced.

“That remarkable preacher of indulgences, *John Tetzel*, of the order of Dominicans, for two whole years demented the people of *Anneberg*, persuading them all that there was no method of salvation but by our own works ; which, however, he taught was impossible ; but said, one only way of obtaining life remained, and that was, to purchase it from the Roman Pontiff : and therefore, we ought to buy papal indulgences, which he defined to be, the remission of sins and the certain entrance into eternal life. I could relate wonderful and stupendous things which I heard from him during these two years ; for he preached almost every day. I attended upon him so closely, that I did often repeat to others, the whole of his sermons, and imitated his very gestures and pronunciation, not in sport, but seriously. For I believed that these were

indeed the oracles of God, and that whatsoever was sent to us from the pope, came from Christ himself. At length he threatened that he would lay down the cross, and would shut the gates of heaven, so that eternal life and the remission of sins would never hereafter be offered, at so cheap a rate. Nor was there any reason to hope, that the Roman See would again exercise such liberality towards Germany, while the world stood: he exhorted, therefore, that every one should have a regard to the salvation of his own soul, and to the souls of his deceased friends; "for now," said he, "is the accepted time, now is the day of salvation." Unless you have the pope's letters, there are sins and judgments from which no other can absolve you." Handbills were caused to be affixed to the gates and the walls, in which it was signified, that as a matter of gratitude for the zeal and devotion of the German people, plenary letters of indulgence would now be sold to the people, at a much lower rate than was at first demanded; and it was added, at the bottom of the paper, *and to the poor gratis, for God's sake.* Hence there arose a discussion between me and the commissaries of indulgences, the Holy Spirit exciting and urging me; but as yet I did not know what I should do. My father had taught me when a little boy, the ten commandments, the Lord's prayer, and the creed, and often obliged me to pray. He also taught me, that all things were of God, and that He would direct me, if only I prayed to him. Likewise, that the blood of Christ was a ransom for the sins of the world; and that it was necessary that every Christian should believe this: that if there were only three persons to be saved, I should believe that I should be one of them: and that to doubt of this, would be to cast a reproach on the blood of Christ." "Certainly," said he, "papal indulgences are a snare by which the money of the simple is obtained; certainly the remission of sins cannot be purchased with money; much less eternal life; but the priests would be offended, if any one were to say this." But as I heard nothing in sermons but the praises of indulgences, and no mention ever of the grace of Christ, or his satisfaction for the sins of the world, I thought that they only were partakers of the death of Christ, who either merited it by their good works, or bought it with money. I remained in doubt, whether I should give credit to the priests, or believe my father; but I was led to place the greater confidence in the priests. One thing, however, was evident, that remission of sins could not be obtained by the poor, if it depended on paying down money for the benefit; I was therefore much pleased with the note subjoined to the public handbill, that *indulgences would be given to the poor gratis, for God's sake.* When, after three days, the cross was to be taken down, and the ladder which was erected to heaven was about to be thrown down; the Spirit vehemently urged me to go to the missionary and demand those letters for the gratuitous remission of sins, offered to the poor; and that I should allege, that I was a sinner, and poor, and wanted gratuitous remission and a participation of the merits of Christ. Accordingly, on the next day, I went about evening, to the house of John Pflags, where Tetzl was surrounded by a crowd of confessors, and offered my petition in Latin, begging, that according to the proposal in the

published handbill, I might have the privilege of obtaining absolution from all my sins, *gratuitously, for God's sake*; and might have granted to me, the pope's letters of indulgence, as a testimonial of the grant. The priests who were in attendance admired my Latin style, which was then rare among boys, and entering into the chamber where Tetzel was, they represented to him my petition, and interceded with him, that he would *gratuitously* bestow upon me *letters of indulgence*. After long consultation they returned, bringing me the following answer: "my son, we diligently presented your petition to the lord commissary, who confesses that he would most willingly grant your request, but that he is unable to do it, and even if he should consent, yet the concession would be of no avail; because these *papal letters* have it expressly signified on their face, that *they only* are capable of becoming partakers of these most ample indulgences, who stretch out a *helping hand*; that is, who give money." Upon which I appealed to the declaration contained in the handbill, posted on the gates, where it was explicitly stated, that the most holy pope had commanded, *that pardon should be granted to the poor, for God's sake*. Again they enter in to this most haughty monk, and beg him to assent to my petition, and represented me to be an ingenious and eloquent young man, and therefore, a person worthy to have such a benefit conferred on him above others. But they returned with the same answer, alleging that no other but a helping hand was capable of being benefitted by these indulgences. Here, I insisted that this was an injury to a poor man, that when God and the pope were unwilling to exclude me from grace, that they should reject me on account of a few pieces of money, which I had not. At length, it was agreed among them that I should give something, if it was only a single groat, so that a helping hand might not be wanting. I answered, I have it not—I am poor. Finally, they said, that if I would only give six pieces of money, that would be received. I answered that I had not even one piece, and therefore could not do it. They now withdrew, and conferred together about the matter, and I understood that they were troubled about two things: first, least if I should be dismissed without receiving *letters*, the thing might be made a handle of, and a disturbance might be excited, because the authentic handbill did certainly contain the clause, that these letters should be given to the poor gratis: and again, they were afraid if I received these *indulgences* gratuitously, that they would be overwhelmed with applications for gratuitous grants from poor scholars and beggars. In this dilemma one came to me, and offered me six pieces of money, that I might give them to the commissary, that thus I might give my aid towards the erection of St. Peter's church, and the conquest of the Greeks, while at the same time, I should be made a partaker of the grace of Christ, and of these indulgences. Upon this, being influenced by some motion of the Spirit, I declined, and said, that if I wished to buy indulgences, I could sell my books, and get a little silver; but I wished to receive them gratuitously for *God's sake*; and if they refused, that they should render a reason to God for the neglect of the salvation of my soul, for the sake of six pieces of money, while God and the pope were

willing that I should be made a partaker of the remission of sins, which Christ had merited and obtained for us, which merit, however, I believed to be committed to the pope, to be distributed to every one, according to his deserts, but *to the poor gratis*. At length they asked by whom was I sent hither? I answered most truly, that in presenting my petition, I had been advised, or counselled, or stimulated to do it, by no person whatever; but that of my own accord, and without the counsel of any one, had come, with the confident expectation of gratuitous remission, depending on the promise contained in the paper which by authority had been pasted on the gates—that I had never before been brought into the company of such men, but was by nature exceedingly bashful, and that nothing but an ardent desire for the grace of God, and the remission of sins could have compelled me to appear among them in that place. Again they urged me to accept the six pence which they before offered me, and said that I should then receive what I so much desired. But I told them that I would receive the benefit gratuitously, or I would commit my case to God. And so we parted; but these seared thieves were much disturbed. And as for myself, I was grieved at not obtaining the pardon of my sins; but I rejoiced to think that still there was a God in heaven who could pardon me, and was willing to do it without any price. I often sung to myself these words, "*as I live saith the Lord, I have no pleasure in the death of the wicked,*" &c. "O, Lord God, thou knowest, that in these things I lie not." For although I was still enveloped in the thickest darkness, yet I went away from them, and thy Spirit O God, moved my heart and my body on this occasion. Thou who art my illuminator and quickener, my comforter and my redeemer. As I returned to my lodging, my heart was melted within me, and I poured out floods of tears; and prayed that as they had denied me the remission of sins unless I would pay them money, I begged of God that he would have compassion on me; and freely grant unto me the remission of sins, and be propitious unto me. I returned to my lodging, and lay down on my bed. There lay on the table of my study an image of my crucified Saviour, which I took up and placed on the chimney-piece, and falling on my knees I poured out floods of tears, and what I then felt may be conceived but cannot be expressed in words. But the sum of what I prayed for was, that God would graciously remit my sins, and be a father to me. I said "I will give myself unreservedly to thee, to do with me what thou wilt; and since they have refused to grant me remission without money, do thou be gracious unto me, and be a Father to me." It seemed to me as if my whole nature was changed, and I was weary of every thing on earth, and had no longer any desires for any worldly possession: my only desire was to live with God and please him.—But who should teach me how to do this? Or how should I be able to ascertain that he had forgiven me and granted to me grace and eternal life? The word, which is the life and light of men was then buried through the whole world, under the thickest darkness of human and most foolish traditions. Either Christ was not named, or he was represented as a judge so severe, that scarce his mother and all the saints in heaven

could appease him, even with tears of blood; and the only comfort proposed was the septennial punishment of purgatory, which differed from the pains of hell in nothing but in duration. Nevertheless, the Spirit suggested a hope to my mind, that God would be propitious. I now deliberated for several days about changing my condition of life. I saw the sins of the world, placed, as it were, before my eyes, and my own sins to be very great. But I had heard of the great sanctity and extraordinary innocence of life, of the monks. How they served God day and night, abstracted from all the corruptions of the world, living soberly, justly, chastely, attending mass, singing psalms, fasting and praying. This was the idea which I then entertained of this kind of life, not then understanding, that it was the very sum of hypocrisy and idolatry. What shall I here say? O Lord my God! I spent two or three days in praying for decisive direction; then I consulted my preceptor, Andrew Staffelstein, the principal of the high school of Anneberg, and begged him to give me his counsel in this weighty affair. He immediately advised and urged me to enter the monastery of the Franciscans, which was then about being rebuilt. He praised the honesty, he praised the piety of these brethren; and then declared that he had long entertained the opinion, that I would prove to be a man of true piety. And least my mind should be changed by delay, he urged me to apply immediately, and he himself went to introduce me to the brotherhood. My parents being still alive, and I an only son, and their heir, I was desirous of communicating the thing to them. But they pressed upon me the saying of Jerome, "that if my father and my mother should prostrate themselves in my way to obstruct me, I ought to tread them under my feet and to flee to the cross of Christ." And that saying of our Lord, "He who having put his hand to the plough and looketh back is not fit for the kingdom of heaven." I omit the infinite number of snares which they laid to entangle my conscience; and they asserted that I never could be saved to all eternity, if I did not use the offered grace immediately. That the alternative was to fall entirely from the grace of God, and miss of eternal salvation, if I did not at once comply with the gracious opportunity. I gave them credit, and in three days, I was received and entered on my *probation*, as they call it; that is, I consented to become a monk, devoted, upright, religious in all respects. My entrance into the monastery was in the year 1510, July 14, the second hour after mid-day. I was accompanied by my preceptor, some of my school-fellows, and a few most devoted matrons, to whom at the gate, I explained the reasons of the step which I was now taking, namely, that I might serve God and please him to all eternity; that I might pray for the remission of my sins, and of those of others; and that as far as possible, I might abstain from all sin, and live a life of penitence. Then I bade them farewell, when they all with tears prayed for a blessing on me, and thus I entered the monastery. Thou, O Lord, knowest that these things are true; nor was I influenced by a love of ease, nor to gratify my appetites, nor with the desire of making a show of sanctity; but my motive was, to please thee, to serve thee! —Thus did I grope my way in the midst of the thickest darkness.

The monks conducted me, in the first place, to the refectory; then I was led to the choir, and to the performance of sacred music, afterwards to a new cell, in which there was a new bed, made of straw, and a pillow of the shearings of woollen cloth. After supper, I was brought back again to my cell, and they commanded me to sleep with my clothes on. But having devoted myself to the service of God, I was willing to sleep on the bare ground, or on the cold pavement. But they prohibited me, saying that I had a long time to serve the Lord. After the *completorium*, and they had all composed themselves to rest, I fell upon my knees, and for an hour commended this my new undertaking to the Lord; with earnest prayer I besought God to be my guardian, my governor, and took him for my guide and master; entreating, that he would so direct me, that I might do nothing contrary to his glory, and my own eternal salvation. Then with my woollen shirt and secular tunic, I lay down and composed myself to rest, and soon fell asleep. At this time, I had reached my twentieth year; nor had I yet seen any rule, or any of the institutions of the monks, to inform me what my new kind of life was to be, expecting that the monks would instruct me, which indeed they did, burying me in the thickest darkness.

While I slept, I seemed to myself to come into a vast desert, where there was nothing to be seen but perpetual desolation, and contiguous to this, were very sharp rocks, such as used to be painted under the image of Christ crucified; or such as may be seen about the castle of Stolpe, in Misnia. Indeed, the whole world appeared to me to be nothing else than a rocky desert. I was miserably wandering in this dreary place, without a companion or guide. Here there was no green tree nor shrub, nor even a spire of grass; but it was desolation itself, and horrible solitude. From this I sought a way of escape, that I might return to a cultivated country, where I might find either men or beasts abiding. For any where I could be more safe than in this immense wilderness, where I was obliged sometimes to creep among the rocks, sometimes to ascend and then again to descend; going at one time in one direction, and then in another. At length I became weary, and began to despair of ever escaping from this terrible solitude, which seemed to extend over the world. I beheld a rock towering in height above the rest, and it was suggested to me, that I should make my way to this, and ascending it, take a survey of the surrounding region, whither I could descry any smoke, or other sign of living beings, or any appearance of fields or lake, to relieve the views of uniform desolation. But when with much difficulty, I arrived at the place and ascended this elevated rock, I could see nothing on every side but rocks and sands extending in every direction, to an interminable distance. Now my mind sunk into discouragement, and I despaired of relief, certainly concluding that there I must die. I descended from the rock with incredible distress, groaning in deepest anguish,—God alone knows the keenness of my anguish. Whilst I thought that I was created to live eternally, here I was perishing miserably; and weariness, hunger and thirst seemed to be added to my burden of grief; for I seemed to myself to have

been wandering for several days and nights among these dreadful rocks. Finding no way of escape, nor seeing any prospect of relief, I commended my soul to Jesus Christ, and to God the Father, and prepared to give myself up to death, for now my weariness was so great that I could neither walk nor stand. I looked around and saw a little nook under a rock, thither I betook myself, and leaning my head against the rock, and extending my hands, I lifted up my eyes, earnestly commending my spirit into the hands of God. And while I was thus resigning myself waiting for the will of God, I thought I heard the noise of footsteps approaching behind me. Whilst I was all attention to perceive what it might be and whether any one was really coming, a man of moderate stature, and of a serene countenance, came up to me. He was bald, but his beard was long and of a chesnut colour, but interspersed with grey hairs. His inner vesture was a green tunic, but without he wore a mantle of red, fastened on the left shoulder by a knot. I immediately understood that it was blessed Paul who now appeared to me: for he was just such as I had seen him painted among the apostles. He asked me what I was doing? To which I replied, that I had been led into that wilderness and could not find my way out, and that I was worn out with fatigue, hunger and thirst, and had despaired of ever escaping from this interminable desert; so had just composed my mind to die there; and had prayed to God that he would be propitious to me a sinner, and would receive my soul. I had scarcely finished these words, when coming up to me, he seized my left hand with his right hand, and sat me on my feet, saying, "arise, and follow me, and your affairs will become more favourable." O Lord, my God, how was I exhilarated! but my dying body trembled, and I was unable to walk. On which, he embraced me with his right hand, and so bore me along that my feet scarcely touched the ground, and in the more difficult passes he carried me outright. After proceeding some distance, the way became pleasanter; but still we saw no vestiges of human beings; but when we had gone some distance farther, there opened to our view, a most beautiful meadow, so that I do not know that any thing more beautiful could be conceived, or more delightful and pleasant. The dew drops hung upon the verdant grass, glistening in the sun, but of various colours; and the variety of colours in the flowers was wonderful, and of such surpassing fragrance, that a whole day would be insufficient to describe their celestial beauties and fragrance. I was refreshed above measure, and desired to rest here a little; but my divine conductor urged me to proceed. At length we came into the middle of the valley, and it seemed to me to be about the tenth or eleventh hour of the day. And here I heard the murmuring of a rivulet, which flowed near, and soon I saw the chrystal water leaping along, not with a rough and harsh sound, but as it were, with a sweet whisper—and when I drew near and beheld it; nothing could exceed the purity and transparency of the water; and when I looked into it, I found the pebbles and sand to be all of a golden colour. Nothing impure was found upon its banks, but either beautiful flowers or flourishing grass. Here I fell down upon my knees, for I now perceived that my divine conductor had been

sent to guide me to the waters of life; and I was preparing to draw up some of the water in my hand, that I might refresh my thirsting, dying soul; but my guide did not permit me. "Nay," said he, "drink at the fountain head," and raising me up, he said, "come on." But by the sight and sweet sound of the running water, my desire to drink was inflamed, and I feared lest the fountain might be far off, and I should be excruciated with thirst. I comforted myself, however, with the thought that I had got so faithful a guide, who, I trusted, would permit me to drink, if he saw that I was fainting in the way. When we had proceeded a little further, behold a beautiful vessel of marble, of the purest white; and when we came up to it, I perceived that it was of one solid stone, perfectly round, and about an ell and a half in height. Within there was an orifice, by which the water flowed out with great force. Now my conductor bade me drink of the fountain; but first I fell upon my knees and gave thanks unto God. I then raised myself up, and drew out water from the fountain in my hand and drank. While I was gazing on the fountain, I saw in the water the image of Christ on the cross, and the wood to which he was affixed, seemed to be firmly inserted in the marble, and the appearance was, as if he was alive. There was an empty space in the fountain, but the water flowed over the cross and the body of our Lord, and rose above it to the height of one and a half or two ells; and when I went to draw out the water and looked into the profundity of the fountain, (for there was no termination to its depth,) I perceived that the waters flowed out of the wounds in the hands and feet and side of Jesus. And the waters were so tinged that their color was such that no ruby could equal the brightness of the red; but on a sudden, they became as clear as crystal. While I stood by this fountain and observed these things, I was affected with such an awe of the present Deity, that I felt myself to be unworthy to touch a drop of that water which flowed through the wounds of the Son of God; and as Peter said, "*depart from me, for I am a sinful man,*" so I fell again upon my knees. Then my conductor, with his right hand seized my right foot, and plunged me in the fountain! O Lord, my God, what was that which now happened to me? For, with my head I struck against the breast of Christ, and came in contact with the great stream which issued from the large wound in his side; and my hands and knees were in opposition with the crucified body on which I leaned, to prevent myself from being sub-merged; and I certainly should have been entirely overwhelmed in the waters, if I had not thus sustained myself. But now this sweet water entered my mouth, my heart, and my whole body, purifying all within and all without me. When I was refreshed with drinking, I raised my head, and felt ashamed that such a sinner should be leaning on such a support; and to be refreshed and invigorated with a drink, of which neither angels nor any creature was worthy to partake. My conductor now received me and drew me out of this fountain of salvation; and asked me whether I had drunk, and whether I was refreshed. But I gave thanks to God the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, for this clemency to me the chief of sinners; I confessed that I was unworthy of so great goodness; yet I dared not,

out of reverence, reproach my guide, because he had precipitated me into the fountain, upon Christ crucified. 'Thus,' said he, 'you know that you have drunk, not from the rivulet, but from the fountain and from the author of the fountain.' When we had rested a little at the fountain, he ordered me to make ready to proceed; I did so, and followed him, and was now able to walk with alacrity, being invigorated exceedingly by the draught of water which I had taken. We now proceeded along the stream into that delightful meadow before mentioned. It now appeared to me to be about the first hour, p. m., and we had been scarce an hour in making our journey. And now there appeared to our view a field so exceedingly long and broad, that it seemed as if the world was included in that field; and it was full of wheat and fruits. 'There,' said he, 'is the place where you must labour—there you must reap.' I answered that I had no objection to labour; nay, that I hated idleness; but that I had never handled a sickle, and that I was utterly unable to reap a single sheaf. He answered, 'you shall be taught what you know not, you shall learn!' When we had come to the entrance of the field, there stood a single reaper, furnished with a sickle, and with robust arms, seemed to undertake the work before him with as much vigor and resolution as if he expected himself to reap this immense harvest. And he had, indeed, in one day, made a great inroad in the field by cutting down the grain. My conductor now said, 'join yourself to him, and you will learn of him, and be assisted.' And I saw that this laborer was a grave man, of mature age, and in appearance resembled my conductor so perfectly, that I began to doubt whether they were indeed two or only one. What needs many words? He took the reaping hook, and reaped several sheaves, thus showing me how the work should be done. The labourer now came near, and expressed his gratification, that he was to be aided by a fellow labourer; and he also showed me how I must take the wheat in my left hand, and how I should use the sickle with my right. I said, 'I take the sickle in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ;' at first the work proceeded slowly, but by degrees, I learned the art of reaping. My conductor stood by, and expressed his approbation of the progress which I made. But when he saw me striving to gather not only the wheat, but the stubble, he said, our Lord has no need of that straw; nothing but the wheat, and the stalk and ears, come into the barn; it will much retard you to save the stubble also. He then took the hook and showed me how to cut off the stalk in the middle, so as to save all the ears. He then restored the sickle to me, and ordered me to leave no useful part of the grain. How studiously did this venerable master lend me his aid, to whom I was now joined as a colleague. And whenever he saw me left behind, he would turn round and assist me in finishing the part which belonged to me. My conductor stood for hours, attentively looking on, to see if we rightly performed our work. When, in the course of our reaping, we reached an elevated ground, I raised myself up, and looked all around, as far as I could see, when I said to my guide, O good God! when shall we be able to reap this infinite harvest? But behold, I see men coming to our aid, sometimes one, and sometimes two, who immediately set in to

reap in whatever part of the field they happen to enter; but what are these few to the infinite harvest which is to be gathered in? Here I seemed to myself to remain several days, with my venerable colleague and governor, engaged with him in reaping; so that I saw that it was possible that by perseverance, the work might in time be accomplished. When we became weary with our labors, we resorted to the rivulet, where he had provided, bread, fish, and roasted flesh, from which we were refreshed; for with the greatest charity he imparted a portion to me. They also who laboured on our right hand and left, drew near to us; and during the whole time, I was so delighted to be in such company, that I seemed to be rather in heaven than on earth. My conductor, on the approach of the first evening, withdrew himself from our sight; and I knew not whither he betook himself, unless it were to attend to other laborers who were reaping in other parts of the same extensive field. The Lord of the harvest did not fail to send us provisions, so that we wanted for nothing, and were free from solicitude; except, that when we surveyed the extent of the harvest, and thought of the approaching winter, we were convinced that some part of the crop would never be secured in the barn; since we who had to gather it in were so few in number. At length I perceived my strength, not only of mind but of body to decline, so that I found I must rest, or sit down in the field. My fellow labourers did what they could to refresh me, and especially my master and governor, to whose service I was attached, encouraged and strengthened me; so that I continued in the field and did not cease to labour, but did what I could. But after a few days, I was greatly reduced; and was, by whom or how I know not, removed to bed, where I lay fatigued and sick. While I thus lay, and with difficulty drew my breath, I looked on my breast, and saw all my flesh to be consumed, so that in my whole body there was nothing left but my skin miserably cleaving to my bones. But under these afflicting circumstances, my mind continued firm, except that I experienced great anxiety that any part of the harvest of such a house-holder should remain unreaped, when the winter approached. While I was agitated between hope and fear on my bed, the person, my most faithful guide, who had extricated me from my perilous condition among the rocks, stood by my bed, and had with him a certain person, in the habit and appearance in which I had often seen Andrew or Philip in paintings. My conductor addressed me with words of consolation, and looked upon me with kind affection; and whilst I was occupied in listening to him—I saw the image of a crucified Christ, on which I had been cast in the fountain, right opposite to my bed, affixed into the wall, of the same appearance as what I then saw, but of a very different quality; for in the fountain the flesh appeared smooth and bright; but here, all the members seemed to be withered up, so that all the bones could be numbered; and the countenance was exceedingly sad. I looked again upon my own breast, which appeared to be nothing but bones covered with skin, and I could scarcely draw my breath, by reason of sickness. Then, that Paul, my guide, struck my breast with his finger, and then pointed with the fore finger of his right hand to Christ, over against

me and said, "*it behooveth thee in all things to be conformed to him.*" By this touch and sight I was awaked out of my sleep, and all my vision was dissipated, leaving in my mind wonderful agitations what it all could mean. Neither did I ever communicate it to any monk, fearing least they would deride me. But I had from the first, the impression that the dream was significant of something. But, O God! how entirely foolish were the interpretations which I put upon it. The rocky desert I thought signified my former secular life; my extrication from this miserable state, I interpreted to mean my joining the Franciscans; by the harvest, I understood obedience to the rules and institutes of the fathers of the order. But it stood in the way of this interpretation, that in the whole dream I never saw a monk of any kind, nor any monastic works. When I was initiated into the monastic institutions, then truly I entered the desert, and was miserably tempted and vexed by the devil; so that I never experienced less tranquillity of conscience, less sense of the remission of sins, and hope of eternal life, than while under these religious vows. While there, I addicted myself to labors, and to works of supererogation, that I might compensate for my defects by those uncommanded services. I devoted myself to prayers, fastings, singing of psalms, daily masses, &c. I made choice of new patrons among the dead, holy apostles, martyrs, images, confessors, whom I constituted mediators between me and Christ; but through the whole of the seven years, in which I pursued this course I found myself deceived by those things in which I trusted. It would require a volume, if I should relate my conflicts, vigils, thoughts, and perplexities of my theological studies, while I was detained in this labyrinth. While the monks were asleep, I glossed over and reduced to short heads, the whole text of the MASTER OF SENTENCES; and read over the whole twice from beginning to end, through the whole questions and distinctions of the four books. I wrote off with my own hand, the whole of the third part of Alex'r. de Hales, concerning grace, sin, good works, &c., and reduced the whole to summaries. I read also Bonaventura, and Gabriel Biel, and sought every where for salvation, and some firm foundation on which to fix my hopes. I also read some of the more ancient writers, as Augustine, concerning grace and free will, concerning the demerit and remission of sins, concerning corruption and grace; and his Commentary on the Psalms pleased me much. But the dregs of the scholastics blinded me; so that I could understand nothing, except that I was a miserable and condemned sinner; an evil tree, because the fruit was evil, who was destined to be cut down and cast into the fire. The monks made me the reader at the public table, where, for seven years, I read the Bible with Lyra's interpretation, until I had almost the whole of it by heart. It was, however, a sealed book to me. I did, indeed, find pleasure in reading the histories of the patriarchs and the kings, but I made no practical use of them, except as furnishing examples of life. It befell me to be afflicted with a flux of blood, which grew worse, under all the treatment of physicians, by which I was daily afflicted with new wounds. At length I despaired of relief, and was angry with my Creator because

he had made me, and yet had not granted me to be righteous; but permitted me by my evil works to procure for myself eternal punishment. I will say nothing about the doctrine of predestination, by which I was cast down as it were to the lowest hell. And when I went to the other monks for relief and explication of my difficulties, instead of getting what I sought, I involved them in the same perplexities with myself; so that, after a while no one would listen to me. But then the Lord had compassion on me, and on all men, in these last days. In the year 1517, when I was twenty-seven years of age, God sent that man D. MARTIN LUTHER, who in that year published certain "PROPOSITIONS," concerning true repentance, remission and satisfaction for sins. *This was my lord and master.* I immediately perceived that he was the man who was sent to extricate me from this dreadful desert. Immediately God opened my eyes and my ears; yea by him, he guided me to that fountain, and threw me on Christ. In this year 1517, he attached me entirely to himself, in the confession of the doctrine of Christ. Five times the monks proscribed me, and for one half year, they would not permit any one to speak to me; nor would they allow me to write letters or to receive letters from others. They even threatened me with perpetual imprisonment, and to place my living body in a sepulchre, as they did to John Hiltenius. For six years I confessed the gospel among the monks, and whenever I had the opportunity of preaching, I proclaimed the remission of sins and eternal life, to be attained by faith alone; this doctrine I at once understood.

After seven years' crucifixion from the monks, I was perfectly freed from their power, and my body delivered out of their hands; my conscience was before free. In the year 1527, I removed to Lygnoea, and was then sent to Gotha, having been sufficiently driven about in the field of the Lord. But O Lord, I owe every thing to thy tender mercy, I am an unprofitable servant, nor am I able to make the least compensation for these gratuitous benefits. But what recompense can I make to *Luther*, my guide, my master, my governor and my helper? What to his colleague, *Philip*? These, also, as God the Father and Christ, were gratuitously beneficent to me, and I, with avidity made use of their liberality; whatever they published was as honey to me; nay, it was "that bread which came down from heaven, and which giveth life to those who eat it."—And that water of which if any one drinks, he shall never thirst again forever; but "it shall be in him as a well of water springing up to everlasting life." And so with my holy superintendent, the reverend father Luther, the messenger of the Lord, I have laboured in this harvest from the year 1517 till 1546, by the grace of the Lord; and his grace bestowed on me a poor earthen vessel; and in itself worthless, was not in vain.

My dear Paul Eber, as often as Luther paints in his writings, and strongly exhibits the condition of his own conscience and that of others under the papacy, and when involved in the midst of the darkness of ignorance of Christ, so often has he portrayed my exact case; but, indeed I was more miserable than it was possible to represent me. But He who loved the world, and who is rich in

mercy ; and who commendeth his love to us in that while we were yet enemies, he was willing to be reconciled to his enemies by his Son, who loved me and gave himself for me—who died that I might live—who went into the desert that He might be tempted of the devil, that He might deliver me out of all temptation—who rescued me from the kingdom of darkness, and translated me into the kingdom of his dear Son—who having procured reconciliation for me, will much more save me from wrath, and where sin abounded will make his grace much more to abound—who will not impute to us our indwelling sin, provided that it does not reign in our mortal bodies—and who, by his Spirit which raised Christ from the dead, will also quicken our mortal bodies ; so that we may no more walk after the flesh, but may mortify the deeds of the body—and having begun a good work in me, will not cease to perform it until he has finished it, and perfectly destroyed in me the works of the devil, and restored the image of Christ.—Who is able to save the sheep designated by the Father, and who lays them upon his shoulders, when found, and whom none can pluck out of his hands—He, I say, on whose breast I lay in the fountain of the abyss of Scripture and the water of life, by means of Luther, poured through the wounds of the side of the Son of God, and from which by the Spirit I drank to the full, with my very heart and soul—He, I say, who ordered me to be conformed to him in life and in death—He knows what he revealed to me in a dream on a certain night, in the year 1510 ; for that was not a vain dream to me, whatever others may think ; for it has been fulfilled during the thirty-six years which have elapsed since that time. Six of these I was creeping through the desert, not so much after the manner of the world, as of the lowest hell ; for the last thirty or twenty-nine, I have been at liberty, and have laboured with that man of God, in the harvest, towards whom I this day cannot feel sufficient reverence, nor adequately admire ; by whom God brought me back from my wandering, and introduced me into the harvest field, to contend against all the enemies of the truth—who freed me, I say, and preserved me through the whole course of my ministry, which I have now brought to a close ; grieving for nothing more than that I have not laboured more constantly, and that now in consequence of the failure of my bodily strength, I can no longer aid the servants of God in doing his work. I am aware that many have thought that I ought to have aided Luther more with my pen than I have done, by writing books and commentaries ; but I understood that I was called principally to be, as the “ voice of one crying, prepare ye the way of the Lord, and make his paths straight”—I saw that God had by his Spirit, prepared learned scribes, and even endowed, as it were, with tongues of fire ; so that it would have been arrogance in me to undertake to write any thing after such men as Luther, Philip, and Brentius.

In the preceding epistle, I have written the latter part too concisely ; but from the vision so particularly recited, and from the writings of Luther, where he describes the state of his own conscience, and that of others, you will be able to understand in what dreadful darkness we were enveloped ; so that we seemed to be placed in the middle of hell, from which we are now delivered.

I do not wish Luther and Philip to read what I have written :— the whole I have often communicated to them, and they have better things to occupy them : but to others who desire to know, you may communicate them. I am not ashamed of my humility, nor of the Gospel, “ which is the power of God to salvation, to every one that believeth.” And I give thanks to God the Father, who opened my eyes, by the instrumentality of his servant Luther, and by the Holy Spirit, so that I might “ see the glory of Christ as of the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth. And of his fulness have we all partaken and grace for grace.” His grace I will not reject, but am freely willing to glory only in the Lord, that the power of Christ may rest upon me.

Farewell, my beloved Paul, and pray for me, that the will of God the Father may be done.

Salute Philip, Rorarius, Cruciger, Marcellus, Pomerarius, Curio, and all the brethren. The sickness of Lazarus, the friend of Jesus Christ, is not unto death, but for the glory of God the Father ; that by it he may be glorified. We desire not to obstruct the glory of God.

FREDERICK MYCONIUS,

Feb. 21, 1546.

Pastor of the church in Gotha, Thuringia.”

N. B.—The original from which his has been translated, may be found in the *History of the Reformation*, by *Daniel Gerdesius*.

SEMI-GERMAN, GREEK: MR. ENGLÉS'S GREEK TESTAMENT.

IN OUR NOTICES, &c., pp. 46–7, *Jan'y*, 1841, the reader will find the following paragraph :

WE WOULD respectfully but earnestly suggest to the accomplished editor (*I. P. Engles, A. M.*), and the enterprising publishers (*H. Perkins, Phila., and Perkins and Marvin, Boston*), to be more exact, in their next edition of the *Greek New Testament, in the use of the letter Sigma*. In the edition before us, that of 1839, our eye is constantly displeased by the use of ς , instead of σ , in the middle of words ; a use utterly offensive and improper. There are five examples of this impropriety in the first chapter of *1 Timothy* ; two occur in the 8th verse of the 3d chapter ; and they are common in the edition. It is on many accounts a very handsome edition ; and the work should be encouraged by American scholars and divines. A cheaper edition for beginners in the Greek language, is needed. We hope to see the miserable catch-pennies for beginners banished from our schools ; and the Testament restored to its ancient place. And then perhaps, the *Minora* and *Majora*, and such like, will also give place to books which may be read with the hope of getting knowledge as well as learning Greek ; books to be really read, and not to be for an empty show of scholarship, by babbling scraps of treatises and names of the venerable fathers of antiquity. It is wonderful how our schools and colleges allow themselves to bolster up this miserable quackery ; which is a sort of epidemic of the age—in regard to the ancient languages.

¶ In the *Presbyterian* newspaper of January 16, the following article appeared :

For the *Presbyterian*.

POLYMICRIAN GREEK TESTAMENT.

Mr. Editor—In the January number of the “ *Baltimore Literary and Religious Magazine*,” page 46, the following sentences occur : “ We would

respectfully but earnestly suggest to the accomplished editor (*J. P. Engles, A. M.*) and the enterprising publishers, (*H. Perkins, Philadelphia, and Perkins and Marvin, Boston,*) to be more exact in their next edition of the *Greek New Testament, in the use of the letter Sigma*. In the edition before us, that of 1839, our eye is constantly displeased by the use of ς , instead of σ , in the middle of words; a use utterly offensive and improper."

The classical scholar needs scarcely to be informed, that the use of the letter Sigma, which is thus censured as *utterly offensive and improper*, is so far from being a typographical blunder, that it is in exact conformity to a rule adopted by a class of great critics. The passage cited (1 Timothy iii. 8,) will be found to be printed in correspondence with the celebrated editions of Knappius; see his third edition, Halle, 1824. In his prefatory dissertation, this great critic thus lays down the rule:—"Figuram *sigmaticis* quâ minusculis literis scribentes in fine vocum vulgo utimur, *etiam in mediis* vocabulis compositis, quorum prior pars in istam literam desinit, exemplo Reizii et Wolfii, ubique usurpavi, velut in his vocibus: $\epsilon\iota\sigma\epsilon\rho\chi\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$, $\pi\rho\sigma\epsilon\upsilon\chi\eta$," &c.

Nor is this all; the famous Henry Stephens adopted the same practice, (see *Matthiæ*, *Ausführliche griechische Grammatik*, vol. 1, p. 24,) and Wolf's *Præf.* ad *Odys.* 1794, p. viii. et seq.

Enough has been said to show that the lection which appears in Mr. Engles' edition is not a fruit of neglect. Whether this is the best method, is another question, and *adhuc sub judice lis est*; but any editor or printer may feel safe under the shielding precedent of Henry Stephens, Wolf, Reizius, and Knapp.

ALPHA.

[Our correspondent (who is not the editor of the Polymicrian Testament,) might have added, that the celebrated Leipsic edition of the Greek classics, published by Tauchnitz, adopts the same form of the *sigma*, in the middle of compound words, when the former part of the compound ends in that letter.—ED. PRES.]

We are happy to infer from the silence of *Mr. Alpha*, that he approves the principal parts of our paragraph; as from the tone of his article, we judge he would have condemned what he thought was amiss.

The point put at issue by him, is a question of very minute learning; such a question as belongs either to a teacher or a man of leisure; and haply we are neither. So that if we have erred, our fault is, to have too decidedly expressed ourselves. We have looked somewhat more particularly at the matter; and are but the more convinced of the truth and timeliness of our criticism. We said (1), that the use of ς , instead of σ , "*in the middle of words*;" was offensive and displeasing to our eye; (2), that its use in this edition of the New Testament, was not "exact;" and (3), that any such use of it was "improper."

As to the *first* remark, we surely are sufficient judges of what is not pleasing to our own eye-sight; and therefore will say nothing about it. The *second* one, we will notice last. The *third* one, contains that "*other question*,"—as Alpha has it, about which we proceed to make a few statements.

In 1 Timothy iii. 8, there are two instances in which Mr. Engles uses ς , where we think he should use σ ; and as the example involves the principle—let us be excused for examining it. Alpha's defence of its use is, (1), that it is not "*a typographical blunder*;" (2), some "great critics" have done the same. We were doubtful whether it

was or not a mere blunder, though we did not say it was; but since we have more carefully examined the edition, we find that it was not; but still that its use is not 'exact,' in it. We said two things; 1, its use, in this manner is improper; 2, even if proper, it is not exact. We proceed to show reasons for both remarks.

I. *What is the habit of the best scholars?*

1. In WALTON'S POLYGLOT, London, 1657, tom. v., p. 824,—1 Tim. iii. 8, the two disputed words are both spelt with σ , and not s ; thus: $\omega\sigma\alpha\upsilon\tau\alpha\varsigma$ and $\pi\epsilon\sigma\iota\chi\omicron\upsilon\tau\alpha\varsigma$.

2. In the *Polyglot of ARIAS MONTANUS, Antverpiæ, Philippi II. &c.*, tom. v. p. 407,—the σ , and not the s , is again used in both words, in 1 Tim. iii. 8.

3. *Sacra Biblia Hebraice, Græce, et Latine, cum annotationibus FRANCISCI VATABLI, &c.* Ex officina Commeliniani, 1616, tom. vi. *in loc*; again we have the σ , and not the s .

4. Alpha says, "the famous Henry Stephens, adopted the same practice;" that is, the practice condemned by us. We have before us a New Testament, in Greek, with two Latin translations; printed "Anno. MDLXV., *Excudebat HENRICUS STEPHANUS, &c.*" It is *Beza's Testament*, probably the original edition corrected by his own hand: as the dedication to Elizabeth of England is dated, *Geneva, December 19, 1564*. Here we find, in the same disputed words, in the passage, both *Beza* and *Stephens*, with us!

5. In the New Testament of IMMANUEL TREMELLIUS, in Greek, Latin and Syriac, 2 vols. folio (the title page of our copy is lost, but the dedication is dated *Heidelberg, 1568*,) tom. II., p. 595; we are again supported in our criticism, on both words, in the same passage.

6. We have a beautiful Svo. Greek Testament, "Glasguæ, 1750" — "ex optimis exemplaribus inter se collatis," &c., and expressly following *Mill, 1710*. Here also, the spelling is with us, in both words, in 1 Tim. iii. 8.

7. *Novum Testamentum Græce, &c.* "Editionis KOPPIANÆ"—continuavit HEINRICHS; *Gotting, 1828*, vol. vii. p. 55,—*in loc*. Once more we are fully borne out in our criticism.

8. *Novum Testamentum, ad Exemplar Millianum, cum emendationibus, &c.*, GRESBACHII, &c., studio et labore, GULIELMI GREENFIELD, London, 1829.—This is the Greek portion of *Bagster's Polyglot*. Again, we are supported, as to both words, in the same passage, by this remarkable scholar (Greenfield)—as by such and so illustrious names already referred to.

9. JOHANNIS COCCEII, &c., *Opera Omnia, &c.* *Amstelodami, 1701*, tom. vi. p. 158, 1 Tim. iii. 8.—Both the disputed words again written as we have said they should be.

10. GROTIUS (HUGO), *In Novum Testam.* *Amsteladami, 1679*, p. 967, 1 Tim. iii. 8.—This man, commonly called 'the learned,' also fully bears us out.

Now in our poor judgment, a man who has such backing as this, need not scruple to say, that a thing is *improper*;—and if his eye is *offended by it*, he may venture to say that also. And moreover, any innovation, silently insinuated into our literary habits and tastes, under these circumstances, ought, we humbly think, to be resisted,

unless enforced by exceedingly powerful considerations; far beyond saying, it is not a blunder in printing; or adding that the practice is sanctioned by a class of critics.

II. We will now turn to authorities of a more elemental kind: and show that the substitution condemned by us is contrary to the common practice of *Lexicographers*.

1. PETRI MINTERT, &c. *Lexicon Græco—Latinum in Novum Testamentum, &c. Francofurti ad Moenum, 1728*. His mode of writing $\pi\sigma$ and σ s, when prefixed to other words, is to substitute σ for π :—and this not only in the disputed words, but in all, so far as we can discover.

2. JO. CHRISTIANI BIEL, &c. *Novus Thesaurus Philologicus, &c. Hagæ Comitum, 1780*. The facts here are the same as in the case of MINTERT.

3. CHRISTIANI STOCKII, &c. *Clavis Lingua Sanctæ Novi Test. &c. Jenæ 1743*, p. 427, and p. 1086. Here also our criticism is fully sustained by this great scholar.

4. CORNELII SCHREVELII, *Lexicon Manuale, &c.*, studio atque opera, Hill, Entic, Bowyer, Smith; Editio xxii., Petrus Steele, New York, 1825. This old friend and companion of our boyhood, comes forward as a firm witness for us.

5. *The Polymicrian Greek Lexicon to the New Testament, &c.*, W. GREENFIELD, editor of Bagster's Bible, &c., London, 1829. A most competent and decisive witness for us.

6. *A New Greek and English Lexicon, &c.* JAMES DONNEGAN, first American from second London edition, by R. B. PATTON. Boston, 1833. At present we refer only to the use of the *sigma*, adopted by DONNEGAN and PATTON; whose practice is with us. Their rules will be noted under another head.

These are the only Greek dictionaries, in our reach at present; except that printed along with Mr. Engles's Testament, which we will refer to presently; and that of BRETSCHNEIDER, *Leipsæ, 1829*, which is rabid for the new method.

III. Let us next look at a *Concordance* or two.

1. *Concordantiæ Græcolatinæ Testamenti Novi, &c.—Genevæ, 1624*. Editio secunda, folio. This is the work of that famous HENRY STEPHENS, spoken of by *Alpha*. We find him not perfectly exact, in the use of the *Sigma*. But though there are a few instances, in which both the one and the other form is used, apparently indiscriminately; yet his prevailing rule undoubtedly is, to use σ in composition before a vowel, and π before a consonant; as any will see who will consult his Concordance. This is a rule, which is utterly disregarded in Mr. Engles's edition. As to the particular words, upon which we run out this examination, STEPHENS spells both of them as we do. See p. 854 for $\pi\rho\sigma\iota\chi\omicron\rho\tau\alpha\varsigma$, and p. 1004 for $\delta\tau\alpha\upsilon\tau\alpha\varsigma$.

2. *Concordantiæ veteris Testamenti Græcæ, Ebræis vocibus respondentis, &c.*, authore CONRADO KIRCHERO. *Francofurti, 1607*. At the end of the second *vol.*, there is an Index filling 290 quarto pages, giving all the Greek words alphabetically; the body of the Concordance, as its title indicates, having the Greek words arranged under Hebrew words. In this Index there are nine columns of words compounded with $\pi\sigma$; and at the end of it, a collection of

those compounded with δ ; throughout these lists we do not find a single instance in which ϵ is retained in compound words.

3. *Novi Testamenti Græci Tameion, &c.*, ex opera ERASMI SCHMIDII, &c., depromptum a GULIELMO GREENFELD. *Londini*, 1830. This Concordance gives us the result of the labors of STEPHENS, SCHMIDT and GREENFIELD. It is out and out with us, whenever it speaks at all.

4. *Concordantiæ Bibliorum Germanico—Hebraico—Græcæ*, Aupiciis gloriosissimæ memoriæ principis ac Domini D. ERNESTI, &c. Ducis, &c.; a M. FREDERICO LANCKISCH. *Lipsiensi*, 1705. The words $\mu\eta\ \epsilon\iota\sigma\eta\ \pi\omicron\lambda\lambda\acute{\eta}\ \pi\rho\omicron\sigma\iota\chi\omicron\nu\tau\alpha\varsigma$, in 1 Tim. iii. 8, are translated by Luther, nicht Weinsauer. In the concordance under the word *Weinsauer* (with two ffs) the Greek of the disputed passage is given, (at letter c,) and the spelling is as we contend it should be.

IV. A few references of a still more elemental kind, will now be made.

1. *Greek Grammar*, for the use of schools, from the German of PHILIP BUTTMAN. Third edition of the translation. Boston, 1831. The translator is EDWARD EVERETT, late Governor of Mass. Page 6, "REM. 1. The two-fold mode of writing some letters is indifferently used, *with the exception of σ and ς ; σ is only used at the beginning and in the middle of a word, and ς only at the end.*" Upon this a marginal note is added in the following words: "Also, by some modern writers, at the end of a syllable, a distinction, however, which leads to great difficulty, if extended beyond the most familiar compositions, as those with the enclitics and with $\pi\epsilon\delta\epsilon\varsigma$, $\iota\varsigma$, $\iota\varsigma$ and perhaps $\delta\upsilon\varsigma$." This needs no comment. The use is wrong; says the note, some writers, and they modern, act thus, as we have here before us proof; but the text had said, as we do, they do wrong in this; and the note adds, that the practice is likely to lead to great difficulties.

2. NEILSON, in his work on *Greek Idioms*, Dublin, 1810: MIDDLETON, in his, on the *Greek Article*, New York, 1813; and MATTHEII DEVARII, in his, on the *Greek Particles*, Romæ, 1588; all use the mode of spelling contended for by us; so far as we can discover in carefully turning over their respective works.

3. We have already referred to DONNEGAN'S *Lexicon*, edited by PATTON, as one witness for the use of sigma. We now cite it to notice the rules laid down by these scholars, on the point in dispute. See under the letter Σ . "In the end of words the letter is written ς , not σ , so also in compounds with $\iota\varsigma$, $\pi\omicron\varsigma$, and $\delta\upsilon\varsigma$. So also in others, in which the words are complete if separated." Upon this we observe; 1. That the practice of the Dictionary itself is not according to the rule; there are thirty columns of words beginning with $\pi\omicron\varsigma$,—and we believe not one of all the words compounded of it, is spelt by themselves, according to their own rule: there are fourteen columns of words commencing with $\iota\varsigma$, amongst which all compounded of it are spelt against their own rule: there are thirty columns of words beginning with $\delta\upsilon\varsigma$, amongst which all compounded of it, are spelt against their rule. 2. We remark, that while this rule goes much beyond the practice of Stephens, that of Mr. Engles goes much beyond this rule; for he has not only applied

the use to additional particles, such as *ὡς*; but also to words that do not admit of being *separated*, so as to form two complete words of the unchanged parts; as *βλασφημιον*, 1 Tim. i. 13, which is spelt was *ς*.

V. We take leave to add a word or two, about the practice amongst the Germans themselves. Several of their most eminent scholars have been already quoted, as testimony for the use we contend for. Many others might be quoted to the same purport; and then we might add more besides, who are not exact in adopting any rule; nor even in following the one they may have adopted. For example, KUINOEL, in his *Commentarius, &c.*, vol. i., p. 734-5, spells *βλασφημιαν*, and various forms of the corresponding verb four times, in a manner the opposite of that used in 1 Tim. i. 13, by Mr. Engles.—KNAPP, who is quoted by *Alpha*, to justify the use by Mr. E. is not exact himself; thus he spells *προσωπον*, with *ς* on p. 463, of his *Scripti Varii, &c.*, and with *σ* on p. 727 of the same book. GLASSIUS, *Philologica Sacra*, adopts the mode of spelling contended for by us: see tom. i., p. 875. So also ZACHARIA, *Biblischer Theologie, Dritter Theil.*, 311 and 349; and *Fierter Theil.*, 483 and 520, spells as we do.

The state of the fact seems to be about as follows; the great, if not entire mass of English, Scotch, Irish, French, Swiss, Spanish, Italian and Dutch scholars, has always pursued the method we contend for; while the Germans, especially of late years, have been divided—the greater part agreeing with the scholars of all other countries; and still more recently, certain American scholars are beginning to adopt this *Semi-German* Greek. We have received many improvements from German scholars, and that on many subjects. They have sent us a new system of medicine—called Homeopathy; a new system of mental science, called Phrenology; a new system of *man*, under the name of Psychology;—diverse new systems of religion, called Rationalism, Transcendentalism, Pantheism; new systems of Hebrew grammar and pronunciation; and now the beginnings of a new system of Greek printing. For our part, we see little to approve, and much to condemn, in such Germanizing.

VI. Having advanced what appears to us, a full justification for saying that the mode of using sigma was improper—yea, we must think, *utterly improper*; we need say very little, upon the other point; viz., that if the evil practice be adopted, some *exact* rule should be followed. How far will you go in the new method? (1.) Will you follow *Everett's* note on *Buttman*, and confine yourself to the *enclitics*, and the three or four enumerated particles? (See IV., 1, above). This Mr. Engles obviously has not done; for example, he has added *ὡς*. (2.) Will you follow the *rule* instead of the *practice* of *Donnegan* and *Patton*; and limit the practice to the particles stated by them, and the case of separable words? (See IV., 3, above). This Mr. Engles has broken in both parts of it; as the reference will show. (3.) Will you follow the practice of *Henry Stephens*, and change *σ* into *ς*, only before consonants, in the allowed cases? (See III., 1, above). This also Mr. E. has not done; for in that case he would have spelled both the disputed words in 1 Tim. iii. 8, as Stephens did, and as we contend for. (4.) Will you adopt the

sweeping principle stated by *Alpha* from *Knapp*, and use *s* in the middle of all composite words whose former part ends in that letter? This Mr. E. has not done; for instance, in *Luke* viii. 14, he prints *τελεισφογουσι*, which *Bretschneider* derives from *τέλος* and *φίγω*, and prints with *s*, accordingly. (5.) Will you stick to any given principle after adopting it; no matter which principle; will you be *exact*, at least in following your own rule? This Mr. E. seems to us, not to have done. For instance, in 1 *Tim.* i. 13, he prints *βλασφημιον*; but in *Matt.* xxvi. 65, he prints *βλασφημισε* and *βλασφημιαν*. And his practice in the text of the Testament, so far as he uses *s* in disputed words, is contradicted by an opposite practice throughout the *Lexicon* which is bound up with his Testament; and further still, the text of *Greenfield*, whose name is on the title page of the book, above his own, is uniformly, we believe, against the contested use, so often adopted in this volume.

Now let us end this matter where we began it. We lay no particular claims to minute learning. We have no taste for unprofitable studies; no time for such as are merely the curiosities of scholarship. What we said about the *Sigma*, was a very small part of a very unimportant criticism. Mr. *Alpha*, who is said to be one of our leading scholars, berated us rather magisterially about the matter; and what was still less to our taste, settled the affair by a few German names. And the editor of the *Presbyterian*, clinched the whole by some approbatory lines.—The matter at issue though very minute, is this far important, that it involves a considerable, and we think an unjustifiable change in our Greek printing. Besides, both our fairness as critics and our *caste* as scholars, were put somewhat at issue. These are our excuses, first, to our readers, and then to Mr. J. P. Engles, for saying so much on the subject. It is many a day, since we wrote a treatise on a Greek letter: and it will be long, we hope, before we find necessity to write another.

MARGARITE ROMANÆ.

The Second Dive.

I. *Tanta Superbia Ludovicus elatus est, ut absque auctoritate Romana sedis imperatorem se appellaverit*; says *PLATINA*. Horrible pride truly, in that naughty Louis of Bavaria!

II. Celestine III., having set the crown on the head of the Emperor Henry XI., who was kneeling before him; pushed it off again with his foot, to signify, says *Cardinal Barronius*, that the Pope not only had power to confer the imperial dignity on him, but to degrade him again when occasion might require.

III. Innocent III., made a law, that the correction and settlement of the disputes of princes appertained to the pope; and taking advantage of a dispute between Otho and Philip, for the empire, he determined that it was the right of the Pope to decide on the validity of the imperial election, and confirm or reject, at his pleasure. This determination is inserted in the *Decretals*, as a standing law and rule of the court of Rome. (*For much of*

this sort of thing, see *Bland. decad. ii. lib. 6—Decretal, Gregor, lib. i. tit. 6, de Elect. cap. 34.—Hist. du Droit, &c., tom. i. p. 351–5.—Platina, p. 142.—Spanh, p. 1746.*)

IV. Gregory VII., wrote to his legates in France, commanding them to acquaint the French and to enjoin it upon them in his name, that every house should pay *Peter-pence*, annually to Rome, as an acknowledgement, that the pope is their father and pastor.

V. The Emperors of Germany, for ages, at their coronation, took an oath of fidelity to the pope, swearing amongst other things, "to abide by the Catholic faith, and to be faithful protectors of the church; to be subject and faithful to the most holy father in Christ the Pope of Rome, and to the holy, Catholic, apostolic, and Roman church."—*Gratian*, inserts the oath enacted by John XIII., (or if *Joan* be omitted, the XII.,) of the Emperor Otho, and affirms that there are copies of many such oaths in the Vatican library.

VI. The Emperor Frederick, after a war of sixteen years with the Roman see, was reduced so low—that he met the pope at the door of the church of St. Mark in Venice, and in the presence of the senate and people, kneeled down, asked pardon, and adored the pope; who for answer, graciously put his foot on the neck of the Emperor, and repeated the words, "*thou shalt tread upon the serpent and the asp, and trample the lion and dragon under thy feet.*" Frederick made answer, '*Non tibi, sed Petro.*' To which the pope answered, '*Et mihi, et Petro.*'—(*Sigonius, Platina.*)

VII. The indignities heaped on the Emperor Henry IV., by Hildebrand, (Gregory VII.,) are well nigh incredible. He obliged him to come as a penitent, in the depth of winter from Germany into Italy. When he arrived at Canassa, where the pope was, his attendants were excluded, and he alone permitted to enter the place; he was then obliged to remain in the outer court of the pope's palace, for three days, being meanly clad as a penitent, bare-footed in mid-winter, and fasting from morning till night: the pope mean-while regaling himself in the palace, mocking at the unfortunate Emperor, and caressing his mistress, the Countess Matilda, whom he called the daughter of St. Peter. On the fourth day the Emperor was admitted to an audience, and absolved from the sentence of excommunication which had reduced him to his low estate: upon conditions, even more humiliating than his personal disgrace, too long to be here inserted, but the reader will find the whole story in various works; for example, *Sleidan* p. 289, &c. *Lambert Schafnab, de Rebus Germ.* p. 219, &c. *Heiss, Hist l'Emp, tom. i.*

VIII. Gregory the Great, by his power over the infernal regions, brought forth the soul of the Emperor Trajan out of hell, in defiance of all the devils united against him.—(*Jo. Diacon, in vita. Greg. I., l. 2, c. 44.*)

IX. Clement VI., by virtue of his power over the celestial spirits, gave an order, in favour of all such as might die on their pilgrimage to Rome, during the year of jubilee, conceived in these terms; "*we command the angels of Paradise to introduce that soul into heaven.*"—(*See Revis, de Conc, de, Tr. l. 2, p. 251, and l. 1, p. 130.*)

X. Galileo, the famous philosopher, retracted his demonstration that the earth revolved round the sun, rather than be burnt at the

stake. But his *heresy* was considered so great and dangerous, that for having advanced it, he was condemned, even after his retraction, to imprisonment, and to repeat as a penitent, the seven penitential psalms, once a week, for three years.

XI. '*Lord of the Isles*,' is one of the titles formerly assumed by the popes, who claimed all *islands* as being peculiarly the property of St. Peter; we suppose, to dry his nets on. In 1331, Clement VI., gave the Fortunate Islands, now called *Canaries*, to a Spanish Count, (*Don Lewis*); on condition of his paying to the See of Rome, an annual tribute of 400 florins of gold.—Before the second voyage of Columbus, he obtained from the pope a grant of all the lands he should discover, west of a line running north and south from pole to pole, 100 leagues westward of the *Azores*. (*See Glos. Hist. of the Canary Islands.—Account of the Europ. Settle. in Amer. Vol. i. p. 17–18.—Labb. Concl., tom. vi. 1521.*)—Adrian IV., conferred the kingdom of Ireland upon Henry II. of England; saying in his Bull, '*Sane omnes insulas quibus sol justitiæ Christus illuxit, et quæ documenta fidei Christianæ susceperunt, ad jus sancti Petri et sacrosanctæ Romanæ ecclesiæ non est dubium, pertinere.*'—Urban II., by a Bull, gave the island of Corsica to a Bishop of Pisa, assigning the same reason as the ground of right in the act; viz., that all the *islands* of the world belonged to him.—(The reader who has a taste for such studies, will find in the "*Memoires pour servir à l'Histoire de France sous Napoleon*," tom. 4, pp. 30–67 a chapter on Corsicā, which like many others in that remarkable work,—for example, in the same vol., "*chapter xix. Venice*"—and in vol. 6, chap. ii., "*Politique du Divertoire. iv. Revolution de Hollande*," pp. 68–171;—come up to the highest standards of antiquity, as models of history.)

XII. *Magis peccare censetur laicus fornicans, quam clericus adulterans, hoc ratione, quod laicus alio remedio uti possit, quod clerico interdicitur est:* saith Rome.—Cardinal Caso wrote a book in defence of Sodomy; its title is *Le Capitolo del forno*. And Pope Sixtus IV., granted a dispensation for three months in the year, to the Cardinal of St. Lucia.—(*See Jurieu, Apol. pour la Reform.*)

XIII. There are no sects in the bosom of Rome. Let us see. There are Augustines, Carmelites, Mendicants, Franciscans, Dominicans, Cordeliers, Recollects, Capuchins, Penitents, Maturins, Trinitarians, Minimes, Celestines, Servites, Friars of charity, Jesuits, Barnabites, Theotines, Lazarites, Eudists, Benedictines, Bernadines, Brigitines, Cameldules, Monks of Grammont, Fonterraula, Fathers of Christian doctrine, the Oratory, &c. &c. &c. We do not speak of difference in doctrine and practice, such as may accidentally make sects: all these, and many more were by the very rule and foundation of each, a separate sect; and what is more, these sects relate only to the *professed*,—the *regular* priests; and do not embrace the *secular* priests at all. The only thing they agreed in was, holding to the pope, as so were all *Papists*; in which they had surely no advantage of Protestants, as to *unity*;—for all Protestant sects, hold to Christ, and so are *Christians*. The violence of one Protestant sect against another, in the worst of

times, has never surpassed that of papal sub-sects, towards each other. "We shall never have peace," said Voltaire, "till the last Molinist is strangled in the guts of the last Jansinist."

[Continued from page 69.]

M O L I N I S M .

No. III.

III. *The SCIENTIA MEDIA and the doctrine of Congruism.*

ALL Christians agree that God knows all things which are possible, even those which shall never be; and that he knows all things which have been or now are, or which shall hereafter be. Some have called the first sort of knowledge the *science of simple intelligence*, and the second the *science of vision*. The Jesuits admit of a third sort of knowledge *intermediate*, between these two, to which (on account of the position or relation which they assign to it,) they give the name of *Scientia Media*. The use or purpose which they assign to this knowledge, may be expressed thus: they say that God knows by this knowledge what creatures exercising freedom, would do in all possible circumstances in which they can be placed—that he knows it before having determined whether or not they shall ever be placed in such or such circumstances. For example; He knows how a particular individual would act, if He should give him such or such a grace, and that too, before having determined to give him either of the supposed graces. The Thomists have discussed at length, the difficulties attending this system; but upon that subject it is not necessary to enter. The Jesuits, however, suppose that God does not determine the actions of a man, in any given circumstances.—They also suppose that God does not perceive any infallible connexion between those circumstances and the part which the man will take. In fact their idea concerning the *Scientia Media* cannot be conveyed better than by saying, that God *divines* what the man would choose or be pleased to do, if he were placed under such or such circumstances, or if there were given him or were withheld from him such or such a grace.

They make great use of this part of their system, and what is remarkable, they use it for contrary purposes. Sometimes they use it to make their doctrine concerning grace agree with *gratuitous* predestination—and sometimes to make it agree with predestination *not gratuitous*. In other words, they use this part of their system both to *destroy* the doctrine of the *gratuitousness* of predestination, and to *harmonize* their doctrine of grace with *gratuitous* predestination.

To see how this is, it must be kept in mind, that the Jesuits invariably deny that God ever gives grace which is effectual to its object, or (as it has usually been expressed in their disputes with the more orthodox portion of their communion) efficacious by itself—*per se et ab intrinseco efficax*; that is to say, no grace by its proper force, determines the will of man to do well.—Whatever grace

God gives, it may always happen that the recipient of it should refuse his consent to it. They contend that it cannot be otherwise without making grace destroy human liberty. Hence it follows that God can determine nothing upon the future actions of men; for having no grace to give them, the effect of which would be infallible, it may always happen that God has decreed that which would not be done. To meet this difficulty, they resort to this *Scientia Media*, by which He makes trial, so to speak, of the various graces which may be given each individual, and thus ascertains beforehand, the success each would have if it were to be given. That done, He determines to give the individual man such a grace as he foresees, the man will yield his consent to, and he determines not to give him any of those graces to which he foresees that the individual would not yield his consent, if they were to be given. In this way, according to the Jesuits, God accomplishes by every man the good he would have him do; and if it be his will to save him, he pursues the same method with him until the end of his life. It is thus they reconcile their doctrine of grace with gratuitous predestination.

The other use of this system may be understood by supposing God to give graces otherwise than through the medium of the *Scientia Media*—that is, not in pursuance of its dictates touching the success of the graces given or to be given. Upon this supposition, the *Scientia Media* is not brought into connexion with predestination. In other words, if God allows things to take their natural course, (i. e., without respect to congruity between grace and the circumstance of its recipient,) man will determine the success of grace, and in this way the Jesuits ascribe to God just as much and just as little part in the actions and destiny of men as they please.

But what is meant by *Congruism*? Bearing in mind that the *Scientia Media* has for its object the decisions of the human will in all possible circumstances, the arrangements which God makes in consequence of this science or knowledge constitute what is called *Congruism*.

We must dwell a little longer upon this subject, at the hazard of some repetition. It is a fundamental doctrine of the Jesuits, that God does not exercise his omnipotence on the will of man. These doctrines concerning the *Scientia Media*, and *Congruism* were invented for the purpose of explaining how God can accomplish his purposes otherwise than by his power—how he can determine man to will and to do according to his pleasure, and to persevere in so willing and doing until death, without operating upon the will of man by his power. This doctrine, therefore, detracts from the doctrine of God's sovereignty. The Jesuits, however, differ very much in regard to the extent to which God acts through the medium and in the manner described. Some contend for great frequency and extent. Others contend that God acts in this manner only rarely. Suarez, and many others, say that God in this manner fixes the condition of all the elect, and thus causes them infallibly, to attain salvation. However near the doctrine of this last class may approach to the doctrine of gratuitous predestination and effectual grace, the Jesuits, as a body, teach their flocks

real Pelagianism. God, they say, does on his part all he has to do to save us. Nothing remains but for men to do their part, in order to attain salvation. Men are always sure to have grace sufficient for that: so that at last their salvation depends on themselves. Augustine, on the contrary, taught that man is entirely dependent on God—that salvation is wholly of grace—so that the Jesuits, as has been already observed, have two parts to their system. So much of it as has been just now expressed is clear and intelligible, but when they come to discourse concerning their *Scientia Media* and *gratia congrua*, none but the learned comprehend their views. This part of their system serves them to amuse or baffle theologians and to prevent or elude condemnation. It is in fact a disguise in the use of which they are exceedingly adroit. But when we say, that their doctrine is in fact that of Pelagius, we must not be understood as meaning that they exclude the views of Semi-Pelagians. For example, they teach that man has not always grace to do what God requires of him; but they add, that man always has the *necessary aid to ask* for this grace. According to their view, it is not necessary, that the *grace to pray*, should by its *intrinsic efficacy* make them resort to prayer; for the grace of prayer, as well as the other graces, depend for their efficacy or success upon the free will of the recipient. This, then, brings the matter back to their principal dogma, *viz.*, that man is the sovereign arbiter of his own lot.

IV. *The doctrines of the Scientia Media and congruism were invented to disguise Pelagianism.— Origin of the introduction of Pelagian opinions into the society of the Jesuits.*

The Jesuits, as has been said, were not the first inventors of their system. The occasion which led them to embrace it so earnestly, was the reformation. Luther and Calvin had aroused the public mind, and had exposed with great power many of the errors of the Roman Catholic church. These reformers it was necessary to oppose by all means which promised to arrest or in the least retard the progress of their influence. Cardinal Contarenius, who died in 1542—about four years before the death of Martin Luther, speaking of the manner in which the dispute was managed by the Catholics, said, "There are men who hold themselves out as the enemies of the Lutherans and as the defenders of the Catholic faith, and who exceed just limits when they wish to establish the freedom of the human will. They exalt man and take away from the grace of God. From being Catholics they become Pelagians, and do what they can to prevent the extension and the fruitfulness of doctrine which is fundamental, and as it were the root from which the others spring: *Ipsi ex Catholicis Pelagianos se faciunt et ne quod in Christiana religione caput et radix est, propageetur et latius diffundatur impediunt.*" This society of Jesuits was not instituted at the death of this cardinal. In a short time, however, they arose, and almost from the first assumed the character of champions of the faith which the reformers attacked.—(See vol. i. p. 202, of this Magazine). The reformers were accused of teaching errors upon the subjects of man's free will, of the doctrine of

merit and nature of good works. The reformers were accused of denying the doctrine of man's free will. Whether it was so, it is not necessary to our present purpose to enquire; but the Jesuits in opposition to their views, whatever they were, elevated the free will of man so far as to attribute to it a sovereign power over its own acts—a power independent of God in its exercises. The reformers also were accused of teaching that there was no power in man to do good and evil. The Jesuits undertook to establish that man has a power which does not depend upon God. The reformers were accused of making God the author of evil, in order the better to prove that he is the author of good. The Jesuits on the other hand, for fear of making God the author of sin, would not even admit that God is the author of the good which man does. The Jesuits indeed avoid these forms of expression, and so did the Pelagians. But Augustine in his Treatise *de gratia Christi*, proved that such was in substance the doctrine of Pelagius; and the same thing may be proved of the Molinists with equal ease and justness. The Jesuits differ from the Molinists not at all in substance but only in the artifices and subtleties which they mingle with the doctrine.

The Jesuits published their doctrine with great eclat during the last twenty years of the sixteenth century; but they had been a long time preparing to do so. Among those of that body who contributed most towards the promulgation of their system, the most celebrated was Louis Molina; yet he was not the first who advanced these opinions. The inclination of the Jesuits to Pelagianism first appeared in the year 1547, during the sixth session of the Council of Trent. Lainez and Salmeron (Jesuits) were the deputies of the society to that body. They required a change in the fourth canon which affirms the free will of man, while at the same time it asserts the power which God exercises over man's free will. The last proposition these Jesuits wished to have expunged, but the Council rejected their proposition as Pelagian. Ignatius de Loyola was alive at that time, but it does not appear whether he favoured the proposition of Lainez or not. Some have undertaken to prove that he held the doctrine of Thomas. If this be so, Lainez must be considered the author of its introduction into that society. He succeeded Ignatius as general of the Jesuits, but his election was preceded by many troubles. Ignatius died in 1555. Lainez governed immediately after, but was not formally elected till 1558. He died in 1565. At the assembly which elected him, a decree was made touching the manner of teaching theology, which adroitly overturned a regulation which Ignatius had inserted in his constitutions, requiring that the doctrine of St. Thomas should be followed.

As this piece of management is very characteristic of that body, it deserves especial notice. Under the appearance of renewing that rule, that assembly (or perhaps its more influential or subtle members) took care to add "that if thereafter a system of theology should be composed *more suitable to the times* it might be taught in the place of St. Thomas and of the master of sentences, after it should be deliberated upon by such fathers of the society as should

be thought most proper for the purpose, and with the approbation of the general," who was Lainez; he having been just before elected.* This addition, it is true, may be understood in a good sense, if we do not consider it in connexion with the attending circumstances. It is evident, however, from the decree, that changes were in contemplation, and those who thought that the Lutherans could not be successfully combated, except upon the principles of Pelagius, had reference to that system, when they spoke of a *system of theology more suitable to the times*—a system quite at variance with that of Thomas touching grace and free will. We may suppose too, that under these words was concealed the design of a system *less severe* in its morals, and more easy to be reconciled with the inclinations of men.

Thus, then, the general who caused this decree to be made was Lainez. To his judgment the matter in effect was referred, and this was the same person who eleven years before had advanced Pelagian opinions at the Council of Trent. Add to this, the result of the matter; the Jesuits did in fact very soon openly abandon the doctrine of Thomas and embrace Molinism—or to speak more plainly, they abandoned the doctrine embraced by the Roman Catholic church generally, and embraced Pelagianism. This change was much for the worse; for however far the church had departed from the simplicity of the gospel and purity of the faith upon some points, the Thomists as a body held much more of the truth than the Molinists and Jesuits. This is easily discernable from the disputes carried on between the Jansenists and Jesuits. But to resume. These consequences agree so well with the terms of the decree, that their insertion cannot be ascribed to chance. That society laboured almost from its origin to introduce into the Roman Catholic church a more corrupted system of theology than that which had obtained, and it cannot be reasonably doubted that this alteration in the original constitutions of the society was intended for that purpose. Molinism is the execution of the plan originally intended by this decree. Thus the decree which *seemed to renew* the order to teach the doctrines of Thomas, was in reality a signal for abandoning them altogether.

Thus the reader perceives that dissimulation and trick were connected with the origin of this affair,—things commonly resorted to by those who set about the establishment of false doctrines. But in this case duplicity and dissimulation were mingled with the proceeding in a most unusual measure, and the particular stratagem employed in this decree, succeeded so well, that it was very often resorted to afterwards. It gave the Jesuits a taste for this method of proceeding. To give another example. When the most famous

**In theologia legatur vetus et novum testamentum et doctrina Scholastica divi Thomae. Thus far the decree corresponds with the Constitutions of Ignatius. The addition follows: Praelegetur etiam magister sententiarum; sed si temporis decursu, alius autor, studentibus utilis futurus, aut si aliqua summa vel liber theologiae Scholasticae conficeretur, qui his nostris temporibus accommodatior videretur, gravi cum consilio et rebus diligenter expensis per viros qui in universa societate aptissimi existimantur cum quo generalis approbatione praelegatur.*

of the doctors of that society set about combating the doctrines of Thomas, they did it under colour of writing a commentary upon them. Such was Molina's famous work concerning the concord of grace and free will. If you look at the title, it is nothing but a commentary upon *certain articles* of St. Thomas; but if you look at *the articles*, they are those in which Thomas establishes the doctrine which Molina combats. The reputation of Thomas in that church was so great that the Jesuits were constrained to respect his opinions and to seem to follow them, but they knew full well that few persons would be able by their own efforts to discover the contradiction between Thomas and his pretended interpreters. Few are capable of examining things of this sort thoroughly. The mass do not look below the surface. They read the title and conclude that the commentary accords with the text, at least, if it should be denied, it is set down as a doubtful point, about which the learned differ. Thus the Jesuits got rid of the odium of opposing the doctrines of Thomas, and under the pretence of a feigned respect for his authority, tranquilly taught a system opposed to his, and to the generally received opinions of the Roman Catholic church at that time. This Thomas, however, did not deserve the respect which the Dominicans claimed for him. The reformers paid but little deference to his opinion. Indeed one of the reasons which Luther had for declining a trial before Cajetan, the pope's legate, was that Cajetan was a Dominican and a follower of Thomas, whose opinions he could not adopt.

REVIEW OF THE PAMPHLET OF SAMUEL ANNAN, M. D., BY THE VISITATION OF GOD, PHYSICIAN AT THE ALMS HOUSE, AND RULING ELDER IN THE THIRD PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH, BALTIMORE.

OUR time has been so much occupied, that it was not till within a few weeks past we were able to give so much attention to *Dr. Annan*, as to read over his pamphlet published early last autumn.

"*Controversy between the Rev. R. J. Breckinridge, D. D., and Dr. S. Annan. Baltimore, Publication Rooms, No. 7, S. Liberty street, 1840.*" pp. 45. We stop not to enquire what "*Publication Rooms*" these may be; but if the bulk of their publications are like *Dr. Annan's* part of this, their patrons are greatly to be pitied.

This pamphlet purports to contain "the whole of the papers," "in the controversy" above named; and was compiled, and chiefly written by "S. Annan;" whose advertisement, on the second page, dated Sept. 19, 1840—closes with the two following consecutive and apparently irreconcilable sentences. "It is proper to say that this pamphlet would have appeared a month ago, if I could have procured a copy of the correspondence of 1833. My final reply was begun and finished within the last few days."

That "correspondence of 1833"—was between the said "S. Annan" and the senior editor of this Magazine. Copies of part of it were in the hands of the Clerk of Session of the Second Presbyterian church;—the originals so far as written by *Dr. Annan*, having

been returned to him many years ago. The Session Clerk was out of the city, at the time Dr. Annan endeavoured to get the Session Book of the church out of the hands of the clerk's family (for reasons best known to himself;) and as soon as the Session knew he wanted copies, they met, appointed a clerk *pro tem.*, and directed him to notify Dr. Annan of his appointment. After this Dr. A. ordered and got a complete copy of all the letters in the custody of the Session, that ever formed part of "*the correspondence*;"—and then instead of publishing them, as part of "*the whole of the papers*;" he suppressed one out of three letters, gave a short extract only of a second, and after committing a gross and material erasure in the third, published it thus mutilated, as if it were perfect! With such a beginning, it is easy to conjecture where his pamphlet would be likely to end.

We have no time and no inclination, to carry on any controversy about matters not really and permanently important. We are still less inclined to push out, beyond absolute necessity, personal controversy, even with decent men. And even further yet, we have no inclination to return upon matters once already triumphantly settled. And in a case like this, where our adversary is a man destitute either of personal or professional standing, to entitle him to any particular notice from us; where he has been already proved to be unworthy of credit in his statements regarding us; and where he now puts forth a defence which by itself ought to put him beyond the pale of respectable society; we feel that we are committing hardly a justifiable act in staining our pages with his name, or disturbing ourselves or our readers with his wickedness.

It is some extenuation of the impropriety of noticing him any further, perhaps, that he is still a public officer of the Alms House, and as yet is allowed to degrade the name of Ruling Elder in the Presbyterian church. And, it is possibly a further mitigation of it, that our design chiefly is to supply documents he has suppressed, to restore those he has erased and mutilated—and to collate those already published. As to any general argument against the papacy, directed to this new champion of the priests, who though he had solemnly and officially declared he believed the Pope of Rome to be Antichrist, and the church of Rome to be a synagogue of satan; yet did not hesitate to publish (*letter of April 13, 1810*), that "*the Roman Catholic priests were able to defend themselves against ALL assailants*;"—of course, we have no idea of doing any thing so useless. So, as to any particular argument upon any part of the case as made by the Papists against us in the name of Maguire; of course again, we have nothing to induce us to take "S. Annan" instead of his colleague and friend "Col. Maguire;" nor to spend precious time with him *now*, when no doubt we shall have all he can say, on oath, as a witness for "the Colonel"—when his civil suit comes on. Nor still farther, do we see any necessity for any general notice of this 'S. Annan,' even on his own account, since our letter of July, 1840; which the reader will find in the August No. of this Magazine for last year; a letter in reply to which the pamphlet now before us contains nearly eleven pages, of which the larger portion consists of as gross, indecent, senseless abuse—as is commonly seen in print.

There have been three separate occasions of quarrel sought out against us by Dr. A.; occasions remote from each other in time, and entirely unconnected, except in his abiding malignity. The last of the three had its origin in the publication by *Dr. Horwitz*, in the No. of this work for December, 1839, of an article intended to vindicate the Mosaic account of the creation, against the errors of modern geologists, and the glosses of a new school of Hebraists. In reply to this article, Dr. Annan commenced a series in the newspapers; which, it is needless to say, were shallow, pert, and inconclusive, empty of sense and learning, and full of pretension and malevolence. After two of his articles had appeared (one on the 8th, and the other on the 12th of February, 1840)—we published in the No. of this Magazine for March, 1840, a page of observations, on the general question put at issue, in the article of *Dr. Horwitz*; in reply to which, Dr. Annan published in the *Baltimore Post*, a most violent, insolent, and vindictive attack, by name, on the senior editor of this Magazine; gave it such a shape as if possible to prejudice not only all moderate Protestants, but especially the Lutherans, against us; interlarded the attack with his salvos to the Papists; and published it on the very day our trial for libel commenced; he being at that moment, an elder in the Presbyterian church, —a witness in the case to be tried, —a colleague, and from subsequent revelations, most probably a confidential friend of the Papist Maguire, our prosecutor.—Now what will the reader think of this man, when he learns, that he has had the shameless effrontery, in the pamphlet now under consideration, not only to assert, but to publish *ex parte* certificates to prove, that at that very moment, he was carefully making professions of warm personal friendship for us! At the moment he was doing, under a feigned signature, his very best to ruin us; he now produces proof, that he was making professions of warm regard for us, no doubt to selected men, by whom he might, when the time came, prove this part of his conduct: nay, making statements to them, diametrically opposite to his statements before, at that time, and since published!—A more atrocious piece of deceitful malignity, was never, perhaps, fastened upon a human being, by his own blinded folly. And this seems to be the chief attainment this individual has made for himself, in that part of his reply which relates to his last general attack on us. For a full account of the rest of the matter, we refer the reader to our letter to Dr. Annan, in the No. of this work for August, 1840.

The second cause of quarrel sought against us, by this man, was several years before the time alluded to above; in regard to which we refer the reader again to the aforementioned letter. And although it was a matter small in itself, yet it not only proved manifestly, that he was always destitute of all sense of what is becoming in a gentleman; but that he cultivated a spirit of malignant hate and indulged when occasion offered, in extreme personal insolence towards us; and shows clearly, that all our forbearance was not only lost on him, but appears to have been construed into weakness and irresolution. It is most remarkable that in regard to this matter—as well as some others—that admitted of no explanation,—he has for once shown a glimpse of rationality; and kept a profound

silence! That must be truly a bad case in regard to which even his garrulity is silenced; and about which so little excuse can be made, that even his dull sensibilities perceive that nothing but shame is to be expected from stirring it.

We pass now to the original cause of offence, in 1833. And here, as we have said, the object we have in view is to place the documents fairly before the reader, and let them speak for themselves.

It ought to be stated that Dr. Annan rarely if ever attended the meetings of the Session of the Second Presbyterian church, after his original cause of offence. Therefore, he had no idea of the nature of the records made by that body, in his case; and by consequence, supposed himself at liberty to say whatever appeared to him best for his case, in regard to the facts of 1833. For if a difficulty about the facts should arise, he could say, it was only a question of veracity between us and him, and then proceed to cast filth upon us. It should also be said, that when the originals of Dr. Annan's letters were returned to him many years ago, he had no knowledge that the Session Clerk had retained any copy. Therefore, here again, he considered himself perfectly at liberty to say what he pleased in regard to their contents; presuming that any dispute about that matter, must, like the foregoing, resolve itself into a question of veracity between us and him; in regard to which, he might hope to create doubts at least, and have full scope for insolence and slander. Unhappily for him, *the record* was full and conclusive; and "*the correspondence*"—in great part was preserved.—To what shifts they put him, to reconcile his statements with each other, and with the truth, let the reader judge.

In Dr. Annan's letter of June 9, 1840, published in the '*Pilot and Transcript*,'—he gives the following account of the troubles of 1833.

"The next charge of Dr. Breckinridge is, that I left his church by his kind advice, because his family would not employ me as their physician.

"I take it that it will be ruled in the court which regulates the intercourse of society, that the clergy are not exempted from the operation of the laws which govern social life, and that if they expect and desire the countenance and support of any individual, they must treat him with that respect and civility which would be looked for from others. If a minister of religion wishes for the personal and pecuniary assistance of any one, it would be irrational for him to think that he would obtain them, or when got, that he could secure them permanently by means of insult and injury. When Dr. B. came to this city, I thought I had, as an officer of his church, some claims upon him, and naturally supposed that, not being under obligations to any other physician, he would employ me. This I expected as a mark of confidence and friendship. I did not anticipate any pecuniary compensation, because it is not our custom to charge the pastors of congregations for medical services. I have attended in the families of half a dozen pastors, and never made a charge nor presented a bill. I intended to pay my pew rent, and render those services gratuitously, as I have always done. He did not employ me. Of course I felt hurt that I had so little of his confidence and friendship, and no doubt expressed it. I, however, deny that I left his church on that account. I continued a member for eighteen months after he took charge of the congregation; and is it probable that if I had been so grievously offended, I would have remained for such a length of time? On the contrary, I had not the least intention of leaving the church, until I received what I regarded as a public insult from the pulpit on the Sabbath day. One of the gentlemen who usually went round with the bag on the days of the monthly collection, sat opposite to me, and on a

certain occasion he nodded to me, and whispered that I should take his place. I declined, because I did not wish to interfere with the performance of his duty. Some delay occurred in consequence. Dr. B. observed it, jumped up, and in his most peremptory manner, spoke as follows:

"I have always thought it was the duty of the elders to take up the collection. If I have been mistaken, I will take care for the time to come to have persons employed to attend to it, so that it may be performed without delay, and that all things may be done decently and in order in the house of God." If the offence had been ten times greater than it was, the pulpit was not the place to give utterance to such a reprimand. *I wrote him a note the next morning, stating that I would not submit to such an indignity, and that I would prefer quitting the church. He informed me in his answer, that I could not leave his church without his permission and that of the session. I sent him another note, in which I said I would leave his church whenever I pleased. Shortly afterwards he sent two of the elders as a committee of the session to effect an adjustment, and get me to remain. I declined, and gave as my reason, that I found nothing but the most abject submission to his dictation, would enable one to avoid quarrels. This I could not submit to, and it was therefore better, quietly to remove out of his way. In a short time I paid my pew rent and abdicated."*

The Italics in the latter part of the foregoing extract, are ours; and we pray the reader to note carefully the statements these sentences contain. They were written by Dr. Annan, before he knew that the fatal records of his old church session, could be brought to confront him; and while he supposed his correspondence was confined to his own hands.

Let us now hear Dr. Annan, as to those same events, in his final response to us, dated September 19, 1840—written after he had come to the knowledge, so overwhelming to his cause and statements, that "*the correspondence*" had been, in great part preserved, and that an *official record* had been made of much of the case.

"Now, Sir, with reference to my leaving your church, which appears to have irritated your feelings to a degree I could not have believed possible; and it is evident you have never forgiven me for this act of insubordination. The public will easily perceive, if you cannot, that seven years is a long time to remember all the particulars of occurrences which I had no desire to keep in my mind, the unpleasant feelings arising from which I had soon banished, and retained none but those of kindness and friendship for you. *My recollection certainly was, (for I had destroyed the correspondence as no longer of any value) that while I submitted to your lecturing with great meekness, I had acted with promptitude, and left your church in a short time. It seems, however, from my letter to you, of July 17th, 1833, which the reader will find in the appendix, that I had no design of quitting the church, but simply requested permission to decline acting as a member of the session, and for a reason there stated, viz: "to protect myself from a repetition of the public reprimand, which you had thought proper to give to some members of the session the previous sabbath."* I remained a member during eight months subsequent to this dispute, and am now prepared to prove by *William Reynolds, Esq.*, who is known in this city as one of our most respectable merchants, and as president of the Citizens' Bank, what had entirely escaped my memory, until recalled by your letter which I am now answering, and who was at that time, and still is, attached to the third Presbyterian church, that it was in consequence of repeated conversations with him, that I was induced to quit you and unite myself with the *Rev. Mr. Musgrave.*

"I am perfectly willing the reader shall judge from my letter, of my views and feelings at that time. It is obvious I felt myself aggrieved by the manner and matter of your remarks from the pulpit; but that neither the disrespect with which,

as I thought, you had treated me at the first, nor yet this additional insult, were sufficient to make me leave the church. I endured it all very patiently, did not go off until the expiration of eight months, and can now prove that your family not having employed me, had nothing to do with the matter, and that it was very reluctantly, and not until I had been repeatedly pressed, I consented to make the change. I was confident you did me great injustice, and judged of me by yourself, when you brought forward the charge, that I had left your church because your family did not employ me.* The truth is I cared but little about it, as my letter shows. I had merely mentioned it to two or three of the session; was satisfied with preserving a respectful distance from you; and had not the most remote intention of deserting your ministrations."

Here again the Italics are ours; and again we pray the candid reader to compare them with those of the first extract and with the documents that follow. These accounts of the same transaction, contained in these two statements, both made by the same individual, both intended to injure us, and both made through the public press within ninety days of each other; are not only diametrically the reverse of each other; but with perfect composure, their author first abuses us and takes credit to himself for certain alleged conduct of both of us; and then when the facts are shown to be just the opposite of what he asserted, he coolly abuses us again, and again commends himself—for the very opposite of what he had just done before!—Such conduct seems hardly consistent with the notion of the man's having any moral sense.

We will now show precisely the state of the facts in 1833, so far as they were matter of sessional record; and in contrast therewith, Dr. Annan's statement of those facts—before he knew they had ever been made matters of record.

"In the first place let me say there was never but *one correspondence* between us about these troubles; that consisted of two letters on each side, all written in July, 1833, and they all related to your "*injury*" and to your "*public insult.*" That correspondence was laid before the church session on the 6th of August, 1833, (see *Session Book*, p. 66,) the consideration of it laid over: Archibald George and John Wilson appointed "a Committee to wait on Dr. Annan and have a conversation with him."—September 3, 1833. "The Committee appointed to wait on Dr. Samuel Annan, reported that after a conversation held with him, *they obtained his consent to withdraw his letters.* It was ordered, on motion, that the Session clerk hand over the same to Dr. Annan" (p. 69.)—October 1, 1833. "The clerk reported that he had complied with the order of the Session by returning to Dr. Samuel Annan his letters" (p. 69.)—May 6, 1834. "Application was

*You say, "the next charge of Dr. B. is, that I left his church by his kind advice, because his family would not employ me as their physician." Is truth so offensive to you that you cannot copy it from a printed page? This is what I said: "When the traverser settled in this city, as pastor of the second Presbyterian church, Dr. Annan was a ruling elder in it; but taking offence that his pastor's family had not engaged him as their physician (as he avowed) he allowed the matter so decidedly to affect his feelings and behaviour, that to save him from difficulty, and bring an unpleasant matter to a close, the pastor kindly advised him either to give up his unhappy animosity, or if he could not, to seek some other church connexion where his happiness and usefulness would probably be greater. He preferred the latter course." (See *Magazine for June*, 253, note.) Are you not ashamed to pervert the simplest statements in so gross a way? The original sentences on which all this part of the matter rests, are such as these: "It is very manifest that with your present feelings towards me, you can hardly expect to be profited by my poor ministrations; while with your present temper and conduct it would be fully in me to expect any advantage to result to us from your continued connexion with our congregation. But is separation or repentance and return to the exercise of long neglected duties, the proper remedy?" Again: "I am not able to perceive how your connexion with our session can be of the least advantage to you or to us, so long as you neglect every duty incident to that connexion." (*Letter to Dr. Annan of July 19, 1833.*) Now can any thing be plainer than that you have misrepresented both the original facts of 1833 and my statement of them in 1840?—(See *Letter to Dr. Annan, Magazine for August, 1840. Also the Pamphlet under Review*, p. 29.)

made by Dr. Samuel Annan, through George Carson, for a dismissal, to join the third Presbyterian church here, which was granted, and the clerk ordered to give a certificate of the same" (p. 79.)

Now, Sir, look at these frightful records and then read your miserable statements. "This I could not submit to," says Dr. A. He consents to withdraw his letters, says the committee!! "In a short time I abdicated," says Dr. A. From and before September 3, 1833, to May 6, 1834, says the record, Dr. A. remained, pretending to be satisfied and reconciled. Is it probable I would have remained such a length of time, demands Dr. A. The record replies, there was *only one correspondence, one dispute*; that occurred in July, 1833, and you left in May, 1834; which gives just the same number of months, days, and hours, whether you apply them to your "*injury*" or to your "*public insult*;" and your letter of July 17, 1833, says expressly, "I never have made complaints" of the former, till after you made them of the latter!!!—Dr. A. says the insult was *to him*, and gives the *personal* circumstances. His letter of July 17, 1833, says, "the public reprimand" was given to "some members of the session,"—You now say, that you wished to leave the church, for the "*public insult*;" but in 1833, you wrote that you only wished to resign the eldership, and "*would gladly avoid*," "*withdrawing altogether*"!!—Now you say, "I wrote him a note the next morning (after the reprimand), stating that I would not submit to such an indignity, and that I would prefer quitting the church." But the correspondence shows, that your first letter was of a totally different kind; and was so vague, as to the ground of offence, as to be misunderstood; and that you had no wish to quit any thing but the eldership.—You now say, "He informed me in reply, that I could not leave his church without his permission, and that of his session:" whereas my first reply says not one single syllable about your leaving the church at all; but relates to your resigning your office only. You proceed: "I sent him another note, in which I said I would leave his church whenever I pleased;" whereas that second note, a copy of which lies open before me, was intended to open more fully your grounds for wishing to resign your eldership, only; and you therein distinctly say, "*I would prefer continuing a simple hearer in your church*"!! You again say: "*He sent two elders*," &c.: whereas the records of the Session show that I never met that body from July 2, till November 19, 1833; that is from before the date of your first letter to me, till after the return of your letters to you by the session clerk; the fact being, that I was dangerously ill or absent from the city, for nearly four months. "To effect an adjustment, and get me to remain, I declined;" these are your statements. The facts are, you did *not* decline, if their object was that stated by you,—for you remained eight months: and the "adjustment" submitted to you was just this, to take back your letters and behave yourself, or expect to be dealt with; and such was the impression your conduct produced on the minds of the session—that when you asked for a dismissal eight months afterwards—there were very serious difficulties about granting it, and but for my urgent interposition in your behalf, it probably would not have been granted; and was at any rate (unless I greatly err) granted in an unusual and qualified form."

This extract is from our letter of July, 1840, to Dr. Annan; the reader will find it in our August No. for that year. All comment upon such facts is of course useless.

And now let us look at the famous correspondence; at least so much of it, as has survived; for as neither the session clerk nor ourself, retained a copy of his first note opening that correspondence—and as he says he destroyed the originals which were returned to him; we can no longer hope ever to see that letter. The documents which follow—constitute the remaining letters of it.

No. 2.—Letter from Mr. Breckinridge to Dr. S. Annan.

BALTIMORE, July 15, 1833.

The undersigned has received this moment through the post office, Dr. Annan's note of this inst., directed to him, and addressed officially to the moderator of the Session of the 2nd Presbyterian church. If it be Dr. Annan's wish, it will

undoubtedly be my duty to lay the papers before the session. But before doing so, I hasten to suggest several considerations which I hope will induce Dr. Annan to withdraw his note and return to the discharge of his duties as a ruling elder in the 2nd P. church.

1. I have no reason to suppose that the session will grant you leave to decline serving as a ruling elder, for they have recently refused to do this, in a case similar to yours, in this, namely, that the applicant offered no reason for the declinature.

2. There is every reason to believe that a ruling elder cannot put off the exercise of his duties in this way. Consult your form of government, chap. iii. chap. v. and chap. xiii., but especially the 6th section of the xiii chapter, from whence it appears that the office itself is perpetual and cannot be put off; but by deposition; and that the duties of the office can only be declined from these reasons: namely, age, infirmities or official unacceptableness to the majority of the congregation, neither of which can be alleged here.

3. The pushing of this matter on the part of Dr. A., in this form cannot, as it appears to me, possibly result in the accomplishment of the object he has in view, and may end in making what circumstances conspire to make me believe is the real ground of this procedure become a subject of discussion, and therefore of injury I fear, to the cause of Christ, and to Dr. Annan himself. At and before the time of my coming here, Dr. Annan was kind and cordial to me, and interested in and attentive to his duties as a church member and elder. A total change in all these particulars has taken place, of which I make and have made no personal complaint, but which I am authorized from very many circumstances, and from personal communications made to me by two elders of my church, with the kindest intentions towards Dr. Annan, and not perhaps without his knowledge, to say, grew wholly out of a matter purely personal and entirely unfit for public remark, in every sense, namely, the employment, by my family, under providential circumstances, of another member of my congregation to be their family physician instead of Dr. Annan.

Dr. Annan is capable of doing me and my master much service in my congregation by the faithful discharge of his duties as a ruling elder. It would be a source of true satisfaction to me, if he could see his obvious interest here and hereafter, and his sacred obligation also to do this. I hope he will see at least in this communication, which I make under a deep sense of duty, a desire on my part not only to avoid giving pain or offence, but to prevent, if possible, the occurrence of events, out of which both might arise, and that he will see his way clear to withdraw his note, before the next monthly meeting of the session which occurs on the 6th of August, and return to the full exercise of his privileges and discharge of his duties as a church member and ruling elder.

With the kindest wishes, I am your servant for Christ's sake.

(Signed)

RO. J. BRECKINRIDGE.

This paper was laid before the session at a meeting held 6th August, 1833, as per minutes, pages 65 and 66—and has been in my possession as clerk of the session, from that time until 20th June, 1840.—When at the request of Rev'd R. J. Breckinridge, it was loaned to him.

GEO. CARSON.

The foregoing letter is totally suppressed by Dr. Annan; although he had delayed his pamphlet a month to get it; and pledges himself to publish every thing!

No. 3.—Letter from Dr. S. Annan, to Mr. Breckinridge.

JULY 17, 1833.

REV'D SIR,—Yours of the 15th I have received, and in reply have to say that you mistake the reason of my addressing the note of resignation to you as moderator of the session of the 2d Presbyterian church. It is true I did feel myself aggrieved in relation to the circumstance to which you refer, and that it was impossible after what I considered an injury to me in a vital point as regards the things of this world, viz: my very subsistence—that I could have the same cordiality of feeling towards the author of the injury whether unintentional or not. But I know that you had a right to act in this matter as you saw fit, and my determination was to continue a hearer, as long as I was pleased with your preaching, not believing it

to be compulsory on me to perform more of the active duties of a member of the session, than I found compatible with the situation Providence had placed me in. Previously I had made great efforts and some sacrifices, I did not feel myself called upon any longer to make them. I never have made complaints, except merely mentioning the facts to two or three of the session, to account for my absence from their meetings. I sent in my declinature simply on account of the public reprimand which you thought proper to give some of the members of the session on last Sabbath forenoon, which I supposed was intended principally for me; and the only object I had in view was to protect myself from a repetition of it. To what you refer when you say "I cannot possibly accomplish the object I have in view," I cannot imagine.

Although I considered myself very seriously injured in my profession, I harbour no revengeful feelings, and intended to continue a hearer as long as Providence permitted. But, Sir, as you say I cannot remain a member of your church, without also serving as an elder, and that is a point I will not contest, I will even admit it to be so. I suppose I have the privilege of withdrawing altogether and joining any other I may prefer. This I would gladly have avoided [HAVING INCURRED IN THIS CITY ALREADY A SUFFICIENCY OF OBLIQUY—BY LEAVING MR. D * WHEN HE DESERTED THE P. C.] You cannot, however, compel one to like any person, there is *no* possibility of *forcing* the feelings to move in any direction, and your letter is too threatening in its aspect, to win one to love. I have no feelings of animosity, and would prefer continuing a simple hearer in your church. But if you say I must, nolens volens, do what appears to you to be right, although contrary to my own opinions, I must go elsewhere.

Yours.

S. ANNAN.

(Signed)

The original returned to Dr. Annan with No. 1, letter from same, of which there was no copy retained.

This paper with No. 2 and 4 of this correspondence has been in my possession since 6th of August, 1833, up to the present time, when at the request of Rev'd R. J. Breckinridge, they are loaned to him.

GEO. CARSON.

Balto., 20th June, 1840.

On p. 44, of his pamphlet, Dr. Annan has printed the foregoing letter, professedly in full; but with several interpolations, calculated to moderate its tone; and with a most extraordinary and if intentional, most disgraceful erasure. He has *substituted* the words "*Dear Sir,*" for the words "*Rev'd Sir*" in the address; and *added* the words "*very respectfully,*" to the word "*yours,*" in the conclusion. He has *erased the words printed in small capitals placed in brackets as printed above. They are the only words erased from this letter! In order to erase them, he had to stop a sentence where there was no stop, not even a comma; as the reader will see by inspecting the letter. And these erased words contain the clearest possible proof, that we had told the truth and that he had told a falsehood, about our difficulties in 1833; viz., they prove that he did not propose to quit the 2nd P. church; that he had not resolved to do so; that he was not pressed to remain; all of which he has publicly asserted, (letter of June 9, 1840, see Italics of first extract printed in this article)—and we publicly denied; and all of which, this *erased and suppressed* passage shows to have been on his part, a total departure from truth; and on ours an exact conformity with it; for herein he gave a pregnant reason for his conduct, yea a characteristic reason—just such a one as would naturally decide a man of his principles!—Let all honest men judge between us.*

*The Rev. John M. Duncan.—[Ers.]

No. 4.—Letter from Mr. Breckinridge, to Dr. S. Annan.

BALTIMORE, July 19, 1833.

The undersigned has received Dr. Annan's letter of the 17th, and supposes it is proper to say a few words in reply. I regret that Dr. Annan should have taken offence originally, and still more the tenacity with which he perseveres in it, and not less than either—the conduct to which it prompts him, and the temper which induces him to justify it. As to the ground of that offence—I will only say that if any disinterested person in the whole world, who is acquainted with the facts, can be found, who will say that there was the least possible just occasion for offence, I will make whatever atonement that person shall direct.

The ground on which your last letter places your proposed resignation, is different from what I had surmised. But even now it is wholly personal, and what is worse, founded on a mis-statement injurious to me. You say it is simply on account of the "public reprimand," which, as you assert, I gave to "some of the members of the Session on last Sabbath forenoon," and which was, you suppose, intended principally for you. The statement to which I suppose you have allusion, was as nearly as I can remember in words, and exactly in substance, this, that—"I had observed for a short time past, some delay and confusion in taking up our weekly collections, that I felt a deep interest in these collections, because they constituted the principal part of our contribution to several important objects, that I was not sure it was the duty of the elders to take up collections—and if they thought it was not, or from any cause wished to decline it, I had reason to hope, our deacons would do it, that as the elders had heretofore done it in this church, I hoped they would take the subject into consideration, and decide it before next Lord's day, so that all things might be done in order in God's house; and that this suggestion was publicly made, rather than in a meeting of the Session, because many of the elders rarely and some never attended our sessional meetings." Now, Sir, I will not attempt to express the surprise, with which I learn that it is *simply* to protect yourself from the repetition of this or such a reprimand, that you insist on putting off duties, assumed with all the solemnity of ordination vows.

It is only out of a real desire to take away all appearance of evil, that I observe the strange misconstruction you put on the sentence in my last letter, which speaks of the object you had in view. I suppose you had no other object than the one avowed, the reasons contained in my letter, all pointed directly at that, and did and could mean no other matter or thing than your proposed resignation.

As I have neither power nor disposition to *compel* any body to do any thing, it is useless to remark on what you say on that point. But it is due to Christian faithfulness to say, that I am not able to perceive, how your connexion with our Session, can be of the least advantage to you or to us, so long as you neglect every duty incident to that connexion. So that my object could not have been to *force* you to continue an elder in name, but to induce you to do your duty as one in fact.

As to your withdrawing from the church entirely,—that is a matter between you and the Session; by a Sessional act members come into our churches—and by such only can they lawfully go out. And as they come in with reasons, so of course they should go out on reasons. Whether the Session will consider it true in fact, that any other constraint is laid on you to quit the church, than such as deserves to be repented of, is not for me to say. But it is very manifest, that with your present feelings towards me, you can hardly expect to be profited by my poor ministrations; while with your present temper and conduct it would be folly in me, to expect any advantage to result to us, from your continued connexion with my congregation. But is separation from the church or repentance and return to the exercise of long neglected duties the proper remedy?

This correspondence on my part is at an end; and if your resignation is not withdrawn before the time indicated in my former letter, I shall of course according to your request, cause it to be laid before the Session, together with this correspondence, embracing any thing you may wish further to advance,—leaving the whole subject in that case, to take whatever course our excellent Standards may require. That it will be for God's glory, I humbly hope. That it may be for the everlasting good of both you and myself, is my fervent prayer.

(Signed)

RO. J. BRECKINRIDGE.

This paper was laid before the Session at a meeting held 6th of August, 1833, as per Minutes, p, 65 and 66.

This paper is loaned to Rev'd R. J. Breckinridge, at his request.

June 20, 1840.

GEO. CARSON, Clerk.

I do hereby certify that the above are true copies of the letters, with the endorsements thereon, now in the possession of the Session of the 2d Presbyterian church.

J. HARMAN BROWN,

Dec'r 30, 1840.

Clerk, pro tem.

The whole of this last letter, except about five printed lines,—is suppressed by Dr. Annan; for reasons which can hardly fail to occur to every one who reads it.

A more melancholy and detestable exhibition of human weakness and sinfulness, cannot well be imagined. Here is a ruling elder in a church, whose sole original cause of offence against his pastor is proved and confessed to be, that his pastor's *family* preferred to employ another member of his congregation, as their physician. This wrangles in his heart, until his bad passions are so excited that he totally neglects his official duties, and barely goes through those which belong to him as a private member of the church. On the first occasion, that presents itself, and that eight or nine months after the original and unintentional offence; he is prompt to take new offence, refuses all explanation, perverts the truth, and insists on doing an act contrary to the constitution of his church, and that upon grounds absolutely and notoriously false. When repressed by the fear of discipline, he draws back, and pretends to be satisfied; and after waiting eight months, is allowed a dismission to unite with another church, for joining which, he has published not only contradictory but irreconcilable reasons. In his new connexion, he avails himself, after years of separation, and without any new offence, of a favour done him by his former pastor; to insult him with the utmost grossness and insolence. And after seven years of rancour, he finally obtains what seems to be a fair occasion to wreak a vengeance, become only more virulent by long delay. Under the pretext of defending geology, free discussion, and certain gentlemen of the city, he forces a public quarrel upon his former pastor, under circumstances which should have disarmed every manly, much more every Protestant, and most of all every Christian heart; and while pretending, as Dr. Annan says he did, to be his friend—stabs him in the dark under a fictitious signature. And when finally, a decent respect for our good name and for the opinions of mankind, forces us to reply; he dismisses all the obligations of truth, despises even the dictates of common decency, and by assault after assault, forces us to make such exposures—as surely no gentleman could desire to make of another, much less a Protestant minister of an office bearer in the church of Christ.

It is needless to say, that the necessity which has been laid upon us, has been all along most painful; and that it is not less with shame, than with deep conviction, we say, that we see no possibility of excusing nor even of extenuating conduct, so unjustifiable, so malevolent, so uncalled for, and thank God, so unusual.

That such a man should permanently retain the power to injure any one, is a great social evil. That society should be perpetually afflicted by persons of this description, is amongst its greatest calamities. And that the churches of Jesus Christ, should, by the visitation of God, be reduced in the smallest degree, under the guidance and controul of offices like this; is one of the strongest evidences of a laxity of discipline, and a woful deadness of piety.

For our part, we have done what seemed our duty to prevent these evils in the present case; and doubt not, that God, in his own good time and way, will bring his own glorious cause, in this as in all other cases, to open and absolute triumph.—Our great concern is, to be found on his side.

[Continued from page 76.]

THE GOSPEL MYSTERY OF SANCTIFICATION,

By the Rev. Wm. Marshall.—Abridged.

No. IX.

ASSERTION X.—*The comforts of the gospel necessary to Christian obedience contain sufficient grounds of assurance of our salvation—not because we believe we are saved but in a way of immediate trust and confidence. Therefore instead of seeking other methods of peace and holiness we must endeavour to believe or trust on Christ confidently persuading and assuring ourselves according to the Divine declarations, that God freely gives to us an interest in Christ and his salvation according to his gracious promise.*

It is evident that those comforts of the gospel which are necessary to a holy practice, cannot be truly received without some assurance of our interest in Christ—hence it follows that this assurance is very necessary to enable us for the practice of holiness. My present work is to show *what this assurance is, that is so necessary unto holiness, and which I have asserted, we must act in that very faith whereby we receive Christ himself into our hearts even in justifying saving faith.*

The eyes of men have been blinded in this point of assurance by many false imaginations. They think because salvation is not promised to us absolutely but upon condition of our believing in Christ for it, therefore we must first believe directly on him for our salvation, and after that we must reflect in our minds upon our faith, and examine it by several marks and signs, especially by the fruit of sincere obedience; and if upon this examination we find out certainly that it is true saving faith, then, and not before, we may believe assuredly that we in particular shall be saved. On this account they say our salvation is by the direct and our assurance by the reflex act of faith; and that many have true faith and shall be saved who never have any assurance of their salvation as long as they live. They find by Scripture and experience that many precious saints of God are frequently troubled with doubtings whether they shall be saved and whether their faith and obedience be sincere,

so that they cannot see any assurance in themselves; therefore they conclude that assurance must not be accounted absolutely necessary to justifying faith and salvation, least we should make the hearts of doubting saints sad, and drive them to despair.

They account it a manifest absurdity to make assurance an essential part of saving faith, because all that hear the gospel, are bound to saving faith, but they are not bound to believe that themselves shall be saved, for then many of them would believe that which is not declared in the gospel of them in particular; yea, that which is a plain lie, because the gospel shows that many of those who are called, are not chosen to salvation. Another objection against this doctrine of assurance is, that it destroys self examination, produces pride and arrogance, and carelessness of duty, carnal security, and all manner of licentiousness. This maketh them commend doubtfulness of our salvation, as necessary to maintain in us humility, religious fear, watchfulness, searching of our heart and way, diligence in good works and devotion.

In answer to these, I shall first explain what is meant by assurance.

I. It is not a persuasion that we have already received Christ and his salvation, or that we are already brought into a state of grace, but only that God is graciously pleased to give Christ and his salvation unto us;—so that it doth not tend to freed presumption and arrogance in the unregenerate that their state is good already, but only encourages them to come to Christ confidently to be forgiven and sanctified. I acknowledge we may (and that many must be taught to) doubt whether their present state be good, and that we must find out the genuineness of our faith and obedience by self-examination before we can have a well-grounded assurance that we are in a state of grace and salvation already; and that such an assurance of our gracious state is not essential to justifying faith, that hence many saints are without it, many having had it, having lost it, and that we should strive to walk holily that we may attain to it,—especially because such assurance is very useful to our growth and increase in faith and all holiness.

The kind of assurance I speak of, answers not the question, whether I am already in a state of salvation?—There is another great question to be answered, that the soul may get into a state of grace; it is, whether God be graciously pleased now to bestow Christ and his salvation upon me, though I have hitherto been very wicked? We are to persuade ourselves, without reflecting upon any good qualifications in us, that God is ready to receive us graciously into the arms of his saving mercy in Christ, notwithstanding all our former wickedness.—Rom. iv. 25, 36.

II. This assurance is not a persuasion of our salvation, whatever we do and however we live, but of our salvation, through mere free grace in Christ, by partaking of holiness as well as forgiveness, and by walking in the way of holiness to the enjoyment of God. We shall not heartily desire to assure ourselves of such a salvation as this is, if we be not first brought to see our own sinfulness and misery, and to despair of our own righteousness and strength, and to hunger and thirst for sanctifying as well as justifying grace.

Such assurance will not beget pride but rather humility and self-loathing—instead of breeding carnal security it will rather make us fear going aside from Christ, our only refuge and security. Noah had cause to enter into the ark and abide there, with assurance of his preservation, yet he might well be afraid to venture out of the ark because he was persuaded that continuance in the ark was his only safety from perishing in the flood. How can a persuasion of salvation in a way of holiness, breed slothfulness in duty or licentiousness? It doth rather mightily allure and stir us up to be “always abounding in the work of the Lord, forasmuch as we know that our labour is not in vain in the Lord.”

III. This assurance is not incompatible with doubtings in the same soul. Many think there can be no true assurance in those who are troubled with doubtings, and who are yet evidently true believers, and precious saints. True, if this assurance be perfect in the highest degree, it must exclude all doubting, and wherever it exists in any degree, it doth to that degree exclude it. But is there not *flesh* as well as *spirit* in the best on earth? Gal. v. 17—*a law in their members warring against the law of their minds?*—Rom. vii. 23. May not one that truly believeth say, help mine unbelief?—Mark x. 24. Can any on earth say that they have received any grace in the highest degree, and that they are wholly free from the contrary corruption? Why then should we think that assurance cannot be true, unless it be perfect, and free the soul from all doubting? The apostle counts it a great blessing to the Thessalonians, that they had much assurance, intimating that some true assurance might be in a less degree, 1 Thess. i. 5. It is strange if the flesh and the Devil should never oppose a true assurance and assault it with doubtings? A believer may sometimes be overwhelmed with doubts,—yet if he still endeavour to call God Father, and pray that God will give him assurance of his fatherly love, and dispel his fears, such an one hath some true assurance, though he must strive to grow to a higher degree, for if he were persuaded of the truth of God’s love towards him, he could not rationally continue his doubts and fears concerning it as sinful, neither could he rationally pray to God to assure him of that love which he does not believe to exist. If it were well considered that there may be imperfections in assurance as well as in all Christian graces, this doctrine would be freed from much prejudice.

IV. The reason why we are to assure ourselves in our faith that God freely giveth Christ and his salvation to us particularly, is not because it is a truth before we believe it, but because it becometh a certain truth when we believe it. We have no absolute promise in the Scripture that God will give Christ to us in particular, neither do we know it while out of Christ, to be true—but we are bound by the command of God, to believe, that God will save all who believe in Christ, and the Scripture doth warrant us, that by believing that God will certainly save us when we come to Christ, we shall not deceive ourselves in believing a lie, but *according to our faith, so shall it be unto us.*—Matt. ix. 29.

Having thus explained the nature of assurance, I shall now prove that there is and must necessarily be, such an assurance or persuasion of salvation, in saving faith itself.

1st. This assurance is implied in the definition of faith; a grace of the Spirit, whereby we heartily believe the gospel, and also believe on Christ as he is revealed and freely promised to us therein, for all his salvation. Believing on Christ is the same with resting, leaning, staying ourselves on Christ or on God through Christ for his salvation. Believing on Christ for salvation as freely promised to us, must needs include dependence on Christ, with a persuasion that salvation shall be freely given, as it is freely promised. Believing on Christ is not only the condition of our salvation but also the instrument whereby we actually receive it. The soul must have its sufficient support, against fears, troubles, cares, and despair, that it may trust and rest. The right manner of trusting and hoping in the Lord is, by assuring ourselves that the Lord is our God and is become our salvation. Ps. xxxi. 14—xviii. 2—Isa. xii. 2—Ps. xlii. 11.—True hope is grounded in God only, that he will bless us, and thus it is an anchor for the soul sure and steadfast. Heb. vi. 17—19. If you trust on Christ without assuring yourselves at all of salvation by him, you rest on him only as you would on a broken reed; if you would stay yourself on the Lord, you must look upon him as your God, Is. l. 10, as he that dealeth bountifully with you; Ps. cxvi. 7. If it be said we may trust on Christ as the sufficient means of salvation, without any assurance that he will bestow salvation on us, I acknowledge that his sufficiency is a good ground to rest upon, but we must understand by it, not only a sufficiency of power, but also of good will and mercy towards us, for if he have no good will towards us, what more have we to hope from the sufficiency of God than the fallen angels have?

2. Several places of Scripture declare positively that we are to be assured of God's willingness to give us salvation, in that faith whereby we are justified, and saved. Thus, Heb. x. 22, 'draw near with full assurance of faith.' The words of the text clearly teach us to understand this of that act of faith whereby we draw nigh to God—that is, the very faith *whereby the just do live*, v. 38. It must be fall in opposition to all uncertainty as to God's willingness to give us salvation, although we are further to labour for that which is *full in the highest degree of perfection*. This faith is affirmed to be (Heb. xi. 1) the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen. It must contain in it a sure persuasion of the great things in our salvation hoped for, making them evident to the eyes of our mind, as if they were already present in substance, though not visible to our bodily eyes. That faith whereby we are made partakers of Christ, and to be Christ's house, must be worthy to be called *confidence and be accompanied with rejoicing hope*. "Whose house ye are if ye hold fast the confidence and the rejoicing of the hope firm unto the end." Heb. iii. 6, 14. What is confidence concerning any thing, but trusting concerning it, with a firm persuasion of the truth of it? This assurance must be in the act of faith whereby we are justified, for as to that assurance which consists in a well founded persuasion of our being already in a gracious state, it is not absolutely necessary to salvation, and it would be sinful and ruinous for many to believe that they are already in such a state.

3. God giveth us sufficient ground in Scripture to come to Christ with confident faith, at the very first, trusting assuredly that Christ and his salvation shall be given to us, without any failing or delay, however vile and sinful our condition has been hitherto. The Scripture speaks to the worst sinners, as if it were framed on purpose to beget assurance of salvation in them immediately. Acts ii. 39—iii. 26. This promise is universal, that whosoever believeth on Christ, shall not be ashamed. Rom. x. 11, 12. It is confirmed by the blood of Christ who was given for the world and lifted up upon the cross for this very end, that whosoever believeth on him, should not perish but have everlasting life. Jo. iii. 14—16. His invitation is free to any, "if any man thirst let him come unto me." Jo. vii. 37, 39. The promise of salvation upon believing is applied personally and to such as have been hitherto in a state of sin,— "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved." Acts xvi. 31. Should we not disparage the faithfulness of God, if after all his free invitations and promises, we should come to Christ doubtfully, in suspense whether he would save us? It is enough that God hath given us his faithful word that they that believe shall be saved, and none else, and that he absolutely intends to fulfil his word so that none shall find it vain. On this account God may justly cause the promise of this salvation to be made to all and may justly require all to believe on him assuredly for their own salvation, and if they will not, he may justly reject them and severely punish them for dishonoring him by their unbelief. Was it not just in God to consume the Israelites who would not believe his promises, when they had sufficient ground for their faith? "Let us therefore fear, lest a promise being left us of entering into his rest, any of you should seem to come short of it." Heb. iv. 1.

The contrary doctrine, excluding assurance from the nature of saving faith, brings forth many evil fruits. It tends to bereave our souls of all assurance of our salvation and all solid comfort which is the life of religion, and makes us subject to continual doubtings of the love of God towards us.—When once men have lost sight of the right way to assure themselves of salvation, they will catch at any straw to avoid drowning in the gulf of despair. It makes some men unwilling to know the worst of themselves, and prone to think their qualifications better than they are, that they may avoid despair. Some foster their doubting as signs of humility, and yet hypocritically complain of them. Many spend their time in pouring upon their hearts to find out some evidence of their interest in Christ, when they should rather be employed in receiving Christ and walking in him by a confident faith. Thus many believers walk heavily in the bitterness of their souls, conflicting with doubts and fears all their days, and this is the cause why they have so little fervency and courage in the ways of God.—The way to avoid these evils is to get assurance and to maintain it and to renew it on all occasions by trusting assuredly in the Lord.

NOTICES, RECEIPTS, ACCOUNTS, ANSWERS TO LETTERS, &c.

FROM JANUARY 18, TO FEBRUARY 12. *New Subscribers.* Thomas Allen, Winchester, and John K. White of Shepherdstown, Va., names added from Jan'y, '41, and \$2,50 for each paid, by J. N. Bell, Esq'r; and the back Nos. sent.—Jackson Duff, Silver Creek P. O., Madison Co., Ky., from Jan'y, and back Nos. sent, by order of Dr. Price; and we had, as before directed, added the name of Miss J. L.; we are much obliged by the kind expressions and substantial friendship of Dr. P.—Rev'd Wm. D. Howard, Frankford, Pa., by order of Rev'd R. S., and back Nos. sent.—Mrs. Moxley, at Mr. J. J. Fisher's, St. Paul's lane, Balt., and paid \$2,50 for 1841, by H. McE., Esq'r.—Mrs. Hamilton, Market street, Balt., and paid D. Owen for this year.—William J. Bingham, name added from Jan'y, '41, and back Nos. sent, by order of the P. M., Hillsboro', N. C.—Rev'd Nicholas Chevalier, Christiansburg, Va., name added from Jan'y, and back Nos. sent.—Mrs. McKenzie, Baltimore, from Jan'y, 1841.

Payments, Orders, &c. James Lenox, Esq'r, city of New York, \$2,50, for '41.—Frederick A. Schley, Esq'r, Frederick city, Md., \$5, for 1840 and '41.—J. N. Bell, Esq'r, Winchester, Va., \$12,50, for himself and for Messrs. Nathaniel Bent, J. G. Baker, and Thomas Allen, of Winchester, and J. K. White of Shepherdstown, for 1841; being \$2,50 each: many thanks to him.—The Magazine for Jan'y, sent a second time to Mr. Thomas Kiddo and Mr. Arthur Morrow, Pittsburgh, Pa.—Alexander Preston, Esq'r, of Winchester, Ky., \$10, the previous payment mentioned in his letter has been received; and he now is in advance till and including July, 1842.—Rev'd Dr. Phillips, of New York city, \$5, for 1839 and '40.—H. Cassel, of Kentucky, \$2,50 for one year's subscription; per Rev'd Mr. Hart.—Received from Mr. Martien of Philadelphia, the sums paid him by Rev'd John Dorrence, and Rev'd H. R. Wilson of Pa., and Rev'd J. C. Coit, and Mr. J. F. Matheson of S. C.; and have credited their respective accounts.—H. McElderry of Baltimore, 2,50 for '41.—Magazine from May to December, 1840, sent Rev'd Mr. Woods, Lewistown, Mifflin Co., Pa.—October, December 1840, and Jan'y, 1841, to William Adger, Esq'r, Charleston S. C.—Dr. E. Stradwick, O. F. Long, Rev'd Robert Burwell, Hillsboro, N. C. \$2, 50 each for 1841, by the hands of the P. M.—Dec'r No. re-sent to the Rev'd J. A. Lyon, Rodgersville, E. Tenn.—J. Kelso, Esq'r., Balt. Co., \$2,50 for 1841.—Rev'd W. Finney, Hareford Co., \$2,50 for 1840.—J. H. Allen, Esq'r, Lexington, Ky., \$10, which pays till the end of 1842.—Rev'd S. Chase, Watertown, N. Y., \$3, by the hands of H. Mattison, which pays for '41, and 50 cents over.—Col. Daniel Breck of Ky., by the hands of Hon'ble John White, member of Congress, \$15 on account.—Dr. A. Sayre, Lex. Ky., \$10, which pays till the end of 1842.—Messrs. George and Hays, of Balt., paid to D. Owen, for John Dunn, Esq'r, of Petersburg, Va., \$5, which pays to the end of '41, and leaves 50 cents to his credit.

Changes Discontinuances, &c. &c. Rev'd J. Butts, direction changed from Amelia Co., Va., to Red Mills, Putnam Co., New York.—Horace Walker, Yale College, Conn., discontinued.

THE PAPAL CONTROVERSY, seems to be manifestly gaining the attention of the public. Our various religious newspapers, are apparently becoming convinced that God has indeed revealed his will with great clearness and fulness, in regard to *Antichrist*, and that those who desire to be found faithful, and to declare the *whole* counsel of God, cannot be silent on this subject. A number of secular newspapers have also opened their columns, to the great and important subject; and amongst the rest and very recently, the Baltimore *Saturday Visitor*, whose editor has avowed the purpose of devoting two columns a week, for one year, to this subject; and several papers on either side, have already appeared; the papal Archbishop, acting by a couple of his priests, having furnished the matter on one side, and several Protestant gentlemen, who are highly commended by the editor of the *Visitor*, being responsible for that on the other.—Oral instruction on the subject is also greatly increased, in several of our chief cities. *Philadelphia*, for

example, in which the Protestant clergy and people as a body, have been heretofore peculiarly dead to this subject; seems to be at length roused in some good degree; and several ministers are delivering courses of lectures on Romanism, in the churches of that city. The senior editor of this Magazine, having been called in Providence to the north, for a few days about the middle of January; delivered a lecture in the church of REV'D MR. MACHLIN, and another in that of REV'D DR. WILIE, both of Phila.; and a third by the particular and public invitation of the students of our Theological Seminary, to them at Princeton, New Jersey. He is therefore prepared to speak from personal knowledge, of the deep and anxious curiosity, which seems to be gradually taking possession of the public mind.—The truth, however, is, that *the people* have always felt more than their *teachers*, on this whole subject; and for the last seven years, we have never had opportunity to speak on it publicly, in any part of the country—without having crowds flock to hear; but the churches that have been open to any instruction on the subject—have been exceptions; the bulk of them have been herematically sealed to it—as we and every other pioneer in the cause have, had most full and mortifying experience. There have been, happily, striking exceptions,—as well amongst our newspapers and churches, as amongst the clergy; and amongst the most honourable of the excepted churches, the two we have now mentioned in Phila., have been justly conspicuous.—Let us thank God and take courage. Let us cordially welcome every new combatant, who is really disposed to testify for God's truth, in the solemn, earnest, humble, and fervent spirit of that blessed truth; to our yet small and despised, but increasing ranks.

IN TURNING OVER some old papers, we find three precepts directed to the sheriff of Philadelphia county, dated, May 31, 1838, and commanding him to summon "*Robert J. Breckinridge*," with four others, to "be and appear before the justices" of the Supreme Court of Pa., "to answer—*Miles P. Squire*"—"Philip C. Hay" and "*Henry Brown*;" the two former "of a plea of trespass on the case"—the last for an unknown, as unstated offence. These are the cases brought by the Rev'd Dr. Hay, the Rev'd Mr. Squire, and Judge Brown, against the aforesaid "*Robert J. Breckinridge*," for the enormous crime of voting and speaking for reform in the Presbyterian church, as a private member of the General Assembly in 1837 and 1838. What has become of these cases? Are they still pending, or have they been dismissed? We considered them so perfectly despicable and ridiculous at the time—that we took no heed about them, and had entirely forgotten them. Yet they were as unprincipled as they were absurd; for these men, firmly believing as they said, that they were themselves attached to the only true Presbyterian church, sued us for voting that they were not true members of our church, called by them, both heretical and schismatical; these men, saying they believed in the total independence of the church, haled it before the civil power, for decisions purely spiritual; and professing to love *peace*, sued a *private member* of the Assembly, for the acts of the body!—It is odd, however, that this terrible "*Robert J. Breckinridge*," was the only *private* member sued; those joined with him, being the moderators and clerks of Assembly in the years stated. If the minutes of those two years are consulted, it will be seen, that whatever may have been the influence, real or supposed, for good or evil, of this terrible man, in those monstrous Assemblies; his name does not appear even on a single one of the ordinary *Standing Committees* of either year. Whatever he did, he did as a *private member*; not only absolutely without power, and without office, but even without patronage and without ordinary favour. The blessing of God and the confidence of his peers—was all he had—all he asked; with these, little else is needed; without them, nothing else is effectual.—It is a mournful truth, however, that even the most absolute rejection of power, and total abnegation of place and office cannot save us either from the unreasonable hate of those we are obliged by a good conscience to oppose; nor what is worse, from the mean jealousies, envyings and detractions of those who should only be helpers in our labours and partakers of our joy at their success.

MR. ROBERT WICKLIFFE, of Lex. Ky., spoke in reply to our speech printed in our January number, about a day and a half. He has since published a pamphlet of 55 pp. 8vo., which he calls "*Speech of Robert Wickliffe in reply to the*

Rev. R. J. Breckinridge, delivered in the Court House in Lexington, on Monday the 9th of November, 1840. It is a most vile, low, and in one word, characteristic pamphlet; base, vulgar, false beyond all conception. The speech actually delivered on the occasion intended to be referred to, was bad enough; but this is worse. Such is this man's fatality of falsehood, that the very title page of this speech contains in no less than *four instances*, of either *suggestio falsi* or *suppressio veri*. Thus: the speech was not delivered in *November* at all, it was in *October*: it was not on the 9th of any month, but on the 12th and 13th: it was not on *Monday*, but on *Monday afternoon* about two hours, and *all day Tuesday*: it was not in the Court House, but the Monday part was in the *Court House yard*, and the Tuesday in the house. This is a very fair sample of the speech, so far as its *accuracy* is concerned. As far as we can judge from all we see and hear from the West—this man, is just now, the most universally execrated individual that is, or ever was in Kentucky. In regard to him and to our relations to him and to this speech, we will give a few words by way of extract from letters from western friends—gentlemen of worth and character. One says to us, "Mr. Wickliffe's last speech (the one we are noticing) has generally excited the disgust it deserves. The prevalent opinion is, that he has disgraced himself, by the grossness of his personal abuse, and his utter failure to exculpate himself from having made false charges against you," &c. Another thus: "I do verily think it is the most villainous production I have ever read. He cannot have written it for this people. It must have been put out for those who have neither heard nor read your speech," &c. A third says to us, "As to Wickliffe, I do sincerely advise that you take no farther notice of him. Your speech is read every where, and is a complete triumph. He is generally considered crazy, and if not, is too thoroughly disgraced for notice," &c. These are but specimens.—Now we must say, we have been inclined to think, that this second book ought not to pass without a formal, written refutation; and it is the present inclination of our mind, that duty to ourself, and to the great interests with which this discussion is mixed up, requires of us, a clear and precise reply to this most atrocious libel. In that case, time will be required, and the aid of friends in the West to collect and arrange the proof in the case; which, however, is upon every new point as ample and as overwhelming, as that adduced in our first defence against this unscrupulous old man, who seems half crazy with the unrestrained violence of his horrible passions.—"*A mad dog howling at a star*," is the brief and awful description which a western editor gives of his conduct towards Mr. Clay. Unhappily, he '*howls*' at all possible objects, and is apparently equally '*mad*' against all that stands before him.—We need hardly say, that the author of this new attack upon us, or some of his creatures for him, have taken peculiar pains to make our excellent Archbishop, and his very worthy and learned prelates, and his most faithful flock in this good city, sharers of his triumph and joy,—in this refined and truthful publication. If the worthy gentlemen find any difficulty in circulating the pamphlet, we might, perhaps, aid them; and would assuredly thereby, do ourself service with all decent and honorable persons.

"PAPISM IN THE XIX. CENTURY IN THE U. S., &c., BY ROBERT J. BRECKINRIDGE. *Baltimore: David Owen & Son 2½ N. Gay-st. MDCCCXLI.*" pp. 343, 12mo. This volume is just published, and can be sold to the trade for 80 cents, on the usual time, on application to the publishers. Any person remitting \$5 free of postage to the conductors of this *Magazine*, or to the publishers, will receive six copies of the work, carefully done up and delivered to his order. Our object is, by putting the book at an unusually low rate, to give it a wide and prompt circulation. The edition is only 1000 copies. The work is printed on fine white paper, and done up in muslin with calf backs; similar to the best 12mos. of the Board of Publication of the Presbyterian church.

IN OUR NUMBER FOR DECEMBER, 1840, p. 583, amongst the *NOTICES, &c.*, our readers will remember, and by turning to the page will see a statement, in regard to the action of the *General Assembly's Board of Publication*, with respect to the publication of the *Institutes* of CALVIN, and a *Selection* of the *Prose Works* of MILTON. As far as we know, the Board has taken no notice of what is said about the *Institutes*; but at their meeting in December, they entered up a resolution that there was an "error in fact"—in our statement as

to MILTON, and desired us to correct it. A correspondence, between ourselves and the Corresponding Secretary of the Board, and also the pastor of the first Presbyterian church at Louisville, Ky., followed; which, as far as we can judge, it is not best at this time to publish. We have also carefully examined, copies of the original correspondence between the said pastor and certain officers of the Board, in regard to the proposed publication of the said selection from MILTON'S *Prose Works*. The facts are briefly these: viz., The pastor of the first Presbyterian church at Louisville, wrote to the Corresponding Secretary of the Board, making enquiries and proposals, in regard to the publication by the Board, of such a selection; the money to be provided by his church and congregation. To this letter the editor of the publications of the Board replied in general terms,—the drift of the letter being, that the “*Ex. Committee*,” had considered his letter, and would cheerfully examine the selection when it was made. In reply to this, the pastor, in a letter devoted mainly to another subject added a paragraph or two, in general terms expressing his sense of the objects of the Board, his general consent to the principles stated in the editor's letter; and his general purpose to forward the proposed undertaking. To this letter the editor replied, answering so much of it as had no relation to MILTON; and saying nothing as to the proposed selection. And here the original correspondence dropped. In this state of case, and after many months had elapsed, we had an interview with said pastor in Ky., and communicated to him, our view and sense of the difficulties the first and second Presbyterian churches of Baltimore, and their pastors, had encountered in getting the Board to agree to publish CALVIN'S *Institutes*, at our expense; whereupon, he stated to us the facts as he understood them, and the impression those facts made on his mind, in regard to the proposed publication of MILTON'S *Select Prose Works*. About that time the chairman of the Ex. Com. of the Board of Publication, made the publication to which reference is had, in our notice of December last; and then we thought it our duty to publish that notice; upon the appearance of which, the Board, reviewed the subject, and acted as we have stated in the beginning of this paragraph; and we understand it to be the mind of the members ordinarily composing the Board, though no such vote is recorded, that if they approve the *Selection*, and money is provided, they will publish it; and that this was always their mind. There has, no doubt, been a misunderstanding all around. And as the Board has officially requested us to correct an error; we have tried, simply to tell all the facts, as we understand them; being also willing, if the Board desires it, to publish the entire acts, doings and correspondence in the case—and being extremely glad, that the Board is *willing* to publish a *selection* of the *Prose Works* of MILTON—as well as the *Institutes* of JOHN CALVIN.

THE
BALTIMORE LITERARY
AND
RELIGIOUS MAGAZINE.

VOL. VII.]

APRIL, 1841.

[No. 4.

[For the Baltimore Literary and Religious Magazine.]

A CALM DISCUSSION OF THE LAWFULNESS, SCRIPTURALNESS,
AND EXPEDIENCY OF ECCLESIASTICAL BOARDS.

THE policy, which has so extensively prevailed for the last half century, among all denominations of Christians, of conducting what are called benevolent enterprizes by the instrumentality of Boards, we are fully persuaded, has been adopted by the Presbyterian church in this country, without examination and without reflection. Professing to be regulated in doctrine, discipline and order, by an exclusive regard for the Word of God, and a firm rejection of all human authority in matters of religious faith and practice, it is not a little remarkable that she should yet be so ready to fall in with the current of popular opinion on questions of such momentous importance as those connected with the work of missions foreign and domestic, and the business of training a rising ministry and providing for the diffusion and defence of the truths of the gospel.

In the very midst of her earnest efforts for reformation and for truth—whilst contending against unscriptural doctrines and remonstrating against unscriptural abuses, she forgets her zeal for the Divine authority, and lends her sanction to a system of measures which certainly has no surer foundation than that of prescription, and that not even of an ancient date.

This singular inconsistency may be, at least, partially accounted for by the peculiar circumstances in which the church found herself placed during her great and glorious contest. All reformations are gradual. The evils of ancient abuses do not develop themselves *at once*. The light breaks in upon the mind slowly and feebly at first, like the first beams of morning, and like them, also waxes stronger and stronger, until all darkness is dissipated, and the hidden things of dishonesty are openly revealed. Great principles are clearly apprehended and acknowledged before their application in all their bearings and to their full extent is distinctly perceived. Some prominent corruption arrests the attention, awakens inquiry, and leads the mind to a clear perception of the remedy in some

great truth which had been overlooked or abandoned. And it is not until the remedy has been successfully applied to the pressing evils which first excited the spirit of examination, that a larger application is perceived to be possible or felt to be desirable. Absorbed in one great subject of attention, the mind overlooks all smaller matters, or matters of less immediate urgency.

In our recent contest, one great principle for which the church was so zealously contending, was that of ecclesiastical responsibility. The first enormous and commanding evil of the voluntary societies, which arrested attention and aroused opposition, was their absolute independence of the authority and jurisdiction of the church. For years, consequently, her efforts were directed to the single point that the *church*, as such, should have the control of all the spiritual enterprises of Christian benevolence. It was not a subject of discussion *how* the church could most efficiently conduct these matters in her ecclesiastical capacity—by common consent, it was admitted that societies or specific organizations for the purpose, were indispensably necessary—and the church felt that she would gain her point and secure the desired oversight and control, by placing these societies or organizations under her own supervision. It never occurred to her to discuss the yet farther bearing of the great principle which she was laboring to carry out upon the actual organization of the Boards themselves. It never occurred to her to ask the question whether what she does by an organization unknown to her constitution is really any more done by her in her *ecclesiastical capacity*, than what she did by the voluntary societies. In her anxiety to throw off an abuse of the former system, she overlooked the inherent evils of the system itself, and destroyed nothing but its voluntary character. Her boards are only substitutes for the voluntary societies, and can no more justly be regarded as the *church*, than the Home Missionary Association or the American Education Society. The principle is that these enterprises must be carried on by the church as a visible, organized body—the fact is, that they are conducted by institutions appointed by the church, and not by the church in her ecclesiastical capacity. The church pushed the application of her principle no farther than to the arresting of the operation of purely voluntary societies—it was reserved for less troubled times to carry it out and put her and all her institutions upon the venerable platform of Christ and his apostles.

That time, we trust, has arrived; and we do humbly hope, that the next General Assembly, standing upon the same principles of ecclesiastical responsibility with its illustrious predecessors of 1837 and 1838, and having its attention confined to no single and absorbing evil, will take a wide and commanding view of the whole subject, and make all the changes which are necessary that our church, as such, and without the aid of substitutes and agents, may fulfil all the trust which God has committed to her. We are fully satisfied that the system of Boards and permanent agencies falls very far short of the spirit of our constitution, and so far from being a blessing, will, in the end, prove a deplorable calamity, unless speedily abandoned. We do not object to this system on account of slight and accidental evils which wisdom and experience may remove

without affecting the essential elements of the system itself. Such evils or rather abuses exist. They are to be found in those regulations by which honorary membership is purchased for money, an enormity similar to the sin of Simon Magus, for which he met the rebuke of the apostle; in their tendency to perpetuate themselves; and in the very partial amount of real investigation to which their proceedings are ever subjected. These are objections to the present plan on which our Boards are organized, but they lie not so much against the system itself as against partial and accidental abuses. The objections which have influenced our minds are radical and fundamental. We believe that the system in its essential principles is directly subversive of the Constitution of our church, unknown to the Word of God, and unsupported by any arguments of expediency or necessity which can commend it to the understanding of a Christian man.

I. These positions we shall endeavor to establish in order. First, then; Boards are directly subversive of the form of government embodied in the Constitution of our own church. They involve a practical renunciation of Presbyterianism. The essential features of our ecclesiastical polity are the parity of the clergy—the office of Ruling Elder, and a series of church-courts, rising one above another, and cementing the whole body together as one harmonious whole. “That,” says Dr. Miller, “is a Presbyterian church, in which the Presbytery is the radical and leading judicatory; in which teaching and ruling Presbyters or Elders have committed to them the watch and care of the whole flock; in which all Ministers of the word and sacraments are equal; in which Ruling Elders as the representatives of the people, form a part of all ecclesiastical assemblies, and partake, in all authoritative acts, equally with the Teaching Elders, and in which, by a series of judicatories rising one above another, each individual church is under the watch and care of its appropriate judicatory; and the whole body, by a system of review and control, is bound together as one homogeneous community. Wherever this system is found in operation in the church of God, there is Presbyterianism.” The only permanent officers in the church of God, which our Constitution recognizes, are Bishops, Elders and Deacons—the only courts are Sessions, Presbyteries, Synods, and the General Assembly. These officers and these courts are treated in our Constitution as abundantly adequate to meet all the exigencies of the church, and to do all that God requires her to do in her ecclesiastical capacity. We profess to trace this system to the Scriptures. We believe that it embodies the leading principles of church government established by the apostles of the Lord; and we cannot question its sufficiency without bringing a serious and blasphemous reproach upon the Spirit of inspiration. Whatever, therefore, is not done by Elders and Ministers, assembled in some one of the courts above mentioned, is not done by them as *Presbyterians*. It is only in these courts that we recognize the church as an organized body. Here, and here alone, do we find Presbyterianism.

Now we maintain that the system of Boards gives us a set of officers and a set of ecclesiastical courts entirely different from those of our Constitution.

The Corresponding Secretary and the General Agent of these Boards are neither discharging the peculiar functions of Minister, Elder or Deacon. They certainly are not Pastors, and are just as far from being Evangelists. They do not claim to be ruling elders and much less would they submit to be called deacons in the sense of our book.

What, then, are they? Where are their mixed and heterogeneous functions recognized as devolving upon any single individual from the first to the last of our Constitution? They combine into one discordant whole, some of the duties of every officer acknowledged in our system—they are two-thirds deacons, one-sixth elder, and one-sixth preacher. The duties, and not the name, make the office—you may call them ministers, and ordain them as such, but if they do not discharge constantly and faithfully the duties of Ministers, God assuredly does not regard them in that light, and man should not; and if the church has marked out a routine of service which our Constitution and the Word of God do not sanction as binding upon any single individual, if she has created a new sphere of labor, and appointed men to fill it, she has been guilty of creating new offices and appointing new ecclesiastical officers. The offices under these Boards are not temporary trusts—they are a permanent vocation—just as much so as the pastoral office itself, and they who fill them, live of their employments just as much as ministers of Jesus live of the gospel. They are permanent officers in the church—and they are as perfectly distinct from those of Deacon, Elder and Bishop, as these respectively are distinct from each other. We have no objection to the name Corresponding Secretary, General Agent, or any other mere name; but we do insist upon it, that new offices are made by human authority in the church of God, in which various conflicting duties are brought together, and a discordant whole created, like Nebuchadnezzar's image, of gold, silver, brass, iron, and clay. The temporary business of a secretary or scribe in any public meeting we understand—the temporary agency of a Pastor for a specific purpose we acknowledge to be Scriptural—but the appointing of men to a permanent and standing vocation, in which it is impossible to be faithful in any of the standing offices of the church, we do not understand—for we have not so learned Presbyterianism.

But we object still farther, that the Boards themselves are to all intents and purposes ecclesiastical courts, exercising a power and jurisdiction in the church of God in direct and unavoidable collision with the authority of the courts acknowledged by our standards. It is a common but a very mistaken apprehension that Boards are merely committees, invested with no other power and acting upon no other principle. Committees are usually appointed for one of two purposes, either to prepare and arrange business for the body which appoints them, or to execute some specific trust by the order and direction of the body to which it is responsible. Of the first kind, are the committees of bills and overtures, and the judicial committee appointed by the Assembly at every meeting; and of the latter kind is a committee of Presbytery to install a Pastor, or to receive the testimonials of Ministers from other Presby-

teries, labouring within its bounds. It is clear that in neither of these views can any of the Boards of the church be regarded merely as committees. They neither prepare and digest business for the action of the Assembly—for they do it themselves—nor execute any specific trust according to the direction or command of the body which appoints them. They are confidential agents—acting upon their own suggestions and their own views of expediency and duty, without pretending to wait for positive orders from the General Assembly. They are clothed with plenary power to act and do as to them shall seem most advisable in all matters embraced in the general subject entrusted to their care.

This ample investiture of power renders them to all intents and purposes ecclesiastical courts. They exercise dominion in the Lord's house. To say that this is not their true character, because they are responsible to the General Assembly, would be to deny that the Presbytery is an ecclesiastical court, because it is responsible to the Synod, or to strip the Synod of its true character, because it in its turn, is amenable to the Assembly. The possession and exercise of power, distinguish a court; and as these are found in the Boards by a most unwarrantable perversion of our Constitution, they are promoted to a level with Sessions, Presbyteries, and Synods. Here, then, we have a new system of ecclesiastical order. In addition to Pastors, Elders, and Deacons, we behold General Agents, Corresponding Secretaries and Executive Committees—in addition to the ancient and established judicatories of our church, we behold, as though Christ had left her inadequately furnished for her great work, a mighty system of Boards of equal authority and much wider operation; and already have these institutions become so intolerably arrogant in the exercise of their unlawful dominion, that they speak of the true judicatories of the church as their auxiliaries. They receive reports from Presbyteries and issue their directions, not in the spirit of a servant accounting to his master, but in the style of a feudal Lord to his humble and obedient vassals.

If, then, these institutions are new ecclesiastical courts composed of new ecclesiastical officers, they are not Presbyterian, because no provision is made for them in our Constitution. The rule is universal, that in all positive grants of power, no more can be claimed than is formally conveyed. A Constitution is a system of fundamental laws; whatever is not expressly stated or virtually implied, is understood to be denied.

But we maintain farther, that our Constitution contains acknowledgments of power as vested in our regular courts which is utterly inconsistent with the power vested by the Assembly in the Boards. We will take, for example, the Boards of Domestic and Foreign Missions. These institutions have the whole matter of preaching the gospel to the destitute and ignorant at home and abroad entrusted to their charge. There are two great departments of the missionary work—spiritual and temporal, and the provisions for each of these are made in our book. The power of ordaining the Evangelist belongs exclusively to Presbytery—so does the oversight of him and his charge if he should succeed in gathering a people to the Lord from among the outcasts of ignorance and sin. To the

Presbytery, according to our Constitution, and to that alone, he is immediately responsible. To it he must give an account of his labours; from it he must seek counsel and direction; and in conformity with its requirements he is expected to walk. But with the single exception of the power of ordaining and of instituting actual process for crime or heresy, the entire supervision of missionaries and their work is committed to the Boards—in other words, the power and jurisdiction granted by the Constitution to the Presbyteries are vested by the Assembly in its own creatures. Compare the following grant of power to the Board of Foreign Missions in the 4th article of its Constitution: “To the Executive Committee, &c., shall belong the duty of *appointing* all Missionaries and Agents—of designating their fields of labour—to authorize all appropriations and expenditures of money and to take the particular direction and management of the Foreign Missionary work subject to the revision and control of the Board of Directors.” Here is unquestionably the power of judging of the qualifications of Ministers—their fitness for particular stations, and here is a right conveyed to control and manage and direct their labors. Turn, now, to the Constitution of the church: in chapter 10, section 8, of the Form of Government it is written, “the Presbytery has power to examine and license candidates for the holy ministry—to ordain, install, remove and judge Ministers.” Here the same powers, in part, are evidently granted to two different bodies—in the one case, they are granted by the Constitution, in the other by the Assembly. The Assembly, unquestionably had no right to take from the Presbytery its constitutional authority, and to vest it in any other organization. It has no right to set aside the Constitution for any purpose whatever. The absurdity and confusion of vesting the same powers in different bodies, are not likely to be felt except in cases of collision. If the Board should determine to send out a man as an evangelist, whom the Presbytery pronounced to be utterly unfit for the work, the Board might do it, and leave the Presbytery to lament the existence of a worm slowly eating out the very vitals of Presbyterianism.—And in the same way the power which is delegated to the Board of Education interferes with the exclusive right of Presbytery to receive candidates for the holy ministry, and to regulate their studies during the period of their trials. The Boards introduce a plan of action and a system of operations which our fathers never contemplated since they have made the most abundant provisions for doing successfully and by the regular process of our courts, every thing connected with the real interests of the church which these recent and anomalous institutions undertake to accomplish. It is plain that under the present system so far is Presbytery from being the radical and leading court, which in all Presbyterian churches according to Dr. Miller it is, the Boards themselves are all and all, and the poor Presbyteries are dwindled down into mere auxiliaries—into hewers of wood and drawers of water.

The other department of duty connected with the Missionary work, respects the making of adequate provisions for the temporal support of the Evangelists and their families. For this business it

is supposed that the Presbyteries are wholly unqualified. It has been frequently admitted that while every thing connected with the spiritual aspects of Domestic and Foreign Missions falls appropriately within the province of the Presbytery, there is no adequate arrangement in our book for conducting the pecuniary matters of the various stations with efficiency and success. This we apprehend, is a great mistake. In the first place, the Constitution expressly provides that the Judicatory sending out any Missionary, must support him—(Form of Government, chap. 18.) In the second place, the book provides that our churches should be furnished with a class of officers for the express purpose of attending to the temporal matters of the church, and these Deacons might be made the collecting agents of the Presbytery in every congregation and through them the necessary funds could be easily obtained and without expense. For transmission to foreign parts, nothing would be necessary than simply to employ some extensive merchant in any of our large cities, who for the usual per-centage would attend to the whole matter, or a Committee of Deacons appointed by the Assembly for the purpose. So far, then, as the collection and disbursement of funds are concerned, our Constitution has made the most abundant provisions.

We know of nothing that more strikingly illustrates the practical wisdom of the Divine provision of Deacons as collecting agents in each congregation, than the fact, that after long and mature experience, the American Board has recommended the appointment of similar Agents in each congregation contributing to its funds as the most successful method of increasing its resources. Our book, however, does not confine Deacons to particular congregations. There should be a competent number of them in each particular church, but we insist upon it, that Presbyteries, Synods and the General Assembly should also have the Deacons to attend to their pecuniary matters. Those ordained at Jerusalem were not confined to a specific congregation, but acted for the whole College of Apostles. By entrusting all pecuniary matters into the hands of men ordained under solemn sanctions for the purpose, our spiritual courts would soon cease to be, what they are to an alarming extent, at present, mere corporations for secular business. If all our Boards were converted into mere benches of Deacons, commissioned only to disburse funds under the direction of the spiritual courts, there would be no serious ground of objection to them; but in their present form they are lords and masters of the whole church. They are virtually the head of the church—their will is law—their authority irresistible; and they combine what God has separated, the *purse* and the *keys*.

If the foregoing remarks are well founded, and the whole power which is now lodged in the Boards in reference to every department of their work, whether spiritual or temporal, belongs constitutionally to other bodies, the argument is unanswerable, that these Boards are subversive of Presbyterianism. It is vain to urge that our fathers never contemplated the extended scale of benevolent operations which God, in his providence has enabled us to carry forward. They were men deeply imbued with the Spirit of all grace

—they understood well, for they had faithfully studied the appropriate functions of the church—they had looked narrowly and closely into the nature, arrangement and powers of the system of ecclesiastical action which Christ and his Apostles had established—they felt it to be adequate to all the exigencies of any age or any part of the world, and in the fear of God they endeavoured to construct all things according to the pattern shown to them in the mount. We, however, in the fulness of our wisdom and the enlargement of our views, have constructed a different system; and the question is now forced upon all sound and conscientious Presbyterians, whether they will abide by their ancient, venerable and Scriptural standards, or swear allegiance to the new order of things which has imperceptibly grown up and stealthily stolen upon us.

Independently of the facts that the Boards are ecclesiastical courts, possessing, to a considerable extent, co-ordinate jurisdiction with the Presbyteries themselves, their unconstitutionality will farther appear from the tendency of their practical working to introduce a system of virtual prelacy. The parity of the clergy is a fundamental principle among all Presbyterians. Whatever differences superior piety, learning and talents may make in the *man*, we allow no difference in the *office*. We tolerate no official authority in one minister above another. Our system does not admit it. But the fact is unquestionable that the various officers of our Boards are invested with a control over their brethren, and a power in the church, just as real and just as dangerous as the authority of a Bishop. They constitute a college of ecclesiastical functionaries who determine the character and shape the destinies of the Presbyterian church in these United States of America. Ministers receive commissions from them, and upon them are dependent for their daily bread, and no slavery is more abject than that which grows out of a hopeless dependence upon others for the necessaries and comforts of life. This tie will bind to obedience much more firmly in ordinary cases than the ordination vow of the humble priest, to reverence and obey his superior lord. We will dare adventure the assertion that there is not a Presbytery in the land, which possesses the real power, and which can exercise it so speedily and efficiently as the Corresponding Secretaries and Executive Committees of our different boards. In 1837, we rebuked the operations of the Home Missionary and American Education Societies, not only on account of their irresponsible character, but also on account of the enormous power which they were able to wield against us. And what less power do our own institutions possess? Are they any thing more than substitutes for the voluntary societies possessing the same inherent elements of mischief and disorder if they should ever fall into the hands of bad men?

The following remarks, in confirmation of our own views, we quote from a source entitled to much consideration:

“Our experience teaches us, as reason also shows, that the great effect of these boards is to cast all power into a few central hands, and render them as independent as possible of the action of the Assembly. The notion of any *responsibility* in these boards is a mere figment. Two or three persons control the proceedings of

the Executive Committee : and then when the Board comes to review their doings ; they have become the doings of the *Committee*, and have the weight of that whole body : and for this reason should be as they argue, and are generally confirmed by the Board ; then the same doings are for a like reason, approved in the *Assembly* : and the church, having *Committee*, *Board* and *Assembly* to vouch, of course, approve ; but remotely, A and B, after all, did the thing, and there never was any just or real supervision of their action. These boards with other nominal ecclesiastical operations are all so located and filled, that, in truth, the Presbyterian church is managed, through these contrivances, by about two or three dozen persons, in all its great practical operations. Their efficient managers are as absolute a hierarchy as exists upon the face of the earth ; and if they are the best hierarchy of all—nay even a Presbyterian hierarchy—still let its true nature be distinctly seen and known.—There are, in effect, residing in Philadelphia, about one dozen persons, ministers and laymen who are the real Board of Missions, Board of Publication and Board of Education ; and who have the official power to be largely all the rest if they please." Well and forcibly does the writer add : " Now, is there a man in the whole church who would be content to admit such a result, if it were *nakedly* propounded ? Not one. But interpose a variety of contrivances called Boards, Committees, and what not, and then the whole church very calmly submits to it ; though really the result is nearly the same. Is there a man in the church who believes that any four or five ministers in Philadelphia are at all superior to four or five hundred of their brethren—much less so much so as to justify such a result even if it were otherwise Scriptural, constitutional, profitable, modest or Presbyterian ? Not one." And from the very nature of the case, this undue accumulation of power in a few hands, must always be the practical result of this system. This single fact shows that it is rotten to the core and utterly alien from all our habits, feelings and associations as Presbyterians. The machinery which no human wisdom can put in operation without destroying the official equality of the clergy—which always and inevitably works a few men to the uppermost seats in the synagogue, may answer for Papists and prelatists, but it is death to Presbyterianism. His holiness the pope, may in consistency with his ecclesiastical principles encourage the propaganda as a prodigious engine for the accumulation of all power, but Presbyterians renounce their creed and deny their polity when they lend their sanction to any institutions, even remotely modelled after such instruments of ecclesiastical despotism.

Under this general head of the anti-Presbyterian character of the Boards, we will suggest another consideration which has commended itself very forcibly to our minds.

It appears to us that this whole system involves an abandonment of the great principle that it is the duty of the church, as such, in her ecclesiastical capacity, to conduct every department of the work which the Saviour has committed to her. To this principle the Presbyterian church is pledged—for this principle she earnestly contended through years of darkness, anxiety and apprehension.

In this contest we participated heartily and warmly according to the measure of grace which was given us, and we can see no reason for abandoning it when victory is now within our reach. "We believe," said the Assembly of 1837, in her circular letter to all sister churches—"that if there be any departments of Christian effort to which the church of Christ is bound, *in her appropriate character*, to direct her attention and her unwearied labours, they are those which relate to the training of her sons for the holy ministry, and sending the gospel to those who have it not, and planting churches in the dark and destitute portions of the earth." Here the obligation of the church in her "*appropriate character*" is distinctly admitted and given as one reason for rebuking the various voluntary associations which, without any warrant from God, had taken these matters into their own hands. The question now arises whether what is done by boards is really done by the *church as such*, "*in her appropriate character*," or as Dr. Miller expresses it, in her "*ecclesiastical capacity*?" Are the Boards, in other words, the church? Have they been constituted its authorized rulers by its glorious Head? Do they pretend to exercise dominion in the Lord's house, by a Divine warrant? Are they Sessions, Presbyteries, Synods or Assemblies—the only courts, according to our Constitution, in which we find the church as a visible organization or in her appropriate character or ecclesiastical capacity! Unquestionably not. Then to act by or through them, is not to act in our ecclesiastical capacity. It is to renounce the principle, for which we have struggled for years just at the moment when complete and glorious victory was within our reach. The Boards are *agents*, *confidential agents* for the church, but they are not the church herself. They are no more the *church* than the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions was when the Assembly recommended it to general confidence, and employed it as the medium of its own Foreign Missionary transactions. The only difference in the two cases is the difference between consent and appointment.—She consented to delegate her duties in the one case to an existing institution, and in the other she creates and delegates by the same act. The one is made to her hands and she consents to the exercise of a certain trust by it—the other she makes herself; but the real and only important question is, not who made the institutions, but *what* are they after they are made? And if they are not the church in her appropriate character or ecclesiastical capacity, the plighted faith of the Assembly requires it to abandon them: that faith is pledged that the *church* shall attend to these things and entrust it to no foreign hands. It is vain to reply that the transactions of our boards are really the doings of the church in her appropriate character, because in her ecclesiastical capacity and by her highest judicatory she actually created them, and they act only by the authority which they received from her; so that the power of the Boards is the power of the church turned into a particular channel by her own act. This reasoning establishes nothing more than the confidential agency of the Boards, but does not identify them with our acknowledged ecclesiastical courts any more than a power of attorney identifies the agent with his principal. The church

puts the work out of her own hands under such circumstances, that she can recall it at any moment or superintend to a certain extent the operations of her agents—but still it is these agents who do it in her name and *not she herself*; and her favourite principle is as completely abandoned as if she had left the whole matter in the hands of the voluntary societies. But we maintain still farther, that if that sort of unity which an agency implies could establish the identity of the Boards with the church in her appropriate character or ecclesiastical capacity, she has no right to entrust her own peculiar functions to any agent, no matter how closely connected with herself. The duties of the church are duties which rest upon her by the authority of God. He has given her the organization which she possesses—for the purpose of discharging these duties. She can, therefore, no more throw them off upon others, than a man can delegate to his neighbor the care of his own family and abandon himself to idleness and ease. If our form of church government is such as God prescribed, it is adequate for all emergencies—if our church courts are based upon the platform of the Bible, God requires from *them* the discharge of their peculiar duties, and not from *another*. He appointed *them* for this very purpose, and gave them no authority to shift the responsibility, the heat and burden of the day upon creatures of their own. If the church can delegate one part of her work, she can delegate another. Presbyteries might form boards to receive, license, ordain, install and remove ministers, and it would be as much done by the church in her ecclesiastical capacity as the work of missions and education as now conducted. We can see no conceivable difference in principle between the right to settle Evangelists in foreign lands, or to prescribe their fields of labour, and the right to settle Pastors at home, and if the one can be entrusted to the care of a Board, the other may be also. But if, as it will perhaps be universally conceded, a Presbytery cannot delegate the power of receiving calls to any other body—no more can it renounce the equally important functions growing out of its relations to the Evangelists connected with it. The general introduction of the principle of delegating the power of ecclesiastical courts to any other body whatever, would produce nothing but confusion, mis-rule and mischief; and a principle which cannot be carried out in all its legitimate applications without an entire subversion of all the distinctive features of our ecclesiastical polity, is evidently foreign to our institutions and wholly un-Presbyterian: and yet upon this principle is founded the strange delusion that what we are doing by *our Boards* we are doing as a *church*, in our “*appropriate character*,” or in our “*ecclesiastical capacity*.”

We are aware that it may be said that this reasoning proves too much—that it takes away from any ecclesiastical body the power to appoint committees for digesting business or executing a particular trust as well as the power to organize boards. But the two cases are widely different. A committee even when acting in the name of the body that appoints it, acts by *particular direction*; the body first determines what is to be done, and the committee is nothing but the instrument of execution. The planning, devising and

deciding upon the matter, are not in its hands. It possesses no discretion—it is like the tool in the hands of the carpenter, or a pen in the hands of a scribe. Power is not so much delegated to it as wielded through it by its original possessor. But in the case of Boards, the power is given into their hands—they consult, deliberate and act according to their own wisdom—they possess as truly a real jurisdiction as the Presbyteries themselves, and all this they have received as a *trust*. Here, then, for the purposes specified in their constitution, the power passes from the body appointing them to the bodies appointed. The Boards are not the instruments by which the *Assembly acts* according to its views of duty and necessity, but they stand in the place of the *Assembly*, and wield its powers in their given fields of operation. The difference, then, between executive committees and boards is just the difference between an instrument and an agent—between acting in a particular way and having another to act for you. In the one case the church does act and in the other she surrenders her power of action; and it is against this delegation of the authority which she derived from her Head for specific purposes, that we feel ourselves bound most solemnly to protest as fraught with nothing but mischief and disorder. We insist upon it, that the church has no right to retire from the work of the Lord, and folding her arms in dignity and ease, commission others to do for her what Christ commanded her to do for him. Her instructions are not to see that the work is done, but to do it herself, and she is faithless to her Lord, to her high and solemn obligations, and to a dying world, if she gird not up her loins and buckle on her harness and give herself to active service in the field of the Lord of lords.

II. The argument from the Scriptures against the system of Boards is of course, a very short one to all those who sincerely receive and adopt our standards. If our model of church government is according to the pattern revealed in the mount, whatever is subversive of its fundamental principles must necessarily be unscriptural and destitute of all Divine authority. The great object of a visible church organization or definite system of church government is to put the church in a situation and provide her with all the necessary furniture of officers and means for building up the kingdom of God and extending its conquests throughout the world. When our adorable Redeemer ascended up on high, “he gave some Apostles, and some Prophets, and some Evangelists, and some Pastors and Teachers, for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ.” As under the old dispensation nothing connected with the worship or discipline of the church of God was left to the wisdom or discretion of man, but every thing was accurately prescribed by the authority of God, so under the new, no voice is to be heard in the household of faith but the voice of the Son of God. The power of the church is purely ministerial and declarative. She is only to hold forth the doctrine, enforce the laws, and execute the government which Christ has given her. She is to add nothing of her own and to subtract nothing from what her Lord has established. Discretionary power she does not possess.

Christianity in its living principles and its outward forms is purely a matter of Divine revelation. The great error of the church in all ages, the fruitful source of her apostacy and crime, has been a presumptuous reliance upon her own understanding. Her own inventions have seduced her from her loyalty to God and filled her sanctuary with idols, and the hearts of her children with vain imaginations. The Bible cuts at the very root of this evil by affording us a perfect and infallible rule of faith and practice. The absolute perfection of the Scriptures as a directory to man was a cardinal principle of the reformation, and whatever could not be traced to them either directly or by necessary inference was denounced as a human invention—as mere will-worship which God abhors so deeply that an inspired apostle has connected it with idolatry or the worshipping of angels.

Now the total silence of the Word of God in regard to such contrivances as Boards seals their condemnation. Nay, they are virtually prohibited by those plain directions of the Scriptures in regard to church-government which lead directly to a different system. But, however this may be, it certainly devolves on those who maintain and uphold them to produce the warrant by which they have been formed. No system of measures so important in its results, so solemn in its bearings upon the kingdom of Christ, should be adopted by any denomination of Christians, without the clear and unambiguous sanction of Him who alone is King upon the holy hill of Zion. To our minds it is clear that our Saviour constituted his church with a special reference to Missionary operations, and we shall be slow to believe that the most successful method of conducting them was never discovered until eighteen centuries after his ascension.

The only plausible pretext by which a Scriptural sanction can be pleaded for such institutions, proceeds upon the supposition of a defect in the constitution of the church. It takes for granted that our regular ecclesiastical courts are inadequate for the work, and then upon the general principle that where duties are clearly imposed, the necessary means of compliance are implied, the church bases the right of resorting to such inventions as shall enable her to obey the commandments of God. But before this reasoning can be allowed, the inadequacy of our ecclesiastical constitution should be fully established, and then instead of patching up its defects, our proper course would be to abolish our whole system, and to seek for one which was adapted to our duties and responsibilities. The argument would prove, not that the church possessed a purely legislative power, but that in the first instance she had exercised her declarative power very badly, and had set forth a constitution in the name of the Lord, which, in its fundamental defects, carried along with it, a shocking impeachment of his wisdom. In other words, if Presbyterianism is a total failure, our proper plan is not to bolster a rotten system, but to re-examine the Word of God, correct our mistake, and adopt that plan, whatever it was, which in the hands of the Apostles was eminently successful.

There is another line of argument by which the unscriptural character of these Boards can be fully made out. The foundation

on which the church rests her authority for engaging in the work of missions, is the Saviour's command to preach the *Gospel* to every creature. It is obvious that whatever system of arrangements for accomplishing this purpose, may be adopted, it should give the fullest security that the contributions of the church go to support *nothing but the Gospel*. The people should know the character and sentiments of the Missionaries sustained by their liberality. Otherwise they are not complying with the Saviour's command. But what security do the Boards give? None but the endorsement of the Presbytery or Presbyteries that ordained the Evangelists. The Assembly has virtually declared this to be no security, by requiring every Presbytery to examine Ministers from any other Presbytery coming within its bounds. We do not allow men to preach at home without a better security than we require from them by the present system, when we send them abroad. We therefore leave our churches in fearful uncertainty as to what they are actually sending to heathen lands in the name of the gospel.

It would be well for the church if all her benevolent arrangements were as happily framed for the preservation of truth as they are for the raising and disbursing of money. To maintain, defend and propagate the *truth*, is unquestionably her great business, and money is valuable only so far as it can be rendered subservient to this high purpose. It should never be made the *end* of any system of ecclesiastical action. Nothing but a criminal indifference to the purity of the gospel could ever have reconciled the church to a plan of operations in which there was not afforded the strongest evidence that the nature of the case would admit, that the "word of the truth of the gospel," and that only was encouraged at home and spread abroad into foreign lands. Those who contribute to our boards, do not know and cannot know whether they are sustaining Armenians, Semi-Pelagians or Presbyterians. They do not know, in other words, whether they are building up or pulling down the kingdom of the Redeemer—whether they are obeying a Divine command, or whether they are not. It is idle to say that we must have confidence in all our Presbyteries—the experience of the past teaches us too plainly that we should have no confidence in the flesh, and that Presbyteries are sometimes as mischievous as any other bodies. This difficulty would be obviated by carrying out the provisions of our book. The Presbytery that sends a man *would know him*—the churches within its bounds would know him—and consequently would know what they were supporting. If the Presbytery that sends him should be unable to support him, it can call upon a neighboring Presbytery to which it is perfectly well known, for assistance; and that Presbytery would have full security from its position for the soundness of the man whom it was called on to assist. Such is the spirit of the provisions in the 18th chapter of our Form of Government. The funds thus raised could either be transmitted by mercantile agents of the Presbytery, or by a central Committee of the Assembly, consisting of business men charged only with *executive duties*, and not entrusted with discretionary power.

III. We pass now, in the last place, to consider those motives of expediency and necessity by which Boards and permanent agencies have been commended by their friends, and even by the highest court of the church itself. And at the very outset of our remarks upon this head, we would utterly protest against the principle that expediency is any measure of duty or obligation in the church of God. We acknowledge no laws but the Divine will, and we acknowledge no successful method of ascertaining the will of God, but His own written revelation which we believe to be perfect and adapted as well as designed to furnish the man of God thoroughly for every good work. We can cordially adopt the language of the immortal Calvin, when speaking of the Divine Word, for it is the language of truth and soberness: "Ab se, si deficitimus, ut nuper dixi, quam libet strenuo enitatur celeritate, quia tamen extra viam cursus erit, nunquam ab metan pertingere continget. Sic enim cogitandum est fulgorem Divini vultus, quem et apostolus inaccessum vocat, esse nobis instar inexplicabilis labyrinthi, nisi verbi linea in ipsum dirigamur, ut satius sit in hac via claudicare, quam extra eam celerrime currere." The position that expediency is an adequate guide in any department of religious duty, proceeds upon a principle having a much closer affinity to the atheistic philosophy of Epicurus, especially as developed in modern times, than to the gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ. The Word of God uniformly represents man as blind and ignorant, incapable of seeing afar off, perverted in his judgment, warped in his understanding, seared in his conscience, and mis-guided in his affections; and therefore requiring a heavenly teacher and a heavenly guide at every step of his progress. He has no light in himself in reference to Divine things. He is a child, a fool to be taught and led. Utterly unqualified by the narrowness of his faculties to foresee the future, he cannot tell even what is good for himself all the days of his vain life which he spendeth as a shadow, and much less can he determine upon a large scale what is expedient for the church of God. Surrounded by his natural darkness, he has a light, most graciously bestowed, which penetrates its gloom—even the sure word of prophecy, and to this he is required to give heed. No more uncertain and fluctuating guide can be followed than calculations of expediency depending upon contingencies which no man can foresee, distorted by the conflicting interests of society, and shaped by the visionary impulses of imagination, or the selfish purposes of pride and ambition. If the test of expediency can be introduced in one case, it may in another; and it would be impossible to set limits to the confusion and disorder growing out of the manifold inventions in which it would be found most fearfully prolific. To remove a single chink from the obstructions which bank up a mighty body of waters, is to prepare the way for the desolations of a flood. The only safe principle is the noble principle of Chillingworth, the Bible, the Bible only, is the religion of Protestants. When this great sun arises, all meaner lights retire as the stars disappear before the dawning day. If, then Boards are unscriptural, Christians cannot entertain the question whether they are expedient or not—their doom is sealed. And here we might safely rest the matter. But

as in some minds there is a mystic spell by which they are strangely tied to these inventions of the flesh, as Solomon himself was marvellously led away by the splendid idolatry of the groves, we shall endeavour to show that even in the estimate of a carnal policy the ordinary pleas of expediency or necessity by which they are recommended, are utterly worthless.

1. And, first, they are wholly unnecessary. All that they do is to diminish the sense of responsibility in the real agents by interposing a medium between them and the body to which they must account. The Executive Committees, in point of fact, do the business of the Boards: and it would certainly be wiser to connect them immediately with the Assembly, than to construct a circuitous route by which their transactions shall come to its knowledge.

Boards occupy the same position to our church which voluntary societies occupy in relation to the Christian community in general. But the same necessity which led to the formation of the latter does not exist to justify the continuance of the former. When the spirit of active benevolence and enlarged operation began to be aroused about the close of the last century, those who felt most warmly interested organized themselves into societies for the purpose of enlisting a more powerful and extended co-operation in their schemes of philanthropy and piety. Each member of these societies became a centre of influence in his own community—the warm and zealous advocate of its claims, through whose diligence and industry the slumbering energies of the church were waked up, and the means acquired of successful and animating action. But it is very certain that the Boards are wholly unnecessary for this purpose among Presbyterians. If our churches are asleep, there is a shorter, simpler, safer method of breaking up their slumbers. Let the provisions of our Constitution be carried out in their true spirit, and we need no other centre of influence—no other advocate of philanthropy and duty in any community, than the faithful pastors in our numerous and growing congregations.

Upon any view of the subject which we have been able to take, the Boards strike us as a mere incumbrance. If the present central plan of operations must be continued, abolish the larger body and make the smaller directly responsible to the Assembly. The larger body, the Board, is only in the way—a sort of shelter to the smaller—the Executive Committee—a wall between it and the General Assembly. As to any counsel and advice which the Boards might give, we presume that the wisdom of the Assembly is abundantly adequate to prescribe any directions to its standing committees which they might require or be disposed to ask.

2. The plea, that these institutions concentrate the energies and resources of the church—that they diffuse information in regard to the necessities of a dying world, and the efforts of the church to relieve them is to our minds exceedingly futile. If by the energies of the church is meant its money, we think that this is very far from being a recommendation—but if its prayers and graces and zeal are intended, we cannot conceive how they are concentrated. We cannot understand how God's people are made to take a livelier interest in His work when carried on by foreign hands, than when

conducted by institutions of his own appointment. The convenience of foreign transmissions is the only plausible pretext, and surely the Boards, as such, afford no sort of assistance in this matter. The diffusion of information through the whole church, would be as certain and as expeditious through the one channel as the other.

It has been said, and gravely said, that without some central organization, our evangelists not knowing the efforts of the church, might, many of them, be found together in the same field. In the first place, such ignorance would disgrace an educated gentleman, much more a minister of the gospel; and in the second place, it assumes that these missionaries seek their fields of labour without consulting the special guidance of the Holy Ghost. It is his province to allot men to their different stations as well as to crown their efforts with the desired success; and if at his call, a thousand evangelists should be found upon the same heathen shore, it would be only a token for good.

Our own impression is, that on the score of diffusing religious intelligence among all classes of our church members, a special organization is not so efficient as the regular action of our church courts promises to be. If these benevolent operations were treated by the Presbyteries as a part of their ordinary ecclesiastical business—if the communications of their ministers from abroad, were read and discussed as the documents sent from the churches at home usually are, and the necessities which they disclose of a dying world, made the subjects of special consideration and earnest prayer, the effect upon the church at large, would be incalculably greater than under the existing arrangement in which these things pass in the solemn conclave of a chosen few, and are known no farther than the circulation of a meagre, monthly periodical can make them known.

3. But the great plea which is urged for these institutions is, that without them in the present state of Christian feeling, nothing would be done. No one would put the shoulder to the wheel. If we understand the force of this plea—it recommends the Boards and a system of permanent agencies as an excellent substitute for vital godliness in the churches. Surely if our ministers and congregations were what they should be, something would be done. They would count it all joy to engage in the work of the Lord according to his own appointment. If the spirit of love and zeal does not exist among us, it is vain to offer unto the Lord any other oblation. He will not accept a substitute for the heart. He will pour contempt upon our most splendid enterprizes, and blast with the breath of his mouth our most imposing organizations. The church, the whole church—all the living members of the Redeemer's mystical body, must be awake and active in his service—each in his own particular province; and if our congregations are now asleep, our first step should be to peal the trumpet in their ears, to break their carnal slumbers, and to tell them, in the name of God, that the Master has need of them. Let us take and propose no substitutes for vital piety and active godliness. Substitutes will only increase and perpetuate the evil. But let us lay the axe at the root of the

evil—begin reformation at the right point, and God will smile upon us and bless us. Let the provisions of our system be carried out and sustained in their true spirit, by every Session, every Presbytery, every Synod, and the General Assembly—let a healthful circulation be diffused through all the veins of the Presbyterian body—let the spirit of primitive Christianity pervade and animate the whole mass—then will the righteousness of Zion go forth as brightness, and the salvation thereof as a lamp that burneth—then she will lengthen her cords and strengthen her stakes and enlarge the borders of her tent—then she will feel herself fully equipped by her great commander, for all the battles of her glorious warfare, and in the joy and strength of her revival it will be matter of astonishment and shame that she ever went down into Egypt for help, or called in the carnal principles of the world to fit her for her contests with the powers of darkness.

In conclusion, all that we ask is Presbyterianism—simple, pure, unadulterated Presbyterianism—the regular, uniform, healthful action of our noble system. We oppose no good work—but we cannot go out against the foe unless the Lord go with us, and we can have no reason to expect his assistance when we have trampled his institutions in the dust. When the law goes forth, it must go forth from Zion—and because we have told her towers, and marked her bulwarks, and considered her palaces, and have been fully assured that she is the city of the Lord of hosts, the city of our God, we are resolved neither to rest nor to hold our peace till out of Zion shall go forth the law and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem.

[Continued from page 125.]

MOLINISM.

No. IV.

V. *It is extremely probable that the system of the Jesuits was already formed at the time of the decree of 1558, already referred to.*

It appears that the system of theology *more suitable to the times*, "his temporibus nostris accommodatior," which was to be set forth in a summary or new treatise, was nothing more nor less than a commixture of Pelagianism with more recently invented subtleties. The idea was that to combat the Lutherans with success, they must adopt the principles of Pelagius. But some of their body had the sagacity to see how odious and contrary to the Scriptures and to the opinions of the ancient church, the system of Pelagius was. Hence the inducement to invent the subtle and artificial system of *Congruism* and the *Scientia Media*. The advantage of this system consists in the facilities which it furnished of preserving Pelagian doctrines on the one hand, and of disavowing whenever it should be necessary, the more offensive parts of it. This was all that the Jesuits wanted, and Molina and his associates reduced it to form, —in fact, executed the purpose expressed in the decree of 1558.

The system of Congruism and *Scientia Media* was published by Molina in his Concord of Free Will and Grace, first published at Lisbon, in 1588. In the edition which he published of the same book at Anvers, in 1595, he declared (quest. xiv. art. 3, dispute 53, number 2,) that he had taught that system in public disputes for thirty years. Of course he knew it as early as 1565, which was only seven years after the decree. And he must have known it at that time, several years, or he could not have been able to teach it publicly in the schools. Again; Fonseca, a Jesuit, in his *Metaphysics*, which he published in 1596, (quest. vi., sect. 8,) boasts that he had embraced that system thirty years before. This is enough to convince any one that the Jesuits knew this system at the date of the decree. The inventor, whoever he was, must have indoctrinated the others by degrees. The heads of the society took the system into favour, and every means was adopted to make it generally received in the society. From the time of this decree, the Jesuits have shown their attachment to this doctrine. But passing other proofs, the reader may be referred to the following: Aquaviva was elected general of the Jesuits in 1581. He held that place thirty-four years. He called together six Jesuits whom he affected to take from different kingdoms—Portugal, Spain, France, Austria, Germany and Italy. He gave them a commission to form a Directory of Studies. As soon as they furnished it, he published it in the society, and had it printed at Rome in 1586, under the title *Ratio atque institutio studiorum per sex patres ad id, jussu R. P. Generalis, deputatos, conscripta*. This Directory contains two articles of the greatest importance, which represent to the life, the spirit of the society. Under the appearance of confirming the constitution of the society which adopts the system of Thomas, this Directory permits a departure from it in its most important doctrine: viz., that God moves and determines the will of man as he pleases. The Directory admits this to be the doctrine of Thomas, and yet allows it to be denied; that is, allows the substitution of the doctrine of Pelagius for that of Thomas, on this head. The other article concerns gratuitous predestination. The Directory acknowledges that predestination is gratuitous—that such was the doctrine of Augustine and the fathers, but it adds by way of slur or disparagement, that the fathers laboured about twelve centuries, to establish this doctrine by the Holy Scriptures and decrees of the popes, but it does not say whether they succeeded or not.

The language shows the embarrassment of the authors of the Directory, and what they say is evidently a homage forced from them, to a doctrine they disliked. They said, among other things, of the doctrine, (*id ad pietatem parum pertinere dicit aliquis,*) that it contributed little to the advancement of piety, a proposition entirely false; for if the doctrine be true, it follows that we must look to God for salvation;—if it be false, we must confide in ourselves. The fact is, these men hated that fundamental truth of religion, that God chooses and predestinates gratuitously unto salvation whom he pleases, and while they lay down the doctrine, they throw out lures to doubt it. This conduct is characteristic of the Jesuits.

This Directory is a most authentic and important production of the society. It was printed twenty-eight years after the decree of 1558. It reveals the new theology. It attacks the most important doctrines of religion; for nothing can be more important than the question upon whom depends the determination of the wills of men—their conversion, their perseverance, their salvation. Consequently, it is of supreme importance for us to know to whom we must look in the matter of salvation—whether to ourselves or to God. The Jesuits took part with the Pelagians and Semi-Pelagians against the Thomists whose doctrine upon the subjects of free grace and gratuitous predestination agreed very nearly with that of the reformers. They invented their system of subtleties in order to insure their success, and this system was soon spread through the length and breadth of that widely extended society. Their success from this early date in their history, forms in fact an epoch in the dogmatic history of the Roman Catholic church. Through their influence, the whole church became rapidly more and more corrupt in matter of doctrine, and coinciding as it does with the age of the Council of Trent, tends strongly to support the views of those Protestants who assign that age as the epoch of the entire apostacy of that church from the faith once delivered to the saints.

It should be observed, however, that the Jesuits at that early period of their history, were under restraints, the force of which became weaker in proportion to their success, and which ceased upon the general prevalence of their doctrines. It has been observed that the Directory paid an unwilling homage to the doctrine of predestination. "*Item definitum est Predestinationis nec rationem nec conditionem esse ex parte nostrá.*" It may well be doubted whether this concession would now be made by any learned member of that society. The reader may be referred to "A Discussion of the Question, Is the Roman Catholic, &c., inimical to Civil or Religious Liberty," &c., between Messrs. Hughes and Breckinridge, pp. 286-7. The passage is too long to extract, but if the reader will take the trouble to refer to it, he will find the doctrine in effect, denied. The sentiments there expressed by Mr. Hughes (who is said to be of that society,) will serve as an example of the theology adapted to the desires of the unregenerate heart in all times and countries. But to return.

In 1558, the Jesuits dared not to attack the doctrine of predestination; they therefore undertook to destroy it by address and craft—and the foundations upon which their system was built, have been briefly indicated. Hence the sources from which flowed into the Roman Catholic church at large, poisoned waters, by which the already languishing and almost expiring life of the entire body, may be said to have been extinguished.

VI. *The bulls of Pius V., and Gregory XIII., against Baius.*

Michael Baius, (in French, Michael de Bai,) was a doctor of Louvain.—The Port Royalists describe him as a man of great simplicity of manners—of a timorous conscience, and of great knowledge. He was made a doctor in 1550, and in the year following was nominated to the place of Professor, by Charles V.

Afterwards he was made Dean of the chapter of St. Peter of Louvain. He also held the place of chancellor of the university and conservator of its privileges, and also of inquisitor general. He had been sent to the Council of Trent, by order of the king of Spain, and by choice of the university. He had studied the writings of the fathers closely—particularly those of Augustine. He was greatly averse to the method of teaching adopted by the Scholastics of his day, and to the novelties which they had introduced into theology. The Scholastics in their turn, did not like his principles, nor the language of St. Augustine, the father whom Baius imitated. Many of the Roman Catholics of that day, in their disputes with the Calvinists had embraced the errors of Pelagius. These were opposed to Baius. The Jesuits also disliked him. We have seen that their project of a new system of theology was well nigh, if not quite matured at the election of Lainez, in 1558, and Molina, according to his own account, was already beginning to inculcate his system. It is probable that the Jesuits contributed, not a little, to make Baius odious, and to raise the storm which broke upon him in 1567, when a bull was fulminated against him. He had other adversaries who while they held to the doctrines of Augustine on predestination and grace, were less acquainted with that author's views upon kindred doctrines—such as the depravity of human nature—the sinfulness of the acts of men while unrenewed by grace—the duty of man in all his acts to have a supreme regard to the glory of God. Baius maintained the views of Augustine on these doctrines, but the class of his opposers now referred to, were infected with notions concerning the state of *pure nature*—a doctrine which had got into the schools before the time of the Jesuits. Finally, the Cordeliers, (that is, the Franciscan or Grey Friars,) were among the enemies of Baius. Their sentiments upon the virtues of the Pagans differed from those of Augustine. Horrentius one of the most famous of their number, who was confessor of the king of Spain, held it to be a doubtful question whether the Pagan philosophers were not saved: so highly did he esteem their virtues. Baius had refuted with much zeal, a dogma of some of the Franciscans touching the right of an ecclesiastic—who had committed a mortal sin to say mass without going previously to confession, the particulars of which dispute need not be stated. The Franciscans were not all agreed upon the question, and some of them made use of the authority of Baius. This made the other party the enemies of Baius.

But to proceed. Seventy-six propositions which were said to be taken from the writings of Baius were denounced to Pope Pius V. Some of these contained nothing more than the unvarnished doctrine of Augustine. For example, the sixteenth "Non est vera legis obedientia quæ fit sine charitate." *That is not true obedience to the law which is rendered without love.* Also the 38th proposition. "Omnis amor creaturæ rationalis aut vitiosa cupiditas quæ mundus diligitur quæ à Johanne prohibetur; aut laudabilis illa charitas qua, per spiritum sanctum in corde diffusâ, Deus amatur." *The love of the rational creature is either that sinful desire, by which the world is loved, and which John forbids; or it is that praise-*

worthy love by which God is loved, and which is shed abroad in the heart by the Holy Spirit. Some of the propositions were obviously erroneous, and neither Baius nor any one else maintained them; others were captious, and might be understood in a good or in a bad sense; some were contradictory. The pope, however, was urged to condemn them all. The father Perretti, general of the Franciscans, and afterward pope, under the name of Sixtus V., was very active in the matter. Finally a bull was obtained, condemning the propositions as being *respectively* heretical, erroneous, suspect, rash, &c., but without mentioning Baius. The words of the bull in this part of it, were, "quas quidem sententias stricto corum nobis examine ponderatas quanquam non nullæ aliquo pacto sustineri possent in rigore et proprio verborum sensu ab assertoribus intento, hereticas erroneas temerarias scandalosas et in pias aures offensivonem immittentes respectivè ac quæcunque super iis verbo scriptoque emissa præsentium auctoritate demnamus, circumscribimus et abolemus," &c. &c.

This word *respectivè*, (respectively,) imports that each of the qualifications mentioned, does not belong to all the propositions, but that we must refer to each proposition condemned, one or several of these qualifications, as they shall be found to suit it.—The pope, however, did not fix by this bull the qualifications which belonged to each proposition, nor did he determine the sense in which each was condemnable. He said, as the reader has observed, that several of the propositions could be maintained. It is worthy of observation, that there was a great dispute on this point; because the sense of the passage extracted may be changed by punctuation. By putting a comma after the word *ponderatas*, and then another after the word *intento*, the clause between the commas becomes parenthetical, and it would mean that some of the propositions could be maintained in strictness and in their proper sense. If, however, a comma be placed after the word *rigore*, the bull would mean, that although the propositions could be maintained in strictness, yet the pope condemned them in their proper sense. The copies of the bull first published in Flanders, were pointed in the first method. But according to either method of punctuation, the bull admits that the propositions could be maintained in some sort. The copies of the bull sent from Rome afterwards, (and this is a specimen of the finesse of that court,) had neither commas nor points of any sort from beginning to end. It is true that the sense of a solemn instrument, like a bull or a law, ought not to depend upon punctuation. It is very possible, in the Latin language, to make the sense of a writing clear without punctuation; but as the object of the actors in this affair was not to make things clear, the ambiguity was needful. In fact the object was to cast suspicion upon the doctrine of Baius, but they dared not to attack him directly. No ground could be discovered which would support the precise and direct condemnation which was asked for. The enemies of Baius were forced, therefore, to be content with a vague decision; which as things turned out, served effectually their purposes.

Before we proceed farther, we invite the reader to pause a moment for one or two reflections. It is the boast, or rather the

pretension of the Romanists, that their church has not only persevered in the true faith of the Gospel, but that it has preserved an unbroken unity in that faith from the beginning. This pretension will pass for truth only with those who are quite ignorant of their history. The fact is, they have had among themselves fierce and long continued contentions upon points of fundamental importance in matters of doctrine, morals and discipline. And although a formal and an external communion may have been preserved, so as to prevent flagrant schism, yet, in truth, there have been sects in that church between whom there was less common ground for communion than there is between any two of the orthodox sects of Protestant Christians. This the sequel of our story will show. These differences we grant have measurably disappeared, by the ultimate prevalence of the principles of the successful party, but unfortunately the worse party has generally succeeded. This is proved by the general corruption of that church. At the present day, we suppose the theology of the Jesuits is predominant in that church, and that is immeasurably worse than was that of the men of Port Royal.*

But to resume. The Court of Rome was very zealous to secure the general reception of this bull. Cardinal Granville, archbishop of Malines was charged with the duty of carrying it into execution — of putting down the rebels. He had authority to apply to the secular arm, if necessary, and that too, without regard to any appeal. Morillon, his grand vicar, read it to the Faculty of Louvain in 1668,

*The reader may be curious to know what can be said in confutation of the 16th and 38th propositions imputed to Baius, as before mentioned. As the elucidation of this query may throw some light upon that new theology, which at the epoch of the reformation, was thought more suitable to the times, we will extract a passage or two from a Compendium of Roman Catholic Theology, published in 1746. In confutation of the 16th proposition, (non est vera legis obedientia quæ fit sine charitate,) it is said "that only the *substance* of the act included in the precept, is commonly commanded; for example, (take the precept, "honor thy father, &c.,) but not the *end* and *mode* of its performance." To prove this, our author cites S. Thomas 1, 2, q. 100, art. 10. He then proceeds thus: "Love, therefore, is not necessary to fulfil all precepts, nor is every action a sin which is not done from love. Yet it must be confessed, that love is required in the person performing the act, in order that the fulfilling of the precept should be *meritorious*, according to 1 Cor. xv.: "If I speak with the tongues," &c. St. Thomas and Sanchez are then cited. The author concludes, "Our Catholic assertion, therefore, is, 'the precepts can be absolutely fulfilled without love.'" Upon the other (38th) proposition, the same author remarks: "This is the reasoning of Jansenius, *lib. 3, de statu naturæ lapsæ, cap. 19*. Every affection of the mind is employed in the love of something; which cannot be any thing else except the Creator or the creature. The former is good, and the latter blame-worthy; as *the love* of the world is forbidden by the apostle. Indeed it appears that all love, except that charity, (i. e. the charity shed abroad in the heart, by the Holy Spirit,) is blameworthy desire." But, says our author, "Thomas overturns this reason, (qu. 24, de veritate, art 4,) saying that a man can fulfil by his free will, that good which is *proportionate to human nature*. The foundation of the others is, that every action is sin which does not proceed from the motive of charity; but this doctrine was repeatedly condemned by Alexander VIII. Charity is indeed every where to be commended, but the obligation of it, is not to be extended to all our actions. The Catholic assertion is, that sin is not committed by giving alms, out of mere natural compassion for example, though it be granted it would not be profitable towards eternal life.

but he did not leave with them a copy of it. He gave them a copy only of the propositions condemned, under an injunction, however, not to communicate them to any person. The (Cordeliers) Franciscans in their general chapter, held at Nivelles in 1568, made their superiors solemnly abjure the seventy six articles in the name of the province; and the provincial of Flanders required the lay brethren, and even the nuns, to make the same abjuration, threatening those who should fall into the errors proscribed by the bull, with expulsion from the order, and with delivery to secular power to be punished with extreme severity. Morillon laboured to make Baius himself abjure the articles; Baius offered to produce similar propositions from St. Augustine; "But," said Morillon in his letter to Cardinal Granville, "I cut him short, saying it was not for me to judge of them, nor to hear them, nor would I hear them." The grand vicar, it seems had principles upon the duty of submission to the pope, which dispensed him from the obligation to inquire after and remove the difficulties of others. In another part of the same letter, speaking of the pope, he said, "All good Christians were bound to obey his judgment even although he be in error,"—a pernicious maxim, and the opposite of the sentiment of Paul—(in Gal. i. 8). Baius thought that he might obtain the explanation from the pope, which Morillon refused, and addressed to him, for that purpose, a respectful apology. The only reply which he received, was a command to submit without any tergiversation, and he was deemed to have incurred censure, because his apology was considered a sort of appeal, and all appeals were strictly forbidden by the bull itself. Baius was alarmed and he yielded to the demand. He abjured without knowing what he abjured, and Morillon gave him absolution.

Gregory XIII. having succeeded Pius V., gave another bull on the same subject at the solicitation of the Jesuit Tolet, afterwards a cardinal, and at that time the preacher of the pope. The bull of Gregory XIII., contains that of Pius V., with a preamble. Tolet carried it to Louvain in 1580; read it to the Faculty and engaged them to accept it. He required a particular acceptance of it by Baius, with which Baius complied. As a reward for this submission, he gave the faculty and Baius each a copy of the bull, which he (Tolet) gave them to understand was a great favor. The conduct of the court of Rome, in this matter, was very extraordinary. It is not necessary to enter into any detailed reflections upon it, but obviously the whole drift of the papal policy was to give currency and effect to the dogma of the pope's infallibility, a pretension too absurd to deserve a remark; the pretension was particularly absurd in respect to the bull in question. The word *respectivè*, respectively, already remarked upon, confounded the true with the false, and made the whole bull uncertain, without the possibility of clearing it up, and the restriction "*although in rigor some of them (i. e. of the propositions condemned) may be sustained,*" adds a further degree of uncertainty to the bull. Baius complained, but could not obtain a hearing. He asked to be instructed upon that which he was required to abjure; he was offered absolution, and finally was absolved.

These bulls against Baius cannot with any reason be regarded as rules of faith even by Romanists, because no Romanist can determine by these bulls what he ought to believe or disbelieve—yet many of them have so treated them. There is not one of the propositions which he is absolutely obliged by the bull to regard as false, for the reasons already mentioned; a Jesuit named Vasques, even declared that Pius V. did not so much intend to *condemn errors* as to take away occasion for the scandal and pain caused by the severity with which Baius censured opinions opposed to his own; that is to say, the pope's object was chiefly to remove an obstacle to the establishment of the new theology which the Jesuits had so much at heart, and which was deemed important to oppose the doctrines of the reformers. If such were the object, the reader will not be surprized to learn that it was regarded by the Protestants as condemning the doctrines of grace. It should be added, that Pius V. was occupied during the whole of his pontificate with the design of a war against the Turks, and with forming leagues between the kings of Europe for that purpose. It is not probable, therefore, that he gave much reflection to matters contained in this bull; in fact it was not published during his life-time. But to conclude this topic, whatever was the nature of the bull, or the care bestowed upon its contents, it created a long and bitter strife in the Roman Catholic church; it led also to cruel persecutions, and the design of the Jesuits, which had just before began to be developed, was consummated by a bull of Clement XI., called *Unigenitus* fulminated in 1703, which undoubtedly condemns in unequivocal terms, the essential doctrines of grace.*

THE RIGHT OF RULING ELDERS IN THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH TO
LAY ON HANDS, IN ALL PRESBYTERIAL ORDINATIONS.

☞ We cut the following article from the *Presbyterian* newspaper, in which it first appeared, some weeks ago. The subject to which it relates, is one of very great importance, and one unhappily, in regard to which there is a diversity of opinion and practice in the Presbyterian church. This Magazine will, whenever it becomes necessary, steadfastly maintain the principles stated in the following paper. ☞

Mr. Editor—I observe in the *Presbyterian*, 2d inst., an article signed "M.," and headed "*Ordination of Elders*," in reply to which I desire to offer a few suggestions; the more especially, as the article has received your own decided recommendation, and is written, I judge, by one for whom the whole church entertains great reverence.

1. You and he both call the practice of allowing Ruling Elders to take direct part in ordaining, *an innovation, a novelty, &c., &c.*

*The reader who desires to see this topic handled more fully, is referred to the fourth column of the *Hexaples*, a work published in France, at first, in one vol.-4to., but was ultimately enlarged to 7 vols., 4to.

In this respect you are both in error. The writer of these lines, as a *Ruling Elder*, over and over *laid hands* on the heads, both of *Preaching* and *Ruling Elders*, in their ordination; and as a *Preaching Elder*, he has known the same to be done in divers of our church courts, for the last eight years. So far as I know, it is the general practice of our church sessions, that the *Ruling Elders* unite with the *Preaching Elder*, in ordaining *new Ruling Elders*; and I have had much opportunity to learn this fact. In ordaining *Preaching Elders*, there has no doubt been a diversity of practice. But, remember, the church Session is a *Presbytery*; the *Ruling Elder* sits in it as a *Presbyter*; he is ordained a *Presbyter*; and his acts, so far as official, are the acts of a *Presbyter*. From hence it follows, apparently, that if ordination is a presbyterial act, and this *Presbyter* has a right to sit in *Presbytery*, he must be authorized to partake in the act.

II. That ordination is to be by the *Presbytery*, and not by a single Bishop, nor even any number of Bishops not met presbyterially; is a fundamental principle of our Confession, and of the Bible, as we suppose. And if the *Apostles* did personally and separately ordain, it was by virtue of their extraordinary office. Now from hence it seems inevitably to follow, either that the *Ruling Elder*, if a *Presbyter* at all, must be ordained by a *Presbytery* of some sort; or else that presbyterial ordination is unscriptural; and a simple minister, without the aid of the session, may ordain; which is episcopacy, *in toto*. Unless, indeed, you deny that a *Ruling Elder* is a *Presbyter* at all: which to deny, is to deny both the Scriptures and our standards, and of course to cast him forth out of *Presbytery*; for none but *Presbyters* have any business there. But if he is a *Presbyter*, and was not ordained by an apostle, then he must have been presbyterially ordained; and in that case, *Ruling Elders* are obliged to take part in ordaining *Presbyters*; and a church session is, as I have said, nothing but a smaller *Presbytery*.

III. Now, having the *Ruling Elder* lawfully in *Presbytery*, as a *Presbyter*, he may, and must do all that any *Presbyter* can do; unless there be some express reserve, exception, or denial in the Bible, or in our Confession; or some plain and necessary disqualification, flowing by good consequence out of the nature of the case, or out of some positive law. But as to positive enactment against him, there is not only none, but both the Bible and our standards, say the *Presbytery* shall ordain—not the *Preaching Elders* in *Presbytery*; and these standards had beforehand defined a *Presbytery* so as to embrace in it, as elemental parts, the *Ruling Elders*; so that positive law *includes*, instead of *excluding* them. But again, as to any inherent or consequential reason, against their partaking, it seems to me the whole case is with, and not against them. For although they are ordained merely to *rule*, and the *Preaching Elders* both to *preach* and *rule*; yet I boldly assert that whoever proves by the Scripture, any *official superiority* of a *Preacher* or *Bishop*, to a *Presbyter* or *Elder*, as your correspondent asserts there is, (for he says, “it is an inferior office;”) that man has subverted *Presbytery*! If the *office* of *Elder* be inferior to any, then *Presbytery* is gone: for *Elder* is *Presbyter*; and if *Bishop*, or

Minister, or any thing else, be above Presbyter—good night to Presbytery.

IV. Your correspondent suggests several isolated considerations. The Ruling Elders, he says, might be elected to preside in Presbytery; but for a good *practice* to the contrary. Not so; they are abridged of this right by our system, which requires the Moderator to *preach* on certain occasions, which they may not do. Here is a departure, by positive law, from general equality; but it is more than compensated by other things, such as representation from vacant churches, &c. Again, he argues that because they cannot preach, neither can they ordain one who is to preach. But this may be variously replied to: as 1, the Minister is ordained to *rule* as well as preach, and therefore a *Ruling Elder* may well assist: but 2, the argument is entirely fallacious. A Governor appoints a Judge, a Senate confirms him, and a Notary Public swears him in: yet of all these, not one is a Judge, or can judge any body: and so of a million of cases. The fallacy lies in supposing that the *Ruling Elders* in ordination, act *privately*—they act as elemental parts of Presbytery.

V. But what needs any difficulty? The *Ruling Elders* may hinder an ordination, or force an ordination, contrary to all the *Preaching Elders*; and yet, merely to take part in an act *purely formal*, is thought dangerous! Nay, the fact is, whether they actually put on their hands or not, the putting on of the Moderator's hand is their act: for it is *the act of the Presbytery*, and they constitute part of the body!

VI. But still further. What is *ordination*? What is putting on of hands? It is the mere public, formal, and official designation of a person to an office, and the assumption of it by him. It is, so to speak, only swearing in the officer. All the examinations are past; and the *Ruling Elders* partook, if they pleased, and voted on them. All the election is gone through by the people and by the Presbytery; the *Ruling Elders*, taking their part in all. But, lo! when they come to *make a public admission that they have in fact done all this*, they are to be stopped; and that for reasons that reach even to the rank of their office, and their official standing! This is most singular. Every thing may be done that is real and potential; but that which is formal and official, may not be done!

This subject is one of great moment, certainly; for not only is the true nature of our own system involved in it, but also the truth of the principles on which alone our system can be sustained against Prelacy on one side, and Independency on the other. For the moment you admit that your *Ruling Elders* are not Presbyters, that moment the Independent has the mastery in argument and truth: and the moment you admit, that although he is a Presbyter, yet Minister, Bishop, or any one else, is officially above him, the Prelatist from that moment is your master in the controversy.

R. J. B.

[For the Baltimore Literary and Religious Magazine.]

INCESTUOUS MARRIAGES.—OPINIONS OF MARTIN LUTHER.

MR. EDITOR:—In your January number, you have strongly expressed your opinion on this subject, in opposition to the editor of the **LUTHERAN OBSERVER**. For that estimable clergyman I entertain a high respect; and, in common with many others, sympathize with him in his conflict with the Infidel Rationalism, by which he is assailed. But let him not strike his friends, in the intervals of his contest with foes. He reveres the name of **LUTHER**, and rebukes those of his—pretended brethren who go aside from the great reformer's doctrine. Let us see how he will relish the "**HYPERTHOODOXY**" of the sixteenth century, in his own church.

1. Translation of a Letter from Martin Luther to George Schud, of date, Feb. 16, 1542.*

"Inasmuch as you seek counsel in a case of marriage, touching a brother who has married his deceased brother's wife, do you flee these abominations of the devil, and burden not yourself with other men's sins. There is no question whether they are to be separated; but they are to be regarded as alien from Christ, if they do not immediately separate themselves, and part into foreign lands, on account of the magnitude of the scandal; the one in one direction, and the other in another. There are sins enough, elsewhere, with which we are pressed, without having to bear these portents. If your Silesians go on thus to offend God, it will be safer to abandon them. Farewell in the Lord, and pray for me."

2. Extract of a Letter from Luther to Hesse, of date, Dec. 10, 1543.†

"Wie? Seyn in euerm Lande nicht Frauen noch Jungfrauen gnug, dass man so nahe muss freyen im andern und schier noch nähern Grad, als die Schwestertochter oder zwo Schwestern nach einander?"

3. Translation, in part, of a Letter from Luther to Amsdorf, of date, July 21, 1544.‡

"Grace and peace! Reverend father in Christ, it is my opinion that the marriage of the pastor, who has married the stepmother of his deceased wife, is incest; unless she was in such a way stepmother, as that the father of the deceased was the stepfather, and not the proper father; [nisi sic esset noverca, quod defunctæ pater etiam fuisset vitricus, non naturalis pater;] and therefore there must either be a separation, or an expulsion from your diocese, because a pastor of the church, so often admonished, has dared such a thing."

When the editor of the *Observer* has inserted these documents, with his exposition of them, I will adduce testimony still more full.

LEVITICUS.

*Luther's Briefe, von de Wette. v. p. 436, Ep. 2048.

†ib. p. 606. Ep. 2181.

‡ib. p. 676. Ep. 2225.

FOREIGN LABOURS IN THE ABOLITION CONTROVERSY,

No. VIII.

Glasgow Discussion;—Fifth Night.—Mr. Thompson's Charges against the Churches of America.

FRIDAY, JUNE 17th, 1836.

MR. BRECKINRIDGE said, the order of the exercises of this evening had, without the fault of any one, placed him in a position which was not the most natural. Considering that it was his duty to support the negative of the proposition for this evening's discussion, it would have been most natural had the affirmative been first brought out. He said, this arrangement was not the fault of any one, because it was not known that the point would fall to be discussed on this particular evening; and had it fallen on last night or to-morrow night, the order would have been as it ought to be. His position was, however, made somewhat easier by the fact, that nothing which Mr. Thompson could say this evening in an hour or two, could alter the assertions which he had already repeatedly made and published in Britain. Since the notice of this discussion had been published, he had, through the providence of God, been put in possession of six or seven papers and pamphlets, containing the substance of what had been said by Mr. Thompson throughout the country, and reiterated by associated bodies of his friends, under his eye. After reading these carefully, he found himself pretty fully possessed of that individual's charges and testimony against the Ministers, private Christians, and Churches of America; he would therefore take them as he found them in those publications, while Mr. Thompson's presence would enable him to explain, correct, or deny, any thing that might be erroneously stated.

The first thing he should attempt to do, was to impeach the competency of Mr. Thompson as a witness in this or any similar case. Mr. Thompson had shown that he was utterly incompetent wisely to gather, and faithfully to report, testimony on any subject involving great and complicated principles. He did not wish to say any thing personally offensive to Mr. Thompson; but he must be plain, and he would first produce proof of what he said, which was, as it regarded this whole nation, perfectly *ad hominem*. He would show the audience what Mr. Thompson had said of them; and then they could better judge what was his competency to be a witness against America. At a meeting in the Hopeton Rooms at Edinburgh, since his return from the United States, Mr. Thompson said:—

“ We were really under a worse bondage than the Slaves of the United States. We kissed our chains, and hugged our fetters. We were governed by our drunken appetite.”

“ The lecturer, in the concluding portion of his address, depicted in a tone of high moral feeling, the degraded condition of Great Britain as a nation, in consequence of her extreme drunkenness. He showed that habits of intemperance, or feelings and prejudices generated by intemperance, pervaded every class, from the highest to the lowest, the richest to the poorest. Statesmen bowed upon the altar of expediency; and, above all, the sanctuary was not clean. As a Christian nation, we were paralyzed in our efforts to evangelize the world—partly by the millions

upon millions actually expended upon ardent spirits—partly by the selfish and demoralizing feelings which this sensual indulgence in particular was known to produce. How could we, as a nation, upbraid America with her system of Slavery, when we ourselves were all but glorying in a voluntary Slavery of a thousand times more defiling and abominable description? * * * In our own country, it might be said, that there was, as it were, a conspiracy against the bodies and souls of her people.”

Now, in any Court of Justice, he would take his stand upon the fact, that the man who made that speech must be a *monomaniac*; and he believed no competent tribunal, after hearing it, would receive his testimony as to the character or conduct of any nation on the face of the earth. Or, if there lingered a doubt on the subject, he should show from the burden of his charges against America, that he spoke in the same general spirit, and nearly in the very same terms of her, as of Britain, although the fault found with each country was totally different. He spoke of each as the very worst nation on the earth, because of the special crime charged. Any man who could allow himself to say, that the two most enlightened nations on earth, were in substance the two most degraded nations on earth; who could permit himself to bring such *railing accusations*, successively against two great people, on account of the sins of a small portion of each—which he had looked at till he could see nothing else, and with the perseverance of a gold leaf beater, exercised his ingenuity in stretching out to the utmost limits, over each community; a man who not only can see little to love any where, that does not derive its complexion from himself,—and who, the moment he finds a blot on his brethren, or his country, instead of walking backwards, and hiding it with the filial piety of the elder sons of Noah, mocks over it with the rude and unfeeling bitterness of Canaan—such a man is worthily impeached, as incompetent to testify. Nay, I put the issue where Mr. Thompson has put it. If this nation be such as he has described it to be, I demand with unanswerable emphasis, how can it dare to call us or any other people to account, on any subject whatever? If, on the other hand, what he has said of this nation be false, I equally demand, how can he be credited in what he says of us or of any other nation under the sun?

After this caveat against all that such a witness could say, he would, in the *First* place observe, that all the accusations brought by Mr. Thompson against America, were imbued with such bitterness and intemperance, as ought to awaken suspicion in the minds of all who hear them. There was manifest not only a violent national antipathy against that whole country, but also a strong prejudice in favour of the one side, and against the other, in the local parties there; which, before any impartial tribunal, ought greatly to weaken any credit that might otherwise be attached to his testimony. Besides an open hostility to the nation as such, and a most unenvomed hatred to certain men, parties, and principles in America; the witness has exhibited such a feeling of wounded vanity, from his want of success in America; such a glorifying of his friends, and that just in proportion to their subserviency to him; and such a contemptuous and unmerited depreciation of his opponents; as

should put every man who reads or hears his proofs, at once on his guard. As to the opinions and conclusions of such a person, even from admitted facts, they are of course worthless; and his inferences from hearsay and idle reports, worse than trash. But what I mean to say is, that such a witness, considered strictly as testifying to what he asserts of his own knowledge, is to be heard by a just man, with very great caution. For my own part, at the risk of being called again a pettifogger, by this informer, I am bound to say, that his conduct impeaches his credibility, fully as much as it has before been shown to affect his competency; and, while I have peculiar knowledge of the facts, sufficient to assert that his main accusations are false, I fully believe that the case he had himself made, did of itself justify all good men to draw the same conclusion, merely from general principles. I will venture to go a step farther, and express the opinion, that they who are acquainted with Mr. Thompson, as he exhibits himself in the public eye, and who have knowledge of the past success, which really did, or which he allows himself to believe did, attend his efforts in West India Emancipation; (a success, however, which I do not comprehend, as the case was settled *against* him and his party, on the two chief points on which they staked themselves, namely, *Immediate Abolition* and *no Compensation*;) they who call to mind the preparation and pretension with which he set out for America, the gigantic work he had carved for himself there, the signal defeat he met with, and the terror in which he fled the country; may find enough to justify the fear, that the fate of George Thompson has fully as large a share in his recollections of America, as the fate of the poor slave.

In the *Second* place, I charge upon Mr. Thompson, that those parts of his statements which might possibly be in part true, are so put as to create false impressions, and have nearly the same effect on the minds of those who read or hear them, as if they were wholly false. This results from the constant manner of so stating what might possibly be true, that it is not only calculated to produce a false impression, and make the casual reader believe in a result different from what would be presented, if Mr. Thompson were on oath, and forced to tell the whole truth; but the uniformity and dexterity with which this is done, leaves us astonished how it could be accidental. He (Mr. B.) assumed that all of them had read, or would read Mr. Thompson's charges. After doing so, they would the better apprehend what was now meant; but, in the meantime, he would illustrate it by a case or two. Thus, when Mr. T. spoke of the ministers in the United States being slave-holders, he did it in such a way as to lead the reader to believe, that this was a general thing; that the most of them, if not the whole of them, were slave-owners. He did not tell them, that none of the ministers in twelve whole states were, or could easily be, slave-holders, seeing they were not inhabitants of a slave state; he did not tell them, that the cases of ministers owning slaves were rare even in some of the slave states; and a fair sample of the majority in not a single state of the Union. He left the charge indefinite, and did not condescend to tell, whether the number of ministers so accused,

was one-half, or one-third or one-fourth, or one-hundredth part of the whole number in the United States. He left it wholly indefinite, on the broad charge, that American ministers were slave-holding ministers; knowing—perhaps intending—that the impression taken up should be, of the aggregate mass of American ministers; when he knew all the while, that the overwhelming mass of American ministers had never owned a slave; and that those who had, were exceptions from the general rule, rather than samples of the whole. It may well be asked, how much less sinful it was to rob men of their good name, than of their freedom? Not content with even this injustice, Mr. Thomson had gone so far as to charge the ministers of America with dealing in slaves:—*slave-driving ministers* and *slave-dealing ministers*, were amongst his common accusations. Now, he (Mr. B.) would lay a strong constraint upon himself, and reply to these statements, as if they were not at once atrocious and insupportable. The terms used by Mr. Thompson, were universally understood in the United States to mean, the carrying on of a regular traffic in slaves, as a business. The meaning was the same here, and every one who had heard or read one of his printed speeches, was, *ex vi termini*, obliged to understand this charge like the preceding, as expressing his testimony as to the conduct of American ministers generally, if not universally. Now, I will admit, that there may be in America, one minister in a thousand, or perhaps one in five hundred, who may at some period of his ministry, when he had no sufficient light on the subject, have bought or sold slaves a single time, or perhaps twice, or possibly thrice. But I solemnly declare, I never knew, nor heard of, nor do I believe there exists in all America, one *slave-dealing or slave-driving minister*, nor any evangelical sect, that would hold fellowship with such a minister.

He would throw under the *Third general head*, charges of a different kind from the preceding. Mr. Thompson, when generalities fail, takes up some extreme case, which might probably be founded on truth, and gives it as a specimen of the general practice; thereby creating, by false instances, as well as by indefinite accusations, an impression which he knows to be entirely foreign from the truth. If he (Mr. B.) were to tell in America, that on his way to this meeting to-night, he saw two blind men begging in the streets, with their arms locked to support their tottering steps, while the crowd passed them idly by; and if he gave this as a specimen of the manner in which the unfortunate poor were treated in Scotland; he would not give a worse impression, nor make a more unfair statement of fact, than Mr. Thompson had done, nearly without exception, in his statements of America. Such a spirit and practice as this pervaded the whole of Mr. Thompson's speeches. He would select a few instances to enforce his meaning. There was a single Presbyterian church at Nashville, Tennessee. Now, he (Mr. B.) happened in the providence of God, to be somewhat acquainted with the past history of that church; and was happy to call its present benevolent minister his friend. He could consequently speak of it from his own knowledge. Mr. Thompson said that a young man went to Nashville, who, either through his own

imprudence or the violence of the disjointed times, was arrested, tried by a popular committee, found guilty of spreading seditious papers, and sentenced to be whipped; that he had received twenty lashes, and was then discharged. This he believed to be substantially true, as he well remembered hearing of the occurrence; and taking the young man's account of it as true, he had been greatly shocked at it, and had now no idea of defending it. But in Mr. Thompson's statement of the case, there was a minute misrepresentation, which showed singular indifference to facts. Mr. T. said the young man went to Tennessee to sell cottage Bibles, in which business he succeeded well, for the reason, adds the narrator, that Bibles were scarce in the South; although he could not fail to know, that before the period in question, every family in all those States that would receive a Bible, had been furnished with one by the various Bible Societies. This, however, was not the main reason for a reference to this case; but was mentioned incidentally to show the nature of the feelings and accusations indulged in by this gentleman. His account went on to say, sometimes that there were seven, sometimes eleven elders of this Presbyterian church. It was not intended to lay any stress on this discrepancy, as the fault might be the reporter's. But seven, or eleven, it was again and again charged, that all of them, every one, was present, trying and consenting to the punishment of the unhappy young man; "plowing up his back," and mingling, perhaps, in the mob which cursed him, even for his prayers. To make the case inexpressibly horrible, it is added, that these seven or eleven elders had, as to part of them, distributed the sacramental elements to the Abolitionist the very sabbath before the day on which all of them participated in this outrage. Now I assert, that if this story were literally true, no man knows better than Mr. Thompson, that no falsehood could be more glaring than to say or insinuate, that the case would be a fair average specimen of what the leading men in the American churches generally might be expected to do, in the like circumstances. Yet for this purpose he has repeatedly used it! No man could know better than he, that if the case were true in all its parts, it would every where be accounted a violent and unprecedented thing, which could happen at all, only in most extraordinary circumstances. Yet he has so stated it, over and over, as to force the impression that it is a fair sample of American Christianity. But, said Mr. B., I call in question all parts of the story that implicate any Christian. I do not believe the statements. Let me have proof. I do not believe there were either seven or eleven elders in the church in question. Record their names. If there were so many, it is next to impossible that every one of them was on the comparatively small committee that tried the Abolitionist. Produce the proofs, and I believe it will turn out, that if either of them was present, it was to mitigate popular violence; and that his influence perhaps saved the life of him he is traduced for having oppressed. He did not mean to stake his assertion against proof; but from his experience, and his general knowledge of the parties, he had no hesitation in giving it as his opinion, that the facts, when known, would not justify the assertions of Mr. Thomp-

son, even as to the particular case; and believing this, I again challenge the production of his authority. But, if it be true in all its parts, I repeat, it is every thing but truth to say, that it affords a just specimen of the Elders of the Presbyterian Churches of America.

Another case, resembling the preceding in its principle, is found in what Mr. Thompson has said of the Baptists of the southern states. There are, says he, above 157,000 members in upwards of 3,000 Baptist churches in those states "almost all, both ministers and members, being slave-holders." Allowing this statement to be true, and that each slave-holder has ten slaves on an average, which would probably be too small for the truth, there would be an amount of slaves equal to 1,570,000 owned by the Baptists of the southern states. If this be true, and the census of 1830 true also, there were only left about 500,000 to divide among all the other churches; leaving for the remainder of the people none at all! So that after all, though churches be bad, the nation is clean enough. Let us now make some allowance for this gentleman's extravagance, especially as he did not think he was speaking under correction, and divide his 157,000 Baptists into 52,000 families, of three professors of religion in each. This is more than the average for each family, especially in a church admitting only adults; and the true number of families, for that number of professors, would be nearer a hundred than fifty thousand. Twenty slaves to the family is below the average of the slave-owning families of the South—so that at the lowest rate, the Baptists in a few states, according to this person, own 1,040,000 slaves at the least; or about half the number that our last census gives to the whole Union. The extraordinary folly of such statements would appear more clearly to the audience when they understood, that perhaps as large a proportion of all the blacks as of all the whites in America, are professors of religion;—that above half of all slaves who profess religion, are Baptists; and that therefore, if there are 157,000 Baptists in the southern states, instead of being "almost all Slave-holders," at least a third of them are themselves slaves.

He gave these instances to show that Mr. Thompson had taken extreme cases, containing some show of truth, as specimens of the whole of America; and had thereby produced totally false impressions. What truth there was in them, was so terrifically exaggerated, that no dependence whatever could be placed upon his testimony. And this would be still more manifest after examining the charge brought by Mr. Thompson, that the very churches in America own slaves; and several of his speeches contain a pretty little dialogue with some slaves in the fields, the whole interest of which turns on their calling themselves "*the Church's Slaves.*" This was spoken of, as if it were in accordance with the ordinary course of things in the United States. Indeed, Mr. Thompson had not only spoken with his usual violence and generality of the "Slave-holding churches of America," and declared his conviction that "all the guilt of the system" should be laid "on the Church of America;" but at the very latest joint exhibition of himself and his friend, *Moses Roper*, in London, it was stated by the latter, in one

of his usual interludes to Mr. Thompson, perhaps in his presence, certainly uncontradicted, that slave-holding was universally practised by "all Christian Societies" in America—the Society of Friends only excepted. It may excite a blush in America, to know that the poor negro's silly falsehood was received with cheers by the London audience. What, then, should the similar declarations of Mr. Thompson, made deliberately, and repeated with infinite pretence of candor and affection—what feelings *can* they excite? And how will that insulted people regard the easy credulity, which has led the Christians of Britain to believe and reiterate charges, in which it is not easy to tell whether there is less truth or more malignity? For how stand the facts? What church owns slaves? What Christian corporation is a proprietor of men? Out of our ten thousand churches, perhaps half are involved in this sin? Perhaps a tenth part? Surely one Presbytery at least? No! this mountain of fiction has but a grain of truth to support its vast and hateful proportions. If there be above five congregations in all America that own slaves, I never heard of them. The actual number of whose existence I ever heard, is, I believe, precisely *three!* They are all Presbyterian congregations, and churches situated in the southern part of Virginia; and got into their present unhappy condition in the following manner:—Many years ago, during those times of ignorance at which God winked; when such a man as John Newton could go on a slaving voyage to Africa, and write back that he never had enjoyed sweeter communion with God than on that voyage; during such a period as that, a few well-meaning individuals had bequeathed a small number of slaves for the support of the gospel in three or four churches. These unfortunate legacies had increased and multiplied themselves to a great, and, under present circumstances, most inconvenient degree. A fact which puts the clearest contradiction on that assertion of this "accuser of the brethren,"—representing their condition as being one of unusual privation and suffering. Of late years these cases had attracted attention, and given great uneasiness to some of the persons connected with these churches. I have had, on this platform, kindly furnished me, like most of the other documents I have, since this debate was publicly known, a volume of letters written to one of these churches, on the whole case, by the Rev. Mr. Paxton, at that time its pastor. That gentleman is now on this side of the Atlantic, and may perhaps explain what Mr. Thompson has so sedulously concealed; how he was a Colonizationist; how he manumitted, and sent his own servants to Liberia; how he laboured in this particular matter with his church, long before the existence of Abolitionism; and how, finding the difficulties insuperable, he had written this kind and modest volume, worth all the Abolition froth ever spued forth, and left the charge in which he found it so difficult to preserve at once an honest conscience and a healthful influence. It will not, however, be understood, that even these few churches are worthy of the indiscriminate abuse lavished on us all for their sake; nor that their present path of duty is either an easy or a plain one. Whether it is that there are express stipulations in the original instruments, conveying the

slaves in trust for certain purposes ; or whether the general principle of law, which would transfer to the state or to the heirs of the first owner, the slaves with their increase, upon a failure of the intention of the donor, either by act of God, or of the parties themselves, embarrasses the subject ; it is very certain, that wiser and better men than either Mr. Thompson or myself, are convinced that these vilified churches have no power whatever to set their slaves free. If the churches were to give up the slaves, it could only have the effect, it is believed, to send them into everlasting bondage to the heirs of the original proprietors. They have therefore considered it better for the slaves themselves, that they should remain as they were, in a state of nominal servitude, rather than be remitted into real slavery. Such is the real state of the few cases which have first been exhibited as the sin, if not the actual condition of the American churches ; and then exaggerated into the utmost turpitude, by hiding every mitigating circumstance, adding some purely new, and distorting all things. Whether right or wrong, the same state of things exists amongst the Society of Friends in North Carolina, to a partial extent, and in another form. They did not consider themselves liable to just censure, although they held title in, and authority over slaves, as individuals, while they gave them their whole earnings, and had collected large sums from their brethren in England, which were applied to the benefit of these slaves. It is not now for the first time that charges have been made against the Church of God, that Judah is like all the heathen. But all who embark in such courses have met with the common fate of the revilers of God's people, and they, with such as select to stand in their lot, may find in the word of life, a worse end apportioned for them, than even for those they denounce, in case every word they utter had been true. We bless God that no weapon formed against Zion shall prosper.

There was one other instance which he had noted under this head, as requiring some comment, which could not bear omission, regarding the private members of the Christian churches in the United States, of whom a casual hearer or reader of Mr. Thompson's speeches, would believe that far the greater part actually owned slaves ; that very few, and they almost exclusively Abolitionists, considered slavery at all wrong ; that with one accord they deprived the slaves of all religious privileges ; and used them not only as a chattel, but as nothing else than a chattel. According to our census of 1830, there were about 11,000,000 of whites, 2,000,000 of slaves, and 400,000 free blacks in America, making a total of nearly thirteen and a half millions. All the slaves were gathered into the twelve most southerly states ; free blacks were not far from half in the free, and half in the slave states ; and of the whites, near 8,000,000 were in the free, and more than 3,000,000 in the slave states. The best information I possess on this subject, authorises me to say that about one person in nine, throughout the nation, black and white, is a member of a Christian church ; the proportion being somewhat larger at the north, and comparatively smaller at the south. There are, therefore, above 1,200,000 white Christians in the United States, of whom about 900,000 live in the

twelve free states, and neither own slaves nor think slavery right; leaving rather over 300,000 for the twelve slave states. Now, if these white Christians, in the slave states own all the slaves, and the other 8-9ths of the whites own none at all, there will be only about six slaves to each Christian there, a number far below the average of the slave-holders—and all the north and all the south except Christians—free of charge and guilt, in the specific thing. But if we divide these Christians into families, and suppose there may be as many as one in three or four of them who is the head of a family, say 100,000 of them, and that they own all the Slaves, in that case there would be an average of twenty slaves to every white head of a Christian family in the slave states; but here again all the slaves would be absorbed—all the north innocent, above two-thirds of the Christians at the south proved to be not slave-holders at all—and all the followers of the devil wholly innocent of that crime! These calculations demonstrate, that the accusations are as groundless and absurd as any of the preceding. And while it is painfully true that in all slave-holding states, far too many Christians do still own slaves; it is equally true, that they bear a small proportion to those who own none, even in those states. If we suppose the Christians in America to be about on an equal footing as to wealth with other people—and to have no more conscience about slavery, than those around them in the slave states—and that twenty slaves may be taken as the average, to each master—and a ninth of the people pious as stated before; it follows, that only about 11,000 professors of religion can be slave-holders; or less than one in every hundred of the whole number in the nation. Yet every one but the first of the above suppositions is against the churches; and yet upon this basis rests the charges of a candid, affectionate Christian brother, against them all!

The only remaining illustration of Mr. Thompson's proneness to represent a little truth, in such a way as to have all the effects of an immense misrepresentation, regards his own posture, doings, and sufferings in America. "Fourteen months of toil, of peril, and persecution, almost unparalleled,"—"there were paid myrmidons seeking my blood,"—"there were thousands waiting to rejoice over my destruction"—"when any individual tells George Thompson, who has put his life into his hands, and gone where slavery is rife; when I, George Thompson, am told I am to be spared," &c. Similar statements—*ad infinitum*—fill up all his speeches, and are noticed now, not for the purpose of commenting on, or even contradicting them; but of affording my countrymen who may chance to see the report of this discussion—specimens as our certificates often run "of the honesty, probity, and good demeanor"—of the individual.

He would pass next to a *Fourth* general objection against Mr. Thompson's testimony, as regards America; which was, that much of it was in the strictest sense, positively untrue. For instance, Mr. Thompson had twice put a runaway slave forward upon the platform at London, or at least connived at the doing of it—who stated, of his own knowledge, that a Mr. Garrison of South Caro-

lina, had paid 500 dollars for a slave, that he might burn him, and that he had done so without hindrance, or challenge afterwards. This statement, Mr. T. has never yet contradicted in any one of his numerous speeches, although he must have known it to be untrue. I have myself several times directed his attention to the subject, and yet the only answer is, "expressive silence." Then I distinctly challenge his notice of the case; and while I solemnly declare, that according to my belief, whoever should do such an act in any part of America, would be hung; I as distinctly charge Mr. Thompson with giving countenance to, and deriving countenance from, this willful mis-statement.—As another instance of the same kind, you are told that a free man was sold from the jail at Washington city, as a slave, without even the form of a trial; which is farther aggravated by the assertion, that this is vouched as a fact, on the testimony of 1000 signatures. This matter, when Mr. Thompson's own proof is produced, resolves itself into this: that Mr. Thompson *said*, there had been a thousand signatures to a certain paper, which *said*, that a certain man taken up as a runaway slave, *said* he was free! If he was a slave, the whole case falls; whether he was a slave or not, was a fact that could have been judicially investigated and decided, if the person most interested, or any other, had chosen to demand it. So that in point of fact, Mr. Thompson's statements touching this oft-repeated case, are all purely gratuitous. And with what horror must every good man hear, that Mr. Thompson, within the last two or three weeks, told a crowd of people in Mr. Price's chapel, Devonshire Square, London, in allusion to this very case, that the poor black had "**DEMONSTRATED HIS FREEDOM,**" and afterwards been "sold into everlasting bondage!" And yet upon this fiction he bases one of his most effective "illustrations of American Slavery," and some of his fiercest denunciations of the American people. Oh! shame, where is thy blush—He could, if time permitted, exhibit other cases, in principle perhaps worse even than these, in which neither the false assertions of Moses Roper, nor the pretended evidence of misrepresented petitions existed to make a show of evidence; and which nothing but the most extraordinary ignorance or recklessness could explain. Such are the assertions made by himself, or his coadjutors in his presence, that slaves are brought to the District of Columbia, from all the slave states, for sale; that five years is the average number that slaves carried to the southern states live; that slaves without trial, or even examination, were often executed, by tens, twenties, and even thirties; that the banner of the United States, which floated over a slave-dealing Congress, in the midst of the slave market of the entire nation, had the word "*Liberty*" upon it (which single sentence contained three mis-statements); that religious men weighed children in scales, and sold them by the pound like meat;—that there were 2,000,000 of slaves in America who never heard the name of Christ; that no white man would ever be respected after he had been seen to shake hands with a man of colour; all which *un-nameable* assertions are contained, along with more than double as many others like them,

in one single newspaper—the London *Patriot* of June 1st, 1836; and in a portion of the report of only two of Mr. Thompson's meetings! Alas! for poor human nature!

[For the Baltimore Literary and Religious Magazine.]

THOUGHTS ON THE CONVERSION OF THE WORLD.

MY DEAR BROTHER BRECKINRIDGE:—I send you the following thoughts, hoping they will meet with your approbation, and if so, that you will give them a place in your highly valuable Magazine. You will subjoin any alterations or amendments that may occur to you. I hope to be at the next Assembly, and to be a member, if my Presbytery please. My chief object in wishing once more to attend the Assembly is to labour to effect something that may enlist our church more fully in the great mission cause.

The following thoughts, though they were not first suggested to my mind on the first sabbath of 1841, they were more deeply impressed by the events of that day. Agreeably to the recommendation of the Assembly, that day was observed by the church at which my family and myself worship, as a day of prayer, for the *salvation of the world*. This recommendation by the highest authority of our church, was wise, and I hope it was observed throughout all our churches. The salvation of the world! It is recommending to the prayers and efforts of all our brethren, the grandest scheme that ever entered into the human mind, or inspired the heart of man. It is an attempt to labour in the same field with the Saviour. To make application of the work, assigned to him by John, when he said "Behold the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world."

The monthly concert of prayer, has the same object, but more specifically devoted to the success of missionaries. It is painful to observe how little attention is bestowed upon those monthly meetings, and how little spirit is thrown into the most of the prayers I have ever heard on those occasions. There seems to be a great disproportion between the magnitude of the object proposed, the conversion of the world, and the effort employed by the church at large, and our church also. Means must be employed to bring the church up to this grand enterprize, or it must fail.

No truth is more distinctly written upon the pages of the Bible, or upon the passing events of the day, than that the world is not to be converted by *miracle*, but by *means*. The millennial day is not to commence in its brightness, this day month, nor this day twelve months, nor in any particular century. Still the world is to be converted, and there is to be a millennial reign of a thousand years. Perhaps these thousand years may be symbolical years, as in other parts of Scripture, and instead of a literal thousand years, it may be three hundred and sixty-five thousand years. However this may be, the millennial day is to be like that to which it is to be compared. It is to have a dawn and a meridian; whether it is to have an after-

noon followed by a dark, long night, we leave to those who are wiser in the language of prophecy than we pretend to be, to determine.

Suffice it, for our present purpose, that the world is to be converted, and righteousness is to cover the earth as the waters do the seas. That is, shall be universal. It is to be like the Atlantic or Pacific. Not as the Adriatic is *now*, angry, but as the Adriatic shall be *then*, with its peaceful waves laving the seven churches of the east revived. No longer making glad the Musleman, but rejoicing the cities of the New Jerusalem, and the enlightened worshippers of the living God. For as the islands shall clap their hands, and the earth shall fully yield her increase, the seas will not go unblest.

I now ask this solemn question; what are the churches, either in Europe or America, doing, to bring about this happy state of things, so often spoken of in the Bible? I do not say they are doing nothing, but are they doing the tenth of what they ought to do? God has distinctly made his election in our world. He has in a very special manner committed the work of enlightening and converting the nations of the earth, to Great Britain and America. It is true there are in France and Geneva, and in various other parts of Europe, and even in Russia, those who begin to feel on these subjects, but the burden of the work seems to be put into the hands of Englishmen and Americans. The opening of a high way for the Lord is to be their work, their glory, and great shall be their reward. I do not speak to the churches of Europe. I ask the question at the churches of my own country. I ask particularly the Presbyterian church of these United States, what are we doing that is at all commensurate with our duty or the magnitude of the work? I. What are the people doing? Have half the people of our communion any adequate idea of the real condition of the world? Do they suppose that the God to whom they and their families bow down day by day, beholds eight-tenths of the human family living in the darkest darkness, and the grossest idolators sacrificing their children, and sometimes one another, to devils? Do they know or seem to care to know the signal success that God in mercy, is conferring upon Missionary, Bible, Tract, and Sabbath School efforts? Do they know that these means and efforts ought to be multiplied a hundred fold? Do they know that the Jews begin to look not to Judea, as an earthly home, but to the *man* of Judea, as the Saviour? Do they know that the disciples of the false prophet are ceasing to beat and to curse Christians, and call them dogs? Do they know that the man of sin, having utterly failed to devour Europe any longer, is seeking an asylum in America, where he is destined to find a *grave*, if American Christians are not wanting in their duty? Do they know that God's time is fully come, and that he has already begun to renew the world, and that every member of the church, from the highest to the lowest, from the eldest to the youngest, every father and mother, and child, from the richest to the poorest, all, all are called upon, as by a voice from heaven, to come and hail this day of the Lord; not with their arms folded. Let the kings of Sheba and Eba offer gifts, and all nations serve before him. For "he shall live, and to him shall

be given the gold of Sheba; prayer, also, shall be made for him continually, and daily shall he be praised." Let every member of the church know that there is no time to be idle, for God "now lifteth up our ensign upon the mountains." He saith, "I will make all my mountain a way." Old as I am, I hope to live long enough to see every pious father and mother in our church, engaged in this work. Surely they would as soon think of neglecting their family Bibles, or their family altars, as neglecting the treasury of God's house, not only putting their own hands to the work, but also teaching their children from their cradles to aid in the *conversion of the world.*

We have been pointing out what the people ought to do in this day of events, which we think is a day of the Lord. We ask, in the second place, what are our Presbyteries doing? They meet usually every six months.—Not unfrequently license men who ought never to have been removed from the plough or the last—enquire into the faithful performance of reciprocal duties of pastors and people—into the fulfilment of previous appointments—certain delinquencies—make new appointments to a few destitute places—settle some disputes or cases that may have arisen in the church sessions—adjourn and go home, while the whole surrounding country is a moral desolation. Is there no better plan? Have we not pursued this plan long enough? What are our Synods doing? Much as the Presbyteries are doing, with this difference, that as their sphere of jurisdiction is larger, and their power less, they often employ themselves in making almost interminable speeches about matters which might be disposed of in five or ten minutes. Still the cause of God languishes, and the boundaries of the church are not enlarged, nor her stakes strengthened.

I will be told it is easy to find fault, but difficult to point out a remedy. This is true. Still I hope I shall do more than find fault. Will my dear brethren of the ministry patiently listen to me? Will the churches listen? The subject is of immense importance; no less than the sustainment of the cause of Presbyterianism in our own country, the advancement of the Redeemer's cause among us.

On this subject I lay down two propositions. I. That it is the bounden duty of every church that is blessed with the stated means of grace, whether it be from the hands of a pastor or stated supply, not only to afford aid to those churches which are not so supplied, but to preach the gospel by the lips of their pastor to the surrounding country. II. The Presbyterian church ought immediately to become (what it has been said to be years ago, by one who has gone to glory) a MISSIONARY SOCIETY, of which every minister ought to be a recognized director, and every elder and private Christian an efficient member. To these two propositions I affectionately invite my brethren and friends, for a moment to hear me.

I will be told, that as to the first of these propositions, its truth is acknowledged, and attempts have been made to comply with its demands. This is granted. But it seems to me the attempt has been made in a very inadequate and uneffective way. It has been attempted by the Assembly's Board, in two ways. By supplying

weak churches, with an amount of money to aid them in supporting pastors. This plan is highly objectionable, especially when it is done without the supervision of Presbytery. It encourages weak churches, or such as think themselves so, to look for aid abroad, when by proper exertions and liberality they might sustain themselves. Few principles of merely human conduct, are of more importance, than the cultivation of a noble principle of independence and self-sustainment. What would we think of the wisdom of that parent or guardian who would continue to treat his child or ward as though he were still a minor, after he had arrived at maturity, and was able and ought to sustain himself? Such child or ward, will never be a man, nor put forth his own powers. The church that receives \$100, this year, if it do not demand \$150 from the Board next; will be careful never to lessen the requirement, and thus remains a weakling and a burden upon the public, for years. I know churches who are receiving the labours of ministers on these terms, who are able to sustain themselves. They have lived in this way for years, and if the plan be pursued, will live so for years to come. There may be feeble churches which ought to be aided, but not without the knowledge and supervision of their Presbyteries. It ought not to be left (as I imagine it often is) to the option of any church, nor ought the Board to attend to any individual church or minister. The oversight of the Presbyteries will, to some extent, remedy this evil. The evil must be remedied.

Another plan of sustaining feeble churches and spreading the blessings of the gospel in our country, has been to send out travelling missionaries. Too much praise cannot be bestowed upon those men who undertake this work. But a travelling missionary, either abroad or at home, except it be as an explorer, to ascertain the places suitable for operation, is like a wandering meteor or shooting star. His light is seen but for a moment, and his path like that of a fast sailing ship at sea, invisible the next moment. I lay it down as an axiom, that a missionary, to be really useful, must, to a great extent, be stationary, or his returns must be punctual, and at short intervals. This is one of the causes of the happy success of our Methodist brethren. The Presbyterian church must learn wisdom from their example. At any rate there is nothing of which I am more fully convinced, than that a more effective method of diffusing the blessings of the gospel must be adopted before we will do our duty, or meet with the Divine blessing. This brings us to our second proposition.

II. Our whole church must immediately be formed into a MISSIONARY SOCIETY, of which every minister ought to be a director, and every elder and private Christian a member. I am asked how this can be effected? I answer; it only requires the full realization of three things, to convert the whole Presbyterian church, ministers and people into a most active missionary society, permanent and effective. 1. The approval, and warm recommendation of the plan by our General Assembly. 2. A practical conviction that it is the duty of the church to comply with our Lord's injunction, to "preach the gospel to every creature," and especially to those who

are round about us. To effect which the utmost generosity and liberality are demanded of those who are blessed with the stated ministry of the word. 3. Let it be fully realized that this is eminently a day of the right hand of God, and that America, and especially the Presbyterian church of these United States, is loudly called upon to rouse herself up, to take hold of God's promises and his work, and to do it in a practical and permanent way. Let me not be thought presuming, when I suggest that,

The Assembly, at its next meeting, take into solemn consideration the condition of a very large portion of the inhabitants of our country; three-fourths of whom never saw the face of a Presbyterian minister, or ever were in one of our houses of worship. The only preachers of the gospel with whom they are acquainted, are the self-denying, hard labouring Methodists. Let the Assembly advise, and if they please, enjoin it upon all the churches in our communion, who are blessed with the stated means of grace, that they agree to relinquish one-fourth or the one-fifth of the pastoral labours of their ministers, to be by them devoted to the waste places about them, to the "lanes and the streets, the high-ways and hedges." Let this be a free-will offering by all concerned, not to interfere at all with the terms of their several settlements or pastoral relations. Let the Presbytery be directed to take this whole business under their watch and oversight, and direct each of their members to spend the one-fourth or the one-fifth (as the several churches may agree,) of their time in the several precincts or circuits assigned to them, and at each return of service to spend a whole week including a sabbath. Thus the whole church with its ministers will be formed into an active missionary society. Each minister to render a full account of the whole concerns at each stated meeting of Presbytery.

For recommending this simple plan to the consideration of the churches at large, I have some hopes and several reasons. I hope there are few churches in our connexion whether they be rich or poor, in our cities or in the country, who would hesitate a moment to make the relinquishment proposed. I would hope in the second place, that there are few, if any faithful minister, who would not gladly embrace the opportunity of becoming an active missionary for the one-fourth or the one-fifth of his time, and this without materially effecting his pastoral relations. And in the last place, I hope that the plan will meet with the cordial approbation and recommendation of our next General Assembly. For the indulgence of these hopes, I have the following reasons:

I. It will at once make every minister of our church an active missionary, for the one-fourth or the one-fifth of his time, and at the same time clothe each of our members with the same character, so far as the relinquishment of part of their pastor's time is concerned, and will wake up an interest for the cause in every pious bosom.

II. It will kindle a feeling of affection and interest towards Presbyterians in the regions round about, when the people know that these good men visit them month after month, are found at their fire-sides, preaching the gospel to them without money.

III. The plan proposes placing all our ministers upon the same level, making each of them a day-labourer, and investing him with a title more honourable than Rev'd or D. D., namely that of **Missionary**. The wisdom of the Presbyteries will make suitable allowance for presidents and professors of colleges and other schools, that none may be idle nor any oppressed.

IV. The plan proposes to embrace most of the advantages of the Methodist plan, which has been pursued so long with such happy results, while it avoids some of its disadvantages and retains the most important feature of Presbyterianism, the *pastoral relation*, so important to the permanency of the church.

V. It coincides perfectly with the spirit of the age. That spirit is **LIBERALITY**. By liberality, I do not mean libertinism. To this, gospel liberty, in principle and in practice, is equally opposed, as it is to bigotry. Liberality is a generous disposition which commiserates the poor and destitute. Every part of the Christian religion inculcates generosity. The example of Christ and his apostles is full of it. The Bible is full of it. "The liberal soul shall be made fat.—The liberal deviseth liberal things, and by liberal things shall he stand." A liberal hand is better than a strong arm.

VI. It proposes to give the most effective aid to the Bible, the Tract, the Sabbath School and the Publishing Societies' interests. For surely no minister will think himself above putting into his carriage, or into his saddle-bags (if he travel on horse-back,) Bibles or other good books, and thus come to every house laden with treasures better than gold, and perform a work *perfectly*, and without expense, which has hitherto been attempted, and but *badly* performed at great expense.

VII. The plan proposes to give dignity to the eldership, and throw suitable work into their hands, by giving them, to some extent, the care of the churches every fourth or fifth sabbath, and an opportunity of mingling with and praying for their neighbours.

VIII. As the plan goes to the enlistment of many in the work of good-doing, would it be improper to suggest that it may interest a class of Christians too much overlooked? Many of our ministers engaged in this work will have it in their power to take their wives with them in these monthly excursions, and thus render themselves doubly acceptable and useful. While those who must be left at home will be called upon to exercise that maternal piety and prayerfulness which are fast becoming a blessing to the church and the world.

Finally; it will to some extent, be filling up the apostles' injunction, "Let all your things be done with charity." I again ask, will any church refuse the relinquishment of pastoral duty required to carry out the plan? Will any minister decline the service? Will the Assembly be unwilling to entertain the suggestions because they come from an humble individual in the far-west, or because the plan proposes a great change in long established customs. Is it not true that the present mode of operation, however God has smiled upon it in days past, is not well suited to the present state of our country, and that something more effective is loudly called for? Something, that to some extent, may supercede the call for

so many temporary missionaries, and expensive agencies? The destitutions and the wide spreading wastes in our cities, and more especially in our country places, make their appeal to the Assembly to adopt this, or some other plan, by which the gospel may be more extensively preached in our happy country, and especially to the poor and destitute.

I respectfully and prayerfully submit the whole to your consideration, my dear brother.

JAMES BLYTH.

[For the Baltimore Literary and Religious Magazine.]

THE DEACON:

An Inquiry into the Nature, Duties and Exercises of the Office of the Deacon, in the Christian Church. By JAMES M. WILLSON, A. M., Pastor of the Reformed Presbyterian Congregation, Philadelphia. 76 pp. 8vo.

"Let the Deacons be grave," &c.—1 TIM. III. 8.

"Let all things be done decently and in order."—1 COR. XIV. 40.

Philadelphia.—Wm. S. Young, 173, Race street. 1841."

No office in the church of Christ, has been more grossly perverted from its original design, than that of the Deacon. In some churches, he has been invested with spiritual authority; and in him, the offices both of Pastor and Ruling Elder have been combined. In others, he has been entrusted with the power of ruling only. In others again, he is, in theory, retained as a standing officer, while practically he has no existence. And in others still, he has a nominal existence, without any specific duties assigned him. Even in those Presbyterian churches, where he is still retained, and where he has not been transformed into a spiritual officer; there is much ambiguity respecting what are his appropriate duties, and the manner in which they ought to be performed. These facts show that very imperfect, if not erroneous views are entertained respecting this office, among the churches generally. The attention of the churches, however, both in Europe and America, has of late been more particularly directed to this subject. It has been more or less the subject of discussion in many of them. A great variety of discordant opinions have been presented, and brought into collision with one another; a spirit of inquiry is awakened; and the time seems to have arrived, when a full and clear exposition of the whole question will be favourably received, and carefully examined by the Christian public.

The appearance of the pamphlet of Mr. Willson is, under these circumstances, peculiarly suitable; and its extensive circulation calculated to do much good. The author has done ample justice to the subject on which he treats. The arguments adduced on every point which he undertakes to defend, are to the mind of the writer perfectly conclusive. Indeed it is difficult to conceive how any mind, open to conviction, can resist them. Even on those points which are rather unpopular, the intelligent reader will find the arguments peculiarly forcible and convincing. We refer

especially to the positions, that the Deacon, by virtue of his office, ought to have the control of the whole ecclesiastical property; and that he is to act in subordination to the ecclesiastical courts. The arguments on these points are especially commended to the serious consideration of all who believe in the *divine right* of Presbyterianism; and who would love to see it preserved, in its primitive purity, simplicity, and beauty. No better way to increase the circulation of the pamphlet is known, than to give its contents.

CHAPTER I. *The Deacon a Standing Church Officer.*—Argument from the Scriptures.—Deacons in the early Christian church.—Opinions on the subject.—Deacons in the Reformed churches.—Expressions of opinion since the Reformation.

CHAPTER II. *The Nature of the Deacon's Office.*—The care of the poor belongs to the Deacon.—The management of the finances generally.—Argument from Acts vi. 1-6.—Views of commentators on this passage.—Argument from the Old Testament.—Argument from the Jewish Synagogue.—Doctrines and practice of the church in the primitive times.—Doctrines and practice of the church in the times of the Reformation.—Opinions of late writers.—Doctrines of Presbyterian churches.—Objections considered.

CHAPTER III. *Of the Substitutes for the Deacon.*—Various substitutes specified.—Boards of Trustees are an innovation—are unscriptural—are anti-scriptural—are of dangerous tendency—are unsafe.

CHAPTER IV. *The Relations of the Deacon.*—THE DEACON IS SUBORDINATE TO THE ECCLESIASTICAL COURTS.—Scripture argument.—The practice of the Christian Church.—Illustration of this subject from the structure of society.—This mode of managing church property is safe.

CHAPTER V. Conclusion.—Appendix.

The work is for sale by David Owen & Son, 2½, North Gay-st. Baltimore.

☞ We insert the foregoing with pleasure; but are not to be understood as endorsing, all the views or arguments of the *Pamphlet* so highly commended. Indeed we rather incline to think, that some of *Mr. Willson's* views are radically different from those contained in our Standards.

The office of Deacon is one of very great importance, and in our judgment, of undoubted Scripturalness. Indeed we can hardly understand how a Presbyterian church can get along without a Board of Deacons, or systematic violations of what it understands to be God's plan for conducting the affairs of his earthly kingdom.

One of our very first acts after being ordained a Bishop, and installed a Pastor, was to call together the church and cause a Board of Deacons to be chosen; and for eight years, we have constantly commended and enforced the subject as opportunity offered in our church courts. It is no small joy to us, to see the church at last take up the matter in earnest.

Unless present indications greatly deceive us, the Deacons of our church, after being long laid aside, are destined at no very distant day, not only to occupy their proper place in all our churches, but to fill up an immensely important space, in the collection, control, and distribution of those contributions and charities—which are now managed, to so large an extent, by persons ordained for other duties—nay by persons not ordained at all—nor even professing religion. For we happen to know, that not only persons who are private members only, but in some cases persons not even members of the church, yea not even worshipping in our churches; are members of important public bodies elected by our General Assembly.—[E.Ds.]

“ PAPIISM IN THE XIX. CENTURY IN THE UNITED STATES.

Being select contributions to the Papal Controversy, during 1835—40. By Robert J. Breckinridge.—Baltimore: David Owen & Son, 24, N. Gay street.—MDCCCXLI.” pp. 344.

ADVERTISEMENT.—The author of the following pages, in submitting them in this form to the public, deems it not improper to explain himself briefly to his readers.

There are several objects which he supposes may be gained, or at least promoted by the publication of this volume. One is, that in this way, the history of the rise and early progress of the papal controversy in the region where his lot is cast, and in some degree throughout America, will be preserved in a permanent and convenient form; a history personally important as it regards many individuals, and not without its use in illustrating the principles, the spirit and the aims of papism in this country.—Another is, that persons really desirous of making themselves acquainted with papism in general, and its character in this age and country in particular; may have not only the means of doing this somewhat increased, but may also see, in our personal experience, the manner in which and the means by which God has been pleased to lead an individual similarly situated with themselves, in the same course, before them. A third, and the prevailing reason, has been the hope of spreading information on one of the most important and heretofore neglected topics of the age; and of stimulating public curiosity and interest, on a subject in regard to which, men seem to have been dead nearly in proportion as the obligations laid on them to be all alive, were transcendent.

The contributions to the papal controversy published in this volume, cover a period of six years of the life and ministry of their author. They have been years of great care and toil, not only in his more important and direct work as Bishop of a large church and congregation committed to his particular oversight, by the great Bishop of souls; but also, as he has been connected with many of the great movements of the age, and very especially with the difficulties and deliverance of that branch of the church of God in which he is a minister. He does not therefore offer this volume to the public, as any thing more, than what a person so situated may be supposed to accomplish in hours stolen from nature, from sickness, and from the ordinary enjoyments of life.

The scholar may repose unqualified credit, in all the references and authorities of this volume. All of them, where they are given as original, have been diligently and laboriously verified; and where that was not possible or was not considered necessary, the authority relied on is stated. Indeed we have found so little to our taste in the elemental volumes, on the papal controversy; and so many inaccuracies of reference perpetuated through successive authors quoting from each other, and all pretending to be original; that we have preferred to push our studies, in an independent manner, up to the original sources, wherever it was possible.

The reader may also rely with implicit confidence on the facts and statements of this book. They have all been made public in the face of assassins seeking our life, of informers watching our actions and words, and of implacable and unmerciful enemies conspiring our ruin. The book is true to the letter.

For any thing more, the author is deeply sensible that if it should be made an instrument of good—it will be because God shall own it. After what he has seen and experienced, after those things of which he has been made the instrument; he is the last that should be found distrusting God. Let the adorable God do therefore, what seemeth to him good; it shall, by his grace, be good also for his servant.

CONTENTS.—The Commencement of the Papal Controversy in Baltimore, in 1825.—Carmelite Convent in Baltimore; an Outrage which was probably Committed therein.—Questions to Determine the True Church.—Romanism, Political and Religious.—The Antiquity of the Protestant Faith.—Worship in an Unknown Tongue; Gregory vii. and the Bohemian Churches.—The General Councils. Which are they? What have they done?—A Visit to the Baltimore Cathedral.—The Last of the House of Vallois.—Judge Gaston of N. C. Religious Liberty. Mental Reservation.—An Address to the American People. Hon. Mr. Gaston of N. C. Catholic Perfidy. Prostitution of the Public Press.—Texian Revolution, before San Jacinto.—Jerome of Prague, and the Council of Constance.—Papal Propagandism in the United States.—Papal Provincial Council; Preaching of Bishop England.—Case of Eliza Burns the Abducted Orphan.—Bishops Full, *versus*, Bishops Empty.—First Kentucky Consecration, of “My Lord Purell.—Lent; its Curious History and Present State.—“The Big Beggar Man.”—Vocation and Preaching of Archbishop Eccleston.—

Conjunction of St. Bacchus and St. Ignatius.—Papal Unity; its Nature, Certainty, and Advantage.—Creed of the Church of Rome; her Dilemma and Imposture.—Eliza Ann O'Neal, and her Rescued Child.—Escape of a Nun from the Carmelite Prison in Aisquith street.—The Case of Olevia Neal the Carmelite Nun, called Sister Isabella.—Review of the Correspondence between the Archbishop and Mayor of Baltimore.—The Tax Book of the Roman Chancery.—*Secreta Monita Societatis Jesu.*—Papism before the Courts of Law: our Legal Persecution.—Letter of Robert J. Breckinridge to the Second Presbyterian Church of Baltimore, on the Occasion of his Presentation by the Grand Jury: with the Action of the Session, and that of the Church thereon.—The State of Maryland against Robert J. Breckinridge.

NOTICES, RECEIPTS, ACCOUNTS, ANSWERS TO LETTERS, &c.

FROM FEBRUARY 13, TO MARCH 15.—*New Subscribers.*—Rev. R. S. Gladney, Carroll, Pickens Co. Ala., from Jan'y, 1841, back numbers till then sent, and \$2,50 paid by Rev'd Mr. Morrow; we will deliver the six bound vols., for 1835-'40, to Mr. M., as he returns, if he can take charge of them.—R. K. King, Plymouth, Illinois, name added from Jan'y, '41, \$2,50, and back numbers sent, by order of J. D. King, of Miss.—Wm. Marshall, Hagerstown, name added from Jan'y, 41, and back numbers sent.—Mr. H. A. Munroe, Unionville, S. C., name added from March.—P. M. Lex., Va., \$3, for Rev'd Mr. Skinner, whose name is added, and back numbers from Jan'y sent.—Mr. Thomas E. Peck, Columbia, S. C., name added from last Jan'y, and back numbers sent, by order of our friend, S. Wier.—John Stevenson, Alexandria, D. C., name added by order of D. Owen, from Jan'y, 1841.

Discontinuances, Changes, &c. James Kilton, West Grave, Pa., \$5, and discontinued; see our private letter for the amount of arrears.—Donald Frazier, Jun., Fowlerville, N. Y., \$3, per Rev. J. H. Redington, in full and discontinued.—Wallace Sigerson, New Orleans, discontinued.—Rev. R. B. McMullen, direction changed from Clinton, Alabama, to Knoxville, Tenn., after the March No. had been sent to the former place.—Rev'd D. G. Doak, Clarkesville, Va., discontinued, by order of P. M. Oak Hill, N. C.

Payments, Orders, &c. Rev'd Thomas Morrow, of Alabama, \$2,50, for '41.—Thomas D. King, Oakland Coll., Miss. \$2,50, which with \$3, paid by him in Oct. '40, makes \$5,50; he began with March, '40, and is thus credited till March, '42, and 50 cents over. We send him without charge, the numbers for August, '39, and Feb'y 40, for which he writes, as we happen to have odd numbers; we have none for Jan'y, 40, or we would send it, and complete his volume, and let his subscription begin at that time.—Nathan Woods, of West Hill, Pa., \$5 for himself and Dr. A. Rankin, both for '41; the Nos. for Jan'y and Feb'y, had been sent to Wm. Kerr, but are sent again at the request of N. W.—Mrs. M. A. Baker, Balt., paid \$2,50, for '41.—Rev. Mr. Love, of Delaware, \$2, which pays till the end of this year.—Rev'd Dr. Gosman, Port Byron, N. Y., per Rev'd Mr. Redington, \$2,50, for 1841.—Rev'd J. L. Pitts, \$2,50, which pays for one year, ending Sept., '40, (if our books are correct), and Mr. F. Schroeder, \$2,50, for '41; both of Frederick city, Md., by the hands of our friend, Rev. J. S.—The number for Dec., '39, sent to Rev'd J. L. Pitts, Frederick, Md.—Settled in person with Mr. J. H. Dearing, up to the end of this year and other private accounts; also with him the accounts of Mr. B. F. Hawkins and Rev'd Mr. Scott, of Tuscaloosa, Ala., which are both paid in full to the end of this year, and delivered the back volumes for Mr. S., to Mr. D.; see statement given to him.—Col. James Patterson, Lancaster Co., Pa., \$2,50, for 1841.

[EXTRA.]

LETTER TO ROBERT WICKLIFFE ESQ'R, OF LEXINGTON KY., PRELIMINARY TO A DEFENCE AGAINST HIS SECOND SPEECH OF 1840.

SIR:—I know no man in the world but yourself, who is able to condense four mis-statements into twelve words. This you have done, within the knowledge of hundreds of your immediate neighbours, in the title page of a recent pamphlet which you call, "*Speech of Robert Wickliffe in reply to the Rev'd R. J. Breckinridge, delivered in the Court House in Lexington on Monday, the 9th of November, 1840.*" I say nothing now as to this speech being a *reply* to any thing; nor as to its being *the* speech it pretends to be; though both these statements are wide from the truth. But every body in Lexington knows, that the speech you pretend to report was *not* delivered in November; was *not* delivered on the 9th of that or any other month; was *not* delivered on Monday; and was *not* delivered in the court house.

I have read the pamphlet with great attention; and have determined not to let it pass without a formal reply. This is no doubt unexpected to you, and was far from my thoughts when I listened to you delivering the speech which you pretend is printed in this pamphlet. The *spoken* speech was so perfectly contemptible, both in matter and form, and those who heard it or were likely to hear any verbal report of it, knew both of us so well, that I disdained to make even a verbal reply to it. The *printed* speech contains many things which were never uttered by you, and which you did not dare to propound as true, when I was present to confute them; it omits many things which the stress of circumstances obliged you to confess while speaking, and many other things too absurd and too easily proven to be false, to be printed even by you; and besides all this, many may read your pamphlet who do not know either you or me. By the publication of this pamphlet, such as it is, you have, for the third time in ten years, placed me in circumstances which make silence, dishonour. You can better determine the wisdom of your conduct, after you have gathered its fruits.

Sir, it has been the fortune of my life to be brought into controversy with some of the worst principles, worst parties, and worst men of my generation. In every case I have had occasion to observe, that in addition to such evils as were common and kindred, each one has had some marked and specific vice which has been eminently personal and distinctive. You, Sir, have not departed from this remarkable instinct. Of all your eminent characteristics, all who know you well, recognize as the most intensely individual, an utter incapacity to perceive, to feel, or to utter truth, when it conflicts with any interest or any passion that may chance, for the time, to occupy your breast. I do not charge you now with deliberate falsehood; I charge you with that, which if less criminal is hardly less calamitous—a total imperviousness to any truth that even seems to militate against you.

And this characteristic is so remarkable and so effective, that I would undertake to prove by any two papers ever written by you, upon any subject in which your feelings or interests were involved; that each, upon the authority of the other, is false in principle, in reasoning, and in fact. How, then, are you likely to appear, when I come to contrast your horrible assertions not only with notorious and even recorded facts, but with each other; and lay before an indignant public, positive proof, from under your own hand, of the utter falsehood of many of the most precise and dishonoring accusations of your present speech? If I do not do this, I will agree to sink to your own level: and my most pitiless enemy could demand nothing worse.

It is a source of sincere regret to me that you have obliged me, twice already, and now for the third time, to exhibit this extraordinary trait of your character. You have forced me to do it; or to see every evil passion of every wicked man and every corrupt party which it has been my duty to resist and expose during an active life, make common cause with you, as you have openly done with them; and have you all like a pack of wolves yelping upon my footsteps, keeping each other in countenance by the fury of your common howlings, and stimulating your common malignity by expressions of reciprocal confidence and signs of mutual aid. The noblest stag of the forest may at last be worried to death by an innumerable multitude of the most detestable curs; and may find, when too late, that it had been better for him to have trampled some into the dust, and tossed some into the air, as they came singly upon him, and were neglected, pitied, forgiven, or despised. Sir, you may find in this reflection, the secret of certain portions of my conduct, which you, and possibly many better men, may have condemned as not altogether consistent with my sacred calling; conduct which a man stronger than myself, or surrounded by fewer and less implacable enemies, or less obviously called of God to contend against them, might perhaps have wisely changed. And yet it is too true, that many of the highest graces and loftiest virtues of religion—are evermore condemned by those, who shrink from their exercise, or suffer under their rebuke.

I shall not, however, on this, as I did not on either of the former occasions when we came in conflict, overpass the boundary of simple defence. This is the line of conduct which I have constantly marked out for myself in all my difficulties with you; and notwithstanding your repeated assertions to the contrary, I confidently aver that the whole tenor of my action amounts only to this. Not that there was want of provocation for me to have carried on a far different warfare; for that has been ample. Not that there was any lack of material for such a conflict; for no man during my day in Kentucky, has been more vulnerable or more defenceless than yourself. But I never had, nor have I now, any desire to do you, or any man, any other hurt than such as the absolute necessity of our relative conditions might require, and the clear dictates of duty impose. In the beginning of our controversies, in 1830, my whole effort, so far as it was personal, was to defend my principles against your circular, your road bill, your pro-slavery, and anti-sabbath principles. And when to these public difficulties was added a private one, growing out of your faithless conduct as the legal adviser of my father's representatives, I did not attack your general character either as a man or as a lawyer—nor even your general management of the interests of my father's estate,

so far as they were committed to you; but only defended, at first, the interests of the family whose trustee I was, against your infidelity in a particular series of acts; and then, subsequently, my own character, which you privately assailed to that very family in order to excuse your own conduct. So, again, in 1840, I appeal to your printed Speech of *August*, and to mine of *October*, to prove the forbearance with which I still adhered to the line of mere defence, and even then upon topics selected entirely by yourself; as I may well appeal to your whole conduct towards me from 1820 to 1840—(of which your *second* speech of the latter year is a just sample)—for the unparalleled provocations under which that forbearance was exercised. And now, finally, in reply to that last and most atrocious publication, which you call your speech of *November*, (October,) 1840; it is still my desire, to make no farther inroad upon you, than is at once necessary for the perfect elucidation of my defence, and fully warranted by indubitable truth; and still to allow to you, the selection of the charges on which I shall be arraigned.

Let me not, however, mislead you, nor deceive others, by the use of phrases which may be considered equivocal. You and I may have different ideas as to what constitutes a defence. To escape just condemnation may be considered by you a sufficient exculpation; and to mistify and embarrass a case which is clear against you, may appear a thorough defence. Not so with me. I judge that defence alone to be complete, by which my innocence is triumphantly established, or through which my justification is made absolute. If in perfecting such a vindication, the prosecutor, the witness, or even the tribunal be made infamous, the legitimacy of strict defence cannot be in the least impeached. You have made the case, Sir; therefore, be prepared for its legitimate and inevitable issues.

It is my intention, if God spares my life, to enter somewhat at large into the various matters charged against me in your *second* printed Speech, that of *November*, (October,) 1840. This I will do as soon as the state of my present duties and engagements, the extent and variety of the subjects you have introduced, and the nature of your accusations will permit. The whole case made by you naturally divides itself into two distinct general subjects; one covering our private relations and difficulties and your purely personal accusations, the other embracing my public life and principles and your impeachments of them. These two cases are so treated by you as to embrace nearly the whole period of my existence, and the entire scope of all my public conduct; and the mixed conclusion at which you derive is, that I have been and am, the very worst of men, of politicians, and of ministers. The cases are, however, intrinsically distinct, and are necessarily obliged to be treated in a manner entirely different, the one from the other; that which is *personal* depending almost entirely on matter of *fact*, while that which is *public* depends as exclusively on the settlement of great and enduring *principles*. I shall, therefore, in my proposed defence, treat our private controversy, as a separate matter, and then our public differences; and will publish these two parts of that defence, separately or together, and in such order as may hereafter appear most advisable.

Whatever, Sir, may be the issue of these discussions, there are three facts in regard to them, which can never be forgotten. *First*, that you have followed me not only into private life, but into a distant commonwealth—and roused me from my humble occupations and retired studies with shouts of indecent triumph, and

assailed and traduced me in a manner absolutely ferocious: *Secondly*, that your atrocious personal accusations against me, have no other justification than the complete refutation be me, of your unprovoked charges against my public conduct: *Thirdly*, that the principles for which you have so long execrated and so unsparingly pursued me, are such as constitute the glory of our age, the highest grace of our institutions, and the most sacred inheritance of man. He who is even victorious in controversies begun and conducted as this has been by you; must nevertheless, be permanently disgraced, wherever honor, manhood, or truth is regarded. But he who makes such exhibitions of himself, and reaps in the process nothing but defeat; leaves to mankind the possibility of no other conclusion, than that besides being totally depraved in principle—he either has no sense or no conscience.

At present I will only say to such persons and parties as suppose they have any thing to gain by injuring me, and who, therefore, hail with delight your infamous publication; perhaps they will find by-and-by, that you are not exactly the person for whose assertions discreet people should stand sponsor, nor precisely the ally to make any cause either successful or respectable. To the candid and fair-minded of all parties, I need say no more, than that in the present case my means of triumphant personal vindication against every new charge you have brought, are not a whit less overwhelming than those already spread before the public in my first defence; and that very much of your conduct has been not less palpably disreputable than your unfounded and vindictive attack on me as the author of a law, of whose very existence I was ignorant, but for the passage of which you had yourself, being sworn, deliberately voted!

Sir, it is not the least remarkable of your acts, that you openly deride the doctrine of God's providence, and scoff at the idea of special supplication for his particular guidance. I bear my testimony to a directly opposite doctrine. And in token of my sincerity, I hereby humbly and earnestly beseech the Lord, my Master and my constant defence, to decide this matter between you and me, according to what is true and right.

RO. J. BRECKINRIDGE.

BALTIMORE, MARCH 17, 1841.

THE
BALTIMORE LITERARY
AND
RELIGIOUS MAGAZINE.

VOL. VII.]

MAY, 1841.

[No. 5.]

IN MEMORY OF THE REV. JAMES A. PEABODY, LATE FINANCIAL SECRETARY OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION OF THE PREBYTERIAN CHURCH.

To the Editor of the Baltimore Magazine.

MY DEAR SIR.—To those who have closed a life of useful toil on earth, by entering on the heavenly rest, it can cause no grief to be forgotten here. Such persons were crucified while on earth, to the love of human praise; and how much more must the rewards and glories of the skies exclude all concern about the opinions of fallible men?

Yet it is the provision of the Lord, for the sake of the church, and for the honor of the blessed dead, who "*rest from their labours*"—that "*their works should follow them.*" The example of the true believer, and his good influence in the world, is the richest legacy which, when dying, he bequeaths to men. It is his witness to the truth and glory of the gospel. It is his illustration of the life of a Christian. It is religion embodied in a memorial which ought not to be allowed to perish. It is like the mantle of Elijah transmitted to Elisha—or like the *bones* of Elisha in which a sort of *vitality* resided after his spirit had departed. For this reason, among others, the word of God abounds in the history of his servants in every age. Their call, their trials, labours, graces, failings, sacrifices, triumphs, and influence, are related in the candour of perfect truth; and every doctrine, precept, and promise is made to live anew in the biography of his people. Nor are these sketches confined to *illustrious personages*—on the contrary, wherever the individual so came into contact with the kingdom of Christ as to give a salutary lesson to the church, whether it were the exalted son of Jesse or the poor beggar who lay at the rich man's gate, the incident is preserved and published. Indeed this relation to religion constitutes the only distinction which the Bible recognises. This is treated as the true and only glory of human character, *eminence in the love and service of the Lord*; this, too, we need hardly add, is the only distinction in heaven.

Every one is familiar with the good effects of a judicious and faithful biography of eminently holy persons. It would be impossible to trace the influence of such books as the *Life of Martin*; of *Brainard*; of *Whitfield*; *Spencer*; *Pearce*; *Harriet Newell*; *Mrs. Judson*, &c. &c.—though coming from uninspired authors, and often very imperfectly composed.

In a word, the memory of the saints is the precious, and should be made the imperishable property of the church. Omitting all trifling details about looks, genealogy, and secular relations—especially rejecting all vain and fulsome eulogies, and all self-lauding, often wrought in tedious diaries; faithful to truth, while throwing a veil of charity over inevitable human frailties—brief, evangelical—for the glory of God, and the good of the rising and of succeeding generations—in fine, copying the spirit and example of the Scriptures—we should draw to the life, and mainly present what will illustrate and honour the religion of Christ.

We have before us an unpretending, but excellent example of the character just described—in the person of the Rev. James A. Peabody. We fear we shall be very far from giving a proper specimen of the sort of biography which we herein recommend. The attempt, however, will, we hope, be kindly received by the church at large, and with indulgence if not with perfect satisfaction by his surviving kindred and friends—while we trust that others may be led by this humble attempt to rescue from oblivion and dedicate to the church the memory of many who have furnished the brightest models of religion, and yet have been allowed to pass away so silently that the benefits of their example have descended with them to the dust.

The subject of this brief memoir, was born at Plattsburgh, New York, February 21, 1803—of highly respectable parents. His father was a lawyer of considerable talents and good practice. But when James was only *seven* years of age, his father died, leaving a widow with eight orphan children, depending on their own exertions for their support in life.—Yet by her admirable efforts, seconded by her children as they successively attained to an age capable of aiding her, and above all, blessed by God, she has been enabled to rear a most reputable household, and fit them for life. At the age of *ten*, he removed with his mother from Plattsburg, which was then the seat of war, to a safe retreat in Dutchess county, N. Y. There he abode, enjoying but meagre opportunities for acquiring knowledge—and engaged actively in aiding his afflicted and only surviving parent to support her children, until 1820, when in his 17th year he was induced by an elder brother to settle himself in the city of Baltimore. At this tender age, and thus far from his mother's care, he entered himself as a clerk in the service of a respectable wholesale grocer. Early in the year 1824, he had become so well known, and was so much esteemed for his excellent character and business-talents that he was sent as supercargo in a merchant ship bound to Port au Prince. His commercial objects there were faithfully and successfully accomplished:—but while in the island he contracted the yellow fever, which seized him with great fury at sea, so that on his arrival at Baltimore, his

life was despaired of. By the mercy of God, he was finally restored, however, and soon entered again actively into business. This illness made a deep religious impression on his mind; and for some time he appeared hopefully serious. But his return to the active duties of life, soon evinced the insufficiency of these impressions—and he, by degrees, lost their influence.—At the close of the same year, (1824,) he re-visited the West Indies in his former capacity without injury to his health, with great advantage to his employers—and with much success in the small adventure which he was allowed to attempt on his own account. In 1825 after closing his shipping commission, he visited his venerable parent and family, finding one member of it removed by death, another married and gone, a third far away on business; but the beloved head and cement of it was still spared to see his face once more on earth.

When he returned to Baltimore, he found himself stripped of all his hard-earned gains, by the fraudulent conduct of the person in whose hands he had left them.

He now exerted himself once more to recover his losses, and reinstate himself in a posture to transact business for himself. But failing to do so, he entered into the service of Mr. Hoben, his first employer, from which he finally passed to the store of Mr. Kirkland.—It was in the autumn of 1826, while he was in the service of Mr. Kirkland, that the writer of this notice became acquainted with him. This was in his 24th year. He was at that time an interesting youth—delicate in appearance; thoughtful; fond of the society of serious persons—steady in his attendance on the public worship of God—and actively engaged in the instruction of the Sunday School connected with the Second Presbyterian church. But he was so extremely reserved and modest that it was difficult to have intercourse with him on the subject of religion, until the depth of his concern forced him to seek the counsel of his Christian friends. It was on the first sabbath of March, 1827, that a powerful work of divine grace simultaneously appeared in the First and Second Presbyterian churches in Baltimore. The earliest known subject of Divine mercy, as well as one of the most hopeful in the latter congregation, was James A. Peabody. As his extreme diffidence prevented him for several months from disclosing his religious exercises, so his deep humility and self-distrust hindered a public profession of religion, until the love of Christ and the power of his purged conscience constrained him. He took this solemn step in company with some fifty others, (the first fruits of the revival,) during the following summer. It would be too little to say of him that he adorned his profession. He *studied* to magnify the religion of his Lord. He surrendered himself supremely to it; mingling the sweetest spirit of meekness and gentleness with an untiring zeal, and a devotion marked by self-oblivion and universal love. During the first year of his public profession, his feelings began to be strongly drawn toward the sacred office. Yet he shrunk from the publicity and responsibility of that delightful but awful trust. Often his conscience and religious affections would draw him to the verge of a surrender of himself to its duties; but

as often the sense of his own unfitness, and the terrors of so sacred and solemn a profession would drive him back. He was left by his friends to the shaping hand of his Lord; believing that "He alone can make a minister who made the world." After the lapse of another year, he was divinely led to dedicate himself to this important work. But now he was met by several serious difficulties. For he was entirely unfit to enter on it, by the imperfectness of his early instruction—yet he had not the means of procuring such an education as was requisite: he was so far advanced in life as to make it painful to spend many years in study: and withal he was not willing to receive assistance from any quarter. In these perplexing circumstances, the *last* difficulty gave way under the strong desire to prepare to preach, and the rest were over-ruled. Application was accordingly made to our own Board of Education for aid, and full testimonials furnished. The Cor. Sec., Dr. E. S. Ely, replied *that* the Board had no means—nor the prospect of any—and strongly recommended him to look to the American Education Society. This was to us a most astounding disclosure, as well as a most humiliating alternative. Yet he preferred this to any effort in his behalf among the members of the church; and finally application was made at his request to the Rev. Dr. Cornelius, then Cor. Sec. of the American Education Society. His response was prompt, favourable, generous. He was a noble man; and a *wise* one. He soon followed in person—offered illimitable aid to all fit candidates for the ministry among us; visited our churches; organized societies; appointed the necessary examining committees—and disclosed and established the principles of the American Board in the bosom of a community charmed with his eloquence and fine address.—Mr. Peabody, at the entire sacrifice of good temporal prospects, set forth in the prosecution of his studies—on his scanty annual allowance; and Dr. Cornelius passed on to the south and west.

Here it may not be improper to note a singular concurrence of providential events. In six months, Mr. Peabody found it impossible to bring his feelings to receive aid in the manner then in use—especially from a body *not* Presbyterian; and accordingly, soon withdrew from that connexion. The Committee of Examination, at their first meeting, acting under the constitution of the society, received under their care, a candidate from the Methodist Episcopal church. Farther; they were led to ponder the analysis of the ever growing pecuniary power of the society, which Dr. Cornelius had read to them from a paper headed "*not published*"—which he would not allow them to retain. They admired the intrepid and noble spirit of that peculiar man who seemed to carry conquest in every look; and they blushed, nay trembled when they recalled the hopeless imbecility of our own Board of Education.—The committee was dissolved; and new purposes solemnly formed never to rest until our Board should be constrained to resolve, and see the resolution performed—that every *fit candidate for the sacred office in the Presbyterian church who needed—should, by the grace of God, have aid—till every demand for preachers of our order every where should be met.*

One member of that Committee became Corresponding Secretary and General agent of our Board of Education, at its re-organization in 1831; and James A. Peabody at the same time its invaluable Secretary of Finance.—His subsequent relation to that cause, (as well as the intrinsic peculiarity of the facts,) will, we are sure, excuse this digression—if we may not more properly say, that it constitutes it an integral and very important part of the narrative itself.

When Mr. Peabody withdrew from the patronage of the A. E. Society, he was again thrown upon his own resources. But Providence opened at this critical moment a door at once for self-support, and for great usefulness, without retarding his progress in preparatory study. The Second Presbyterian church, to which he belonged, was surrounded by a population of 25,000 people, one half of whom with their children were destitute of religious instruction. The late revival had greatly enlarged the number of efficient Sunday school teachers, and (by their efforts,) of Sunday school pupils also. But the demand for such instructions out-ran the means of supply. This suggested the plan of a Sunday School missionary, to be supported by the church. Mr. Peabody was appointed. He studied severely in the forenoons and evenings, and visited the children of the destitute in the afternoons. Thus he not only progressed in his studies, but enlarged the schools under the care of the church, to some 750 pupils—and organized a system whose chief fault was its immense extent and unmanageable weight. This system he sustained with noble efficiency and zeal until the time arrived for attaching himself to the Theological Seminary at Princeton. This was in the autumn of 1830. His loss was immediately and severely felt in the Sunday School, and indeed in that extensive portion of the destitute population of Baltimore to which the influence of his labours had incidentally extended. Yet his duty to his Master was too clear to be mistaken, and the church with many regrets gave him up. His connexion with the Seminary was very interesting, and useful to him in many important respects; and his standing and demeanour, while a member of it, were such as might have been expected from such a man. But Providence had appointed for him another sphere for which he was so admirably fitted that the professors earnestly united in recommending him to enter it, before he had closed his first year of theological study. During the sessions of the General Assembly of 1831, the call for the resuscitation of our Board of Education, which had been growing more loud and general for several years—broke out into open and irrepressible demands. The Assembly appointed a Committee for its re-organization. The chairman of that Com. was its undisguised opponent; but regarding it with scorn, for its imbecility, he said with open contempt, "well, brethren, this thing is dead already, let the Philadelphia members of this Committee give it a decent burial." It is said that at that moment, the present respected and beloved chairman of the Executive Committee of the Board of Education, shed tears—under this ungenerous but merited taunt. Yet availing themselves of the occasion thus offered, "the Philadelphia brethren," retired; they resolved to recommend the en-

largement of the Board; and proceeded to select the most efficient and devoted friends of the Presbyterian church, in the city and throughout the church, for a future Board. The chairman concurred—the Assembly adopted—and from that moment began the new and efficient action of the despised Board. Though “dead,” it received from God a glorious resurrection; and six years after, the same board reported the reception of the one thousandth student, candidate for the ministry, who had been received and aided by it!—J. A. Peabody, soon after the re-organization, was elected its assistant, and finally its Financial Secretary. And strange to tell, he had been, during a part of his early life, a member of the congregation of which the said thoughtful and generous chairman who had appointed the funeral obsequies of the Board, was for several years the pastor: thus, without being aware of it, and surely without intending it, he was made the instrument of rousing our slumbering Board; and then of training a noble agent for its service.

In the latter part of the same summer, (1831,) Mr. Peabody fully entered on the duties of his office—Here his fine business talents, which without their being aware of the design of Providence he had in early life been led to cultivate, were brought into the most important uses. His skill as a clerk and correspondent; his financial knowledge; his active and orderly habits; his energy; his untiring perseverance, ingenuity and steady ardour of mind, made him, we may say without doubt, the most important officer of the Board. The routine of office duties need not be detailed; though the extent of his arduous and valuable labours can hardly be conceived by one not daily at his side and conversant with his habits. Indeed “office duties” hardly conveys any just definition of his employment. Here a new and great institution was in fact to be created; the most serious responsibilities were to be borne, not merely in collecting and disbursing money for the support of candidates for the sacred office; but a most intimate and important intercourse personally and by letter, was constantly to be maintained with them; their number too was daily increasing—and new expense called for, new plans, efforts, and publications; without a treasury, yea in debt from the start;—without co-operation by agents in the field, or as yet even from the churches and Presbyteries; with a system to form, then to carry into effect; to begin as if of long existence, yet having nothing effectual to exist on—this was his work. And although he was not the head of the office, and was sustained by as admirable a body of laymen as was ever organized for the work of the Lord, yet the chief Secretary was very often absent on public duties abroad in the land—and the Board and Committee were like their secretaries, inexperienced in this peculiar and difficult service. Wherefore a large part of the system, especially in its details, was devolved upon him. How he executed the trust during eight years of unremitting toil, and of enthusiastic devotion to it, let the result itself inform us; let the crowd of its candidates; let the fruits of their labours; let the voice of the church tell. Nay, it must be left to the disclosures

and rewards of the last day. To it he devoted his life; and for it we may say, poured it out.

It might be indelicate in the writer to say more on this part of the subject—but this much is due to the memory of one whose services to the church of God have never been appreciated by those who were not connected with the office, or intimately acquainted with his habits.

Though Mr. Peabody had never enjoyed the opportunities of acquiring a full theological or even academic education, yet he was considered by the Presbytery of Baltimore sufficiently prepared in both respects to receive license to preach as a probationer; which they conferred on him with much cordiality in the year 1832. He was afterwards received by the Second Presbytery of Philadelphia, as a candidate for ordination, *sine titulo*; and his examination was in part effected—but at the meeting fixed for the completion of the work, he modestly withdrew his application, finding his licensure sufficient for all the pulpit services which he was ordinarily called to perform—and distrusting his own qualifications. There is no doubt, however from what had already taken place in the Presbytery, that he could honourably have passed to the office of an Evangelist; and that the purpose of sending him forth into the churches on frequent excursions for the Board, made his request reasonable and even necessary. Yet some uncalled for objections to the principle, being started, he humbly withdrew.

As a preacher, he had too much diffidence and too feeble a voice to do justice to his powers, zeal, or attainments. He wrote with ease, vivacity, and sometimes with great force. But he had a very humble opinion of his own performances—so that while he freely and frequently laboured as a missionary among the destitute parts of the city—and occasionally performed useful agencies for the Board, he seldom appeared before the larger churches, and never without a struggle with himself. Yet he was as far from being secular in his spirit as the most devoted and severely occupied pastor—and his occupation though touching business and monied relations at every step, was immediately associated with the spread of the gospel, and his ardent aim throughout, was, the *conversion of the world*. We may safely add, that probably no man of his age who has entered the ministry since his time, has done more for the honour, purification and enlargement of the Presbyterian church; or for the conversion of the world. He was sitting at the very fountain of those influences which are intimately blended with each of these great objects. The good he has been enabled to do will live after him. It appears profusely now—but not in his person or name; and will continue to strengthen and expand while one of the many valuable young men whom he materially aided to reach the ministry—shall publish salvation and win souls to Christ.

Mr. Peabody lived long unmarried. In the midst of his severe toils, his compensation was inadequate to the support of a family, and his soul was wedded to his work. In April of the year 1837, he became acquainted with the amiable and interesting lady, Miss Emma G. Peale, youngest daughter of the celebrated artist of Philadelphia, Rembrandt Peale, to whom he was united in marriage in

the spring of 1838. He was exceedingly happy in this union which alas, was destined to be so soon dissolved!

From the earliest childhood Mr. P. had manifested an unusual taste for the fine arts; and his genius through life, though never cultivated, was constantly appearing, especially in the use of the pencil—and in music. There is no doubt that he might have become one of the most distinguished artists of the age, if his principles and aims had not led him to repress his talent in that way. Indeed, notwithstanding all his efforts, it sometimes burst out in the production of exquisite pieces, not unworthy of the first masters. It was through this peculiar talent that he was first drawn into acquaintance with the accomplished young lady who soon made conquest of his affections; and in April of the year following, gave him her hand in wedlock.

In the latter part of the winter of 1838, while engaged in preparing the *Biblical Repertory** for circulation, he was seized with a sudden and most alarming hemorrhage from his lungs. After a dangerous attack, he so far recovered, as to be able feebly to resume the duties of his office. But his health was never afterward fully restored to him. This, however, was only the occasion of calling out a diseased state of his lungs which had long been lurking in his system. For it appeared from a post-mortem examination, that though there was but little *consumption* of the lungs, there was an extraordinary induration, the right lobe having become entirely useless; but a small portion of the other was fit for respiration; and that portion, replete with hard particles, showing the existence of long and fatal disease.

During the hot months of summer he retired with his little family to the quiet village of Lawrence, New Jersey. It was there that the writer was permitted to see him for the last time. His end was evidently fast approaching; nor was he unconscious of it. He felt as a man of his sensibility and devotion to Christianity might be expected to do. When he looked at his lovely boy and youthful bride, he must have lingered in giving the full consent to die.— And when he surveyed the large field of his ripening usefulness, and the still larger desolations of the world lying in unreclaimed iniquity and ruin, he must have felt *in a strait betwixt the two*, at a loss which to choose. But he left it where Paul left it, with the Great Head of the church; and calmly waited his summons to depart.

At the close of the summer, he repaired to Keysville, N. York, on a visit to his venerable mother, with some faint hope that exercise and the bracing atmosphere of autumn in the north might do him good. But a month spent in Keysville, warned him that his danger was increasing and that he ought to fly from a northern sky, even at that early day. In returning home, he felt anxious to

*For a year or two before his death, he had become the publisher of this important periodical, and did very much to reduce its accounts to order, and to extend its circulation in the Presbyterian church. It was his great attachment to the principles of the church and his high esteem of this work as their able advocate, rather than much prospect of profit, which led him to devote to its service those leisure hours which others bestow on the recreation of the mind, and the repose of the body.

visit some endeared relations of his wife, residing near Boston.— But the journey was too much for his shattered frame. He was barely enabled to reach their residence at Lynn, Massachusetts.— On the evening of his arrival, his hemorrhage returned with renewed force, and continued at intervals, until his exhausted nature sank, and he calmly yielded up his spirit to God, in the firm and joyous hope of eternal life. He was enabled cheerfully to commit his bereaved young widow and infant orphan to that divine and faithful Redeemer, who had said “*leave your fatherless children, and I will preserve them, and let your widows trust in me.*” He vindicated the goodness of God with his dying breath, saying that all was done wisely and well; begged that if a single murmur escaped his lips, he might be immediately informed and reproved; and committed his departing spirit with elevated and unshaken hope to his beloved Saviour.

His last words were these: being asked if he had any parting directions for his wife, he said, laying his feeble hand on “Clarke on the promises,” “*this contains all I wish to say.*” She was lying in agony at his side, and so gently “did he fall on sleep,” the sleep of death, that they were not aware of his departure till the icy coldness of his hand which was clasped in her’s, communicated the solemn tidings.

And now we commend these most interesting survivors to the love and care of that church for which he gave his life. On his death-bed he dedicated his boy to the Lord Jesus, and his youthful widow, now a member of the church under the pastoral care of the Rev’d Henry A. Boardman, seeks to fulfil their joint vows, in the Christian education of her son; and taking him by the hand, would like Christiana, follow their sainted father and husband to the skies.

J. B.

[Continued from page 169.]

MOLINISM.

No. V.

VII. *Lessius and Hamelius, Jesuits, censured by the Doctors of Louvain and Doway, and the conduct of the Court of Rome relative thereto.*

THE subject which we have undertaken, may perhaps seem to the reader of small importance. He may have been accustomed to regard the Society of Jesuits as a body belonging to former times—once formidable indeed, but now virtually extinct. The Society has undergone great mutations of fortune, and it has survived attacks which would have destroyed effectually any other association. But to this day it lives in spite of almost universal obloquy. Since the downfall of Napoleon Buonaparte, the policy of Rome has been changed in relation to her means of operation. She has revived the three orders of Dominicans, Franciscans and Jesuits, and they have gone forth as the emissaries of that see. Without pretend-

ing to say, as some have said, that these three orders are symbolized by the three unclean spirits, like frogs, which, in the Revelation of John xvi. 13, are said to come out of the mouth of the dragon, and out of the mouth of the beast, and out of the mouth of the false prophet; we may say of the order of Jesuits that no society has ever shown itself possessed of greater power to do evil. They are a secret society. Their machinations are conceived with consummate skill—they are laid underneath the surface of society and managed with a want of good faith, and of moral principle proverbially their own. The members of this Society are among us, and they are the most active members of the Roman Catholic church. By an easy and brief process they may become aggregated to our political communities, and in form at least, become citizens, though in fact the principles of their association are necessarily incompatible with the obligations of a citizen. It has by some been made a question whether it is consistent with the spirit of our political institutions to allow the existence of any secret societies, and it is well known that a political question has been made concerning one secret society. It is foreign to our purpose to inquire into the particular question alluded to. But has the surmise ever occurred to the reader that this very question may have been set on foot by that order? Does the reader ask why that Society should raise it? With a design to pre-determine the principle in their favour by applying it to a case in which it would be likely to fail. Those who are acquainted with the artifices by which that Society has attained its ends—its oblique methods of approach, would not be surprized at the fact; but whether it be so or not, the Jesuits would no doubt take the failure of the Anti-Masonic question as a favourable omen of their own success in the like emergency. Without intending to cast the slightest reflection upon those who have taken part in that question, and without intimating the slightest opinion as to its merits one way or the other, the writer may be allowed to say he has always considered it unfortunate that so important a principle should be staked in a cause which (comparatively with the society of Jesuits) may be pronounced inconsiderable. But it is time to resume our subject.

The Jesuit Lessius was from Brabant. He entered the Society in 1572, at the age of 18 years. He died in 1623, at the age of 67 years. His Theological works are numerous. The Jesuits regarded him as a saint, and preserved his relicks, and they say he wrought miracles. Notwithstanding this, his maxims upon the subject of morals were abominable. He began the study of theology at Doway. The Jesuit who wrote his life, informs us that at the beginning of his course he was in great perplexity to harmonize the system of doctrine which he approved with the authority of certain doctors, to whom he thought himself bound to adhere. With a view to do so, he subjected his mind to torture, but could not make his reason yield to authority. He carried his difficulties to Rome. At length Suarez relieved him by saying that he must not think it sacrilege, to differ with certain great men. He added, if the historian is to be believed, that his remark must be confined to matters which concerned neither the faith nor morals. But

neither the disciple nor the master observed the restriction in practice.

Lessius entered fully into the new system of doctrine concerning grace, and became fully possessed of all its subtleties. Having come to Louvain to teach theology in connection with Hamelius they inculcated, in common, the new system. The theological faculty became alarmed and endeavoured to reclaim these Jesuits, but finding their efforts unsuccessful, they formally censured, in 1587, certain propositions derived from their writings. Three of these propositions respected the inspiration of the Holy Scriptures. The drift and effect of these was to detract from the authority due to the Scriptures. The other propositions turned upon the subject of predestination and reprobation. In all, there were thirty-one propositions censured. The faculty professed to contrast the ancient doctrine of the church with the new doctrine of the Jesuits. They say, among other things, that the doctrine of St. Augustine, touching grace, free will, predestination and reprobation, is not combatted (by these Jesuits) in a single point of small importance (as they said) but in almost all its parts, and that it is directly attacked and absolutely destroyed. The faculty also attempted to prove that these Jesuits made no other objections than those of the Semi-Pelagians. The Doctors of Louvain addressed their censure to the bishops of the Netherlands. The Jesuits drew up an apology for their propositions and their doctrine. The doctors of Louvain then prepared a justification of their censure, and sent it to the nuncio of the pope, in August, 1588. The faculty of Doway also prepared a censure of the same propositions which was concluded and signed, 20th Jan'y, 1588. It was drawn up by Estius who was at that time chancellor of this faculty. These two censures and the justification mentioned, are undoubtedly composed with great ability, and *Molinism* is shown to be altogether irreconcilable with the doctrine of the primitive church. The Jesuits, however, not long afterwards acquired the ascendancy in the faculty of Doway; and in 1722, by a series of intrigues they engaged four doctors, representing that faculty, to draw up a long censure of this act of their predecessors, which is replete with Pelagian doctrines. This was one of the fruits which the Jesuits gathered from the bull *Unigenitus*, of which some account will be given hereafter. But to resume; the bishops of the Netherlands prepared to hold provincial councils, in order to confirm the censures of these two faculties of theology; but Aquaviva, at that time the general of the Jesuits, had sufficient influence with Sixtus V., (then the pope,) to prevent it. Sixtus V. acted upon the ultra-montan notion, that it was not allowable to any but the Roman pontiff to define and settle controverted points of Christian doctrine; a maxim which many of the Romanists of that day held to be false and contrary to the usages of their church. The maxim, however, was favourable to the Jesuits; for by remitting all such questions to the Court of Rome, they obtained at the least, delay; during which they could teach their own tenets openly and without any censure, which they were bound to obey. Besides this, they had a greater chance of succeeding in their plans by intrigues at Rome than at

any provincial council, as events showed. Their interest, therefore, made them ultra-montans, that is, the advocates of the absolutism of the papal see; and such indeed they have always been.

VIII. *Molina's Book—in what respects it contains novelties—and how far his doctrine is similar to that of Pelagius.*

MOLINA had been for a long time professor of theology in the University of *Evora* in Portugal, at the time he first published his book, in 1588, at Lisbon. Its title is, *The Concord of Grace and of Free Will*. Afterwards it was published at Lyons, Venice and Anvers, with additions and alterations, though without any change in the substance of its doctrines. The Dominican, Serri, who wrote the history of the Congregations *de auxiliis* says, (in lib. i. c. 13, of that work,) concerning Molina, "I will say what can scarcely be disputed by any one, that the chief aim of Molina was to introduce a new theology concerning Divine grace—to stop up the ways by which the ancient church had walked, and to open new ones, previously unknown and full of danger; and in fine to set himself up proudly against St. Augustine and the other doctors who had triumphed over Pelagianism." According to Molina's system, a man may divide with God the glory of his own salvation, and boast of the co-operation of his own free will, with grace. Molina admits that his system is new, which would have been sufficient to discredit it, had he not openly flattered the wicked propensities of corrupt human nature. In a few words: Molina's book contains Pelagianism combined with a system of subtleties, in order to give that system of error currency. Some of the Jesuits contended that Molina taught the doctrine of gratuitous predestination, and for this they had a pretext, but no solid reason. The peculiarity of his system is this:—it holds out to those who embrace it, the means of destroying the doctrine of gratuitous justification, and at the same time, of seeming to maintain it as far as it is their interest or pleasure to do so. Accordingly you may find passages which apparently support this doctrine, and also other passages which in effect subvert it. Molina and all the Jesuits who embraced his system, attack openly and without reserve, the doctrine of *effectual* grace, or *grace per se et ab intrinseco efficax*. They never swerve from a direct line on this subject, though they do as to the doctrine of gratuitous predestination. Their doctrines of *scientia media* and *congruism* already mentioned, were invented as a means of enabling them to preserve the doctrine of gratuitous predestination, as far as they should think it expedient to do so. This is mere artifice and a sort of fraud, to which none but a dishonest disputant can resort. The novelty of Molina's system does not consist in the Pelagian and Semi-Pelagian opinions which form the body of it. This part of it can be called novelty in no other sense than Pelagianism itself was an innovation on the doctrines of the primitive church. The novelties of Molina were the subtleties of the *scientia media* and *congruism*, or rather the engrafting of them on Pelagianism; for as has been observed, he was more or less indebted to the Scholastics who preceded him for these. Molina

himself says that no one had ever taught his system, and Saurez, Vasques, Fonseca, and Granado (also Jesuits) admit the same thing. Molina and many other Jesuits admit that Augustine knew nothing of their system. Molina, for example, after having proposed a solution which in effect destroyed the doctrine of gratuitous predestination, says that Augustine was too much enveloped in darkness to perceive the solution. (See part i. qu. 23, art. 4, disp. 1, numb. 6, ad finem, of Molina's Book.) Molina speaks of himself as the inventor of the system, but the Jesuit Fonseca disputes with him the glory of it. The fact is of no importance. It is sufficient to say, that the Jesuits among themselves invented it about the year 1588—Lessius and others taught it as well as Molina. The large share which the latter had in bringing the system into vogue, gave it the denomination of *Molinism*.

This system has (as it has already been said,) a double aspect, viz., one popular, and the other *theological*. The common people perceive nothing of the system different from Pelagian opinions, upon the subject of grace and predestination, which really constitute the sum and substance of the system. Theologians only comprehend the subtleties which have been added to it by the Jesuits, and which of course were entirely unknown to Augustine and his cotemporaries. At least if Pelagius knew them, he hid not make any use of them, and on this ground the Jesuits may justly claim for their system the quality—for we will not call it the merit—of novelty. It is true, however, that the doctrines of *congruism* and *scientia media* pre-suppose, or rather involve other heresies which were known to the ancient church. For example, these doctrines involve, in fact are built upon, the following error, viz.: "that the free will of man *sovereignly* disposes of the aids or succour which God gives or proffers, and that it fixes or determines at pleasure the success or failure of this aid or succour, without this, that God decides upon a point so important." Now this single fact shows that Pelagianism is so incorporated with the subtleties of Molina that they cannot subsist without it. Remove from his system this doctrine of *equilibrium*, (as it is called,) which Augustine so strenuously combatted, and the subject matter to which the *scientia media* and the doctrine of congruism is applied, will no longer exist. This system of Molina, therefore, is contrary to the doctrine of the ancient church because it depends necessarily upon a doctrine which the fathers denied and conclusively disproved.

But the Jesuits do not admit that their system is thus connected with Pelagianism. They join in pronouncing Pelagianism a heresy. Still they do maintain the doctrines of Pelagius, and Molina's book is full of them.

IX. The commotion caused in Spain by the publication of Molina's book.—The conduct of the Jesuit HENRIQUES, in relation to it—Pope Clement VIII. imposes silence upon both parties.

THE book of Molina caused great excitement in Spain. The Dominicans complained of it. They accused him of reviving Pelagianism, and endeavoured to prevent its circulation. Molina sus-

tained himself against the Dominicans by the credit of the Empress and her son Cardinal Albert, Archduke of Austria, and then inquisitor general of Portugal. So the book was published by approbation of the Inquisitor. During the next two years, new editions appeared at Venice and Anvers. At first many of the Jesuits opposed the book, among whom was Bellarmin. Perrius thought the society ought to abandon Molina and his book, but his most strenuous opponent was Henry Henriquez, a Portuguese, who entered the Society in 1552, and died at Tivoli in 1603. He wrote a treatise, *De Fine Hominis*, to oppose Molina's doctrine, which he published in 1593, and several other pieces in 1594 and 1597. He accused Molina of opening the door to Pelagianism and Semi-Pelagianism, and of undermining the doctrine of the providence of God. He thought the book ought to be prohibited. Some of his expressions are remarkable; for example, he said "this book prepares the way for Antichrist by the affection with which he exalts the natural forces of the free will (of man), against the merits of Jesus Christ, the aid of (Divine) grace and predestination." In another place, this author says: "If such a doctrine should come to be maintained by astute and powerful men, the members of some religious order, it will cause great peril to the whole church and the ruin of many Catholics." (*Quæ doctrinæ, si a viris astutis ac potentibus alicujus familiæ defendatur, afferet periculorum discrimen toti ecclesiæ et ruinam multis Catholicis.*) This remark was made about 120 years before the publication of the bull *Unigenitus*, which bull may be regarded as the consummation of the design, of those who conceived the new system of theology, better adapted, as was supposed, to combat the doctrine of Luther and Calvin and the other reformers. By astute and powerful men, no doubt Henriquez meant the Jesuits, who had already at that time, got things into a train for the purpose of espousing the cause of Molina before the Pope.

But to proceed: In Spain and Portugal, the disputes between the Jesuite and Dominicans became more and more violent. Cardinal Quiroga, Archbishop of Toledo, wrote to Clement VIII., informing him of the disturbances which their disputes excited. The pope thereupon wrote briefs to Quiroga (who was also grand inquisitor) and Cajetan, who was his nuncio at Madrid, interdicting cognizance of the affair. He required them to prohibit the theologians of both these orders from using irritating language in their disputes, and to condemn the opinions of both till the church should decide. He ordered them, also to obtain from both parties a precise declaration of their sentiments, with a statement of their principal authorities and arguments: also, he enjoined them to consult the universities of Spain—the bishops, and the most able theologians on this subject.

The nuncio made known the orders of the pope to provinces of both orders on the 15th of August, 1594. This brief was followed by two others, having the same objects in view. But they did not stop the dispute; on the contrary, they gave occasion to divers censures of Molina's book, by the bishops and theologians of Spain, and among others, to those of Henriquez, already mentioned.

In the mean time Molina went to Madrid, and denounced the propositions of Bannes and Zumel to the Inquisition. This was

a stratagem which the Jesuits at that early period resorted to. They had done so once before, in Flanders, on the occasion of the censure of Lessius by the Faculty of Doway. On that occasion they endeavoured to slur the doctrine of the Faculty by comparing it to what they called the error of Calvin.

The Jesuit Ripalda avowed that recrimination was the policy of the Society. "Bannes," said he, "and the greater part of his disciples began to treat this doctrine (i. e. of Molina,) as though it were Pelagian: our party to turn the tables applied the note of Calvinism to the opposite doctrine." This policy has not become antiquated. Let a Protestant of any religious denomination even now in this free country, affirm of Romanism or Jesuitism, ought that is unfavourable to either system, as for example, that it is destructive of civil and religious liberty,—it will be found that the Jesuits will attempt to turn the tables, and in defiance of reason and all history, propound the same proposition, of the system maintained by the accuser. This policy is worthy of being remarked, inasmuch as it reveals the purpose of the society to attain its ends by all ways, without embarrassing the conscience with scruples about the means of success. The impudence of such conduct is the more insufferable as it pre-supposes a degree of ignorance in large masses of society, which fits them to become the dupes of the most stupid as well as of plausible falsehoods.

[To be continued.]

WHAT HAS BECOME OF THE SLAVES OF THE LATE JOHN RANDOLPH?

JOHN RANDOLPH OF ROANOKE, has been dead, if we remember aright, six or seven years. He left several wills, one of which liberated all his slaves, and directed certain portions of his large estate to be sold, and the proceeds applied to their benefit. This will, after the most thorough and ample investigation was, as we understand, fully established by law, as his last will and testament; and of course, all his slaves were thus declared to be entitled to their freedom, by the act of their eccentric but generous master.

JUDGE WILLIAM LEIGH, of Halifax Co., Va., and BISHOP MEAD, of that state, are understood to be the executors of this will, thus established. And the public will not fail to remember that the former gentleman, who was handsomely provided for in the contested will of MR. RANDOLPH, generously surrendered all his interest under it, in order to become a witness, and thereby at once vindicate his deceased friend's memory and secure the administration of justice to the objects of his beneficence.

The heirs at law of JOHN RANDOLPH are HENRY ST. GEORGE TUCKER, Esq'r, President of the Court of Appeals of Va.; and BEVERLY TUCKER, Esq'r, Professor of law in the College of William and Mary in Va.; and possibly some others, unknown to us.

These gentlemen, are the half-brothers of MR. RANDOLPH; and are to be supposed not only willing, but desirous of executing the intentions of their deceased relative; the more especially since those intentions have been ascertained and established, by those

very laws, which it is the office of one of these distinguished gentlemen to teach, and of the other to administer.

And yet it is, we believe, four or five years, since the validity of the will, emancipating these slaves, was established; while nothing is known to the public to have been done to put forward the benevolent designs of their deceased benefactor. On the contrary, there are reasons to suppose,—that all these slaves, amounting, as we learn, to several hundreds—perhaps between three and four hundred—are still at work, on the estates of their late owner, in Charlotte Co., Va., as slaves; and without any more apparent prospect of freedom—than during the life of MR. RANDOLPH.

How is this? For whom is their labour, (worth perhaps \$10,000 a year,) bestowed? Where are their earnings since the death of their master? By whom are they held in bondage? And what is to be the issue of this matter?

It seems to us, the public, and more especially the friends of MR. RANDOLPH, and those of the black race, have a right to feel some interest in this case, which is extremely remarkable in every part of it. And we respectfully submit to all the distinguished gentlemen whose names have been herein mentioned, that while their high character justifies the confidence of the public; on the other hand the nature of the case renders the obscurity which has come over it, a subject of just anxiety, which is not allayed by remembering the great efforts that were made to deprive these slaves of their freedom, and at the same time stultify one of the most illustrious and gifted men of his age.

Since the foregoing was written, we have understood, that the facts stand thus: the former controversy was entirely between the various *legatees* of Mr. Randolph, claiming under several wills—one of which, viz., that emancipating his slaves was established, as between the *legatees*. But, that Mr. *Beverly Tucker*, who was not a party to that contest, now comes forward as *heir at law*, to *overset all wills*; and that he is now engaged in endeavoring to effect this object, by a suit in chancery; the slaves, mean time, remaining, we presume, as slaves, and in custody of the law.

We do not know what the real facts are, nor what the rights of the parties may be. But we confess we look with great distrust and aversion, on any attempt, by any man, to prove JOHN RANDOLPH a mad-man; yea, and *such* a mad-man, that for years together, and those years in which he was trusted by his neighbours and honoured by his country, he had not even a gleam of reason nor an interval of sanity, sufficient to make a will. That this attempt should be made by a brother, is still more reprehensible. And that, if successful, it should reduce again to slavery, some hundreds of persons, once declared free, by the wise, learned, and incorruptible tribunals, of that ancient commonwealth, *magna mater virum*, is not the least painful part of the supposed attempt.

We say again, we do not know the facts. But we think we and the public have a right to know them. What we have herein written, is on authority of the most imposing kind; and therefore, we have felt free to call public attention to a subject which cannot fail to interest every benevolent and just man.

[For the Baltimore Literary and Religious Magazine.]

FAMILY RELIGION.

"I could wish myself accursed from Christ for my brethren my kindred according to the flesh."

Whatever be the literal meaning of this passage, its practical lesson is plain. The apostle here teaches us by his own example, that we should be actuated by such a love for our brethren, as to be induced to pray and labour for their salvation. Doubtless, Paul acknowledged his duty to regard all mankind as his neighbour; to love them all, as he did himself. But in this instance he manifests that interesting concern for the spiritual welfare of his kindred and countrymen as is peculiar to a regenerated heart. A disposition similar to this was manifested by Andrew, when on finding the long expected Messiah, he first communicated the glad tidings to his brother Simon. And although the spirit of Christianity does not cherish family partialities, or exclusive patriotism; yet these sentiments of attachment to relatives and country, being inherent in our nature, are, therefore, not to be extirpated, but are to be exercised in subordination to the higher service due to our Creator, in seeking with a devoted heart, to have our friends enriched with the unsearchable riches of Christ.

Our duties to our relatives are numerous and important. But alas! they are not sufficiently understood, and but imperfectly performed. How few professing Christians experience "great heaviness and continual sorrow of heart for their brethren, their kindred according to the flesh, who are yet out of Christ." How few feel it their duty to exhort their brethren daily, "to flee from the wrath to come." And still less the number of those who perceive the danger to which their friends are exposed, have the moral courage, or even the willingness, to show them their transgressions, and to lead them to "the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world."

Fearfully, indeed will our condemnation be augmented, when, standing before the burning throne of judgment, we behold beside us, a brother, or a sister, a wife, a child, or a friend, ruined by our neglect, or evil example. O! how shall we behold their countenance agonized by the untold horrors of perdition, without feeling in our own bosoms, a thousand additional stings of the worm that dieth not, and writhing with deeper anguish amidst the everlasting burnings! And if it were possible for a shade of distress to obscure the peaceful sunshine which illumines the abode of the righteous; what horrible darkness would pervade our souls, even in heaven; if in beholding the smoke of the torment of the lost, we have to remember but a single instance of imprudence or neglect, by which a dear friend was not restrained from the commission of a fatal sin; or encouraged by our criminal indifference, to live and die ignorant of the way of salvation!

Would to God, every Christian had the self-denial of the Apostle Paul, who made himself all things to all men, if by any means he might win some. We hear him at one time say—"If meat make

my brother to offend, I will eat no flesh while the world standeth, least I make my brother to offend." And at another time, when besought not to go up to Jerusalem, he answered—"What mean ye to weep and break my heart? for I am ready not to be bound only, but also to die at Jerusalem for the name of the Lord Jesus." Were we followers of Paul in his faithfulness to those around him, what mighty revivals would there be in our families! And let us be persuaded, that if we are religious every where but at the family altar, our religion is of a very equivocal character. Genuine religion, like charity, must begin at home. If it exert its holy influence, first in the family circle, then we have some reasonable ground to hope for the increase of unfeigned and practical piety in the world, and pure devotion in the temple of God.

If we were followers of Paul, even as he was of Christ, then should we behold how sweet and pleasant a thing it is for brethren to dwell together in unity. Then should we "bear each others burdens, and love each other with pure hearts fervently." We need not be reminded how this would smooth the rugged path of life; and sustain us under the trials which constantly beset us. For then could we press toward the mark for the prize of our high calling, free at least, from those family feuds, and unbrotherly bickerings, which so frequently and effectually impede our way to glory, and render us "unmeet to be partakers of the inheritance with the saints in light."

J. P. C.

[For the Baltimore Literary and Religious Magazine.]

ACTION OF THE PRESBYTERY OF LOUISVILLE, IN THE CASE OF REV'D MR. HUBER.

MESSRS. EDITORS.—Having, this moment, for the second time, finished reading the proceedings of the Presbytery of Louisville, in the case of Joseph Huber, it burst spontaneously from my lips, "well done good and faithful servants" of the Lord Jesus! "Well done," Presbytery of Louisville! Aye, brethren, whatever ye have done, or left undone, in other respects, (for we knew you not,) yet well done in *this*, that ye have *practically*, in the name and strength of our Divine Master, lifted up your voice like a trumpet, against an enormous and increasing evil. The deposition and excommunication of one of your number for the twice repeated and unrepented sin of *incest*, is the thing I speak of. May God give you grace to maintain and defend your well taken position, and enable you to carry out your scriptural principles, without respect of persons. Be assured there is many a sound head and warm heart in the Presbyterian church, that rejoins in what you have done, and gives God thanks, wishing you God's speed. There are many in our church who for a long time have been grieved and alarmed, at the increase of incestuous marriages among us; and the more so, because there were few or none of all our church courts who gave that decisive and effectual testimony against this insidious enormity which faithfulness to the Lord Jesus peremptorily demands. *Your ac-*

tion, therefore, dear brethren, we hail with joy, and hope it may be the beginning of a thorough and universal reform in our entire church, in regard to this matter.

We "know not to give flattering titles." Yea, we abhor flattery in all men, and especially among ministers of Christ; but we will speak the truth. Your example, brethren, is noble, and God grant it may be followed by every Presbytery in our land. Are we not a *reformed*, or at least a *reforming* church, and shall the evil in question be suffered longer to exist a stain and disgrace to the Presbyterian name? God forbid. In direct contrariety to the express language of our Confession, and what is infinitely worse, in direct opposition to the Divine law of incest, shall marriages within the forbidden degrees of consanguinity and affinity, be tolerated, nay, *defended* in our communion? Shall not only the obscure and ill instructed, sin through ignorance in this thing, but must also the elevated, the learned and the influential in our Zion, give themselves the same latitude, regardless of laws ecclesiastical or divine? Yea, shall "*the hand of the princes and rulers* (as in some places) *be chief in this trespass.*" And shall this pass unbeked in a church which is called at present to witness and suffer for the *truth*? God forbid! O, where are the *Ezras* and *Nehemiahs* whom God in our day has raised up to bring back our Israel from their backslidings and wanderings, and to rebuild the temple of the Lord and the walls of Jerusalem in troublous times? Are they so engaged in other and collateral labours, as to have no time to give due attention to this thing? Or are some of them, like Ezra of old, so grief-stricken, horror-smitten and dejected, in view of the magnitude of the evil, that they have no courage to proceed? Then, where are our *Shecaniahs* to encourage them, saying, "*yet now there is hope in Israel concerning this thing,*" let it be attended to "*according to the law. Arise, for this matter belongeth unto (you): we also will be with (you), be of good courage and do it.*"

It must be confessed that *retrospective* action in our case would be perplexing and fearful in the extreme. Of this course we express no judgment. But the duty of present or prospective action is plain, and the subject unembarrassed. The brethren of Louisville have had wisdom given them to take the right ground. The resolutions which they passed are just what they should be, and are worthy to be adopted by every Presbytery in our church. Let us transcribe them for the benefit of all.

1. "Resolved, That every member of this Presbytery be required to abstain from solemnizing marriages within such degrees of kindred as are forbidden in the twenty-fourth chapter of the Confession of Faith.

2. Resolved, That every Session in connection with this Presbytery be required, hereafter, not to admit to church membership, on examination, persons who are living in such marriage relations.

3. Resolved further, that should any member of our church, in future, contract such marriages, the sessions of the churches to which they belong, be required, without unnecessary delay, to apply the discipline of the church to such cases."

Now here is something tangible and specific. Here are rules, plain, practical and scriptural—and it requires only the faithful

irrespective application of them by the Presbyteries and Sessions, to every particular case, and by God's blessing on his own ordinance of discipline, this evil and corrupting leaven would soon be purged from our church, to her great increase in spiritual prosperity and honour.

Who can tell what evil has already occurred through incestuous marriages? Who can tell how much wrath from the Lord has already gone out against us on this account? I speak to those who abide by God's word—to whom, as thus saith the Lord, is the end of all controversy—who appeal "to the law and to the testimony," in the plain, unsophisticated sense of Scripture—and "prove all things, (and) hold fast that which is good," according to the only infallible rule. The address is to those "who tremble at the commandment of our God," and consider that a "jot or tittle" of the divine law, outweighs mountains of false glosses and traditions of men.

To such a pass has it come in the churches, that all things are unsettled or unsettling. God's most holy word is made to mean any thing or every thing according to the corrupt fancies and lusts of men. Persons of a certain class, seem to esteem the whole artillery of the Bible as leviathan the weapons of his assailants, who "esteemeth iron as straw, and brass as rotten wood." But as "the Lord with his sore and great and strong sword shall punish leviathan the piercing serpent, even leviathan that crooked serpent, and shall slay the dragon that is in the sea," however, he may deride human weapons; so also shall the sword of God's Spirit, "the word of God," in the end reach every one who now disregards it.

There are not wanting many in some professed churches of Christ, who deny, in whole or in part, the present divine authority and application, even of the moral institutes of the Old Testament, and the law of incest, with the rest. Yea, and in these professedly enlightened and Christian United States, do not our state legislatures legislate among the statutes of Jehovah in regard to marriage, and in place of them substitute their own? In the code of the great and influential state of New York, (to speak of no others,) incestuous marriages are legalized. They do not, indeed, carry out the principle to its fullest extent; for they must needs shrink from the monstrous consequences, that would follow. But in vain do they make distinctions. Either the whole Levitical law of incest is now binding, or no part of it is. If men affirm and establish it by law, that a man may marry within one of the prohibited degrees—with equal propriety it may be established, that he may marry within all; and where would this end? Nature, corrupt, unregenerated nature itself revolts with unutterable disgust, (except in such instances as Robert Owen and Fanny Wright,) from the contemplation of the consequences that might ensue! Let human legislators, and let all men beware how they either add to, or take from the word of the living God, for whosoever shall do this, it will surely be required of him.

It is in some respects a refined and polite age in which we live, but withal a very corrupt one. Whatever smooth, plausible, and self-deceiving things may be said to the contrary, let all men know and remember that according to God's law, and in his view who sees and knows every thing in its principle and tendencies, incest,

is ranked with *sodomy* and *bestiality*. And this we say with great tenderness and regard for the feelings of those who unwittingly, or otherwise, have married within the prohibited degrees. The proof of our assertion is in the 18th chapter of Leviticus. From the beginning to verse 23, we have the law of *incest* laid down, in numerous particulars, both express and implied, including, also, the law of *sodomy* and *bestiality*. And from verse 24 to 28, it reads as follows: "*Defile not ye yourselves in any of these things, (that is by incest, sodomy or bestiality, for the preceding context requires this construction,) for in all these things the nations are defiled which I cast out before you: and the land is defiled: therefore I do visit the iniquity thereof upon it, and the land itself vomiteth out her inhabitants. Ye shall, therefore, keep my statutes and my judgments, and shall not commit any of these abominations; neither any of your own relation nor any stranger that sojourneth among you; (for all these abominations have the men of the land done, which were before you, and the land is defiled;) that the land spue you not out also, when ye defile it, as it spued out the nations that came before you.*"

The language above quoted is exceedingly strong and emphatic, and if it applies, (as we have shown it does,) to the guilt of *incest*, then I demand if our favoured American land, a land like Canaan of old, flowing with milk and honey—may not be preparing, when our iniquity, in this and other respects, "is full," to *spue us out*? The signs of the times are portentous—already the low and fearful sounds of terrible convulsions among the nations are distinctly heard, and our guilty nation may come in for no small share of the vials of Jehovah's wrath, out-poured. In what particular way this may be brought to pass, we know not—but this we know, as God is true, that our iniquities, whether individual or national, unrepented of, and unforsaken, will sooner or later find us out to our sorrow. The unerring spirit of prophecy foretells of such troublous times, on earth, both in church and state, as have not been since the beginning of the world. The time is hastening, when the Lord "shall come out of his place to punish the inhabitants of the earth for their iniquity." Then will he tread the "great wine press of the wrath of God"—"he will tread" his enemies "in anger, and trample in (his) fury, and their blood shall be sprinkled upon (his) garments, and he will stain all (his) raiment." Such terrific and glowing figures, does the spirit of God use, in speaking of judgments, yet to come upon mankind—and *when* they come in their desolating, overwhelming and irresistible flood, then, without doubt, the land defiling sin of *incest*, will come up in remembrance before God, and righteous retribution be rendered with interest.

But God has not yet whet his glittering sword—his hand has not yet taken hold on judgment—the thunderbolts of his wrath are not yet hurled—for "he is long-suffering to us ward, not willing that any should perish but that all should come to repentance." Let us, then, be admonished and turn away every man from his iniquities, for "who can tell if God will turn and repent, and turn away from his fierce anger that we perish not?" Therefore, "seek ye the Lord, all ye meek of the earth which have wrought his judgment; seek righteousness—seek meekness, it may be ye shall be hid in the day of the Lord's anger."

J. H. R.

[For the Baltimore Literary and Religious Magazine.]

POPIISH NOTIONS RESPECTING THE HOLY SCRIPTURES.

THE body of people styling themselves Receivers of the Writings of Swedenbourg—or New Jerusalemites—approximate more nearly to the errors of the Romish sect, than any other class of professing Christians, except the receivers of the Oxford Tracts. Both of them agree in denying virtually *justification by faith*; and the place of departed spirits is nearly the *Limbus patrum* or the prison of the fathers as held by the Romanists. But inasmuch as Baron Swedenbourg professed to be the living, infallible judge, to settle the true meaning of the Scriptures, and so thrust himself into the very place claimed for the popes, his teachings of course meet with no respect from the subjects of his self-styled holiness. A late Catholic Herald, accordingly, reviews a manifesto put forth by the Swedenborgians, and in a very sensible and gentlemanly manner exposes the nonsense of their principles.* And the editor makes sport of the statement, that in the Bible there are *three senses*, distinct, yet united by correspondence, and that the Scripture in each sense is Divine truth, accommodated respectively to angels, spirits and men. But do not the Romanists recognize three senses in every sentence of the Bible? Do they not teach that there is one sense which strikes the mind of the ordinary reader, and which is fitted to lead him into error;—another which the priests may draw from it, and which they hold as *their private opinion*, but not as a *matter of faith*;—the third, being the true meaning, is known to the Pope, or a General Council, and they only can authoritatively declare to a waiting world what it is. So that according to the Romanists, the true meaning of the Scripture can only be unfolded by the pope, and every thing taught or believed by priests and Bishops, is only an *opinion*—a *private interpretation*, until he sanctions it.

These remarks lead us to an extract we have lately seen, on reading the Scripture, by a priest in the diocese of Strasbourg.

He makes the following important admissions on the reading of the Bible by the people:

1. "The reading of the Holy Scriptures, when it is attended with a spirit of humility, steady faith, and unreserved deference and docility to the decisions or interpretations of the church, cannot be too much recommended; and it is because the primitive Christians were animated with these holy dispositions, that their pastors exhorted them to read and meditate frequently the sacred writings. The constant attention of the ministers of the churches to explain to their flock all the difficult passages, and the respect paid to their explanations removed the dangers to which a private reading might have exposed the faithful."

* This manifesto, dated Jan'y 1, 1841, is signed by Condy Raguet, considerably known as a writer on currency, and Solomon Brown, of New York, famous as a dentist and for a poem on the art of plugging teeth. Rufus Dawes, a poet, and the first person concerned in the publishing the Oxford Tracts, in this country, has been endeavoring to overthrow the ordinary notions of the sublime and beautiful, and introduce others in conformity with Swedenborgianism. It is a little remarkable, that three sons of Noah Worcester, one of the earliest American writers in favour of Unitarianism, are New Jerusalemite preachers.

1861.] P
The early
Bible—the
Christian tea
word, and in
tences—and
reading of th
preaching an
it in private
knows in th
ers removed
humbly and
Protestant m
2 "St. J
READING OF
sation of her
young lady pr
virtue. He in
the Holy Scri
education and
and encourage
occupation."
We are gl
advocate for
the old lady
Testament, a
dent that this
advise her to
to reading th
mon's Song la
be likely to e
Which would
3. "How is it
and the great no
arocations of th
able independen
time to exami
the numerous co
ped this is abs
moralis with an
The closing
by any thing
Herald's asse
convent, "no
insulted Cath
of scenes tha
sets."
Now if AN
of Bible read
common in
ratus? Are
gual, and to
they do not,
to make the

The early Christian teachers did exhort the people to read the Bible—the modern Romish priests dissuade from it; the early Christian teachers were abundant in preaching, expounding God's word, and in the families of their people, elucidating difficult sentences—and so they freed them from all danger in the private reading of the word of life—but what Romish priest is frequent in preaching and expounding the Bible so that his flock may peruse it in private with edification and delight? Is there an instance of it known in the United States? But more, the early Christian teachers removed all the obstacles out of the way of those who wished humbly and piously to study the Bible—who are most like them? Protestant ministers or Romish priests?

2. "ST. JEROME, WHO WAS SO ZEALOUS AN ADVOCATE FOR THE READING OF THE HOLY SCRIPTURES, in his letter to Seta, respecting the education of her grand-daughter, recommends her to put them into the hands of this young lady progressively, in proportion as she advanced in years, capacity, and virtue. He insisted that the Song of Solomon should be the last.—The reading of the Holy Scriptures, is, therefore, commendable, and the faithful who by their education and previous instructions are duly prepared for it, ought to be exhorted and encouraged to devote a part of their leisure hours to this pious and profitable occupation."

We are glad to see justice done to St. Jerome,—*he was a zealous advocate for the reading of the Holy Scripture.* It is evident that the old lady to whom he wrote, had the whole of the Old and New Testament, and that she was accustomed to read it—and it is evident that this was very common in those days—St. Jerome did not advise her to send her grand-daughter to a nunnery, but to put her to reading the Bible, and to go through it in course, placing Solomon's Song last. In modern times, from whom would similar advice be likely to emanate? From a Roman Catholic or a Protestant? Which would be most likely to do as Jerome did?

3. "How is it possible that a labourer, a country-woman, a sailor, a soldier, and the great number of other people who are engaged in the different and busy avocations of the world, in order to provide for themselves and families a comfortable independence, and even the daily necessaries of life, could find a sufficient time to examine the original text, to compare it with its various translations, and the numerous commentaries and explanations which have been published? *and yet this is absolutely indispensable, in order to regulate their faith and morals with any sort of security.*"

The closing assertion of this paragraph is unequalled in audacity by any thing we have seen, except it be the editor of the Catholic Herald's assertion, that after the escape of Olevia Neal from the convent, "nothing but the forbearance and determination of the insulted Catholic inhabitants, secured Baltimore from a repetition of scenes that have left so foul a stain on the character of Massachusetts."

Now if ALL THIS be necessary to regulate the faith and morals of Bible readers, it must be necessary to every priest. And is it common in America to find the priests with all this critical apparatus? Are they devoting their time to study the Bible in the original, and to compare it with various translations? No—and that they do not, is plain from their preaching. They do not endeavor to make the sacred writings intelligible, by illustrating and expound-

ing them from the pulpit or in Bible classes. But if all this study of originals and translations be necessary to regulate with any sort of security the faith and morals of the people, must it not be equally necessary to regulate the faith and morals of the priests? And what security can we have of their morals or their faith, if they do not use all these helps to a thorough knowledge of the Scriptures?

But herein is a miraculous thing—the reading of the Bible may inflame dangerous passions in the young—therefore keep from them the Bible—but are the books usually put in the hands of young persons to prepare them for confession, perfectly free from all tendency to inflame dangerous passions? We remember to have seen a book by the Godless Abner Kneeland, against the Bible, and he had copied in several successive pages, every text that might be, by any possibility, likely to pollute the mind;—now could we find that book, we would gladly lay it beside almost any book of the Romish church, from Den's Theology down to the meanest manual for the Confessional, and defy any man to say whether on any three consecutive pages of any one of the latter, there was not more of loathsome, unheard of vulgarity and obscenity than the most diseased imagination and the most desperate liar could pretend to find in the whole Bible. Yet Den's is read by the priests and the manuals by boys and girls—but their pure minds must be guarded from the infection of the Bible!

G. S. U.

[Continued from page 140.]

THE GOSPEL MYSTERY OF SANCTIFICATION,

By the Rev. Wm. Marshall.—Abridged.

No. X.

ASSERTION XI. *It therefore belongs to the practical part of the Christian life, to maintain the same immediate trust and confidence in dependence on the divine faithfulness, that so our enjoyment of Christ by union and fellowship with him, may be continued and increased in us.*

HAVING exhibited to you the effectual means of holy practice, it remains to lead you to the exercise and improvement of them for the attainment of holiness. Faith in Christ, is the duty with which a holy life begins, and by which the foundation of all other holy duties is laid in the soul. Faith is the grace by which the Holy Spirit, unites us to Christ and makes us branches of the living vine; by it we pass from our corrupt natural state, to a new holy state in Christ, and from death in sin to the life of righteousness, and whereby we are comforted and so established in every good work.

Therefore you are first to make it your diligent endeavor to believe on Christ. Many make little conscience of this duty. They are sometimes terrified with apprehensions of other sins, and will examine themselves concerning them, and perhaps will write them down to help their memories and devotions, but the great sin

of not believing on Christ, is not thought of in their self-examination or registered in their long catalogue of sins. Even those who are convinced that believing on Christ is a duty necessary to salvation, do neglect all diligent endeavors to perform it; either because they account it a motion of the heart, and easily performed at any time, or on the contrary, they deem it utterly impossible except God's Spirit work it in them; or they account it a duty peculiar to the elect, and that it would be presumption to endeavor to perform it until they know themselves to be elected to eternal life. But we should make it our endeavor to believe to the saving of the soul—because it is necessary to our salvation. He that believeth not on the Son, shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on him—John iii. 37. Who shall be revealed from heaven in flaming fire, taking vengeance on those that obey not the gospel of Christ—2 Thess. i. 7, 8.

Believing on Christ is a duty that will require diligent endeavor and labor for its performance. "We must labor to enter into that rest, lest any man fall by unbelief." Heb. iv. 11. We must show diligence unto the full assurance of hope, that we may be followers of them who through faith and patience inherit the promises. Heb. vi. 11, 12. Therefore we have need to be strengthened with might by the Spirit in the inner man, that Christ may dwell in us by faith. Eph. iii. 16, 17. It is easy, pleasant, and delicious to believe on Christ, because it is a motion of the heart without any cumbersome bodily labor, and it is a taking of Christ and his salvation for our own, which is very comfortable and delightful, and the soul is carried forth in this by love to Christ and his own happiness, which is an affection that makes even hard works pleasant and easy; but by reason of opposition from our inward corruptions and Satan's temptations, it is made difficult to us. It is no easy matter to receive Christ as our happiness and salvation with true confidence and lively affection when the guilt lies heavily on the conscience—especially when we have long been accustomed to seek salvation by the way of the law,—when our lusts incline us to the things of the flesh and the world, and Satan doth his worst by his own suggestions, and by false teachers, and by worldly allurements, to hinder the sincere performance of this duty.

Many works that are easy in their own nature, prove difficult for us in our circumstances. Thus to forgive our enemies, and to cast our burden on the Lord, are easy to be performed in themselves, but it is often hard indeed to perform them. The very easiness of some duties makes their performance difficult, as in the case of Naaman; so some think believing on Christ too easy a remedy to cure the soul's leprosy. Yet though the work be so easy, experience shows men are more easily brought to the most difficult observances than to this. They that slight the work of faith for its easiness, show that they were never yet made sensible of innumerable sins, and of the terrible curse of the law, and the wrath of God under which they lie, and of the darkness, and vanity of their minds, the corruption and hardness of their hearts, and their bondage under the power of sin and Satan, and were never truly humbled; without this, none can believe in a right manner. Many sound believers

have found to their sorrow, that it has been a hard matter to bring their hearts to the duty of believing—it has cost them vigorous struggles and sharp conflicts with their own corruptions and Satan's temptations—only the Holy Spirit can make it easy to us.

Though we cannot possibly perform this great duty in a right manner, except the Spirit of God work in us, it is necessary that we should endeavor to perform it, and that too before we can find the Spirit working in us what is good. We can perform no holy duty acceptably, except the Spirit work in us, yet we are not hereby excused from working ourselves, but are rather stirred up to the greater diligence. Phil. ii. 13. The way in which the Spirit works faith in the elect, is by stirring them up to endeavor to believe; and this way is suitable to the means the Spirit uses, the exhortations, commands and invitations of the gospel, which would be of no force, if we were not to obey them until we find faith already wrought in us. Neither can we possibly find that the Spirit doth work faith or give us strength to believe, until we act it, for all inward graces are discerned only by their acts, as seeds are discerned by their springing. We cannot see such a thing as love to God or man in our hearts, until we love; we know not our spiritual strength until we have learned it by experience from the use and exercise of it. Though the Spirit works other duties in us by faith, he works faith in us by hearing, knowing and understanding the word—"faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God." Rom. x. 17. Therefore as soon as we know the duty of believing, we are to apply ourselves directly to the performance of the duty, and in so doing, we shall find that the Spirit of Christ has strengthened us to believe.—The Spirit comes indiscernably upon the elect, to work faith in them, like the wind that blows where it lists, only we hear the sound of it as it passes. John iii. 8. We must therefore begin the work—it is enough that God discovers beforehand in the gospel what faith is and the ground we have to believe on Christ for our salvation, and that God requires this duty of us and will enable us in the performance of it, if we apply ourselves heartily thereunto. Therefore whoso receives the gospel discovery as the word of God, in hearty love, is taught by the Spirit, and will certainly come to Christ, believing on him. John vi. 45.

Though the Spirit worketh saving faith only in the elect, yet all that hear the gospel are bound to believe as well as to obey the moral law, and they are liable to condemnation for unbelief as well as for any other sin—he that believeth not is condemned already, because he hath not believed on the only begotten Son of God. John iii. 18. The unbelieving Israelites were broken off from the good olive tree, because of their unbelief. Rom. xi. 7, 23—It is no presumption for us to trust confidently on Christ for everlasting life, before we have any good evidence of our election, because God, that cannot lie, has made a general promise, that whosoever believeth shall not be ashamed. Rom. x. 11, 12. The promise is as firm and as sure to be fulfilled as any of God's decrees, and therefore it is a good and sufficient ground of our confidence. It is certain that all whom the Father hath given to Christ by the decree of election, will come to Christ, and it is as really certain that Christ

[MI.]

will in
not, the
are calle
for if we
not, we
who stu
We a
ance, fo
and the
mefigne
precious
contain
other, b
to us in
be to p
1. Y
truth
dispos
perien
of som
them c
must be
the nam
ly woul
ger of
and self
manifol
matters
to, in th
1st.
of wra
ains, s
and ha
not po
do any
to esca
supern
the de
sinful
of our
that c
that
us tr
high
thin
of
and
the
2
but
as
Ho

will in no wise cast out any that come. John vi. 37. We need not, therefore fear that by believing assuredly on Christ, when we are called by the gospel, we shall infringe God's decree of election; for if we believe, we shall be found among the elect, and if we do not, we shall thereby wilfully place ourselves among the reprobates who stumble at the word.

We are to endeavor to believe aright. This is of great importance, for the great duty of love, which is the fulfilling of the law, and the principal fruit of sanctification, must flow from *faith unfeigned*. There is a counterfeit faith; we must seek for the precious faith of God's elect. I have showed that saving faith contains two acts—one is believing the truth of the gospel, the other, believing on Christ as revealed to us and freely promised to us in the gospel, for all his salvation. *Our great endeavor must be to perform both these acts in a right manner.*

I. You are highly concerned to endeavor for a right belief of the truth of the gospel of Christ, that so you may be well furnished, disposed and encouraged to believe on Christ. It is found by experience that when any fail in the second act of faith, it is because of some defect in the first act. There is some false imagination in them contrary to the truth, which is a strong hold of Satan, and must be pulled down before they can receive Christ. If they knew the name of Christ, as he is discovered in the gospel, they certainly would not fail to put their trust in him. We are in great danger of entertaining such imaginations, because of our ignorance and self-conceit, of our guilty conscience, corrupt affections, and manifold errors, wherewith our judgments are prepossessed in the matters of salvation. To prevent such defects as we are most liable to, in the first act of our faith, consider, that,

1st. You must believe with a full persuasion that you are a child of wrath by nature, fallen from God by the sin of Adam, dead in sins, subject to the curse of the law, and to the power of Satan, and liable to insupportable misery to all eternity; and that you cannot possibly procure your reconciliation to God, or spiritual life to do any good work, by any obedience to the law, nor find any way to escape out of this condition by your own reason, but only by supernatural revelation, nor be freed from it but by him that raiseth the dead. We must not be afraid to know our own vileness and sinfulness, but must be heartily desirous and glad to know the worst of our condition—and when we have found the worst, to know that our hearts are deceitful and desperately wicked, beyond all that we can know and find out. This is all necessary to work in us true humiliation, self-despair, and self-loathing, that we may highly esteem and earnestly seek the salvation of Christ as the one thing needful. It makes us sick of sin and sensible of our need of the great Physician—for want of this humiliation, the scribes and Pharisees were not forward to enter into the kingdom, while the Publicans and harlots prest in.

2d. You are to believe assuredly that there is no way to be saved but by receiving all the saving benefits of Christ, his Spirit as well as his merits, sanctification as well as remission of sins by faith. Holiness and forgiveness are inseparably connected, so that none

are freed from condemnation by Christ, but those who are enabled to walk holily. Rom. viii. 1.

3d. You are to be fully persuaded of the all-sufficiency of Christ for the salvation of yourself and of all that believe; "his blood cleanseth from all sin." I John i. 7. Though our sins be never so great and horrible, and continued in never so long, he is able to deliver us from them and to mortify our corruptions. Many that are fallen into great sins do not account the grace of Christ sufficient for their pardon and sanctification, and thus become careless of their souls through despair. They think theirs is the unpardonable sin, —but the reason why the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost is not forgiven, is because they never repent of that sin, and never seek to God for mercy through Christ—"it is impossible to renew them again to repentance." Heb. vi. 5, 6. Others despair of ever getting the victory over their lusts, because they have formerly made many resolutions and vigorous endeavors against them in vain. The grace of Christ is sufficient for them when every other means have failed. To despair because of the greatness of guilt and corruption, is greatly to dishonor and undervalue the grace of God, his infinite mercy and the infinite merit of Christ's blood and the power of his Spirit.

4th. You are to be fully persuaded of the truth of the general promise in your own case, that if you believe on Christ sincerely, you shall have everlasting life, for the promise is universal and without exception. If God exclude you not, you must not exclude yourselves, but rather conclude peremptorily that if you, however vile and unworthy, shall come, you shall be accepted as well as any other in the world. Some, when truly convinced of sin, think it vain to come to Christ for salvation, for that he will never save such as they are; but they can at worst but be lost creatures, and Christ came to seek and to save that which is lost. If they that are dead in sins, cannot be saved, then all must despair, for none have any spiritual life but they who receive it from Christ by believing. Some think themselves to be worse than others, and that none have such wicked hearts as they have—but they should know that Christ came to save the chief of sinners, and that the design of God is to show the exceeding riches of his grace. Eph. ii. 7; and it is but our ignorance that makes us think ourselves like nobody, for all others are naturally dead in sins and the imagination of the thoughts of their heart, is only evil continually. Gen. vi. 5. Others think they have passed the day of grace; but "behold now is the day of salvation," 2 Cor. vi. 2, even as long as God shall call thee by his gospel.

5th. You are to believe assuredly that it is the will of God that you should trust in Christ, and have eternal life by him, and that he will help you as well as any other in this work.—His call and command to you in the gospel, to believe, makes us set cheerfully on the work of believing. We are not to meddle with God's secret of predestination, or the purpose of his will, but only with his revealed will, in his gracious commands and invitations. This will of God is confirmed by his oath: "As I live, saith the Lord, I have no pleasure in the death of the wicked." Ezek. xxxiii. 11. Christ

testified
but the
have a
though
interp
the en
perem
world,
for us,
the bri
the wa
don all
pernic
to the
6th.
glorio
You
and t
We n
knowl
esteem
incomp
that the
necessa
cellenc
gospel
lest the
II. T
self and
heart—
and fre
hearts
assured
we nee
parably
ceive h
good q
only to
Avo
have p
of God
as soo
who r
the v
many
and h
open
ficien
this d
perfo
take
be gi

testifies he would often have gathered the children of Jerusalem, but they would not. Matt. xxiii. 37; and Paul teaches that God will have all men to be saved. You are to reject and abandon all thoughts contrary to this persuasion. You are to make a good interpretation of all those things that seem to be against thee—that the end of them is to drive thee to Christ. The most absolute and peremptory denunciations of wrath against us while we are in this world, must be always understood with a secret reserve of salvation for us, on condition of our faith and repentance. "The Spirit and the bride say come. Christ saith, whosoever will let him take of the water of life freely. Rev. xxii. 17. Therefore we must abandon all thoughts that hinder our coming to Christ as very sinful and pernicious, arising from our own corruptions, and utterly opposite to the mind of Christ and the teaching of the Spirit.

6h. Add to all these, a full persuasion of the incomparable glorious excellency of Christ and of the way of salvation by him. You are to esteem the enjoyment of Christ as the only salvation and true happiness; as having in it unsearchable riches and glory. We must account all things but loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus. Phil. iii. 8. Christ is precious in the esteem of all true believers. I Pet. ii. 7. Their high esteem of his incomparable preciousness and excellency induces them to sell all that they may buy this pearl of great price. The devil knows how necessary it is for our salvation, to discern all the glory and the excellency of Christ—therefore he makes it his great work where the gospel is preached, to blind the minds of them that believe not, lest the light of the glorious gospel of Christ should shine into them.

II. The second principal act of faith is that whereby Christ himself and his Spirit and all his salvation are actually received into the heart—that is, believing on Christ for all his salvation, as revealed and freely promised to us. The Spirit doth dispose and incline our hearts to a right performance of this act, by enabling us to believe assuredly the great things of the gospel. We must rejoice that we need nothing else but Christ to lean on, and that he is incomparably better than any other that can be imagined. We must receive him as a free gift. Look not on your faith or love or any good qualification in yourself as the ground of trust in Christ, but only to the free grace and loving kindness of God in Christ.

Avoid all delay in the performance of this great duty. Until we have performed it; we lie under the power of sin, and the wrath of God. The work is of such a nature that it may be performed as soon as the gospel is heard. We have many examples of those who received it at the first hearing of it—the three thousand on the very first day it was proclaimed in Jerusalem. Acts ii. 32; and many at Paul's first preaching at Antioch. Acts xiii. 48; the jailor and his household as soon as they heard. Acts xvi. 33-4. If God open the hearts of his people to attend diligently, they may be sufficiently instructed by one brief sermon, to begin the practice of this duty; and when they know their duty, God requires immediate performance, and allows no delay. Some put off, that they may take their fill of pleasures, praying and hoping a large space may be given them for repentance, before they die; such delays show

that they are really unwilling to repent and believe until they are forced by necessity, and that they prefer earthly things above Christ. Others imagine that they may lawfully defer believing till they have examined the doctrines or evidences of the gospel, but the truth of the gospel doth so clearly evidence itself by its own light, that if people did not wilfully shut their eyes, they would easily perceive the image of his grace, mercy, justice, wisdom, holiness and power manifestly engraven on it. Others rest on the outward means of grace instead of endeavoring to receive Christ by faith, though they be convinced of the truth of the gospel. This is not waiting on God, but disobedience, *he requires us not to wait at the door, but to come in, for all things are now ready.* That holy waiting on the Lord, commended in the Scripture, is ever accompanied with believing and hoping in the Lord, and invariably depends on it. Ps. xxvii. 13, 14; Sam. iii. 26.

We must endeavor to continue and increase in faith. As long as we remain on earth, we must endeavor to continue in the faith, grounded and settled, not moved away from the hope of the gospel. Col. i. 23, and to hold the beginning of our confidence steadfast to the end. Heb. iii. 6, 14; to build ourselves up on our most holy faith, Jude 20, abounding therein with thanksgiving. Col. ii. 7. Though we receive Christ freely, we are but babes in Christ, and must not account ourselves to have attained or to be already perfect, Phil. iii. 12, 13, but we must strive to be more rooted and built up in him, till we come to be perfect men, unto the stature and fulness of Christ. Eph. iv. 13. Continuance and growth in faith, will require our labor and industry, though we are to ascribe all the glory to the grace of God in Christ, the author and the finisher of it. Heb. xii. 2.—We often meet with greater difficulties in going on to perfection, than we did in the beginning of the good work, the wisdom and mercy of God so ordering it, that we should be exercised with the sharpest dispensations of providence, and the fiercest assaults of our own corruptions, *after we have grace given us to stand in the evil day.* Our faith must be of the same nature to the end, though differing in degrees; we have need to strive for more faith, that we may receive Christ more heartily. If you find your faith has produced good works, you should thereby increase your confidence in Christ, for salvation by his mere grace. If, however, you can see no fruit, increase your confidence in him, for the weakness of faith hinders its fruitfulness; if you fall into gross sin after having believed, cast not away your confidence, but strive rather to believe that you have an advocate with the Father, and that he is the propitiation for your sins; let not the guilt stay upon your conscience, but wash it away with all speed in the blood of Christ, that you may be humbled in a gospel way, and may the more hate your sins, because of the love of God. Peter might have been ruined forever by denying Christ, as Judas was by betraying him, if his faith had not been upheld by the prayer of Christ. Luke xi. 31. If God seem to deal with you as an enemy, by bringing affliction upon you, say with Job, "though he slay me, I will trust in him." Strive to increase faith by faith, that is, by acting faith frequently, and trusting in God to keep and save.

[To be concluded.]

NECROLOGY.—WILLIAM HENRY HARRISON.

DIED on the morning of the 4th of April, 1841, at the executive mansion in Washington city, WILLIAM HENRY HARRISON, President of the United States of America, in the 69th year of his age, and at the end of the first month of his presidency.

This is the only instance in the history of this great republic, in which its chief magistrate has been taken off during the period of his service in that most exalted station.

General HARRISON was the ninth President of the United States. Of the eight who preceded him in his magistracy, three, his immediate predecessors, survive him.

He was a native of Virginia, the most ancient and illustrious of our commonwealths; the birth-place of five of our nine presidents. From her bosom came forth the leaders in the most remarkable political changes that have signalized our annals; in 1776—in 1800—and in 1840—the revolution that placed our country in the rank of nations, that which gave permanent ascendancy to the Democratic party, and that which brought the Whigs into power. However unworthy many of our citizens may once have deemed the name of JEFFERSON to be added to that of WASHINGTON, and however multitudes may still deem that of HARRISON unworthy to be added to either of the two; yet the name of HARRISON, was as really the strength of the Whig party of 1840, as that of JEFFERSON was of the Democratic party in 1800, or that of WASHINGTON of the whole people in 1776.

Neither of these illustrious men originated, much less directed the vast ideas and interests of the masses that put them at their head, in their respective eras. They only became, each in his turn, the exponent of a mighty national movement, irrepressible, irresistible at its period. General HARRISON, has had the singular destiny of reaping all the triumph of one of these intense movements, without having lived to risk his glory upon subsequent events. And we judge, that however small his opponents may consider his merits to have been—or whatever turn affairs may hereafter take; *the American people*, who literally burst all the shackles of party, and derided all the tricks of politicians of all grades, to lift up this man to the pinnacle of glory; will cherish his name for ages, as one of the dearest in annals crowded with virtue and honor.

And truly it is a name strongly linked with liberty, and with some of the grandest movements of mankind. To us, the two public documents (after *Magna Charta*) that most illustriously exhibit the sovereignty of right—are the *Warrant* for the execution of *Charles Stuart*, the first King of England of his name; and the *Declaration of Independence*, against *George Guelp*, the third of his name. The former embodies the sentiments of a great, just, and free people, vindicating their recovered liberty, by the judicial condemnation of a bloody and perfidious tyrant; the latter, sets forth in a unanimous legislative rejection of another tyrant, by a brave people resolved to be free,—the clear and elevated principles on which the independence of states reposes. *There is but one name common to these*

two glorious instruments; IT IS THE NAME OF HARRISON! HARRISON the regicide; and HARRISON, the signer of the Declaration of American Independence; and HARRISON, the leader of the remarkable political revolution of our own day; it is the same name, the same family, from father to son in direct descent, the same remarkable and unique association with the vast movements of the people, the vast ideas of generations!

It is not our part to characterise the revolution of 1840; nor shall we do so, either in a moral or political aspect. We have merely spoken of it, as in fact a remarkable revolution in public sentiment; and then only, as it relates to the late president. We have, it is true, our own very decided opinions upon these subjects; opinions too, which we do not conceal. But it is not otherwise than as free and Christian men, that we would now speak;—as patriots, not as members of any party;—as men contemplating a great Providential dispensation, and the mighty interests connected with it. This is a posture in which, alas! our public men and our political writers, too seldom stand—too rarely speak. Let us then, have liberty for once at least—occupying a position never presented before—and mournfully impressed with the weight of a calamity, universally allowed to be national; to rebuke the spirit of mere party,—to testify against the malignity, the falsehood, the selfishness and the corruption of party,—to speak truth fearlessly, yea severely, for our country. Let us have space for once,—neither proscribing others nor proscribed ourselves for opinion's sake—a proscription the most detestable that ever intruded into a free government; to lift up our voice for that beloved country, torn, bleeding, polluted, and ready to be devoured by the accursed spirit of party; and for the sacred principles of liberty, long ago made subordinate to every trick of politics, and every vicious end of bad men.

We have said it was *the American people*, that called this man—alike remarkable in his life and in his death—to the first trust amongst men. It was a spontaneous, a general, an unexpected, a national act; so much so, that he received the votes of twenty states out of twenty-six, and had a majority of states in every great geographical division of the republic; the north, the centre, the south, and the west, alike conspiring to honor him. If, in looking back upon the vile calumnies that were heaped upon his three immediate predecessors, we are so far removed from the passions of the canvasses that preceded their elevation, by the mere retirement of those distinguished men, as to blush for their authors, and for our country; how much more, in the case before us, when the stroke of death, has put an eternal barrier between the illustrious patriot and his traducers? Let his errors and weaknesses, whatever they may have been, die with him. His fame is the property of the whole nation; and all that justifies his triumphant choice by the people, justifies the nation to mankind and to posterity; yea, justifies liberty to all her votaries. It was a great national act; death has set his ineffaceable seal upon it; let all its issues be for the national glory.

Great masses of men seldom act from unworthy impulses; never from weak ones. Men have said that the President lacked great mental powers. Perhaps he did; at least we feel satisfied the

people d
Men hav
may hav
moving
pervaded
The A
They sav
ened.
well nig
trustwor
to repres
first and
truly or
HARRIS
like an
the mor
They fi
that th
mistake
motive
concei
This
superad
is not s
in times
of circu
But the
saw a n
respons
irrespon
but had
be had
human
countr
harder
not ad
erly ch
and wi
but wi
and al
private
him fo
chre a
A
What
office
soldi
with
his h
quiet
of or
Glori

people did not elect him, because they thought he possessed them. Men have said he lacked profound knowledge of affairs. This may have been true; we are sure, at any rate, that this was not the moving cause of the unparalleled enthusiasm in his behalf which pervaded all ranks of the people.

The American people saw that the times were totally out of joint. They saw that the bonds of public and private morality were loosened. They saw that honesty, whether of opinion or practice, was well nigh banished from amongst political parties. They saw that trustworthiness, whether to perform service, to keep treasure, or to represent opinion was utterly out of date. They wanted, as the first and chiefest thing, *an honest man*; and they thought, whether truly or falsely let posterity decide, they thought they had found in HARRISON, *an honest man*. This was the secret of that confidence, like an immoveable rock, which the more the man was traduced the more caused him to grow into the very hearts of the people. They firmly believed that their affairs required an honest man; and that they had found him. And never was a confidence, however mistaken any may suppose it to have been,—more honorable in its motive, to him who inspired it, or more ennobling to those who conceived it.

This was the secret of the national *confidence*; but there was superadded a pervading national *enthusiasm*—which mere integrity is not sufficient to inspire. It was indeed a striking sight, to see in times like these, a man who in all trusts, and under every variety of circumstance, was supposed to have preserved unsullied honesty. But the people saw, or fancied they saw, more. They thought they saw a man, who through a long life of most arduous and most responsible public service—and amid many and some times almost irresponsible public trusts; had never—we will not say abused—but had never even used the legitimate powers and opportunities he had so constantly enjoyed—to promote himself—or to injure any human being! A man, who had long and faithfully served his country—in utter forgetfulness of his own interests, and of what is harder to forget, his own passions; and whom that country had not adequately rewarded—had not sufficiently loved—had not properly cherished. This idea took possession of the national mind; and with a feeling no how resembling a cold selection for office, but with an impassioned and vehement burst of national affection and almost romantic devotedness, the people sought to this poor, private, and aged man, with their loud and ardent cry—and lead him forth, not so much into supreme trust, as by it to that sepulchre around which a nation mourns.

A greater, a better, or a purer political lesson was never taught. What a lesson to the nations of the earth to behold a man, without office, without power, without money, without patronage, without soldiers, without ships; to behold a man thus circumstanced, come without shedding one drop of blood, or violating any law, from his humble and retired abode on the outskirts of civilization, and quietly and without resistance, take possession of the government of one of the greatest and most enlightened nations of the earth! Glorious—thrice glorious commentary on the nature of our institu-

tions and the spirit of our people! What a lesson for our own public men to ponder, is furnished by the national impulse which brought this simple man to supreme authority; and by the qualities and conduct which inspired such public gratitude and admiration! What precious proofs, that the nation *means* to act, not only well, but nobly; so that even they who suppose the people are deceived, are still obliged to honour them; and they who see that the parties and their leaders as such, are to a deplorable extent corrupt, are obliged to admit, that the mass of our people of all parties, love their country and are worthy of their liberties!

Of all our presidents not one except the first, the great, the good WASHINGTON, has so fully, so prominently acknowledged the providence of God; nor did even he so signally proclaim his belief and trust in the *Christian religion*, as General HARRISON.

"It is better to trust in the Lord, than to put confidence in man." Never was a divine truth more forcibly exhibited by an act of Providence, or more pertinent to the people of this land.

We add two proclamations, caused by this solemn event. They explain themselves; and seem to us in their style and form, eminently suitable.

CITY OF WASHINGTON, April 4, 1841.

An all-wise Providence having suddenly removed from this life, WILLIAM HENRY HARRISON, late President of the United States, we have thought it our duty, in the recess of Congress, and in the absence of the Vice President from the seat of government, to make this afflicting bereavement known to the country, by this declaration, under our hands.

He died at the President's House, in this city, this fourth day of April, Anno-domini, 1841, at thirty minutes before one o'clock in the morning.

The people of the United States, overwhelmed, like ourselves, by an event so unexpected and so melancholy, will derive consolation from knowing that his death was calm and resigned, as his life has been patriotic, useful and distinguished; and that the last utterance of his lips expressed a fervent desire for the perpetuity of the Constitution, and the preservation of its true principles. In death, as in life, the happiness of his country was uppermost in his thoughts.

DANIEL WEBSTER, Secretary of State.

THOMAS EWING, Secretary of the Treasury.

JOHN BELL, Secretary of War.

J. J. CRITTENDEN, Attorney General.

FRANCIS GRANGER, Postmaster General.

WASHINGTON, April 4, 1841.

The circumstances in which we are placed by the death of the President, render it indispensable for us, in the recess of Congress, and in the absence of the Vice President, to make arrangements for the funeral solemnities. Having consulted with the family, and personal friends of the deceased, we have concluded that the funeral be solemnized on Wednesday the 7th instant, at 12 o'clock. The religious services to be performed according to the usage of the

Episcopal Church, in which church the deceased most usually worshipped. The body to be taken from the President's House to the Congress burying ground, accompanied by a military and civic procession, and deposited in the receiving tomb.

The military arrangements to be under the direction of Major General Macomb, the General Commanding in Chief the Army of the United States; and Major General Walter Jones of the militia of the District of Columbia.

Commodore Morris, the Senior Captain in the Navy now in the city, to have the direction of the naval arrangements.

The Marshal of the District to have the direction of the civic procession, assisted by the Mayors of Washington, Georgetown and Alexandria, the Clerk of the Supreme Court of the United States, and such other citizens as they may see fit to call to their aid.

John Quincy Adams, ex-President of the United States, members of Congress now in the city or its neighborhood, all the members of the Diplomatic body resident in Washington, and all officers of Government, and citizens generally, are invited to attend.

And it is respectfully recommended to the officers of Government that they wear the usual badge of mourning.

DANIEL WEBSTER, Secretary of State.

THOMAS EWING, Secretary of the Treasury.

JOHN BELL, Secretary of War.

J. J. CRITTENDEN, Attorney General.

FRANCIS GRANGER, Postmaster General.

THE AFRICANS OF THE AMISTAD.

OUR readers are, no doubt, all informed that the Supreme Court of the United States has decided this long pending and exciting case, in favor of the Africans; and that they are decreed to be free, and so discharged without day.

This is a result which we are fully convinced will be hailed with satisfaction, and joyfully acquiesced in as right by every American citizen, of all parties and of every class.

The naked facts, as judicially ascertained, appear to be, that these Africans were recent victims of the slave trade—taken from their own country by violence and fraud—carried to the Spanish Island of Cuba—kept there a few days or weeks—fraudulently transhipped from one port of that Island to another, in order to be placed in final slavery—and while at sea rose on the captain and crew, killed several persons—and in attempting to go back to Africa, were navigated by certain Spaniards then aboard, into our waters—and here taken possession of by one of our public armed vessels. The case presented, was a claim for salvage by those who took the Africans into possession; a claim for them as slaves, by the Spaniards on board; and a claim for them, by the Spanish minister, under certain treaty stipulations, whether as slaves or as pirates. A claim was also interposed by the British minister, adverse to that of the minister of Spain—asserting the freedom of

the slaves, by reason of treaty relations between Spain and Great Britain.

This case was unfortunately prejudiced in the minds of a large class of American citizens, by the early and unscrupulous use made of it, by the abolitionists about New York, to promote their own principles and aims. It is, however, finally decided in favour of the Africans—without in the least sanctioning the fanatical projects or principles of this deluded party.

The case was also attempted to be identified with the question of negro slavery existing in portions of this country, by a class of persons holding the extreme antagonist opinions to those of the abolitionists; we mean the pro-slavery people; and by them, too, was this cause prejudiced in the minds of many good men.

The case, from the beginning, was in the hands of the best laws and the purest tribunals, that exist amongst men. It therefore appeared to us, always, improper, as well as unnecessary to agitate the public mind in regard to it. Nor, for our own part, did we ever entertain a doubt, that the Supreme Court of the United States, would, whenever it decided the case, not only decide it correctly, but render such reasons for its judgment as would satisfy mankind. It was one of the noblest eulogies ever passed on the law, by one of its brightest living ornaments, that whatever just men will say is right, a true lawyer can prove to be legal! Tell us what ought to be, and we will find law for it; is the true and the grand principle. Tell us what is law, and we will say that ought to be; is the base and the false.

The universal sentiment of nearly all states deserving to be called civilized, has been at last openly pronounced, against the slave trade; and the Supreme Court has interposed the simple, but sublime decision of naked reason and right, that these men, being the victims of that horrible trade, were free, and so to be held and taken; and as free Africans, are just as much entitled to the benefits of the law of nature and of nations, as free Spaniards.

The universal feeling of all free states, is hostile to that vile and crooked policy of corrupt rulers—that puts one set of principles on the statute book, and practices on another set in the common intercourse of life. Spain has abolished the slave trade by treaty and by ordinances having the force of law; and yet Spain not only connives at the carrying on of that trade, but furnishes facilities for it; and here we have the spectacle of her public amassador demanding these free Africans, as slaves and pirates—contrary to the fundamental laws of his own kingdom. Our courts have justly, firmly, nobly, refused not only to aid, but to permit such public fraud upon innocent men.

The universal principles of human right, justify every free creature, in resisting unto blood, all unlawful attempts to take away liberty. Here are free Africans, stolen and forcibly brought away from their own country—contrary to the law of nations, of nature, of our republic, of Spain, and above all, of God. They recover their liberty by force, on the high seas, and try to return to their native land. For this, an attempt is made, to have them sent, by the public act of a free people, into a half civilized Spanish Island,

for the avowed purpose of being put to a cruel death. Our courts say, they have committed no crime, known to any law, of force in any of our tribunals; and every heart of man, must respond to the truth and justice of such a judgment.

It is a glorious sight to see, this handful of old men—with a rare simplicity and modesty, and yet with immoveable firmness and rectitude as well as unrivalled wisdom and intelligence, delivering, almost in a whisper, decrees so fraught with truth and justice—that surrounding commonwealths bow to them with cordial reverence. And what a grand illustration of our national principles, spirit, institutions and posture—to behold the power of this great nation interposed, to save these poor, oppressed and ignorant men; and so interposed, as that reason, and law, and right, have governed every movement; and every part of the case, and every interest connected with, been patiently considered and decided!

We are heartily glad these poor Africans are delivered from their bonds, dangers, and troubles; and sincerely pray the Lord, to overrule the remarkable course of their destiny, to the great good of their own souls, and to the permanent advancement of their native land; to which we hope they may be induced to return, after being instructed in religion and the elements of our civilization.

POPERY AND TEMPERANCE IN BALTIMORE.—CATHOLICITY OF CATHOLICISM.

TEMPERANCE makes much slower progress amongst the Papists of America than those of Ireland; for which many reasons might be assigned.—In Ireland, by the last accounts, between four and five millions—have already taken the pledge; and as each Papist who takes it, pays down about half a dollar, and pays about two cents a week afterwards; Father Matthew, has gathered above two millions of dollars in hand, and a fixed revenue of above two millions a year more, for his ecclesiastical superiors. In Ireland every Papist, except perhaps the bishops, will take the temperance pledge; for besides the union of this cause there, with the superstitions of popery, and the great revenue it produces, there are important reasons of a revolutionary kind, which commend it to the leaders of the Papists. It affords a bond of union—virtually taking the place of *ribbon-ism* and other secret cut-throat societies, forbidden by the government; and moreover, whenever another general massacre shall be considered proper and prudent in Ireland, the *temperance medal*, will be as good a badge for day and night as any; a far better one than any they had in 1641.

Our good city of Baltimore, has lately been the theatre of a very remarkable movement in the temperance cause—and immense progress has been made in it, by a new class of labourers, viz., *reformed drunkards*, of whom there are perhaps not fewer than a thousand at least, now enrolled in various societies in this city.

The *Washington Society*, being the earliest, and the largest of these new societies, got up a grand public celebration for the 5th of April, which was its first anniversary: and other societies unit-

ing with it, a procession of five or six thousand temperance men and youths, with banners, &c. &c.—was marshalled through our streets on that day; and made a truly striking and exhilarating appearance to all the friends of the good cause. As one of the oldest of the rank and file, and one of the earliest and steadiest fighters in this reform, the writer of these lines thanked God and took courage, at a sight at once so novel and so imposing.

No such cause can be expected to go forward without some excesses and errors; and we should be very far from approving all that was done and said in getting up and carrying through this great celebration; or even all the principles, upon which a reform so important in itself, is urged onward. We feel particularly called on to print the letter which is given below, and for the genuineness of which we have indubitable evidence; and to be just, we feel equally obliged publicly to rebuke some of the doings of Mr. HUNT, who calls himself a Presbyterian minister, but has spent much time of late years as a strolling lecturer on various subjects; and who after the refusal of Mr. Read, for the reasons given in his letter, became a sort of orator of the day, on the 5th of April. On two occasions, portions of this man's doings in this city, (as they have been related to us,) under the pretence of advocating the cause of temperance, have been far more worthy of a mountebank than of a Presbyterian minister; in which latter character we are happy to be informed, no true Presbyterian in this city has condescended to recognize him. We hope in the event of another celebration, our temperance brethren will be more fortunate in their selections of orators.

BALTIMORE, MARCH 31st, 1841.

MR. JAMES DUNN.

Dear Sir:

When you communicated to me, on Monday last, the very flattering request of the Committee of Arrangements, for the Temperance Celebration of the 5th of April, that I would officiate as the orator of the day, I was under the impression originally received by the Committee of the Maryland Catholic Temperance Society, that there was to be no public religious ceremonial connected with it, and I, therefore, promptly expressed my gratification in accepting so distinguished an honor. To prevent all mis-conception, however, I accompanied you to the residence of the Rev. Mr. Schreiber, President of the Md. Cath. Tem. Soc., and entered fully into an explanation of Catholic principles (which you perfectly understood,) which would prevent our participating in any proceedings, where a religious ministry which we do not recognize, was to be employed. We separated with a distinct assurance from you that nothing would be done requiring any conscientious sacrifice on the part of Catholics. It was, therefore with surprise that I read in the papers of this morning, a programme announcing prayers by two Protestant clergymen. Under those circumstances, I must decline the execution of a task to which I had looked forward with pride and pleasure; and make this communication, at the earliest moment, to enable the Committee to make such arrangements as may become necessary in consequence of my resignation.

I have the honor to be with great respect,

Your ob'dt. serv't.

WILL. GEO. READ.

This is a pretty specimen of the *Catholicity of Catholicism*.—And moreover, it is official, and from the highest authority. *Mr. Will. Geo. Read*, is one of the principal Papal layman in our city; connected with our most respectable people; a lawyer and a politician;—and more than all—a *zealous convert from Protestantism*; a gentleman in whose pious nostrils any thing not allowed by *holy mother*, is so offensive, that the religion of his own honoured ancestors, and of those distinguished living relations, from connection with whom he derives the chief part of his own consideration in society—is an intolerable stench.* “*Rev'd Mr. Schreiber*”—too, is not only “*President of the Md. Cath. Tem. Soc.*”—but is a papal priest—under the eye of the resident Archbishop; so that we have the highest possible sanctions all round—to this most catholic, most liberal, most temperate of all *te-to-tal missives*.

The “*two Protestant clergymen*”—who were guilty of the horrible outrage of intending “*prayers*,” were, one a Lutheran and the other a Methodist. We sincerely rejoice that no Presbyterian was so lost to all sense of reverence to “*holy mother*”—as to be caught in a public attempt to offer “*prayers*”!!—But alas! since we come to reflect, this does us small good. For *Mr. Will. Geo. Read*, with the knowledge of “*Rev'd Mr. Schreiber, President*,” &c., and upon full “*explanation of Catholic principles*,” so full that *Mr. James Dunn*, though not, we believe, a Papist, “*perfectly understood*” them; even under these imposing circumstances, the grand objection to the “*two clergymen*” was that they were—shall we say it?—Alas! Alas!—they were—“*Protestant*”!!—So all of us, are alike condemned:—alike excluded from the favour of *Mr. Will. Geo. Read* and “*Rev'd Mr. Schreiber, President*,” &c., and holy mother! Alas! Alas!

In all seriousness, we earnestly commend this letter, and the principles involved in it, to the sober consideration of Protestants; especially of such as patronise papal schools—give money to papal institutions—promote papal interests—and lend themselves to men and principles, of which this letter is a sample. Here is the mother principle of popery, openly set forth from the highest quarters.

We must give up our God and our rights, or we must put down papism. This is the naked alternative presented by the principle on which *Mr. Read* acts. For ourselves, we accept the guage:—we thank the Papists for making the case; we are glad to see the inevitable issue, set fairly and nakedly before the people.

**MR. READ*, is neither a new acquaintance of this Magazine, nor a raw hand in Papal affairs. The attentive reader of our pages, for the last six years, has often seen his name. We refer to our *Mag.* for March, 1837, *Vol.* iii. pp. 96—104, for a long letter to him, in regard to certain matters connected with the mobs of August, 1836.

OXFORD DIVINITY AND ROMANISM COMPARED AND IDENTIFIED.

Messrs. Editors:—I propose to submit to your consideration some reflections suggested by reading “Bishop Mellvaine on Oxford Divinity,” with extracts from the work, that (provided you deem the *bundle* worthy a place in your Magazine) those of your readers who do not have access to the book may judge how far the worthy prelate has succeeded in convicting the Oxford men of Popery.

No attentive observer of the movements of the papacy can doubt for a moment that the most vigorous measures are now in operation to reanimate its waning power. That these efforts will be crowned with complete and final success, and the world be again subjugated to the dominion of the pope—that the gloomy days of the eleventh, twelfth, and thirteenth centuries are to return upon us, and liberty of thought and speech to be suppressed, and the true spiritual worship of Almighty God banished again from the glorious light of heaven to the caves and fastnesses of the mountains—that these dire calamities are to be visited again upon the insulted, priest-ridden nations, we do not, we cannot believe. “The curse of Jehovah rests upon Rome, and “strong is the Lord God who judgeth her.” We verily believe the day is not far distant when the Lord Jesus will blast her with the breath of his mouth, and consume her with the brightness of his coming. But, though this event be sure, nevertheless there shall previously be a mighty conflict. Perhaps the three unclean spirits (Rev. xvi. 14.) are already gone forth unto the kings of the earth, and of the whole world, to gather them to the battle of that great day of God Almighty—that great day so much predicted in the prophetic Scriptures. Verily the kings of the earth, with the old man of Rome apparently at their head, do seem to be marshalling their hosts for the onset. Witness the numberless associations for the *propagation of the faith*, fostered by kings and princes, that are yearly pouring millions into the treasury of the Pope from every quarter of Catholic Europe. Witness the hosts of bishops, priests, and laymen (officers and trained soldiery) that are constantly landing on our own shores. Witness the tremendous commotions, fraught with important results, that convulse Britain. Witness, I say, these earthquakes among the people, and tell me if the *signs of the times* portend not unheard-of things. The earth heaves to and fro like a monster in labor; and what new existence is to be ushered into being, God only knows. Britain and America, offering as they do by reason of their free governments the fairest opportunities, appear to have been selected as the grand theatres for present operations. What the prospect is in our own land, it is enough to know that the Catholic population has increased a million and a half within the last thirty years.

But it is not the open attacks of the whore of Babylon we fear; it is her secret machinations; the luke-warmness of Protestants; and the *covert assaults of professed friends*. These latter are they who threaten to undermine the boasted bulwark of the Protestant faith—men who are violating the most solemn vows, and salving over the abominations of the *mother of harlots*, (*mother church* they delight to call her,) that English palates may once more be brought to relish them. Whether these men be *honest*, is a question with which we have no concern; that they are working the very best work for the papacy they could, to our mind is evident. Men of extensive erudition and attainments—distinguished members of England’s proudest university—of acknowledged personal worth and piety—brilliant, ready, and most specious writers—nominally attached to the doctrine and order of the Established church—opposers, though tender and apologetic, of some unimportant Romish heresies—they are the very best agents that Rome or Satan could select “to plant again the standard of the Vatican on the walls of Lambeth.” Urging forward their measures with a vehemence

and activity rarely equalled, they are deluging Britain and America with volumes of lectures and "Tracts for the Times;" so artfully blending truth and error, and so cunningly concealing the ugly poison of their system with an *ad coptandum* sprinkling of godly sentiment, that the unsuspecting reader imbibes the noxious principle, before he is aware the filthy potion has polluted his lips. And there are many in high places, even in these United States, deeply infected with this poison; who though anti-papists—oh yes, valiant assertors of civil and religious liberty—yet the more they examine the subject, are inclined to think that Luther in many respects was in error; and the benefits ascribed to the Reformation somewhat questionable: and as to John Calvin—why, he burnt Servetus!! One of these gentlemen will discourse by the hour on the apostolic succession, and the different orders of the Christian priesthood, and the excellencies of the Roman and Parisian Breviaries, and the voice of antiquity and tradition, and the excesses of evangelical Christians, and valid ordinances and ordinations, etc. etc. But only ask him to give you his views in reference to the foundation of a Christian hope, and he is dumb. Ask him how a man is justified in the sight of his Maker, and he returns the question. If you reply, by faith alone in the Lord Jesus Christ, he qualifies a feeble assent in some such dastardly manner as the following:—*Yes, we are justified by faith; but St. James speaks of a man as justified also by works: there is a discrepancy between Paul and James, and I hardly know how to reconcile them. These sacred mysteries should be handled with peculiar caution and reserve.* Such are the men who repudiate the Protestant name—a name too dear in its rich and abiding associations, to be mentioned but with admiration and devout gratitude. The truth is, it is but a step from High-Churchism to downwright Popery.

But let no one imagine that Bishop McIlvaine sympathises with these semi-Papists; far from it. He hesitates not to denounce Rome as *the* Antichrist, the Babylon of the book of Revelation; and to endorse the emphatic language of the noble writers and reformers of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Let the following from Jackson serve as a specimen. "Like a harlot drunk in a common inn, she (Rome) prostrates herself to every passenger, and sets upon all the temples of God, whose keys have been committed to her custody, that they may serve as common stews for satiating the foul souls of infernal spirits; whom she thither invites by solemn enchantments, as by sacrificing and offering incense unto images. And finding pleasure in the practice, dreams she embraceth her Lord and husband, whilst these unclean birds enage themselves in her's and her children's breasts. 'The idolatry of Rome-Heathen agrees with the idolatry of Rome-Christian, as the type or shadow with the body or substance.'"

It is time, however, we directed the reader's attention more particularly to the Oxford Divinity. Bishop Mcl. very properly assumes the doctrine of justification by faith alone in the imputed righteousness of Christ, as the test whereby to try the Oxford writers; in as much as this was considered by the reformers themselves as involving the sum and substance of the whole matter in dispute; and in as much as it was an erroneous idea of the method of justification, that gave rise to the gross corruptions and pestiferous rites of the church of Rome. After stating at large the doctrine of the church of Christ on this subject, as revealed in the Holy Scriptures and embodied in the formularies of the different branches of that church, particularly of the church of England; and after unfolding with much minuteness and accuracy the doctrine of the church of Rome on the same subject, as matured by Peter Lombard, Aquinas, and other schoolmen, adopted by the Council of Trent, and expounded by its leading members and advocates—he compares the sentiments of the Oxford writers with the one and the other, in regard to the *matter* of justification, the nature and office of justifying faith, the office and efficacy of the sacraments, especially of baptism, and other kindred and dependant points. To avoid

unnecessary prolixity, however, we remark once for all, that Bishop McIlvaine is a rigid doctrinal Calvinist, (though we suppose he would scarcely allow the appellation, as he *labours* to prove the Lutheran origin of the thirty-nine Articles,) and so interprets the articles and homilies of the Anglican church, as did her founders and earliest and ablest doctors. And since this theology is well known, we omit the copious extracts from the old English authors, and copy only those from the Oxford and Romish writers.

Three propositions to show the identity of the doctrine of Oxfordism with that of Rome:—See *Oxford Divinity*, pp. 125—32.

1. That the Schoolmen described the righteousness of justification, precisely as do our Oxford Divines.

2. That they felt the same necessity, as do the latter, of finding out a distinction between an indwelling righteousness that justifies, and an indwelling righteousness that sanctifies, and that they fell upon precisely the same subtle and shadowy expedient.

3. That this very distinction of the ancient Schoolmen, which equally characterizes the divinity of our Oxford Schoolmen, is used by our ancient writers as one distinctive characteristic of popery.

1. As to the first of these propositions, there is no need of argument—Mr. Newman (Oxford) declares it. “Great divines, (he says,) as Lombard and Thomas Aquinas, (*the two head Schoolmen*) declare that the Holy Spirit indwelling, is the *formal cause of justification*”—Justification by *inherent righteousness* in other words;—or to use the words of St. Thomas himself, “justifying grace is something real and positive in the soul, a supernatural quality.”

The second proposition may be as readily dispatched. It will be remembered that while Mr. Newman (Oxford) most directly asserts that there is but one righteousness; that justification and sanctification are substantially the same; that the usual distinction between them is unscriptural; that they are really one, the terms renewal and justification being *identical*; he attempts what he considers a most important distinction, a distinction on which Dr. Pusey positively asserts, that he and his fellows “*exclude sanctification from having any place in our justification,*” and on which Mr. Newman asserts, that justification is “not renewal, nor the principle of renewal, but perfectly distinct from renewal, *with which Romanists identify it.*” The idea then is that between “the divine gift,” or “the justifying principle,” or “the inward reality of righteousness, or “the indwelling of the Holy Ghost,” (whichever expression we choose) and personal holiness, there is such a difference that while the latter is the *complex* of the several virtues of the renewed mind, the *other includes them all, but is not any of them.* Hence that curious description of the justifying righteousness, as a “something which is *within* us, but not *of* us, nor *in* us, not any quality or act of our minds, (though within them,) not faith, not renovation, not obedience, not any thing cognizable by man, but a certain divine gift in which all these are included.”

Now on what ground can Mr. Newman assert that the Romanists “*identify justification with renewal,*” one whit more than he does; how can he rest, as he does, his grand claim of distinction between his doctrine and that of Rome on the fact that *they* make that identification and he does not, when we find him saying, that “the *real* distinction already alluded to, (his own,) is *allowed in the church of Rome, and held by Romanists*, both before the Council of Trent and after?”

“St. Thomas contends that the *gratia justificans*, (the justifying righteousness,) is not the same as the habit of love; the latter belonging to the will, and the former to the essence of the soul. In which opinion he is followed by Cajetan, Conradus, Soto and others. Bonaventura” (one of the most mystical and superstitious, and idolatrous of the Schoolmen,) “assents, so far as to consider there is a real distinction between them. This alleged distinction was a subject of dispute at the Council of Trent between the Franciscans and Dominicans, on all which accounts it was left unsettled by the fathers there assembled.”

We add to the above, the extract from Annati, in Tracts for the Times, No. 71. “It is *de fide* that man is justified by inherent righteousness; it is not *de fide* (not an established article of faith,) that justifying righteousness is a *habit or quality.*”

Now, with all this before him how could Mr. Newman say, as he does on page 150 of his Lectures, that Romanists make justifying righteousness "consist in a supernatural quality," as if that word *quality* were decided upon any more, among them, than it is with him, and as if in the use of that word lay the great difference between his doctrine and theirs?

Enough has now been said for our second proposition, viz., that the Schoolmen and our Oxford Divines, not only are agreed as to inherent righteousness for justification, but are characterized by precisely the same vain device to prevent its being considered exactly the same thing as sanctification.

3. For our third proposition that our ancient writers have used that very distinction as a distinctive characteristic of popery; Hooker will suffice as an example.

In the commencement of his famous discourse on justification, he sets out with that admirable account of the doctrine of the church of Rome, which we have laid before the reader already. The only authority which he quotes for the account there given of what justifying righteousness consists in, according to Rome, is in the words of Thomas Aquinas, containing the precise distinction in question, and which Mr. Newman refers to, above, as agreeing with his own.

"Justifying grace is something real and positive in the soul—not the same with infused virtue as the master (Lombard) maintains; but something beside the infused virtues, faith, hope, charity; a certain habitude which is pre-supposed in those virtues, as their principle and root; it occupies, as its subject, the essence of the soul, *not its powers*; yet from it flow virtues into the powers of the soul by which the powers themselves are formed into actions."

This is precisely Mr. Newman's idea; a "*Quodlibet* of the Schools," (as Bishop Andrews says,) a *habitude* distinct from any *habit*; an *essence* in the soul distinct from any *quality* of the soul: righteousness distinct from the righteous affections of faith, hope, and charity. And this is the Romanism of the Schoolmen, which Hooker selects as the best expression of the very essence of all Romanism. And this is Oxford Divinity—and this is what the Council of Trent referred to as the source and model of theirs—the new divinity of the dark ages, engendered of pagan philosophy and papal superstition, married together under the bands of the Schoolmen.

It is manifest from the above, that the question which the Trent doctors left unsettled, and therefore open, was one on which Aquinas differed from his master, Peter Lombard; the latter making justifying righteousness precisely the same as sanctification; the former attempting the distinction which Mr. Newman and Dr. Pusey would now use as evidence that their doctrine differs from that of Rome.

Such then is the doctrine at once of Oxford Divines, and of a race of theologians eminently distinguished in their day, for the preference of heathen dialectics to Holy Scripture, the words of Aristotle to the writings of the Christian fathers, so that those who made the Bible their guide, were called in distinction from them, by a name rendered opprobrious by the general neglect of the Bible—*Bibliocists*.

The question is forced upon us;—since the age that was distinguished by the bringing in of this doctrine of inherent righteousness for justification, was also so remarkable for the introduction of all the other chief corruptions of Romanism, such as the full doctrine of *image worship* as now established, that of *transubstantiation*, of *purgatory*, of *indulgences*, &c.; and since the very men who were foremost in the former, were also eminently distinguished as patrons of the latter, as Aquinas and Bonaventura, (the latter, the chief devotee of the Virgin Mary,) what are we to anticipate from the introduction of precisely the same doctrine of justification among Protestants? Is its natural strength abated? Call it by a Protestant or a Romish name, set it up at Oxford, or at Trent, is it not the same; the old righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees, and as able as ever to lead men to go about "establishing their own righteousness, not submitting themselves to the righteousness of God?" The light abroad may face it down; the barrier around, of better principles, may hedge it in. But can it live now in a Protestant land, without having, and exerting, and manifesting those same old tendencies, especially upon such as shall receive it at second or third hand, from its original propagators? The present aspect of the Oxford system, so far as its practical developments have had room and time to appear, answer impressively, *No.*"

Before proceeding farther, we have a remark or two to make on this curious description of justifying righteousness, as a 'something which is within us, but not of us, nor in us; not any quality or act of our minds, (though within them,) not faith, &c.' Let us conceive of a poor sinner, conscious of his utter inability to help himself, coming to one of these teachers of salvation, and from the depths of his soul agonized under a sense of the condemnation of God's violated law, and with the fearful declaration of the psalmist, "In thy sight shall no man living be justified," ringing in his ears; and crying out, men and brethren, what shall I do to be saved? 'How shall man be just with God?' Picture to the mind that miserable man standing before the ambassador of God, with the intense anxiety of one who feels there is nought between him and hell, and receiving this reply:—"We are justified by a divine gift, imparted for the sake of the merits of Christ; a something within us, but not of us, nor in us." How tangible this, for the fainting spirit to grasp and lean upon! What an anchor to the soul, both sure and steadfast! How admirably fitted this wretched mortal to apprehend such metaphysical distinctions! if distinctions they can be called. What a pitiful, Christ-dishonoring exhibition of the glorious gospel of the blessed God! What a divine mystery this something within us, but not of us, nor in us, for the high angels that excel in might and knowledge, to look into!

Again; conceive of that tremendous day, when an assembled world stands before the judgment-bar of the omniscient and immaculate God. The gates of the eternal city, impaled with celestial light and glory, are open to admit the ransomed few; and far beneath,

"As far remov'd from God and light of heav'n,
"As from the centre thrice to th' utmost pole,"
"Stand hell-gates wide unfurl'd."

Will the judge receive an undefined something as a passport to the mansions of peace and glory? Will an undefined and undefinable something stay the wrath of the Lamb, or extinguish the flames of perdition? What an abomination! What a deceiving of the souls of men! Such sentiments emanating from the priests of her whose trade it is to make merchandize of the souls of men, might be productive of little injury; but who can estimate their dangerous tendency, when avowed and published to the world by Protestant ministers—dignitaries of a church watered by the blood of the martyrs of Jesus!

It is also worthy our attention to observe the mysticism in which this miserable doctrine is shrouded. Ecclesiastical history teaches us that this has always been the resort of the better class of innovators in holy things. When hard pressed by the advocates of truth, it serves them the same purpose as the inky discharge of a certain little marine animal, by which it effectually conceals itself from its pursuers. Under cover of learned nonsense and driveling verbiage, that may be construed to mean any thing or nothing at all, as convenience requires, they manage to elude detection; till emboldened by success, they dare produce to light of day the ill-shapen monsters of their crazed heads and vain hearts. But if such conduct be unworthy honourable men in worldly things, how much more so in heavenly? If base when temporal interests of great magnitude, nay, of the least magnitude, are at stake, how much more so when eternal interests are involved? when the very essence of the gospel of reconciliation is in dispute? If ever—for the sake of the souls that God has made, let us have plainness of speech now. Whether the Oxford divines have exposed themselves to the charge of dissimulation, we leave others to judge. At all events, their mysticism is a sure index of the company they keep. This is not the language of the sons of the martyred Cranmer and his fellow-labourers; it dates its origin anterior to the era of the reformation, and claims kindred with the musty tones of the dark ages. In short, this whole

array of
murky s
Oxford.
alumber
The fi
Council
"It is
deliveran
that these
out benefi
confusion
"This dis
Scripture
justificati
so rapidly
really on
"Justifi
renewal
Whence
so as to b
the merits
After t
Council p
"The o
by which he
the spirit of
"Thus,
as if it wer
rejected.
inherent in
infused into
vii, Sess. v
We think
that the Ox
doctrine of
between the
will appear
whole matte
by somethi
—then justifi
in his letter
presence."
soul, throug
In other wor
may be mor
sio, he may
of great pri
ular confess
has demonst
justification
rent righte
these two ey
But it ma
bers of the
doctrine and
let any can
Presbyteria
orthodoxy
from what

array of learning, sophistry, and false doctrine, is only a reviving of the murky spirits that have quietly slumbered for centuries in the alcoves of Oxford. Truth and righteousness would have suffered no loss, had they slumbered to eternity.

The following extracts identify the doctrine of Oxford and that of the Council of Trent.

"It is usual at the present day to lay great stress on the *distinction* between deliverance from guilt, and deliverance from sin; to lay down as a first principle, that these are two coincident indeed, and contemporary, but *altogether* independent benefits, to call them *justification and renewal*, and to consider that any confusion between them argues serious and alarming ignorance of Christian truth."

"This distinction," Mr. Newman says, "is NOT SCRIPTURAL." "In truth, Scripture speaks of but one gift which it sometimes calls *renewal*, sometimes *justification*, according as it views it, passing to and fro, from one to the other, so rapidly, so abruptly, as to force upon us irresistibly the inference that they are *really one*."—*Newman's Lectures on Justification*.

"Justification is not merely the remission of sins, but also *sanctification and renewal* of the inward man, by his voluntary reception of grace and gifts. Whence a man becomes righteous from unrighteous, a friend of God for an enemy, so as to be an heir according to the hope of eternal life, and the communication of the merits of the passion of our Lord Jesus Christ."—*See Ox. Div. p. 66*.

After saying that the *meritorious* cause of justification is Christ, the Council proceed to declare that

"The only *formal* cause is God's justice, not by which he himself is just, but by which he makes us just, wherewith being endowed by him, we are renewed in the spirit of our minds, and are not only reputed, but are *made, truly just*."

"Thus, neither our own proper righteousness is so determined to be our own, as if it were from ourselves; nor is the righteousness of God either unknown or rejected. For that which is called our righteousness, because, through its being inherent in us, we are justified; that same is the righteousness of God, because it is infused into us by God, through the merit of Christ."—*Decrees of Trent; Canon vi., Sess. vi., and Canon xvi.*

We think it must now be abundantly manifest to every unprejudiced mind, that the Oxford writers are essentially popish—popish in the fundamental doctrine of the Christian religion; viz., as to what it is that interposeth between the wrath of God and our souls. Popish, root and branch too, as will appear hereafter. The reader must bear in mind that the pith of the whole matter consists in this:—are we justified by something *within us*, or by something *without us*? If by something within us—no difference what—then justification by imputed righteousness is a figment. Now Dr. Pusey, in his letter to the bishop of Oxford, says, "justification is God's *inward* presence." "It is the act of God imparting his divine presence to the soul, *through baptism*, and so making us the temples of the Holy Ghost." In other words, justification is the same as sanctification; and hence a man may be more justified at one time than at another, or, through subsequent sin, he may lose his justification altogether. Hence, to recover this pearl of great price, the whole round of popish lies and abuses—penance, auricular confession, indulgences, purgatory, &c. &c. And Bishop McIlvaine has demonstrated this to be the unavoidable tendency of Oxfordism. Now justification by imputed righteousness is Christianity; justification by inherent righteousness, or personal holiness, is Romanism. With which of these two systems does Oxfordism agree?

But it may be asked, do not these learned gentlemen, as consistent members of the church of England, deny any such connection between their doctrine and that of Rome? Most certainly they do; but with what reason, let any candid man determine. It will be recollected that our New School Presbyterian friends endeavored a long time to keep up a show of orthodoxy by employing Calvinistic terms in a sense entirely different from what usage had assigned them. Now it is instructive to observe

the similarity in the developements of error. 'This disengenuous use of terms is precisely the expedient adopted by the Oxford divines, to conceal their heresy. Thus we read in Mr. Newman's Lectures, that, "*Imputed righteousness is the coming in of actual righteousness.*"—What is this but arrant imposition on the simple and too credulous reader? What 'but a violent subjection of a plain scriptural doctrine to the most crushing screws of system-making?' One of two conclusions inevitably follows: either Mr. Newman is shamefully ignorant of what the Scriptures teach on this subject, horribly deceived himself, and sadly deceiving others; or is willfully deluding his fellow-men into the belief of an error that has been the source of incalculable evil. Let him choose either horn of the dilemma; either is adequate to tear him in pieces.

So much for popery *in rudiment*; we propose now to exhibit very concisely some of its developements. "By their fruits ye shall know them." A corrupt tree bringeth forth corrupt fruit.

Baptismal justification and regeneration.—"Faith being the appointed representative of Baptism, derives its authority and virtue from that which it represents. It is justifying because of baptism; it is the faith of the baptized—of the regenerate; that is, of the justified. Faith does not precede justification; but justification precedes it, and makes it justifying. Baptism is the primary instrument, and creates faith to be what it is, and otherwise is not, giving it power and rank, and constituting it as its own successor. Each has its own office, baptism at the time, faith ever after—the sacraments, the *instrumental*, faith the *sustaining* cause."—*Newman's Lectures.*—*Ox. Div. p. 196.*

Again: "Faith secures to the soul continually those gifts which baptism primarily confers. The sacraments are the *immediate*, faith is the *secondary subordinate*, or representative instrument of justification." The following is part of an editorial in a late number of the Churchman. "The young who are admitted by baptism into the Christian church, should be addressed and treated as Christians, as those whose regeneration and justification are already past, as those who have been invested with the faith and privileges of the gospel, and so to be urged to the formation of moral tempers and domestic habits, from the motives of gratitude and joy for the blessings of redemption." Here, then, is the *opus operatum* of the Papists, out and out—the efficacy of the sacraments, not as means of grace, but in and of themselves efficacious to confer grace without respect to the state of the recipient, provided only that he does not shut up his soul against them. And the same distinctions that the Romanists make in regard to faith before and after baptism, and in regard to mortal and venial sins, have been eternally fastened upon the Oxford writers by Bishop McIlvaine. And as they admit a man may lose his justification through sin committed after baptism, they must either hand over these past-baptismal sinners to eternal damnation, as *unprovided for in the covenant*, or flee to penance and purgatory for their relief!

But let not our sympathy be unduly excited. The case of these past-baptismal sinners is not one whit harder than that of all Protestants who depend for their spiritual instruction and nourishment upon the ministrations of men *not episcopally* ordained. The American bishops, H. and O. consign all who are without the pale of the Episcopal churches, pastors and people, to the *uncovenanted mercies of God!* and remember, out of Christ, God is a consuming fire!! Yes, in the midst of the solemnities, we can scarcely control our risibles. Is it not silly enough to hear the feeble old Gregory, as a toothless lion, belching out his harmless anathemas? must we, with the Bible in our hands, be goaded on, till, like Democritus, we split our sides with laughter, at these sarciful imitations of the pope's ghostly authority? Perhaps as Christians, we ought rather to weep over the folly of our fellows; yet, frail mortals as we are, who can repress a smile? It reminds us of one Salmoneus King of Elis, a queer fellow of old, who

drove his chariot over a brazen bridge, and darted burning torches on every side, to imitate the thunder and lightning of Jupiter.

The rule of faith. "The sacred volume was never intended, and is not adapted to teach our creed, however certain it is that we can *prove* our creed from it, when it has once been taught us."—"The mere private study of Holy Scripture is insufficient (i. e. without the precomposed creed of the church as a guide,) for the arriving at the exact and entire truth which it really contains."—"From the very first, the rule has been as a matter of fact, *for the church to teach the truth*, and then appeal to Scripture in vindication of its own teaching," while the way of heretics from the first has been "to elicit a systematic doctrine FROM THE SCATTERED NOTICES OF THE TRUTH WHICH SCRIPTURE CONTAINS."—Newman's Hist. of the Arians. All real Protestants, therefore, who take the Bible, the whole Bible, and nothing but the Bible, as the only and all sufficient rule of faith and practice, must quietly submit to the *authorized* teachings of holy mother church. Of a piece with the preceding, and equally popish, is their view of

Tradition. "With relation to the supreme authority of inspired Scripture," says the Professor of poetry at Oxford, "it stands thus:—Catholic tradition teaches revealed truth, Scripture proves it; Scripture is the document of faith, tradition the witness of it; the true creed is the Catholic interpretation of Scripture, or scripturally proved tradition; Scripture by itself teaches mediately and proves decisively; *Scripture and tradition taken together, are the joint rule of faith.*"

And has it come to this, that they lay aside the inspired word of the eternal God as an incompetent standard and interpreter of truth? Rome has never been guilty of a more profane and awful degradation of the Scriptures. This is Romanism in its highest state of development—the last grand device of Satan—the top-most stone in that mighty fabric of iniquity and superstition that did for ages overshadow the world—a cloak with which the Babylonian whore covers her putrid sores and gangrene, and rolls the responsibility of her horrid lies and blasphemies upon the blessed God himself. Subject the Bible to tradition, as the Oxford writers have done in agreement with Rome, and you open the door to every conceivable form of heresy; you subject the consciences of men, not to the will of their sovereign Lord and King, as revealed in his word, but to the *dicium* of usurping priests. Under cover of tradition, the most grievous burthens may be imposed on God's heritage. Mankind have had sad experience of the desolating effects of this infernal engine.

In view of these convincing proofs of the popery of Oxfordism, we call upon all Protestants, and especially all Protestant Episcopalians in the United States, to set their faces as flint against it. It is nothing more nor less than the old poison. It has already made many converts among us. Only a few days ago, we read in one of the secular papers, that an American bishop had received and accepted an invitation to preach the dedication sermon on the opening of the new chapel erected for Dr. Hook, one of the leaders of the popish party in the Established church. Already has the trump of victory been sounded by the papal hosts—*Oxford is ours again.* Let us, then, as men, as Christians, gird on our armour, prepared to repel every assault of error, and to do battle in the name and cause of the High and Lofty One. Soon shall the tide of conquest be changed—soon shall the welkin ring with the victorious cry, *Magna est veritas, et praevaluit.*

AN OLD FASHIONED PROTESTANT.

NOTICES.

ONE OF THE MOST AMUSING series of articles we have ever looked over, is that called '*Hexagon*,' written by that distinguished scholar and divine, Dr. SAMUEL H. (*Hexagon*?) Cox—of New York. The series, too, is like to last without any known terminus—the doctor's labours in many respects resembling the asymptotes of a parabolic curve—which the mathematicians teach us, will approach forever, but never touch. We find in the *Evangelist* of the 3d of April, No. xlix., of the series;—and if our memory is correct, only *one* out of *eight* sides of the doctor's diagram, has been as yet fully argued up. The idea of a disquisition on *orthodoxy*, by Dr. Cox, is itself in the very highest degree amusing; and to make the conception perfectly exquisite, he has been diligently serving up the extreme correlative idea,—in trying to prove DR ALEXANDER, a heretic. We always had a kind of curiosity for Dr. Cox; that sort of interest which we feel, in people about whom we are not sure whether they are cracked or not; and now, we assure him, our amusement has been boundless, in following his attempts to prove *heresy*, upon the most deeply read theologian, the most exact thinker, the most clear and precise preacher, and amongst the most evangelical men of his age; and besides all this, a man more universally known, for these elevated attainments and qualities—than any other in America. This is too good; our New School friends, are really the merriest jesters of the day. The concluding sentence of No. xlix., in which Dr. Cox cracks a joke upon the venerable and beloved father at Princeton, in connexion with our name;—will excuse us to all parties, for this reverence to the '*Hexagon*.'

THE BOOK STORE OF DAVID OWEN & SON, which has been lately established, and has been far more extensively engaged in the sale of works in the papal controversy than any other, perhaps than *all* others in Baltimore; was set on fire, sometime after midnight on the morning of April 6. Above this book store, is the printing establishment of the *Saturday Visitor*; and the office of that paper, which our readers are aware, is now engaged in publishing a pretty full discussion on the doctrines and practices of the church of Rome—is in the back room of the book store. If the fire had not been providentially discovered, before it had obtained much head—the book store and the printing office—with perhaps the entire block of buildings,—and no one can tell how much beside—must have been consumed. The fire appeared to have been carefully put into the book store, through a hole cut into it from a public stair-way adjoining; and was evidently the work of an incendiary. We are happy to add that the Messrs. Owen were insured, as they hope to the full amount of their actual loss; which was considerable, as *water* is nearly as bad for books as *fire*. This would be a very short way to get rid of unpalatable books, and to ruin unruly trades-people; if it were not that the loss falls on the insurance office, and the books can be re-printed. Though more cruel, and in this age more difficult, it would be more effectual—to burn *authors*.—Our readers are aware that the faggot is the instrument of revenge, publicly threatened by *Daniel O'Connell*, against the people of Great Britain, in case it becomes necessary in order to effect that repeal of the Union between England and Ireland, for which even some American Protestants are so deluded as to be agitating with our Papists.

☞ Receipts, Accounts, Answers to Letters, &c., omitted for want of space, will appear in our next number.

THE
BALTIMORE LITERARY
AND
RELIGIOUS MAGAZINE.

VOL. VII.]

JUNE, 1841.

[No. 6.

ABOLITION LEADERS—FOREIGN AND DOMESTIC.—WARDLAW.—
BIRNEY.—GARRISON.—THOMPSON.—THE WORLD'S CONVEN-
TION.

OF all the remarkable propensities of modern abolition, none is more extraordinary than its want of candor and fair dealing with its opponents, and its total disregard of the feelings and character of every one who will not bow down to it. Whether its most distinguished advocates, in both hemispheres, are exempt from the taint of these degrading vices, let the public judge after reading this statement.

On the evening of Monday, July 27, 1840, there was a great Anti-Slavery meeting in Glasgow, Scotland,—in the chapel of Dr. WARDLAW, “for the purpose of receiving Mr. William Lloyd Garrison,” &c. &c.; at which Dr. Wardlaw himself presided. We copy from “*the Glasgow Chronicle*,” of July 29, the extract immediately following. Mr. George Thompson, in a set speech, presented Mr. Garrison to the Meeting; and then he made the speech, from which the following incident is taken :

“ He (Mr. Garrison,) did not know what was become of Peter Bothwick, but “ he knew what had become of West India slavery, and he knew what had become of Mr. Breckinridge, and he knew that much of what he had testified to “ on that occasion was not true—(cheers and hisses) and that he was recreant as a “ man, as an American, and as a Christian. (renewed cheers and hisses.) He “ was introduced to them as having nobly emancipated his own slaves. They “ were still in slavery. (Hisses and cheers.)

“ The chairman—(Dr. Wardlaw.) It was represented in the presence of Mr. “ Breckinridge, in that place, that he had emancipated his slaves, and shame to “ him, he allowed the statement to pass uncontradicted. (Cheers.)

“ Mr. Garrison resumed. For want of the necessary documents, he found he “ could not speak to the discussion, but this much he could say, that when he be- “ gan to make notes upon his published speeches, he found as he proceeded, that “ there was no end to it, as there was not one line, not one sentence, but was in “ opposition to the truth. (Disapprobation). He was sorry to say this of any “ man, and more especially of a minister of the gospel. He denied that he had “ ever attempted to raise a mob against Mr. Breckinridge in Boston, and showed “ that the Abolitionists could not have done so, but it appeared as he had nothing “ better to advance, he seized upon him. (Cheers.) &c. &c.

Let us now make another extract, from another paper, implicating some of the same, and also additional parties. *Mr. James G. Birney*, then a candidate for the presidency of the United States, during a late visit to Europe delivered many public addresses in Great Britain, on what the abolitionists are pleased to call "*American slavery*;" and amongst others, one at Glasgow, in the latter part of last October. The extract which immediately follows, is taken from "*The American and Foreign Anti-Slavery Reporter*," printed New York, December, 1840.

"The *Glasgow Argus* of October 22d, gives in six solid columns, an account of a public meeting of the Glasgow Emancipation Society, the principal object of which was to hear addresses on the condition of slavery in the United States &c. from J. G. Birney, H. B. Stanton, C. L. Raymond of America, and G. Thompson, and J. Scoble. Rev. Doctor Wardlaw, chairman, after some excellent remarks, introduced Mr. Birney to the notice of the meeting, as one who had illustrated his principles by a noble and generous example, (the emancipation of his slaves,) and whom they would hear on that very account with the greater delight. (Cheers). MR. BIRNEY proceeded to give an account of *American slavery* as it is, and the contamination of the church of various denominations, with the system. He 'sat down amid cheering.' MR. THOMPSON wished to enquire of Mr. B. the precise position in which the Rev. Robert J. Breckinridge stood in relation to his slaves. DR. WARDLAW also wished to hear an explanation, as he had stated, as a fact, that Mr. Breckinridge had emancipated his slaves; and that gentleman never contradicted his statement. Mr. Birney said he had been personally acquainted with Mr. B. since he was very young, and his impression was, after enquiry, that Mr. Breckinridge's slaves were all at work, as slaves, at this day."

We have no idea of arguing any question or principle involved in these statements. But we desire to place the proof of the falsehood and malice of the chief of them, that relate to us, in the simplest possible light.

1. *Dr. Wardlaw*. This gentleman asserted on both the occasions above referred to, two important facts in regard to us: 1. That the Rev. Robert J. Breckinridge allowed him to make statements in his presence which were creditable to him, and which were not true; in regard to the emancipation of his slaves. 2. That he did not contradict those statements of Dr. W. These are serious accusations; and if untrue, are the more dishonourable, considering the circumstances under which, and the emphasis with which, they have been made. We will state the facts of the case, and leave the public to decide.

Dr. Wardlaw presided in his own chapel on the occasion of our discussion with George Thompson, in June 1836. On taking the chair, the doctor made a speech introducing Mr. Thompson and Mr. Breckinridge to the audience; in the course of which he used in regard to the latter, the following expressions:

"Mr. B. stands high in personal character, in family respectability, in ministerial reputation, in public esteem. And what is of essential consequence for this assembly to know, he is not a slave-holder, nor a friend to slavery. In the very letter in which he accepts Mr. Thompson's challenge, he has publicly avowed that he "believes slavery to be contrary to the spirit of the gospel, and the natural rights of men." And he has given practical evidence of the sincerity of this declaration, in the fact of his having parted with a patrimonial property in slaves, at no inconsiderable pecuniary sacrifice, &c." (*Discussion on American Slavery, &c. Glasgow, George Gallic, 99, Buchanan Street &c. 1836. Second edition, page 6.*)"

This declaration is the only one of the kind ever made by Dr. Wardlaw, in regard to us, so far as we know. No man knows better than himself, that it was made without our knowledge or consent; and without any previous conference with us on the subject. But the questions now are; 1, Was it false? as he now asserts it was. 2, Was it permitted to pass uncontradicted, nay unexplained? as he more than insinuates it was.

First, as to the truth or falsehood of the fact. There is now lying before us, a deed, signed, sealed, attested and delivered, on the 13th day of January, 1835, in which "Ro. J. Breckinridge" *emancipates and forever sets free*, all his slaves upon certain limitations expressed on the face of the deed; of which more presently. This deed was personally acknowledged in the office of *James C. Rodes*, Clerk of the County Court for the County of Fayette, and Commonwealth of Kentucky, on the 14th day of January, 1835; and a third person acting for the slaves, ordered it to record: all of which is attested by the Clerk on the deed, and will appear of record to any who choose to examine. If any desire to enquire farther, they will find repeated deeds, some before the one above mentioned; others of date subsequent to it, of record in the same office: the latter class successively executing the stipulations of the deed of 1835, as necessity required. And if any choose to examine still farther, they will find on page 22 of a speech delivered by the said Breckinridge in the Court House yard at Lexington, Kentucky, on the 12th October 1840; a particular declaration, made in the presence of a thousand persons, of the original fact. We barely ask the public to compare these facts with the statements of Dr. Wardlaw, and then decide what that individual could possibly expect us to do, or what he would be at; if it be not to take vengeance for a certain letter—which he has left unanswered for nearly five years.

Secondly, the alledged silence.—This is a most remarkable and unfortunate allegation; and if Dr. Wardlaw can escape with honour, the making of it, it must be on account of such an infirmity of memory, or such an ignorance of what he was bound to know, as can hardly be paralleled amongst upright men. On the 116 page of the "*Discussion on American Slavery*" already quoted, there is printed, as part of one of our Speeches on the 5th night of the debate with George Thompson, a series of resolutions of the Synod of Kentucky, taken from the *New York Observer* of April 23d, 1836; and then the following sentences, were uttered by us in the presence of Dr. Wardlaw, and were afterwards three times printed and extensively distributed over Scotland: they are quoted from the aforementioned page, of the second edition.

"The plan revealed in these resolutions, was the one of all others, which most commended itself to his, (Mr. B's) judgment. *And he most particularly asked their attention to it, on an account somewhat personal. He had several times been publicly referred to in this country, as having shown the sincerity of his principles in the manumission of his own slaves. He was most anxious that no error should exist on this subject, which was one he had not at any time had any part in bringing before the public, and which, as often only as he was forced to do so, had he explained.* THE INTRODUCTORY REMARKS OF THE CHAIRMAN, (Dr. Wardlaw), HAD LAID HIM UNDER THE NECESSITY OF SUCH AN EXPLANATION, WHICH HAD NOT SO NATURALLY OCCURRED AS IN THIS CONNEXION. *He took leave therefore to say, that this Kentucky plan was in substance, the one he had been acting on for some years before its existence; and which he should probably be amongst the earliest, if his life was spared, fully to complete.*"

It is only necessary to say that "this Kentucky plan," as it related to emancipation, was simply this: 1, Voluntary, gradual, prospective emancipation, of our own slaves, as they successively arrived at 25 years of age: 2d, The settlement of this matter, by

individual deeds of record. It may be proper also to remark, that the whole matter is gone fully into in a personal exposition in the speech from which the foregoing extract is taken, and even minute family arrangements stated, in order to avoid the possibility of mistake.

To say that with these facts before the public we confidently rely on their indignant condemnation of Dr. Wardlaw's conduct; is far short of our sense of the strength of our case. If there remains one spark of honour or generosity in Dr. Wardlaw's bosom; he will himself admit and correct his injustice, as signally as he has committed it.

2. We come now to Mr. Birney. "*Mr. Birney said his impression was, after enquiry, that Mr. Breckinridge's slaves were all at work as slaves at this day.*" It can hardly be expected that a man whose impressions of patriotism lead him to traduce his own country to foreigners who are conspiring against its honour and peace, and whose inquiries into truth, conduct him to the conclusion that immediate abolition, universal levelling, and general amalgamation are the grand desiderata in American society; should inquire for truth where it might be expected to be found, or be properly impressed with it, if he should chance to light on it. Mr. Birney has pursued such a line of conduct towards his country, his church, and his old friends; that we have no reason to find fault or to regret that he should have mixed us up in his calumnies against his brethren, his kindred, and his home. If he had desired to know the truth, it was fully and easily in his reach; and was even notoriously not as he said. The facts already stated make this manifest.

3. *Mr. Garrison.* It seems even the Abolitionists of Glasgow were disgusted with this man's violence and falsehood; and were likely to hiss him down, if Dr. Wardlaw had not helped him out. "*There was not one line, not one sentence, but was in opposition to the truth.*" This is frantic nonsense. "*He denied that he had attempted to raise a mob against Mr. Breckinridge in Boston.*" What we said in Glasgow was this; "He might mention, however, that he himself had once almost been mobbed in Boston, and that too by a mob stirred up against him by placards written, as he believed, by William Lloyd Garrison. *He had never obtained direct proof of this, but he might state as a reason for his belief, that the inflammatory placards were of the precise breadth and appearance of the columns of Garrison's paper, (the Liberator): and of the breadth of the columns of no other newspaper in that city.*" (Discussion &c. p. 21). We never doubted, nor did those with whom we acted at the time referred to, in Boston, that Garrison instigated the mob, which tried in vain, to prevent the Rev. DR. JOHN BRECKINRIDGE and ourself from publicly advocating the cause of Colonization in that city. But we never asserted the fact positively. The plot failed, and Garrison became ashamed of it, only, as we believe, on that account. Again he says; "*He was introduced to them, as having nobly emancipated his own slaves.—They were in slavery.*" What would the people of Glasgow have said, if Mr. Garrison had publicly told them that the deed of emancipation of 1835, of

which we have before spoken, was published all over the United States, in the Abolition Newspapers; was known to every one of them; and was denounced by them merely on two accounts; viz. 1. Because the emancipation provided for by it, was not *immediate*; and 2. Because, as they pretended, it was a mere trick, and not *bona fide*, on our part. If Mr. Birney had said he knew all these facts, and Mr. Garrison had owned, that he had himself published the deed; what would the effect have been? Would to God we had been at Glasgow again for one single hour, to have confronted these audacious men. But we trust these lines may yet reach the eyes of that enlightened and considerate people; and aid in showing them who, and what, they are, who have deliberately suppressed the truth, and falsified recorded proof, to blacken the character of one who has done more for the black race, and at greater sacrifices, than all of them put together; and who but for them, and the like of them, might by God's blessing, have aided in doing still better and greater things.

4. *George Thompson.* "Mr. George Thompson wished to enquire of Mr. B. the *precise position* in which the Revd. Robert J. Breckinridge stood in relation to his slaves." A very pretty interlude: well acted—no doubt, well rehearsed beforehand. "*Precise position.*" We will tell you Mr. Thompson, with all plainness of speech our *precise position* to the whole case. It is as it regards you Englishmen who insolently meddle with our affairs, and falsely traduce our characters and acts, and audaciously assault our feelings; a *position* of defiance and scorn. It is as it regards those false, treacherous, and mean spirited Americans who are your co-workers, dupes, and tools; a *position* of uncompromising aversion and resistance. It is, as it regards you sir, such a *position*, that if the joint amount *lost* by us and *gained* by you, through our several connexion with this subject, was jointly computed; it would, we doubt not, very much exceed that '*testimonial fund*' of 4000 pounds sterling, with which you were about to be endowed for your *disinterested* labours, when our Glasgow conference intervened, and by its result made your '*precise position*' so peculiar that you have never ceased to feel the tenderest solicitude about ours.

It is well known to the American public, that the particular transactions which have called for this notice, had a special relation to what was called "the world's anti-slavery convention." There are many reasons why that assemblage is worthy of a passing observation; and the writer of these lines is well entitled to make it, since he had the fortune to be denounced by name in its sessions; a fate, which as it more intimately identifies him with his country, traduced and dishonoured on the same occasion, he should the less regret.

If the convention had been what its name implies, it would have been truly an august assembly, met on a glorious errand. If it had been a convention of the world, instead of a gathering of some hundreds of English men, attended for effect, by a few Americans, and a French man or two, the whole put together not representing a real constituency, many times larger than their public

meetings in Exeter Hall : if its real design had been to consider in a large, deep, and noble spirit, the great question of involuntary servitude, with the single purpose of its universal and earliest possible termination throughout the whole earth : then we are ready to confess, it would have been a truly magnificent spectacle, a truly ennobling occasion. For we can never conceal from ourselves, that the permanent continuance of slavery, in whatever form, is incompatible with the dictates of nature, of reason, and of religion ; subversive of the best, dearest and most manifest rights of mankind ; wholly insufficient and delusive as a basis of civilization, advancement and permanent glory for states ; and thoroughly incompatible with the highest security, development, and general well being of society. Nothing can be more certain than that it ought to end, except the fact that it must end. However deep our convictions may be of the folly and wickedness of the schemes of those now called Abolitionists ; they are not less so against slavery in itself considered. In both these sentiments we rejoice to believe, that we coincide with the great bulk of the American people, in every portion of our wide spread country ; but if we stood absolutely alone, we should not the less freely proclaim them, when ever called *by duty* to do so.

But we must insist that no gathering was ever more misnamed ; that no proceedings were ever more despicable in comparison with their pretended end ; that no assemblage of persons has more outraged truth and principle ; and that not one in our day, is more worthy of public and universal contempt and derision.

Consider for one moment, of kings and princes and privileged orders—met to talk about universal freedom ! The German lieutenant of hussars, carried by the caprices of a girl, like a toad thrown into the air from the end of a board—at one grand leap, smash upon a throne ; he is surely the very man to preside at a universal liberty meeting. And M. Guizot, speaking in the name of Louis Philippe, and remembering what a devoted and ardent friend he is to human rights, must have had a hearty fit of laughter after his harrangue.

We wish Lamennais had been there to read a passage or two out of his *Servitude Voluntaire*, for the particular benefit of Guizot and his master. How odd at any rates it must have sounded, to hear Albert say, '*our queen*' ; and the Duke of Sussex speak of the condescension '*of our sovereign*' ; and the Frenchman add '*the king my master* : ' all these being all the while universal liberty folks, and talking to and in favor of people met from the whole world, to vindicate universal freedom and equality !—These things are infinitely disgusting ; but they are of great moment also ; for they show the utter hypocrisy and hollow heartedness of the whole affair ; and the immeasurable villany of the leading actors in it.

The delegates from America, above all, seem to us to deserve the execration of mankind. There they sat, and not only heard unmoved, the most atrocious calumnies against their country ; but said and did all they could to make those calumnies credible, and that country infamous. O'Connell the basest and most polluted braggart and liar in Europe, distilling his most fœtid vocabulary, for a

triple venom to pour out upon America; and children of America—*yea, a candidate for its Presidency*.—Heaven pity us! not only hearing and applauding, but reiterating insults, which, if what was stated were true, no American should have uttered; and being false, every one should rather have suffered a thousand deaths than allow to be uttered unrebuked, in his presence. Love of country is the last sentiment that forsakes that breast where virtue dwells. The mother that bore him might as soon cease to be the object of a good man's reverence, as the land he calls his home. It is in vain to speak of any great or noble impulse taking refuge in a soul, dead to the high and hallowed claims of country. He who is no patriot is no philanthropist. He who loves *na* man, cannot love *all* men. He who who loves *no portion* of the earth, cannot love *it all*. He who loves not his country, loves nothing but himself and vice.

In speaking of the English, we should always have two perfectly distinct ideas in our mind, viz. the *nation*, and the *oligarchy*. The English nation is one of the noblest in the world. It has appeared distinctly but a few times on the theatre of affairs: at Runnymede; under the commonwealth; at the revolution of 1688; at the coercion of Parliamentary reform in 1831. The English oligarchy is amongst the most ambitious, unpitiful, grasping, audacious, unscrupulous, and false, that ever existed amongst men. It has bullied, robbed, and butchered mankind—during the greater part of seven hundred years; and at the present moment, still reeking with the blood of Southern Africa, it is grinding India to dust, plotting the conquest of China in an unjust quarrel, oppressing its subjects in Europe, and pushing its unquenchable avarice and ambition into every corner where man can be terrified, corrupted, or subdued. America alone has defied, beaten, and foiled, this oligarchy: so that America enjoys the proud distinction of its quenchless hate, and sleepless fear.

This '*World's Anti-Slavery Convention*' has had no real object but to promote English interests, ambition, and hate. Let us show this conclusively, by two signal proofs.

First. In India there are 130,000,000 of Asiatic subjects of the British crown. Of these nearly all are in a condition in all respects wretched, as it relates not only to liberty, but every element of social advancement; and after a century of British rule, the great mass is incomparably poorer and more degraded than before. But besides this, there is a substratum of the most horrible slavery existing in British India, to an extent ten fold greater than that existing in the United States. And worse still, there exists a kind of slave trade, hardly inferior in wickedness to the African, by means of which the nominally free people of India are removed in large masses to other British possessions: and there, under the pretext of being held to service, are subjected to practical slavery. Thomas Clarkson, though broken down by age and infirmities, could not entirely forget these great and dreadful truths, which had been burnt into his heart by the labours of fifty years. The committee of the convention, intending to use him for their vile purposes, as

soon as they knew he reached London, waited on him and ascertained, as they feared, that the good old man had made *British slavery in India*, a very prominent topic in his written speech for the convention. After repeated applications, they induced him not only to omit wholly all mention of that subject, of which characteristic baseness the proof is positive; but caused him to add, as there is every reason to believe, the insulting proposal of a perpetual non-intercourse of trade with our southern country. And in the whole Convention, these pure philanthropic, benevolent English, could hardly remember that India existed!! We have no words to express our abhorrence of such proceedings, and of the men who could be guilty of them, and especially of the American men, who could connive at them.

Secondly. The anti-slavery party in Great Britain, and their colleagues, advocates and pensioners in this country have attacked the cause of African Colonization as proposed and executed from America, with ceaseless and senseless fury. They have done all that was possible to poison the benevolent of both countries against it; and to this end, besides all public methods, have obtained and published far and wide, private statements of opposition from prominent men, especially in England; for example, Clarkson and Buxton. For ourselves, we consider all this parade of names, and especially of foreign names, perfect moonshine, on all sides, of every American question; and proof of nothing so clearly as public servility to foreign opinion; and we mention the fact only as evidence in this case. In this 'World's Anti-Slavery Convention,' great pains were taken to denounce African Colonization from America; and both Clarkson and Buxton lent themselves to this trick. Now hear what follows. At the very moment all this was doing, who but this same Mr. Buxton comes forward, backed by the same English oligarchy with full and detailed schemes (*three only*) to colonize and take possession of Western Africa; turning the power of the realm to back the plans; and proving their feasibility by the use of *West India negroes!!!* And we unhesitatingly assert our belief, that England meditates no less than the conquest of all central Africa, by means of black forces, and colonists from the West Indies, as a counterpoise against the French operations on the northern edge of that unhappy continent. What is denounced as criminal in us, when attempted from motives of benevolence, and for the general good of man, becomes most humane the moment British avarice or ambition makes it necessary for selfish and wicked ends. And Americans sit by without sense enough to comprehend, or spirit enough to rebuke, or principle enough to abhor, such unblushing hypocrisy and insolence. Which of the three is the true version?

We think we have a right to speak freely, and to feel deeply on these subjects. We look upon our country as the chief hope of man; its glory and prosperity as needful for the cause of universal humanity. So on the other hand, we have labored and suffered more for the cause of the coloured race, than any other except the direct spread of the gospel; and have felt the deepest

[1841.]

conviction,
the world
respecting
ing to de-
plan of me
every prom
on mischie
gather into
feeling, pe
such a fact
nounce it;
speedily to
We rep
these subj
of our life
an unusu
out upon
of this uni
beration, a
ples and c
feel an earn
on the whol
cause we ju
ance and d

A
Our res
count of the att
errors of popery
also remember
lecture in the s
livered by Mr.
our benefit, and
occasion. Its
of the printed c
tomic both in
in the church of
becomes mistre
that no gentlem
man church: h
that this letter
mple? Is tha
the enlightened
Papist, answer

HONOUR
of being ac
32

conviction, that in some high and glorious form, the destinies of the world are mixed up with the great problems yet to be solved respecting that remarkable race. But here is a pestilent sect, seeking to degrade our country, and laboring to defeat every salutary plan of mercy to the slave and to Africa, and panting to destroy every prominent friend to both; a faction capacious of evil, bent on mischief, sold to error; whose providential use seems to be to gather into one mass all the bad elements of thought, action, and feeling, peculiar to our age. We have a right to speak freely of such a faction. And in the name of all good, we rebuke and denounce it; beseeching God to bring it to its senses, or bring it speedily to nought.

We repeat, we have a right to speak freely, and feel deeply, on these subjects. A very large share of the labours and sacrifices of our life have been devoted to the cause of the black race; and an unusual portion of the malevolence of party has been poured out upon us from all extremes of questions affecting the interests of this unhappy race. We have acted throughout with great deliberation, and our deepest convictions are satisfied with the principles and course we have been led to adopt; and we confess we feel an earnest desire to be truly understood, and fairly represented on the whole case; not so much on any personal account, as because we judge the whole subject to be one of transcendent importance and difficulty.

AMERICAN POPERY, WITH THE MASK OFF.

Our readers, no doubt, remember to have seen in the newspapers, an account of the attack made upon the life of the Rev. Mr. SPARRY, for lecturing on the errors of popery, last winter, in Dr. WILEY's church in Philadelphia. They may also remember to have read in this Magazine, that its senior editor had delivered a lecture in the same church on the same subject, in January last, just before that delivered by Mr. SPARRY. The following letter was written to Dr. WILEY for our benefit, and in consequence of his allowing his pulpit to be used by us on that occasion. Its genuineness may be fully relied on: and also, the perfect accuracy of the printed copy—to the word and the letter. The whole is extremely characteristic both in manner and spirit. This is the kind of scholar and Christian made in the church of Rome. This is the sort of man that we are to expect when Rome becomes mistress in this fair and free land. We do not of course, mean to say, that no gentlemen, no scholars, and even no Christians, are to be found in the Roman church: by no means. But we verily believe, and that is what we say—that this letter reveals a fair general sample of the mass. Now is it a desirable sample? Is that church to be commended that produces such on an average? Let the enlightened man, the good citizen, the true Christian, whether Protestant or Papist, answer that question. □

Philadelphia Jan 20 1841.

HONOURAD & Respected Countryman I have not the pleasure of being acquainted with you personally only true* some of your

public Acts and from some of your Church Members whom i have Lived with on Brotherly friendship for years past & often in my travels true the United S. as an Irishman Prided in your Name as a Mighty theological Divine and a Son of a Noble 98 Sire, for my first time, Ever being in your Church Was on the Evening of the 19 to my Surprise to See you Seated in your own Pulpit Giving Countenance to the Most Disgraceful Billingsgate Diabolical Slang that Ever was Utterd by any Demon with the Mark of Cain Consoladated in his Eyes & Eyelashes & you Sir to hear that and Not Contradict him is to my surpris & all others What i Could not believe but for my own Eyes Your Opressed Starved Distracted Catholic Countrimen Women & Children Insulted By whole sale from a Madman the Decendant of a Hessian Serf who Like the Beast of Burden was purchased by a Cursed England to Deluge your Native home in the Blood of Virgin Innocence Likewise Washington in his struggle for Liberty Mr Wiley Sir you know well what that Lying Devil uttered a Gainst Catholics was, as false as Hell, and you Sir as a Scholar and an Irish Gentleman Not Contradict the Renegade Scoundral i feel for your Aged Dignity What have we to do with either Catholics or Protestants fanaticks of ages Past they are Either in heaven or hell for their Conduct.

this Damnable Raskil Cawls, on the *Prespetarians to Resist Papists Until Blood*

the Orange oath is Knee Deep in Papist Blood

Mr Wiley Discoutenance this Wolf in Sheeps Clothing and Pursue the straight way that your ancestors have done & your Com-patriot that most Nobl Irish Divine

Rev Mr Potts.

With Great Respect I Remain your well Wisher & Countiman

JOHN GRIFFIN 89 SOUTH

WHARVES.

You may Shew this Letter to the Miscreant Devil if you Please. Make what Youse you Please of this

I, wish you would Publish it i am no Gramirian

[Continued from page 207.]

M O L I N I S M .

No. VI.

X. *The effects of the conduct of the Court of Rome in relation to the disputes between the Jesuits and the Dominicans.*

THE conduct of the Court of Rome in relation to these disputes, tended to make the members of that communion depend entirely upon the particular church of Rome for their opinions, or rather to regard its voice as oracular. Expectation was deferred from year to year, and the state of suspense was favourable to its ambitious pretensions. The disputes between these parties turned, to some extent at least, upon important subjects. Had they been entirely frivolous, there might have been reason enough for a temporizing policy. But no good could possibly result from holding in suspense the decision of questions, touching the doctrines of grace.

It gave Molina and his disciples time to promulgate their gross errors, while it embarrassed those who held a better system of doctrine, in counteracting them. But this important consideration was over-ruled by motives of policy and ambition. The history of the Roman see furnishes many examples of the prevalence of ambition over the interests of truth. The maxim, indeed, upon which that see proceeded, was utterly false, viz: "that it belongs to the pope exclusively of all others, to define and settle controverted points of Christian doctrine." But having assumed it as a just principle, it was adding abuse to abuse, to hold important matters in suspense, with a view merely to its own aggrandizement. The questions in dispute, it should be remembered, concerned the enquiries "who it is, that decides sovereignly, and in the first instance the condition of man—who it is, that determines his will to good—who it is, that operates in the will of man the consent by which he obeys God, and consequently to whom man ought to resort, and in whom he ought to place his confidence in relation to all these things—whether in God or in himself." In other words, the question was, whether or not Molina's doctrine was the same in substance as that of Pelagius. The Dominicans and their coadjutors maintained that Molinism was nothing less than Pelagianism, and the pope, for such reasons of policy as have been mentioned, kept in suspense during a long period the decision of that question, obviously true as it was.

Meantime the Jesuits were busy in sowing their errors,—in accusing their opponents, and in harrassing them with chicanery. The people became accustomed by degrees to their errors and the new doctrine ceased to appear strange by reason of its having become familiar. The multitude of theologians began to think they could get along well enough with Jesuit theology, and became more and more willing to let things take their course. Thus truth suffered, while error gained strength. The idea of the authority of the pope also gained strength, and became more and more firmly established at the expense of truth. Ignorance also gained credit from this policy, and the uselessness of sifting such questions came by degrees to be a plausible opinion. Yet the doctrines in question were of daily use. Not a prayer could be made to God, without practically deciding between the different parties. There was no middle course possible, and while the pope deferred his decision, he in fact decided that those who had fallen into the hands of deceivers should continue subject to them.

Matters proceeded, however, to such length in Spain that Lanuza, a theologian of the order of St. Dominic, thought it proper to bring the subject before the king, then Philip II. Lanuza declared his astonishment at these briefs of the pope which he said were unprecedented.—He assured the king that the Jesuits were the first who had obtained from a pope the imposition of silence. It is not to our purpose to enter into his reasons for opposition, but the fact of so violent a dispute, is pertinent to show that the unity of a church containing such hostile and warring elements, was external only, or apparent rather than real. Nevertheless, it may be stated that Lanuza accused the Jesuits of overturning the doctrine

of St. Thomas, which the constitutions of Ignatius Loyola required them to teach. He reproached them with the unworthy stratagem of attempting it in the character of the interpreters of Thomas. He told the king that they attracted numbers to their party by interested views; promising to some benefices; to young ecclesiastics, admission to the sacred orders; and to older ones, chairs of professors. He added some prognostics relative to the society—one of Melchior Camus, who declared “the time would come when kings would desire to resist the society, and would not be able to do so”—and another of a Jesuit who said to a Dominican that “one day the society would endeavor to prevail against the church of God, and would make efforts to succeed in it.”

To cut this subject short: Philip, who was a bigot and a cruel persecutor, referred the parties to the Pope, who modified in the year following (1598) the prohibitions contained in his briefs, and at the same time established the congregations *de auxiliis* as they were called, in order to examine the matters in dispute thoroughly.

XI. *The Congregations de auxiliis under Clement VIII.*

These were assemblies called by the pope, and held at Rome, to examine Molina's doctrine concerning grace and predestination. The Latin word *auxilium*, signifies *aid, succour, help*. The grace (*auxilium*) concerning (*de*) which those congregations were held, was the grace by which God aids or helps man to do good. Hence the phrase *congratio de auxiliis*. These congregations were continued during about nine years under the popes Clement VIII. and Paul V.—Sixtus V. died in 1590. Urban VII., Gregory XIV., and Innocent IX., were successively elected, but did not live long. Cardinal Aldobrandini was then elected, and he took the name of Clement VIII. He died in 1605, having occupied the papal throne thirteen years. Then came Leo XI., who died within the month of his election. Cardinal Borghese was then elected, and he took the name of Paul V., and reigned fifteen years. Gregory XV. succeeded him in 1621, and Urban VIII. in 1623, who held the pontificate till 1644, i. e. near twenty-one years. Innocent X. succeeded him, (in 1644). It was under Urban VIII. and Innocent X. that the famous dispute concerning the book of Jansenius commenced, about which something must be said hereafter.

But returning now to the pontificate of Clement VIII., and the congregations *de auxiliis*, (about 40 years before the affair of Jansenius,) Clement VIII. named examiners in 1597, but the congregations did not commence until the second of January, 1598. The examiners were at first ten in number—three of them bishops and the rest theologians of different orders. Four years after, *viz.*, in 1602, the pope himself determined to be present at the congregations, and he (adding some cardinals) increased the number to fifteen. Seventy-eight congregations were held in the presence of pope Clement VIII., between 20th March, 1602 and 22d January, 1605. This pope died the 4th of March, 1605. Paul V. resumed the congregations in September, 1605, and held seventeen between that time and the 1st of March, 1606.

The most important subjects discussed in these congregations, were the doctrines of Predestination and the efficacy of grace. In regard to the doctrine of grace, they examined the question whether or not it was by itself efficacious; that is to say, when man consents to that which is good, whether it is God that operates or produces this consent in man; or whether God (so to speak,) limits his work to the giving of succour or aid, so that man, according as he makes a good or-ill use of the aid so given, yields or withholds his consent; without this, that God by his grace determines him more to the one than to the other course.

In respect to predestination, the congregations examined the question whether it is gratuitous or not, that is to say, whether God determined the number of those who are saved before having regard to their merits—whether God has prepared heaven for each one of them, and that succour or aid which will infallibly cause them to get thither, by causing them to persevere in good to the end, or whether, on the other hand, God had respect to the good use which they would make of the succour he gives them before determining any thing concerning their condition.

Many other questions were discussed in those assemblies; some of them essentially connected with those mentioned; others naturally connected with them, and some of them were of great importance. For example, the doctrine concerning original sin was incidentally discussed on the second of September, 1602, when it was made to appear that the views of Molina and his partisans were entirely inconsistent with that doctrine.

Molina's doctrine concerning predestination and grace was also discussed, and the relation which it bore to the doctrine of the Pelagians and Semi-Pelagians concerning the same subjects. In respect to the doctrine of grace, it soon appeared that Molina did not admit the doctrine of *grace efficacious by itself*—to use the phraseology of the parties in question. Molina and his defenders explained their views clearly on this point, but they did not do so in regard to the doctrine of predestination. Sometimes, indeed, they admitted the doctrine of gratuitous justification, but then they applied to it, the artifices of their doctrine of the *scientia media* and *congruism*. On several occasions, however, it was admitted that Molina's views were inconsistent with this doctrine, and it was admitted, too, that his doctrine was in effect the revival of the dogmas of the ancient Pelagians and Semi-Pelagians.

It is impossible to give more than a meagre outline of the history of these congregations in an undertaking like the present. If the reader is curious to pursue this subject, he may be referred to an extended History of Congregations de auxiliis, written by Serri, a learned Dominican. Yet it may not be improper to add a few facts, tending to show the pertinacity as well as the trickery and bad faith with which the Jesuits managed their part in these congregations.

The length of time spent in the discussions, is a fact worthy of notice; and it is said that the examination of the whole subject was commenced (*de novo*) anew, at least seven times during the

nine years employed in these sessions. The first year (1598,) the examiners spent in considering the doctrine of Molina. The next year, the Dominicans and Jesuits were heard. The discussion continued fourteen months. Then followed two new examinations—then another in the presence of Clement VIII., which continued three years, and that was the fifth. Then another was had in the presence of Paul V., which continued near six months. That was the sixth. Then Paul allowed the examiners nine months to draw up their decision. This required another examination. During the third examination, Achilles Gaillard, a Jesuit, proposed terms of accommodation, which consisted in an offer to establish the doctrine of gratuitous justification by means of the doctrine of the *scientia media*, each party to have the liberty of teaching or denying the doctrine of efficacious grace—that is to say, the parties were to have the liberty of teaching contradictory doctrines on the question, whether the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ is that which in the first instance produces the consent of man to good, or whether that consent is the effect of the man's free will. The Dominicans rejected this proposition and required a decision of the question clearly and distinctly. The propositions were dropped and the congregations continued to the 12th of October, 1600. The examiners then presented to the pope twenty propositions of Molina, which they censured, (Hist. Cong. de Aux. l. I., ch. 11,) declaring that the doctrine censured was that of the Pelagians and Semi-Pelagians. All of them signed the censure but two. The pope received the censure favourably and pronounced a discourse of more than three hours' length, against Molina. The Jesuits then raised a loud clamour—filled Rome with their complaints—presented petition after petition to the pope, and pretended that they had not been fully heard. This stopped the pope short, and determined him to order a fourth examination, which occupied the whole year following. But the result of this examination was the same. Mean time (October, 1601,) Molina died at Madrid, just at the time the examiners were finishing their censure of his doctrine.

The Jesuits resorted to stratagems in order to prevent the pope from making a decision, a full account of which may be read in the last chapters of the second book of Serri's history of these congregations. They made use of the confessional, also, to insinuate their doctrines among the people, at least they did so in Spain. They also held out the idea that a general council was necessary to decide the dispute, to which Bellarmine agreed, as appears by a letter he wrote to the Pope: and finally they insinuated that without denying that the pope was infallible, yet it was not an article of the faith that any particular pope was infallible, which tended, as they designed it should, to alarm the pope and prevent a decision against them. The result of all this was that Clement VIII. ordered still another examination, which was made in his presence, accompanied by cardinals as before mentioned, which continued until his death. The same things were decided upon this examination as had been decided before. It was during this series of sessions, that the Jesuits who had been banished from France nine

years before, on account of the crime of Jean Chatel against the person of Henry IV., obtained their re-establishment in that kingdom, and they had the address to obtain the intercession of the French king with the pope in their behalf.

During the discussion, an instance of fraud occurred which is somewhat remarkable. Gregory of Valentia, one of the Jesuits who took part in the discussion, cited a passage from the 19th book of Augustine's City of God, which as it stands, had no application whatever to the question. The author's language, however, was so constructed that by substituting the word *scilicet* for *et*, the passage became very pertinent to Valentia's purpose. The temptation was too great to be resisted, and he in reading, made the change. Lemos, one of the opposing party, perceived it, and charged him with falsifying the text, and required a verification on the spot. The pope assented. Valentia, tried to retain the manuscript in his hands, but was obliged to give it up by the repeated commands of the pope, when it was seen that the word *et*, stood where *scilicet* was read. The fraud was shown to the pope and the whole assembly. The pope showed his displeasure. Gregory of Valentia fainted, and the session was broken up. Gregory did not afterwards appear in the congregations, but went soon after to Naples, where he died in the spring following. The pope was asked what he thought of the salvation of Valentia. He replied that if there was no other grace than that which he defended, he had not gone to paradise.

On the 21st of January, 1605, Cardinal Du Perron was introduced into the congregation. He came on the part of the King of France, to solicit the pope in favour of the Jesuits. The pope, however, had formed the design to censure the errors of Molina, and as he told Cardinal Monopoli, he had fixed upon the eve of Pentecost for that purpose; but the pope died on the 4th of March, and his design was prevented!!

[To be continued.]

[For the Baltimore Literary and Religious Magazine.]

THE UNITY OF THE CHURCH.

No. I.

IN the organization of his church, God has provided for the development of our intellectual, moral, and immortal nature. Provision is likewise made to meet and call forth the principles of our social constitution. Associated agency is a constituent in the arrangements of Jehovah, for the accomplishment of his purposes. By its authority the Bible recognises and sustains the natural relationships of life, brings over them a sacred influence, and upon supernatural principles, reveals the divine constitution of others. These are ordained in subordination to the communion of saints, and in the administrations of that happy fellowship, are brought into view.

In the church of the Lord, this communion is established, explained, and enjoyed. There is found the complete system of evangelical doctrines, as unfolded in the oracles of truth; the divinely arranged series of the ordinances of religious worship; and the settled principles of the forms of order for the household of faith. These address themselves in the name of Zion's Lord to the mind, the conscience, the heart, and the will of the sons of men, and are sensibly felt by the children of God; point them to the most ancient, extensive and interesting association upon earth; and in it, call into action every power and every endowment of the immortal spirit. *That which we have seen and heard declare we unto you, that ye also may have fellowship with us; and truly our fellowship is with the Father, and with his Son Jesus Christ.*

In the communion of Zion, the bonds that connect her children are very numerous; they are indeed, tender, and they are likewise very strong; some of them too strong to be broken by the power of Satan, or to be sundered by the violence of human passion, rendered more intense by influences from the nether regions. Of these bonds, the first and most important is that which connects the soul with the Redeemer himself, and in him to all those who have an interest in his redemption. Each of these more than silken bonds is cast around the soul, for the blessed purpose of binding heart to heart, and ere the feeblest of these can be severed, violence must be done to the inner man. Some of these mere exterior bonds may indeed, for a season be broken, and those upon whose soul they never had a hold may easily cast them away; but not so the heir of eternal life. Every saint is voluntarily in union with his Saviour, and in this relation it is not merely optional with him whether in the highest enjoyments of which the immortal spirit is susceptible, he shall have communion with fellow saints. Without consulting the pleasure of any whom he has called to his fellowship, the Redeemer himself has settled this question. Happy for the children of God themselves, that thus it is!

Of union and communion among the saints there is nevertheless a form of great importance, upon which, by the folly and sin of men, breaches may be, and alas, have been extensively made. It is this fact which gives occasion to these remarks, in the further prosecution of which we shall offer a few considerations upon the unity of the church; advert to the reality of her divisions, and offer some thoughts upon the obligation of her friends, to endeavour the reparation of those divisions. Recognizing the church's twofold form of *visibility* and *invisibility*, it is perhaps unnecessary to say that it is as a visible society we now propose to speak of her as ONE. "Those who profess the true religion with their children," and whom the pen of inspiration describes as *called to be saints*, and who *in every place call upon the name of Jesus Christ our Lord*. Such are addressed in this language. *The promise is unto you, and to your children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call.*

THE UNITY OF THE CHURCH.

In the assertion of this unity the oracles of God are most explicit. Its importance was long felt by the disciples of Christ, and as

one of the greatest calamities that could befall them, its violation was deprecated. Under this view of the matter, apostles and apostolic men proceeded, and with what earnestness the chief men of the protestant reformation plead for it is well known to those conversant with their works. Of this last the Institutes of Calvia is a standing witness. A spirit very different from that which actuated apostles, apostolic men, and reformers, has gone abroad, and in the length and breadth of Christendom, has found entertainment. More fierce than the Roman quaternian who refused to rend the garment of the Saviour, to rend his body, is contended for by his professed friends, not only as a natural right, but likewise as a Christian privilege and duty in combination. Schism and faction in the church have, in a great measure, ceased to be felt as evils. By the often repeated and almost unresisted indulgence of the schismatical propensity of not a few of her professing children, a deplorable callousness of heart to the distresses of Zion on this quarter has been superinduced.

How shall this state of things be remedied? How shall that healthful state of mind, productive of a deep moral sensibility to this evil be restored? How awaken the Christian temper upon this subject, to a proper state of feeling and of action? To this end, perhaps no means would contribute more effectually, than a frequent, full, and calm review of the Bible doctrine of the unity of the church, taken, not partially, not from a single, or possibly an unfavourable position; but fully, by going into an ample discussion, examining the details, their bearings and results; and then from some commanding point of view, survey the whole subject as one. This would require a volume instead of one short paper. Without attempting a discussion so comprehensive, a few thoughts, calling the Christian mind to the scriptural view of the matter may be useful, for surely could the church be brought under the influence of the sentiment of inspiration upon the subject, all would soon be well. Let it then be kept in mind that,

1. No truth of God's word is more distinctly stated than that which affirms, that the church is ONE. *Upon this rock I will build my church. The church of God which he purchased with his own blood. We being many are ONE BODY in Christ. For as the body is one, and hath many members, and all the members of that one body, being many, are one body, so also is CHRIST. For by one spirit are we all baptized into ONE BODY: for THE BODY is not one member, but many. Now ye are THE BODY of Christ, and members in particular. Ye are all ONE in Christ Jesus. We being many, are one bread, and ONE BODY.*

This unity of the church is not affected by the distinct localities of her several parts. These localities do no more than indicate so many departments of the ONE EMPIRE of our Lord; so many streets or wards of the ONE CITY of our God; or so many apartments in the ONE HOUSEHOLD of faith. The empire is ONE; it is the kingdom of Christ; the city is ONE,—it is the city of the mighty King; the house is ONE,—it is the habitation of God. Of this *oneness* of the church, the proof now adduced is but a mere specimen. Quotation after quotation might be made; and should any deny it,

for the establishment of our position, material of argument upon argument is furnished in the sacred page. But what we fear is not a direct denial of this truth; it is defect of the proper feeling of the import of the truth, which in terms, will be readily conceded, that it is to be dreaded. Until all that is involved in the comprehensive truth of Zion's unity be in a good measure apprehended; the obligation to act upon it be felt, and the crime and danger of disregarding it be appreciated; we would have it exhibited before the public mind; presented in its irrepeatable conditions, its various bearings, authoritative power; and thus pressed upon the individual and social conscience. The members are many and they are placed in very different circumstances; but the body is ONE. The Head is one, and under this Head there is not, and, without monstrosity, there cannot be corporate plurality. *My dove, my undefiled is but ONE.* By divine institution the church of God is one; by the unity of her system of principles in doctrine, worship, and order, she is one; and by the actual recognition of the Redeemer, she is one. Whatever breaks in upon this unity tends to the destruction of the mystical body of Christ: and of course, can never meet the approbation of the glorious head. He sensibly feels, complains of, and rebukes those arts of laceration. *In all their afflictions he was afflicted. He that toucheth you toucheth the apple of his eye. We have not a High Priest that cannot be touched with the feeling of our infirmities.* Upon them who inflict those wounds, he casts an indignant frown, and says, *In as much as ye have done it to one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto Me.* And if pardoning mercy do not interpose of such at last, how dreadful will be the account!

2. This is not a mere invisible, ideal unity. It is one that rests upon such a foundation, and embraces such characteristics as are capable of giving it not only a real but likewise a visible existence. In order that it may be duly valued, and that with appropriate care, we may guard against a disruption of its sacred bonds, it is indispensibly requisite that the principles of this *oneness* be distinctly understood. We have just remarked that this is not a *mere invisible, ideal, unity.* By this remark it is not intended to treat with levity the doctrines of an invisible spiritual relation between the Redeemer and the souls of saved men. This is a reality of a character too hallowed to be thought or spoken of with lightness. We rejoice in its truth. In the heart of the sincere believer, Christ dwells through faith, and is there the hope of glory. Christ is the substance of every evangelical truth. What is the doctrine of the incarnation but the declared fact, that "God was manifest in the flesh"? What is the truth of the atonement, but the fact of the Son of God having rendered the stipulated satisfaction for the sins of men, and thereby secured reconciliation between God and the sinner for whom he died? These solemn truths have a place in every believer's heart: but how? Verily in no other way except but by faith. Credit is given to the truth; that which the faithful testimony declares is trusted for the attainment of all that it promises. Truth, then, has a place in the heart; Christ in his mediatorial fulness is the matter of that truth; by it he makes his entrance into the soul, and

with it dwells there, making it *the engrafted word*. He is there too by his spirit. *My spirit shall not depart out of thy mouth, nor out of the mouth of thy seed.*

Thus betwixt Christ and the believer we find a two-fold bond. The Spirit of adoption, whose habitation is the soul of the child of God, and under his influence, the principle of a living faith, sending forth its confiding acts upon the blessed Redeemer, constitute a relation that shall never be dissolved. Through the all prevalent intercession of Jesus it is sustained, and of its perpetuity we are assured by the unchangeable promise of grace. Satan may sift as wheat; the soul may be exposed to the impetuous winds of temptation, and may be terribly tossed; but while controlling the storm, we hear the voice of the great intercessor, saying to each of these sons of God, thus tried, *I have prayed for thee that thy faith fail not*. The energies of omnipotence are put into requisition, and the saint is *kept by the power of God unto salvation*. These bonds are indeed, invisible. No created eye can trace the steps of the Almighty Spirit in this work, otherwise than by their effects; nor is the faith of God's elect discernable except in its acts and by its fruits; nor the operations of divine power, but by its results. It is an invisible union, and it is a real and permanent one. *None shall pluck them out of my hand*, says the Faithful and True Witness. *None shall pluck them out of my Father's hand*, is his sealed promise. How replete with consolation! The deep and dark devices of the infernal regions may be formed; the stormy passions of man's disordered heart may be roused and rage; the demon influences of the nether world may be brought to bear upon those schemes and those passions, to give them efficacy; but all in vain. There is an eye of love that watches all their movements, a counsel of wisdom that will disappoint their aims, an arm of power that will restrain their rage, and render vain their efforts. The sacred bonds of this blessed union remain untouched, and the living fountain of the related communion continues to send forth its refreshing streams. The Spirit abides in the soul as his place of action, and faith continues its confidence in the unchanging love of God, in the redeeming righteousness of the Saviour, and in the stability or the everlasting covenant. The living saint is likewise in an inviolable connexion with the purpose, the immutable purpose, of grace. He is *chosen to salvation through sanctification of the Spirit, and belief of the truth*. The entire redeemed family in heaven, and on earth, thus related to their Mediator as their living and saving head, are in him, in communion with each other, by a hidden but operative principle of grace. By holy tempers, exalted aims, determined resolves, and eternal interests, they are one. These compose the true church of God. Thus associated, they constitute the *one mystical body* of Christ. Who can lightly treat the association and interests of those so near to God, and so tenderly loved by the blessed Redeemer? In this brotherhood, no faction can exist. The church invisible is incapable of schism.

But exterior to this invisible unity, and subordinate to it, there is a visible unity of the church of God, and a communion of saints,

under organical regulation, which though sustained by a sacred relation to the Saviour, and preserved by many a consecrated influence, may nevertheless, be injuriously affected by adverse agencies. Among the bonds of this happy connexion, sent forth from Zion's Lord, and by which, as with an almighty grasp, he lays hold upon his people, "so as never to let them go," we again advert to the great principles of evangelical doctrine as revealed in the word of God, and found in the uniform faith of his church. *The sheep hear his voice—they know his voice.—My sheep hear my voice, and I know them, and they follow me.* In the pure doctrines of the gospel, the voice of the great Shepherd is heard; that voice is known by the flock. The accents of the gospel are heard through the medium of its institutions of worship and of order, and in the dispensations of its ministry. In the possession, professed belief, order and administrations of the gospel, the church has her visibility. Her distinguishing characteristics are evangelical truth, the sacraments, as seals of God's covenant with her and a ministry legitimately appointed. Wherever these are found, there is the church of God. In these will be found those points of unity that constitute her *one*. One body, one spirit actuating that one body, one hope, one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God over all, through all, and in all. With the several members of this one body, thus united, the Saviour maintains a happy fellowship; and in so doing, emphatically rebukes those who would cast out any orderly member from the habitation which the children so much love.

This view of the subject as the basis, and in order to the protection of the hallowed communion of saints, embraces the idea of **ORGANICAL UNITY**. The Redeemer, the Lord Jesus Christ, is the alone, the exclusive, Head of his church; the living and governing Head, invisible indeed, to the material eyes of her members, but ever and everywhere really present and efficient, in all her departments. He maintains the visible unity of his hallowed corporation, by her profession and administrations, under evangelical courts, inferior and superior, in his name, constituted upon spiritual principles. The ultimate, visible form of this unity is to be sought in one supreme representative Synod, Assembly, or Council; the particular name is of no consequence. To this court, by divine institution, belongs the right, in the light of God's revelation, to declare the church's faith, order, and forms of worship; and under the Redeemer, and according to the settled principles of his law, to provide for all that is of general interest in her profession and relations, leaving the mere incidental things of locality to be disposed of according to local circumstances. The nature of the subject, the principle of apostolic example, and the requisites to the efficient action of the church, all go to the establishment of this position. It is sustained by the principle of sound presbyterial order. The cutting up of the church of God into little sectional fragments, under local, independent presbyteries, or synods, according to geographical lines, the nature of soil, its productions, or civil regulations, is to forget the liberal and comprehensive principle of Presbyterianism. The religion of Jesus Christ in its doctrines, institutions, and order, is adapted to the

condition of humanity, in every region of the earth. Whatever may be the character of the climate, the productions of the soil, or the form of local, political institutions, the religion of the Bible is the same. It addresses itself to what is universal and permanent in our nature, in order to enlighten, purify, elevate, and harmonize. *There is one Lord, and his name shall be one in all the earth.* To the accomplishment of this, the presbyterial form of order, and it alone, is remarkably adapted. Under its regulation, let the higher principles of our religion be brought to bear upon man's powers of intellection and his susceptibilities of heart, in every nation of the world, and the result will be powerful and happy. In the household of faith, narrow views, mistaken apprehensions, and unblesed influences, have prevailed, to the production of schism, and establishment of faction. In view of these evils, not a few have abandoned the hope of any very extended, visible, organized unity of the empire of our Lord; and profess to seek nothing beyond an organization upon a scale of narrow limits. This an essentially independency; and if correct, the sooner Presbyterianism is abandoned the better. If little localities must be allowed to control the religion of the Son of God, and regulate the form of the order of his kingdom; then shall her only bonds of visible unity be a general and loose adherence to an organized, ill defined, and irresponsible profession. But no; a better day will dawn.

As the principle of presbyterial order goes, even now, to give *substantial* validity to the administrations of Zion, in all her departments, the most irregular of them even, so shall that principle, when fully and consistently developed, in its legitimate applications, make her communion one, and that under an orderly and well constructed organization. In order to this happy consummation, 'the friends of Presbyterianism must cease to be the panders of schism; one and all of them must cease to hold up the doctrine of a Catholic organic unity, as a visionary speculation. The absurd claims, and impious measures of Rome upon the one side; and upon the other, the anti-social disorganizations of independency, to which some good men were driven, seem to have, in a measure, bewildered the Presbyterian mind. But the observations of past times, and those of the present day, will yield to the light and the happier influences of an approaching period. An under current of moral and spiritual influences is moving on towards this point; whilst science and art are putting in requisition the resources of physical nature, and fitting those resources to subserve the interests of Emanuel's empire; and among other of those interests, that of the harmonious, combined, and efficient action of its remotest parts. For all this God has formed his purposes, made his arrangements, and given his promises. Be it our part to understand, to believe, and, at our post to obey.

In sacramental communion, we have one of the interesting expressions of the unity of the family of God. And setting aside all that superstition, in ages of darkness and imposture had added to it, we know the institution in which it is enjoyed is holy. Sacramental fellowship is the exclusive privilege of Zion's children. Like her ministry, the sacraments of the church have a peculiarity

which forbids them to be given indiscriminately, to all. One reason of the requisitions of high qualifications in those invested with the ministry, is to fit them to guard against profanation, the sanctity of the sacraments. The converting ordinances of the church, such as the exhibition of her doctrine, and the offering of her prayers, appertain to all, and to them every description of character among men may have access. Not so however with her ministry and her seals. These require peculiar qualifications. The sacraments, as seals, confirm to the church, as a divine corporation, the title granted her to the privileges embraced in the exceeding great and precious promises; and which belong to individuals, because they are constituent members of this spiritual corporation. Those who enjoy these are placed under responsibilities of a character high and special. A first principle in the polity of this corporation, a principle sustained by analogy, and by the laws of the book of God, is the right of *ecclesiastical review*, and *authoritative control*, over those to whom the sacred privileges are allowed. Whether in this matter there be discrepancy between any existing practices and acknowledged first principles, is a legitimate as well as important subject of inquiry. To it we may again advert, but in the mean time, pass it without farther remark.

3. The church in the apostolic age, was thus visibly one. Not only one as her spiritual, living members were in union with Christ, and, in him, united with one another; but also as a visible association, whose united voice was heard in their profession, whose administrations were subjected to the eye of all, and the efficiency of which was felt in every land. Every where do the inspired writers of the New Testament contemplate the apostolic church, as visibly one. To her belonged, in all her locations, the same system of divine truth; the same ordinances of worship; the same principles of order; and the one ministry gifted to her by her exalted Lord. As the one church which is the pillar and ground of the truth, she was confessed by God and man. This visible unity was organical. To her general representative Synod, Assembly or Council, her ministry and members were, in their respective places, amenable. See Acts 15th and 16th chapters,

We will not be understood as affirming, that this unity was so complete as to exclude every tendency to faction; that the harmony was so perfect as to keep her several departments from all approximation towards schism; or that views and feelings, upon every point of interest, were so far one, as to vanish from her borders every appearance of discrepancy. This condition of the church, alas, belongs not to earth. It is reserved for heaven. That it belonged not to the apostolic church is more than sufficiently proved by the Grecian murmurings against the Hebrews; the no small dissensions at Antioch, as before there had been contending with Peter, in the case of Cornelius; the separation of Paul and Barnabas; the errors of the Galatian congregations, and the disorders of the church at Corinth, not to mention the "much disputing" in the more solemn assembly at Jerusalem. Such was the state of things in this communion when just formed by apostolic authority, and which under the eye and guidance of inspired

ministers. This is man. How humbling to our fallen nature!— How instructive the record, that puts us in possession of the facts!

These unsightly features of conduct are not adduced in justification of modern deviations from the perfect standard of behaviour; yet they do indicate to us, the duty, under certain circumstances, of great and continued forbearance. They were not harmless.— They tended to mar, and did actually mar the beauty, and retarded the progress of the church, in her triumphant course, though they did not essentially or formally break her bonds of union, or destroy her oneness of communion. Like certain diseases of the natural body, not constitutional but incidental; they were enfeebling in their tendency, but not inconsistent with continued life, nor altogether with efficient action. Those evils were not fundamental; they were not incorporated with the church's faith; no pledge was either given, or even required, to their support; nor was any approbation of them even by implication, authoritatively expressed. They were evils, but they were personal not social; evils injuriously affecting social movements, but not sustained by the constitutional provisions of the association; and in general administrations not predominant.

Hence the difference between the schismatical tendencies and movements of restless spirits in the apostolic church, and the ecclesiastical factions of modern times; these latter by solemn judicative acts, incorporate their mistakes with their faith; and in their profession, their blunders are advocated and sustained. Separations are made, and expressly for the maintenance of their erratic dogmas; the separate bodies assume a distinct form of existence. Thus their distinct existence is not for the sustentation of the common faith, or the general principles of order—for these are common to the true church of God; but for the maintenance and propagation of the sectional error. This is all that is distinctive in the constitution of such; and who-ever enters into their fellowship is understood, either directly or indirectly, but really, and to the extent to which the communion enjoyed may be received as reaching, as giving a pledge and yielding a support to that distinctive peculiarity. Provisos we know may be made, explanations may be given, unexpressed; understandings may be supposed; yet after all, no party will yield a communion which would operate unfavourably upon its sectional distinction, nor, generally, to any will the accommodation be conceded, if not supposed, in some shape, to minister to the advantage of the distinctive dogma. The schismatical peculiarity is sedulous in its action, and ingenious in its devices, to make its liberalities as well as the more fundamental articles of the common faith, with which may associate itself, subserve the interest of its own establishment and the extension of its influence.

In the age of the apostles, while schism was beginning to stretch forth its violent hand to rend the union of the church, and to break in upon her communion, exclusive fellowships among her congregations had not yet been formed. Paul, while he rebuked error and reprov'd disorder, was in communion with the whole church, and the whole church was in fellowship with him. He and Peter and Barnabas, though occupying different fields of labor in the her-

itage of God, never thought of excommunicating each other from any portion of that heritage. Error of no slight description had fascinated the congregations of Galatia, and disorders of a character exceedingly wild, had shaken the Corinthian church; yet Paul and they were still united in the bands of ecclesiastical communion. Those churches were not incorrigible. The rebuke of truth and the rod of discipline had not lost their power. The spirit of heresy and that of ecclesiastical disruption had not unfolded all their anti-social tendencies. Christians of that day confessed themselves the children of the church, felt that they needed her maternal care, knew that their covenant God was with her; and they would neither by a rash absconding rend the mother's heart, nor by a faithless disregard of truth, treat with lightness the gracious presence or the authority of their Father in heaven. They loved the light and the order of their house; and they kept the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace.

4. An obligation, by divine authority, is imposed upon the church, and it binds each of her sons in his place, to endeavor the preservation of her unity, so far as it actually exists; and to extend its influence to where it is not duly felt. Of this obligation the confession is generally made; and, as far as party interests are concerned, each section of the church recognizes its truth. Each member, in his own sphere, is understood as having engaged "to follow no divisive course from the doctrine and order" of his own department. But, alas! the existence of that separate department may itself be an exemplification of "a divisive course," from the doctrine and order of the apostolic church. A deep and serious consideration of the truth, as laid down in the oracles of God, upon this subject, and an honest attempt to ascertain its application to individual cases, would be of use. In this attempt the pledges of a mere factious spirit must be forgotten; attention to the fellowship of Zion, as resting on its own broad and permanent foundation, must be given; its preservation, upon that basis, wherever it is found, must be an object of care; but more regard is due to it as it is the support of the communion of saints at large, than as it is the bond of a partizan association. In turning to the Bible, we find the evidence of this obligation to be very full. It is urged upon the footing of principle; the highest standard is brought into view, and a complete conformity to that standard must be sought. *I beseech you, brethren, by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye all speak the same thing, and that there be no divisions—σχίσματα, schisms—among you; but that ye be perfectly joined together in the same mind, and in the same judgment.*

And again,—endeavoring to keep the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace,* is a part of duty enjoined by apostolic authority. This unity is that which is taught by the spirit of God, to which his hallowed influences tend, and in which the hearts of those taught by him are one. The points of spiritual contact which the apostle proceeds to enumerate, are many. There is *one body*; one blessed association, the confessed church of the living God; *one Spirit*,

*Ephesians iv. 3—5.

the life-giving Spirit of the Redeemer, the promised Comforter, who dwells in the exalted Head, and has his residence also in the body, as the great animating agent in every member who is in vital union with the whole; *one hope*, one high object of expectation, eternal life—and, however various in this ever shifting world their condition may be, there is a place of final rest, and of active enjoyment, to which the eye of every confiding heart is turned, and in the possession of which, at last, all shall be happy, happy in a communion that shall never be broken; *one Lord*, one exalted Head, giving life and light, exercising authority over all, and to all, giving assurance of safety, the one Mediator between God and man, the centre of all blessed union in the empire of grace and glory; *one faith*, one divine system of evangelical truth, and embraced by a living faith of the elect of God wrought in their hearts by the special agency of the Holy Ghost; *one baptism*, one initiatory ordinance of recognition of membership in the church, as an organized body, and while a significant emblem of the washing of regeneration and the renewing of the Holy Ghost, it is also a solemn seal of the promise of mercy to the household of faith, and of the pledge of her members to fidelity in the cause of God; *one God and Father of all*, the Eternal Jehovah, in the person of the Father, and in pursuance of the inviolable arrangements of the adorable Trinity, supremely presiding over all the interests of his empire, inclusive of those of grace, and those of the objects of his everlasting love, by his Spirit, diffusing through all a blessed influence, and among all evincing his presence, by the gifts of his munificence. Such are the points of unity that connect into one the mystical body of Christ, numerous, interesting, and close. Upon them no assault of violence, contrary to their end, can be made, without the accumulation of dreadful guilt.

It must, however, be kept in remembrance, that the attainment of the end, the maintenance of this unity, is not, in the present imperfect state of man, to be expected without an earnest struggle. Such is the import of the inspired language—*earnestly endeavoring to guard*. Energy must be put forth with intensity, to gain and to preserve the object. The saints have their infirmities, and these will often manifest themselves in forms provoking to a disruption of the bonds of union. This condition of character was in the view of Paul, when he vehemently and affectionately urged upon the Ephesian Christians a *walk worthy of the vocation wherewith they had been called*. And in what did this walk consist? *In all lowliness and meekness, with long-suffering, forbearing one another in love*.

Thus were they, in regarding this unity of spirit and its numerous bonds, just now repeated, to be earnestly engaged.

The provision, in the organization of the mystical body of the Redeemer, against the introduction and dangerous progress of schism, is another source, whenever we desire proof of the obligation laid upon us to endeavor the preservation of its oneness: *that there should be no schism in the body*. 1 Cor. xii. 25—*God hath tempered it together*. The members are numerous, the official characters various, and possessed of diversity of gifts; the design of which is, that, in useful action, the body should be in harmony and

have progressive growth, each, in his appropriate place, contributing his proportion to the gaining of the ultimate end.—*The whole body fully joined together and compacted by that which every joint supplieth, according to the effectual working in the measure of every part, maketh increase of the body unto the edifying of itself in love.* Eph. iv. 16.

Again; is the church the special kingdom of our Lord? At the head of this kingdom he admonishes his subjects, that *a kingdom divided against itself cannot stand.* Is she represented as a house, a household, a family? *The house which is divided against itself cannot stand.* Is the church the mystical body of Christ? It is the extreme of insanity for the members of that body to oppose, to wound, to attempt the injury of one another. Ah! under these aspects, what feebleness has the church manifested? To what reproach, as a family marked by domestic broils, has she been subjected? And how much of what is worse than insanity, have her children, in their folly, unfolded to the idle gaze of an unbelieving world. To the warning voice of inspiration, on this subject, the children of Zion have been criminally inattentive. *If ye bite and devour one another, take heed that ye be not consumed one of another.* This work of consumption has made fearful progress. From its appropriate vocation, very extensively have the spirit of schism and the voice of faction diverted the Christian mind. This mind has often been worse than idle. Hence its leanness. Councils have been distracted, judgment broken, kind affections alienated, and action rendered feeble; or when intense, it has been ill applied. How afflictive the sight of professed and cordial friends of the Redeemer and his blessed cause, the enlightened and ardent expectants of immortality, expending their energies in the infliction of injuries upon each other! At one moment exulting in the amount of mischief done, and at the next, suffering under the lashes of remorse and the agonies of a relenting heart; relenting, but not with sufficient strength to bring the lip to a confession of the wrong, nor to urge the hand to the perpetrated harm. Had half the mental resources which have been expended in party conflicts, and for mere party ends, been brought into the counsels of truth, and been directed to the extension of the empire of light, how very different might have been the results, to both the personal and social concerns of the members of the Christian commonwealth?

In these remarks, it is trusted, we will not be misunderstood. They bear not against a faithful testimony or a determined stand, in behalf of the faith of the gospel and the enlightened order of the house of God. This is indispensable duty. Not so, however, the contest for the mere opinion of the man, the conflict for a perverse principle, for a prescriptive practice, unsustained by principle, or for a misplaced application of an acknowledged axiom. Such subjects, urged with the fierceness of the zealot, the heartlessness of the pharisee, or the sly insidiousness of the ambitious hypocrite; and not any thing bearing the seal of heaven, as a condition of communion in the family of God, are the objects contemplated in our animadversions.

In distinct and decided language, the church must proclaim the truth of God committed to her trust. As long as error walks abroad among the moral and spiritual desolations of the world, seeking the extension and perpetuation of these, and, the more effectually to succeed, likewise seeking, either by insolent demands or insidious wiles, a home and resting place in the church, so long the doctrinal wall of her profession must be kept without a breach, and the vigilant eye of her administration must be upon the movements of the enemy. The ends of her fellowship must be distinctly kept in view, its principles and means must not be forgotten. The spirit of a ghostly,—that stranger to the law of love,—must have no place assigned it within the limits that her charter covers, nor must the sickly affectations of unprincipled tenderness, be permitted to govern in her counsels. Her creed must have the firmness of truth, her communion be based upon pure evangelical principle, and her administrations be in harmony with the avowals of her faith and the ends of her fellowship.

Amidst all the defects, in the existing organizations and administrations of Zion, which go to perplex her profession and enfeeble her exertions, it is not forgotten that in her are lodged, and in her are found, the means and agencies of the world's reformation. Within her limits is found an amount of moral worth vainly sought for in the wilds of the world. There is the dwelling place of the Saviour, the residence of his Spirit, and the abode of his saints. Upon the fields of Zion a light is spread, and on her heights the principles of order rest, which, in contrast, expose to view, in more prominent relief, the inconsistencies of her imperfect children, than is done in the case of the men of the world, when judged of by the world's standard. To know the evils that injure the church of the Lord, to feel those evils as they ought to be felt, and truly, and fully, to apprehend the difficulties in the way of their removal, are indispensable to the introduction of a happier state of things. To these suggestions, the reader is requested to lend his enlightened and serious attention.

G.

REV'D MR. J. C. HARRISON'S WITHDRAWAL FROM THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH.

WE re-publish, from a western newspaper, the letter which follows—in obedience to the request printed in its postscript. In doing so, we spontaneously testify to the piety, the honor, the talents, and the worth of this gentleman, whom we have known intimately from our earliest childhood, and whose withdrawal from our church we sincerely regret; the more especially as we are bound to say, it was made not only, as we judge, on a wrong estimate of the principles involved, but as we certainly know, upon a total misapprehension of the facts of the case. The senior editor of this magazine was a member of both the Assemblies which had Mr. Harrison's case under consideration; he was appointed by both, to manage the case, which was left without attention by Mr. H.; and he dictated to the opponents of Mr. H., the final minute in the case; a minute which, he is confident,

every disinterested person will say, ought to have been perfectly satisfactory to Mr. H. ; and was far more than under the personal circumstances, and in the general disorder of our ecclesiastical affairs, and in the midst of the whole fury of the abolition and pro-slavery discussion—could possibly have been expected; and we are moreover convinced, that if we had known the grounds on which Mr. H. withdrew, before he took the step—we could have satisfied his candid and upright mind, that there was not the least call for it in the case.

We, of course, entirely dissent from Mr. H.'s eulogy, expressed or implied, on *Mr. J. C. Stiles*.—We consider him one of the most reckless and inexcusable disturbers of our church; a man who cannot be bound even by covenanted obligations, and whose spiritual pride and insupportable arrogance make his proceedings as offensive, as his ignorance of the doctrine and order of our church, and of the real merits of the case, makes them ridiculous.

Brothers Rice and M' Roberts :

I have just noticed a communication for your paper, signed by bro. R. C. Grundy, as Stated Clerk of the Ebenezer Presbytery—in which, in connexion with my name, are some remarks that might lead to impressions both incorrect and unfavorable. Now as no man should allow himself to be utterly indifferent to the respect of the community, it would seem to be but duty to one's-self if one well can, to ward off such impressions as the remarks in question are calculated to make.

In the piece in question, the name of "J. C. Harrison," is so coupled with those of Messrs. Garrison and Philips as to lead the reader to suppose that the three individuals named, stand in the same relation to the Presbyterian Church. But this is far from being the fact. I have but little sympathy with the New School party. It is true that I no longer belong to the Presbyterian Body, but I did not fall out with that venerable branch of the church of God for the same reasons which seem to have actuated the New School. I continue to hold real Presbyterianism in great respect, nor have I ever sympathized with those Synods which were declared by the G. Assemblies of '37 and '38 never to have had any legitimate or rightful connexion with the church and people of the Presbyterians. Whilst those brethren who have recently left your communion will [it is not doubted] be decided by the church of God at large, to have pursued a course the most uncalled-for, strange and unaccountable; the brethren appear to have felt themselves to be in such a posture, as were (of old) the friends of John Hampden in England, and as were the Southern fathers of our own glorious revolution; whilst, however, those for whom they have entertained so extravagant a sympathy have been nothing better than errorists in religion, schismatics in government, and apostates in regard to both. Never perhaps on earth before, was the fire of Southern blood as needlessly enkindled. I own myself a warm admirer, (judging from report,) of the gallant bearing, the abilities and eloquence of brother Stiles: but how he and his associates can have been brought to entertain so marvelous sympathies and affections, for those northern schismatics, abolitionists and anti-patriots—is an enigma which I can nowise begin to solve.

For my own part, my case stands thus :

I was in the midst of a field of labor in Ohio (as a minister of Christ,) and as to slavery I was, and I was by my people considered a gradual emancipator in principle.—But the New School and Abolition portion of the Cincinnati Synod and Presbytery stepped in between the people and the preacher—laid down rules of action for the latter unknown to the constitution—and arrested him in his Lord's service, by acts which left the constitution and the church bleeding at every pore, and which must have greatly marred and injured the suffering cause of souls.

Yes; such was the course of New School Abolitionists. And it could be wished that the OLD SCHOOL party themselves in that question had been free from guilt in this cruel course of action. But THEY TOO did at least CONNIVE at the vile atrocity. They, with a mere show of resistance, allowed the scheme to go on and to succeed. I had had the misfortune to be born on the south side of "Mason and Dexon's line," and to be not altogether apostate from the principles of the Henries and the Jeffersons of my native region of country.

These enemies, therefore, of public principle and of individual rights went on in their career. They shed my ecclesiastical blood. They commanded the churches to hear me no more—and assumed the responsibility of preventing all the good which I might have been the means of accomplishing.

Yes, brethren; I was thus driven from a field of labor which nearly all the despots in question had encouraged me, themselves, to occupy; but—what was yet more strange, and more hard to be borne—I found myself when driven back to the land from whence I had removed, no longer to have [seemingly] the sympathies or the good-will of those with whom I had so recently been bound up in affection and in mutual good-offices—and, withal, found myself even left weltering in my blood by "the priests and the Levites" of the two G. Assemblies (otherwise noble) of '37 and '38.

Was a republican and Presbyterian to stand all this? Was a man whose kindred had never failed, either in Europe or America, to peril their all in the REAL cause of man's rights—to submit to this two-fold injustice and cruelty?—I became a CUMBERLAND Presbyterian. My connexion is NOT New School, and NOT abolition. Such connexion shall be left for those who have a relish for things that are unworthy and dishonorable: but for my part I would avoid all fellowship with Northern New Schoolmen, with Northern Abolitionists, with all the disciples of Benedict Arnold, and with all the followers of our Divine Lord's first betrayer.

As for the Cumberland Presbyterian body; I have all reason to hold them in gratitude. They acted the part of the good Samaritan. There is no need at this time to espouse the cause of either their doctrines or their morals. They profess and they HOLD the same things. Between them and the Southern Old School Presbyterians there is a discrepancy as to a single point of Calvinistic theology, yet is there no reason to be seen, why (in the language of St. John, when he no longer could preach) they should not "as little children LOVE ONE ANOTHER."

I would close by saying to my kindred and friends, who are fol-

lowing in the new schism—that I would deem it a real misfortune to offend them—but a greater, not, when it is called for, to speak the truth.

J. CABELL HARRISON,
C. P. minister of the Gospel.

P. S. Will the "Union Evangelist," of Uniontown in Pennsylvania, and the Cumberland Presbyterian paper which is published in Princeton, Ky., and the Baltimore Religious and Literary Magazine please, each of them, to give this brief article a republication?
J. C. HARRISON.

SUPPRESSION OF THE ORDER OF JESUITS, IN SPAIN.

THE following decree for the suppression of the Jesuits, giving them an annuity of 25 cents a day for the priests and monks, and 15 cents for the lay brethren, appeared in the Madrid Gazette of July 9th.

"ROYAL ORDER."

"It being necessary for the prosperity and welfare of the State, that the *pragmatic sanction* of the 2d of April, 1767, which enacts the law 3, chap. 26, book 1, of the late digest, shall be re-established in full force and vigour; and as thereby my august great grandfather, Don Carlos III., was pleased to suppress throughout the kingdom, the order known under the denomination of the Society of Jesus, and taking possession of their temporalities, by and with the advice of the Council of Ministers, I have decreed in the name of my august daughter, the Queen Donna Isabella II., as follows:

"1. There shall be forever suppressed throughout the kingdom the Society of Jesus, which, by a Royal decree of the 29th May, 1815, was ordered to be re-established, which decree is from henceforth null and void, as it was already pronounced to be by the Cortes of 1820.

"2. The members of the Society shall not be permitted to reunite in any body or community under any pretext whatever, fixing their residences in any place which they shall make choice of in the kingdom, with the approbation of the Government, where those who are ordained shall remain in quality of secular clergy, subject to their respective rules without wearing the habit of the said order, or retaining connection or dependence whatsoever with the superiors of the Society not in Spain, and those who are not ordained in class or in quality of laymen, subject to the common law.

"3. The temporalities shall be taken possession of without loss of time, in which are included their estates, effects, furniture and moveables, as also real estates and civil and ecclesiastical rents which the regulars of the Society possess without prejudice to the charges and subsistence of the regulars proper, which shall consist of five reals per day to the priests during their life or until they shall have obtained a location, and three reals to the laymen equally, which shall be paid to both one and the other every six months

from the treasury of the sinking fund, and which they will forfeit by leaving the kingdom.

"4. Foreign Jesuits who are within the Spanish dominions in or out of their colleges, and likewise their novices who have not yet commenced the profession shall not enjoy the benefit of these provisions.

"5. The estates, rents, and property, of whatever kind they may be, which the regulars of the company actually possess, shall be immediately applied to the extinction of the debt or payment of its interest. From this shall be excepted, however, the pictures, libraries and chattles, which may be useful to the institutions of arts and sciences, as also the colleges, residences, and houses of the society, their churches, ornaments, and holy vessels, respecting which I retain to myself the disposal, under the advice of the Ecclesiastical Council of what may be necessary and convenient.— Let it be understood and executed.

(Signed by the Royal hand,)

MANUEL GARCIA HEEREROS."

"Aranjuez, July 4.

[For the Baltimore Literary and Religious Magazine.]

SKETCHES AND RECOLLECTIONS FROM MY NOTE BOOK.

No. IX.

WE think we see a movement, though distant, yet distinct, towards the mightiest of all consummations—a consummation, more noble and more glorious than earth has ever witnessed since it heard the cry of "It is finished"—even that consummation of long looked for glory which shall be preceded by the restoration and return of Israel's wandering out-casts. All the signs of the present political dispensations of the earth point to the time and place and circumstances of that last death-struggle in which God's people and principles shall prevail over the combined powers and principles of popery in church and state. That great battle, which shall be as fruitful in its consequences, as it will be ferocious and bloody in the character and amount of its carnage, is most obviously not far distant. This nearing of a mighty consummation, to be preceded by great political convulsions and sacrifice of human life, we argue from the unerring records of divine writ, enlightened by the commentary of current events both in the political and ecclesiastical world. The war has been already commenced which shall continue to wax warmer and fiercer, until blood and carnage, such as history has not as yet recorded, shall ensue. This war has been commenced by that restless and ambitious power, whose too eager and precipitous desire after universal dominion over mind and matter, is at this very moment erecting the gibbet of her own infamy and destruction. Look over all the earth and see the simultaneous movement of all the followers of "the dragon and the beast and the false prophet." Behold the renewed activity by which they are prosecuting their attempts at proselyting;—see with what intense avidity they are again grasping at power;—look at the insulting

audacity with which they have revived the accursed order of Jesuits and rebuilt for them the bastille; and, as from these things might be expected, behold the commencement of popish persecution! These things are matters of notoriety even to superficial observers. And the consequence is that there is a stir, feeble, it is true, but ominous, in the protestant camp. Not content with the possession of the ten kingdoms that arose out of the Roman empire and "agreed to give their kingdoms to the beast," although the doctrines of the reformation were preached in, and to some extent received by them, the false prophet is now most manifestly attempting to subsidize, not only that part of Europe not included in the ancient western empire, and which embraced and holds the truth as it is in Christ, but also this continent!

Now as this colossal despotism, with its Jesuits and bastille, attempts to subsidize this protestant land, let us take a glance at its moral character, that we may make ourselves somewhat acquainted with its claims upon a free, moral and religious people. As this is a subject much too vast, for papers as fugitive and unpretending as these, we shall merely select a few instances and persons; but as these shall be from the very head and heart of their holiness and infallibility, a few will be as fully and fairly descriptive of the mass, as if we had time and patience to exhibit the whole concern in all its actions and actors. A fallible system with fallible agents might with propriety demur to the selection of any given men or measures as genuine specimens of the whole; but the case is altogether different when the system is infallibly pure, and its agents assume the name and affect to exert the prerogatives of the "Lord God Almighty."

Sixtus IV. Let us, then, for a single moment take a peep in upon the character and conduct of that *holy and infallible* power, which is known as "God's vicegerent," or, as he is at other times called, "our Lord God, the Pope!" And as we can present this notable personage in but a few of his phases, let us look at him first in the person of Sixtus IV.; who was "our Lord God, the Pope," in 1471-1484. One of the ablest historians says "Sixtus patronised *debauchery* as well as *murder*. His holiness, for this purpose, established brothels extraordinary in Rome. His infallibility, in consequence, became head, not only of the church, but also of the *stews*. He presided with ability and applause in two departments, and was the vicar-general of God and Venus. These seminaries of pollution, it seems, brought a great accession to the ecclesiastical revenue. The goddesses who were worshipped in these temples, paid a weekly tax from the wages of iniquity to the viceroy of heaven.—The sacred treasury, by this means, received from this apostolic tribute, an annual augmentation of 20,000 ducats. His supremacy himself was, it seems, a regular and steady customer in his new commercial establishments. He nightly worshipped with great zeal and devotion, in these pontifical fanes which he had erected to the Cytherean goddess." (*Edgar's Variations of Popery.*)

Mr. Waddington, in his Church History, says of this same wretch, who blasphemously called himself "God's vicegerent," that, "His character corrupted his talents and stained his noblest projects with

falsehood and perfidy. As he could discern no distinction between virtue and crime, he employed the basest means to obtain the best ends"—and as a proof of this, a semi-popish writer says that in an Italian war he promised that if Marino was delivered up to him, he would spare the family of the Colonnas. His proposition being acceded to, with savage ferocity, he caused "the prothonotary Colonna to be attacked and executed in his own house. The mother of Collonna came to San Celso, in Bainchi, where the body lay, and lifting up the severed head by the hair, she cried, 'behold the head of my son! Such is the faith of the Pope!'"

If his holiness, Pope Sixtus IV., "the vicar-general of God"—the infallible head of an unchangeable hierarchy, be not an instance of a demon incarnate, I question if such can be found in history! His life and character is a mixture of *perfidy! murder!! and uncleanness!!!*

From this foul monster, stained with blood, and rotten with uncleanness, and execrable for his enormous perfidy, let us pass on to

Alexander VI. The German historian, Ranke, whose work might well be denominated an *Apology for the Popes*, so decidedly is he partial to them, says of this "vicar-general of God," that his "great aim during the whole course of his life was to gratify to the utmost, his love of ease, his sensuality, and his ambition.—The question how a pope should marry, provide for and establish his children, affected the politics of all Europe. He caused his brother, who stood in his way, to be murdered and thrown into the Tiber. His brother-in-law was attacked and stabbed on the steps of the palace by his orders!"—This same semi-popish writer says, "There is a perfection even in depravity. Many of the sons and nephews of popes did similar things, but none ever approached his (Pope Alexander's) bad eminence: *he was a virtuoso in crime!*"

Hear how this partial historian speaks of his death, "He once meditated taking off one of the richest cardinals by poison: his intended victim, however, contrived by means of presents, promises and prayers, to gain over his head cook, and the dish which had been prepared for the cardinal was placed before the pope. He died of the poison he had destined for another!"

But alas, even this character of boundless ambition and perfidy and atrocious murder, falls far short of doing justice to this incarnate demon. Pope, in his *Essay on Man*, himself a Papist, likens him to *Cataline*. Waddington, calls him "the most profligate of mankind," who in early life was "stigmatized by a public censure for his *unmuffled debaucheries*. After that, he publicly cohabited with a Roman matron, by whom he had five acknowledged children. Neither in his language nor in his manners did he affect any regard for morality or for decency."

Guicciardini, says that when poisoned by the cup or dish which he had prepared for his own guest, "all Rome rushed to St. Peter's to behold his corpse, with incredible festivity; nor was there any man who could satiate his eyes with gazing on the remains of this serpent, who by his immoderate ambition and pestiferous perfidy, and every manner of frightful cruelty, of monstrous lust and unheard-of avarice, had poisoned the whole world."

Bower, in his *History of the Popes*, says, "All who speak of Alexander, seem to agree in this, that for lust, avarice, cruelty, treachery, and perfidiousness, he scarce ever had his equal."

Burchardus says, "His holiness was a great lover of women. In his time the apostolic palace was turned into a brothel; a more infamous brothel than any of the public stews."—"His pontificate was a continued series of the blackest crimes; of murder, rapine, perfidiousness, lust and cruelty."

Edgar says, "Alexander the Sixth, in the common opinion, surpassed all his predecessors in atrocity. This monster, whom humanity disowns, seems to have excelled all his rivals in the arena of villany, and outstripped every competitor on the stadium of miscreancy—Rome, under his administration and by his example, became the sink of filthiness, the head-quarters of atrocity, and the hot-bed of prostitution, murder and robbery.

"He formed an illicit connexion with a widow who resided at Rome, and with her two daughters. His passions, irregular and brutal, could find gratification only in enormity. His licentiousness, after the widow's death, drove him to the incestuous enjoyment of her daughter. She became his mistress after her mother's death. His holiness, in the pursuit of variety and the perpetration of atrocity, afterwards formed a criminal connexion with *his own daughter*, the witty, the learned, the gay and the abandoned Lucretia. She was mistress to her own father and brother!

"Simony and assassination were as prominent in Alexander's character as incest and debauchery. He first bought, it has been said, and then sold the keys, the altar and the Saviour. He *murdered* the majority of the cardinals who raised him to the popedom, and seized their estates."

Daniel says, "His debauchery, perfidy, ambition, malice, inhumanity and irreligion made him the execration of all Europe."

Thus, no fewer than seven witnesses, which we have here collected, and those of different nations and varying in religion from popery up to decided evangelical protestantism, agree in representing this *infallible* vicar of God—his holiness, Pope Alexander the Sixth, as a monster of the most hideous moral atrocity;—bloody beyond all previous precedents;—unequaled in the most unheard of lust and incest, and surpassing all his most infamous predecessors in perfidy, cruelty and avarice! What a frightful picture of a church, of which such a moral monster was the infallible head! And it is the boast, too, of this church, that she is unchanged and unchangeable! And to such a church, with such popes, it is and always has been the sworn and unchangeable effort of the papists to convert, even Protestants! And that, too, by the argument that there is no salvation in any other church, united with the unwise and unholy admission on the part of Protestants that there is salvation in theirs. When King James desired the conversion to popery of Villiers, the witty duke of Buckingham, he sent to him fathers Petrè and Fitzpatrick. Petrè, addressing the duke, said, "we deny that any one can be saved out of our church; while your grace will allow that our people may be saved."—"No, curse ye," said the duke, "I make no doubt ye will be all damned to a man." The reverend Jesuit started and said gravely, "Sir, I cannot argue with a person so void of charity." "I did not expect, my reverend father," said the duke, calmly, "such a reproach from you, whose whole reasoning with me was founded on the very same instance of charity in yourself."

[Concluded from page 222.]

THE GOSPEL MYSTERY OF SANCTIFICATION,

By the Rev. Wm. Marshall.—Abridged.

No. XI.

ASSERTION XII. *The Scripture calls upon Christians to walk no longer according to the principles or means of practice that belong unto the natural corrupt state of man, but only according to that new state given in Christ, which we receive by faith, and according to the principles and means of practice that belong to it, and to strive to continue and increase in such manner of practice.*

WHILE we are *in the flesh*, or under the power of sin, and at enmity with God, all our obedience will be rendered out of fear rather than love; we shall serve God from the selfish motive of obtaining deliverance from wrath, and thus our works will be constrained, and not hearty, and consequently we cannot please God. Therefore when we have believed on Christ for salvation, we are not to walk as if we were still under condemnation, and as if we had need to propitiate God by good works, or as if all our hope rested on our own good frames and righteous performance; for this is to act like slaves, after we have received the adoption of sons; it is to refuse to believe the love of God in Christ Jesus. The Scriptures, therefore, direct us to walk as the children of God, as those who have received mercy, as those who hope in the Lord—who rejoice in Christ Jesus and have no confidence in the flesh.

They describe the Christian's manner of life as "living by faith." Heb. ii. 4; Gal. ii. 20; Heb. x. 38,—walking by faith. 2 Cor. v. 7,—faith working by love, Gal. v. 7, overcoming the world by faith, 1 John v. 4, quenching the fiery darts of the adversary by the shield of faith, Eph. vi. 16. Some make no more of *walking and living by faith*, than merely a stirring up of ourselves to duty by such principles as we believe. If this were so, the Jews might be said to have lived by faith, because they were moved by their principles, to be zealous for God; and so Paul, also, while a persecutor; but to live by faith, is to die to the law, and live to God; it is the same as to live by Christ whom we receive and make use of by faith, to guide and move ourselves to the practice of holiness.

The same manner of life is commended to us by the terms, walking, rooted, built up in Christ, Col. ii. 6, 7, having Christ living in us, Gal. ii. 19, 20, putting on the Lord Jesus, Rom. xiii. 13, 14, being strong in the Lord, Eph. vi. 10, doing all things in the name of Christ, Col. iii. 17, going in the strength of the Lord of God, Zech. x. 12. These phrases are frequent, and do sufficiently explain one another; and show that we are to practice holiness by virtue of his strengthening endowments moving and encouraging us thereto, Paul teaches the same by his example,—that our continual work should be to know Christ and the power of his resurrection and the fellowship of his sufferings, and to be made conformable to his death, if by any means, we may attain to the resurrection of the dead. He means such an experimental knowledge of Christ and his death and resurrection as will effectually make us like him in dying to sin and living unto God, and he would hereby guide us to make use of Christ and his death and resurrection, by

faith as the powerful means of holiness in heart and life, and to increase in this till we come to perfection.

As we are still imperfect—the law of sin warring in our members, we are in danger, after having begun in the spirit, to trust to the flesh, and to act as if we were still under the covenant of works, and had need of making our peace by our obedience: and thus we shall look away from Christ, and seek by considerations drawn from the law, to stir ourselves up to zeal in righteousness. We must, therefore, strive to maintain in us a persuasion, as Paul did, that Christ hath loved us, and given himself for us, and hereby we shall be enabled as he was, to live to God in holiness, through Christ living in him by faith. It is by faith we stand—and we must walk by faith, if we would walk with God.

ASSERTION XIII. *All the ordinances of God's appointment for the establishment and increase of your faith and love, are to be used only in this way of believing in Christ and walking in him, according to the new state given in him.*

Though all holiness be effectually attained by the life of faith in Christ, yet the use of the means appointed in the word of God for attaining and promoting holiness, are not hereby made void. We do indeed assert and profess that a true and lively faith in Christ is alone sufficient and effectual through the grace of God, to receive Christ for our justification and sanctification, and eternal salvation, but we also assert and profess that several means are appointed of God for the begetting, maintaining, and increasing this faith, and acting and exercising it, for the attainment of salvation, and that these means are to be used diligently. True believers find that they need such helps—yet they account none necessary or lawful to be used for the attainment of holiness, besides those that are appointed of God in his word. We must use them as helps to the life of faith in its beginning, continuance and growth, and as instruments subservient to faith in all its acts and exercises, whereby the soul receives Christ and walks in all holiness by him—God's ordinances are like the cherubims of glory, made with their faces looking towards the mercy seat; they are made to guide us to Christ for salvation by faith alone. The Scriptures with all the means of grace appointed in them, are able to make us wise unto salvation *only by faith* in Jesus Christ. I shall show how the divinely appointed means of holiness are to be used.

I. We must diligently endeavour to know the word of God. Other means of salvation are necessary to the more abundant well-being of our faith, and of our new state in Christ, but this is necessary to the very being thereof, for faith cometh by hearing. Rahab was justified by faith before she had any visible communion with the church of God in any divine ordinances, yet not without the word of God, even the same word of God which is written in the Scriptures, though that word was brought to her by the report of the heathen, Josh. ii. 9, 11. Our great work must be to get such a knowledge of the word, as is necessary and sufficient to guide us in receiving Christ and walking in him by faith. You must endeavour chiefly to know the Father and the Son as they are revealed in the gospel, whom to know is life eternal, John xvii. 3—to know Christ as the end of the law for righteousness, and therefore you must

seek to know the commands of the law, that by your knowledge of them, you may be made sensible of your inability to perform them, of the enmity in your heart against them, the wrath you are under for breaking them, and the impossibility of being saved by your own works; that so you may fly to Christ and trust only to the free grace of God for justification and strength to fulfil the law acceptably through Christ. And for this end you must endeavour to learn the utmost strictness of the commands, their exact perfection and spiritual purity, that you may be the more convinced of sin, and stirred up to seek unto Christ for remission of sin, purity of heart and spiritual obedience, and be brought nearer to the enjoyment of him. The most effectual knowledge for your salvation is, to understand the desperate sinfulness and misery of your natural condition, and the sufficiency of the grace of God in Christ, for your pardon and holiness.

II. Another means is examination of our state and ways according to the word of God; that if we be in a state of sin, we may know our sickness and come to the great physician without delay, and that if we be in a state of grace, we may know that we are of the truth, and assure our hearts before God, by the testimony of a good conscience. Think not you must begin by doubting whether God will extend mercy to you, and that you must leave this wholly undecided, until you have found out by self-examination how to resolve it. You should rather begin with much assurance that the door of mercy is open for you, and that God will certainly save you, if you put your trust in him through Christ. Mis-spend not your time, in poring upon your hearts to find whether you be good enough to trust on Christ, or to find whether you have any faith before you dare be so bold as to believe on him. Mis-spend not your time in examining whether you have committed the unpardonable sin, except it be with the full purpose to assure yourself more and more that you are not guilty of it. The question to be settled is, whether you be in a state of grace or not,—and you must be willing to know the best as well as the worst of yourself.—Humility does not bind you to overlook your good qualifications—your work must be to find if there is a spark of grace in the ocean of your corruption; if there is, notice it, own it as such, for the praise belongs to God, Phil. i. 11. You must try inherent grace by the touchstone, and not by the measure; by its nature, not its degree.

To discover whether we be in the faith, the best way is to examine our faith by *the inseparable properties of a true saving faith*. Thus:—are we made thoroughly sensible of our sinfulness and of the deadness and misery of our natural state, so as to despair absolutely of ever attaining to any righteousness, holiness or true happiness while we continue in it? Do we see the excellency of Christ, and the all-sufficiency of his grace for our salvation? Do we prefer the enjoyment of him above all things, and desire it with our whole heart, as our only happiness, whatever we may suffer for his sake? Do we desire with our whole heart to be delivered from the power and practice of sin, as well as from the wrath of God and the pain of hell? Do our hearts come to Christ and lay hold on him for salvation, endeavouring to trust on him confidently, notwithstanding all fears and doubts that assault us? You should also examine your faith by its fruits; and you are not only to examine

whether your inclinations, purposes, affections and actions be holy, but by what considerations they are excited and maintained? whether by fears of hell and mercenary desires to purchase the favor of God, or by the belief of God's having first loved you—by the hope of eternal life as the free gift of God through Christ, and by trust in God to sanctify you by his Spirit according to the promises? Happy are you if you can find so much evidence of the fruits of faith, as may enable you to express your sincerity in these moderate terms. "We trust we have a good conscience, in all things willing to live honestly, Heb. xiii. 18.

III. Meditation on the word of God. It is a duty whereby the soul doth feed upon the word, and strengthen itself for every good work. They that are regenerated, find by experience that their spiritual life is maintained and increased by often minding the same word—"as new born babes, they desire the sincere milk of the word that they may grow thereby." 1 Pet. ii. 2. The end of our meditating must not be mere speculation and knowledge of the truth, but rather rigorous pressing it on the conscience, to stir up our hearts to the practice of it. Take special care to act faith in your meditation—set the loving-kindness of God frequently before your eyes; by meditating on it lovingly, you will be strengthened to walk in the truth. Ps. xxvi. 3; 2 Cor. iii. 18.

IV. The sacrament of baptism must needs be of great use to promote the life of faith, if it be made use of according to its nature and institution—it being a seal of the righteousness of faith. It is not sufficient to avoid the pernicious errors of those that pervert baptism,—you must also be diligent in improving it to the ends for which it was instituted. Put the question seriously to yourselves,—What good use do you make of your baptism? How often or how seldom do you think upon it? Do you not render it of none effect by your neglect of it? We ought frequently to ask ourselves, "unto what were we baptized! Acts xix. 3. What does this ordinance seal? What doth it engage us unto? And accordingly we must encourage ourselves by our baptism, to lay hold on the grace it seals to us, and to fulfil its engagements.

V. The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper is a spiritual feast to strengthen our faith. The end of it is to remind us of the death of Christ, in the mystery of it, *his body broken for us, and his blood the blood of the new testament*,—that so we may receive and enjoy all the promises of the new testament. The chief excellence and advantage of this ordinance is, that it is not only a figure and resemblance of our living upon a crucified Saviour, but also a precious instrument whereby Christ, the true bread, is conveyed to us and received by us, through faith.

VI. Prayer is to be made use of, as a means of living by faith. Though God's will is not changed by it, it is ordinarily accomplished (and it is his will that it should be accomplished) in this way. It is a duty so great, that it is put for all the service of God, which if it be done, the rest will be done well, and other ordinances of worship are helps to it. Is. lvi. 7. It is the great means whereby faith exerts itself to perform its whole work, and pours itself forth in all holy desires and affections. Ps. lxii. 8. We exercise all our graces by it, and by it we receive grace. Ps. cxxxviii. 3; Luke xi. 13; Heb. iv. 16; Ps. lxxxi. 10. It is added to the spiritual

armour, not as a particular piece of it, but as a means of putting on all and making use of all aright, that we may stand in the evil day. Eph. vi. 18. You must strive in prayer to stir up and act every other sanctifying grace, through faith moving you thereto. *You must make the whole Scripture your common prayer book, as the primitive church did; it being the language of the Spirit, reaching all occasions and conditions and fitted to speak to God in.* If you use a form, you must follow it by the Spirit, further than the form goes, according as he shall guide you by the word.

Besides these, might be mentioned, *singing of psalms and hymns and spiritual songs—and fasting—and also fellowship and communion with the saints*, Acts ii. 42. This last should be used diligently in private converse. Ps. ci. 4—7, and in public assemblies, Heb. x. 25; Zech. xiv. 16, 17. God makes the several members of a church instruments of the conveyance of his grace and fulness from one to another, as the members of the natural body convey to each other the fulness of the head, Eph. iv. 16. Follow no church further than you may follow it in the way of Christ, and keep fellowship with it, only on account of Christ, and because it follows and hath fellowship with Christ. Do not think you must attain this or that degree of grace before you join yourself in full communion with the church;—when you have given yourself to Christ, give yourself to his church, though you find much weakness, for these ordinances serve to strengthen you. See that thy communion tend to thy edification.

In conclusion:—That we may be confirmed in holiness, only by believing in Christ and by walking in him by faith, we may take encouragement from the great advantages of this way, and its excellent properties. It tends to the abasement of all flesh, and the exaltation of God only. Rom. iii. 27, 28; 1 Cor. i. 29—31; Eph. iii. 8, 9. It shows us that all our good works, and living to God, are all by the power of Christ living in us by faith. Gal. ii. 20; Eph. iii. 16, 17; Col. i. 1. It consists well with the other doctrines of the gospel—1, with the doctrine of original sin, not only the guilt of Adam's sin, and a corrupt nature, but utter inability to spiritual good and proneness to sin. Ps. li. 5; Rom. v. 12. There is an utter inability to keep the law truly in any point—if there were no way to holiness, since the fall, this might make us despair, but there is a new heart, a new birth, a new creature—2. With predestination. Since as to all good wrought in us, we are God's workmanship, we may well admit he hath appointed his good pleasure from eternity—3. With justification and reconciliation. This doctrine might tend to licentiousness, if people were to be brought to holiness by moral suasion, and their natural endeavors stirred up by the terms of the law, by slavish fears and mercenary hopes—4. With the real union with Christ,—and, 5, With certain final perseverance.—It is the only way revealed by God, of attaining to holiness. It is pleasant, plain, easy, and paved with love;—the good old way wherein thou mayest follow the footsteps of all the flock. It is the way to perfection; the holiness it promotes differs only in degree and manner of manifestation from the holiness of heaven. Here we have but the first fruits of the spirit, Rom. viii. 24, and live by faith, not by sight, 2 Cor. v. 7. In heaven, the saints live by the same Spirit, and the same God is all in all, 1 Cor. xv. 28; John iv. 14.

[For the Baltimore Literary and Religious Magazine.]

MUSINGS, AT THE CLOSE OF 1840.

FAST flying year, with loaded wings
Of blessings from the King of kings,
Rise upward at his feet to pour
Thanks for mercies running o'er.

Wild have storm and tempest raged—
Soon their fury was assuaged;
A city lies despoiled forlorn, (1)
Of wealth and beauty rudely shorn,
Yet midst the blending gloom, the crushing blast
And loss of thought, an angel passed!
How many an one was sheltered in that day,
Who never to our Father deigned to pray.
Fierce blazed the flame, (2)—Long Island's coasts
Gleamed as with bescons when invading hosts
On murder's errand come,—but rose no band
From peaceful sleep to dare the midnight wave,
'T was but a moment! help from human hand,
Were vain that hapless company to save.
That crowded company! The deafening surge,
The freezing night-wind and the scorching glare,
They chant to living men their funeral dirge,
They mock their efforts to escape the snare.
Yet mid those terrors there was joy and peace,—
Foretastes of pleasures which shall never cease,
For God was there.—And when the tidings came
Of loved ones lost, then burned anew the flame,
Consuming health and hope,—but stormy wind (3)
And flaming fire, were messengers He chose,
To break, that He with mercy might upbind,
And give through Jesus, lasting, sweet repose.
And when of Zion, in Christ's crowning days,
It shall be said, 'These souls were ransomed there,'
Then to the Only Wise shall rise the praise
Of those he saved by anguish and despair.

On India's plain, fierce persecutions burst (4)
And sickness followed lack of bread and thirst,
And they who led of God, in meekness bowed
To the Creator only, saw the cloud
Of trouble lightened by a rising ray,—
Their fears dispelled, their doubts dissolved away,
'The day-star rises in their hearts,'—Fulfilled
Are glorious promises which oft have thrilled
The pious heart, and swelled the earnest prayer
That God at length would break the fowler's snare
And captive millions, slaves of idols vain,
Taste the rich blessings of a Saviour slain.

Heard are the prayers, and what believing eyes,
Waited and longed for, now we see arise.
Nor comes the Hindoo only, to the cross,—
But where the ocean billows madly toss
Around the clustered isles, there bathed in tears
A crowd of anxious suppliants appears. (5)
There while the hooting scorner spreads his snare
And pours his mockery on the tear and prayer,
Our gracious God sends forth his power to save
And scatters blessings e're they dare to crave.

And there the kingly ships in grandeur sweep
Startling the dwellers on the peaceful deep,

- And win cheap victories (6) o'er unarmed men,
 To swell the honor of IMPERIAL FRANCE!
July's three days! And were the triumphs then,
 Such deeds as this of glory to advance?
 Or on the unoffending Jew to wreak (7)
 The malice of the bigot and the knave?
 Crushed for the horrid crime of being weak,
 Too weak one struggle for their right to brave!
 O glorious nation! mild and gentle creed!
 How full of works of tenderness and love!
 By thee the Jews, racked, tortured, mangled, bleed!
 Tahiti trembles in her shadowed grove!
 Oh, to thy teachings let us then commit (8)
 Our children as they leave their mother's knee,
 ● For who like thee, so wisely trained and fit,
 To make them loving, upright, pious, free?

There is a hush upon our native streams, (9)
 The wind no longer wafts the conflict loud;
 Waste not the energy in pleasing dreams,
 But to God's service, be it humbly bowed
 And for him used with zealous heart and hand
 As late in schemes by ardent patriots planned,
 Our commonwealth to bless. Fast fleets the day,
 Hard is the struggle, dangers crowd the way.
 As for thy country, stir thee for thy soul,—
 As for thyself, so rouse thee for the whole
 Of thine own brethren, all thy dying race,
 That in thy father's house, each find a place,
 So, for thyself—so, for thy brethren strive
 Till thou, by Jesus' help, at heaven arrive. K. H.

1. The tornado at Natchez.
2. The burning of the Lexington, between New York and Providence.
3. Psalm cxlviii. 8. "Stormy wind, fulfilling his word."
4. In the district of Kishuaghur, a sect sprung up a few years ago, calling themselves, *Worshippers of the Creator*. They were subjected to frequent persecutions by the Hindoos,—and afterward they were greatly afflicted by drought and famine. Among these people, there has been a remarkable turning to the Lord—55 villages having put away the false worship for the true.
5. The Sandwich Islands have been the scene of a most glorious display of divine grace.
6. The Pacific ocean has been favored with a specimen of *Lynch Law*. A French frigate has robbed the Island of Tahiti of a large sum of money, and compelled the government to receive several Roman Catholics, who had intruded themselves contrary to the law of the country. The first act of one of these propagators of the faith, was to put up a nine-pin alley. And at the Sandwich Islands, the French commander was full as eager to secure the admission of *French brandies* as of Romish priests.
7. The persecutions of the Jews at Damascus and Rhodes have been got up and countenanced chiefly by Romanists—Count Ratti-Menor, the French Council at Rhodes being the master-worker in all the cruelties. Well may we say, *glorious nation!* for what greater glory can we conceive of, than the battering of Bamboo huts by a French man-of-war,—or the deliberate purpose to massacre the American missionaries, if a way were not made for the entrance of factious priests and intoxicating liquors. Except it be, reviving against defenceless Jews, the lies and the prejudices of the age of the crusaders!

8. Such being the acts not of the infidel, but of the French nation since its reconciliation with the pope—and these deeds being for the upholding of Romanism, how peculiarly proper is it for Protestants to commit their

tender children to nuns and priests! And how reasonable would it have been, to have given a portion of the school fund of the city of New York, to the exclusive control of the subjects of an Italian prince!—For such in reality does the promise of canonical obedience make every Romish prelate, their oath being identical with that which the miserable John, King of England, swore, when he made his submission to the Papal legate.

9. The late presidential election has shown what men of both parties can do, to circulate intelligence and propagate their opinions. Let our professing Christians ask themselves—"Ought I not to give as liberally, and to identify myself as thoroughly with the cause of Christ, as I lately did with the interests of my favourite candidate?"

[For the Baltimore Literary and Religious Magazine.]

"PREACH THE GOSPEL TO EVERY CREATURE."—*Mark xvi*; 15.

THIS command was delivered by our blessed Saviour immediately before his ascension. He had accomplished the redemption of his people. He had paid their ransom on the cross. He had borne their griefs and carried their sorrows. He had been bruised for their iniquities. He had washed away their sins with his heart's blood; and by his perfect righteousness had inscribed their names in the book of life. And now that he is about to depart to prepare a place for them, leaving them his peace, he commands them to preach peace to every creature—to proclaim liberty to the captive—light to those in darkness—healing to the diseased—gladness of heart to the disconsolate, and the wiping of tears from every weeping eye. To preach to every creature the gospel—the gospel of grace—the gospel of reconciliation—"the glorious gospel of the blessed God." Immediately he is parted from them, and ascends to the right hand of the Majesty on high, where highly exalted, he is a Prince and a Saviour, to grant repentance to Israel and the forgiveness of sins."

Let us consider some of the reasons that should induce us to obey this last command of our risen Lord.

1. *It is the command of him who is entitled to our obedience.*

The sovereignty of the Creator over the creature is such, that, other considerations apart, the simple fact that we have been called into existence by the almighty power of God, binds us over to obey whatever he may command. We ought to obey God because he made us. We are his, and therefore, our obedience is his due. From this results necessarily, the just enactment of his law which metes to the transgressor, the dreadful wages of eternal death.

And our relation to Jesus Christ multiplies the obligation. For not only are we the creatures of his power, but also the objects of his redeeming love. "God commendeth his love toward us in that while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us." "He gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works—and especially zealous of the best of all works, preaching the gospel." "Hereby perceive we the love of God, because he laid down his life for us: and we ought, if need be, to lay down our lives for the brethren." But how can we possess this spirit of Christ, in being as devoted to our fellow creatures, as he was to us, if we have not deeply at heart, the fulfilling of the command which enjoins the offer of salvation to the helpless and the perishing?

Such is the constitution of our nature, that even the unregenerate

conscience condemns, in tones of decided reprehension the sin of ingratitude? How strong and how universal the detestation of the child that refuses parental affection with heart breaking ingratitude? Or the *creature*, (he is unworthy the name of man) whose heart beats not with warm pulsations for the friend by whose beneficent offices the broken heart is bound up, and every temporal want anticipated—by whose kind regards life and its joys, become dearer; and whose refined and delicate charity, void of selfishness, entertains no expectation of return, whilst it seeks to impart every blessing in the power of mortal to bestow! Now the universal opprobrium which is stamped upon ingratitude, proceeds from the universally acknowledged obligation to be grateful;—That every favour received, demands a proportionate return, not only in the affections of the heart, but also in outward service. How strong then the obligation of gratitude to Jesus Christ! He who relinquished glory—submitted to reproach and contempt; and endured unimagined misery in life and in death—all to save us sinners from merited perdition, and to make us kings and priests unto God. What soul enriched with such blessedness, can refuse obedience to Christ? Who that enjoys the consolation of the gospel will fail to offer that gospel to others? Is not the believer of the gospel bound to obey Christ in all things, and therefore in this, by ties cemented with the Redeemer's blood? What then must we say of the man who having heard of this command of him whom he professes to receive as his Saviour, fails to obey it? Whose ungrateful, dead soul is insensible of those bonds of love; those ties of blood? How shall we define such a man, if he be not characterised by turpitude unsurpassed?

2. *The gospel improves the civil and the moral condition of mankind.*

In proof of this, we appeal to the civil and moral condition of the nations nominally Christian, as composed with that of cotemporary heathen nations. We say nations *nominally* Christian; because there is no nation, as such, really and fully Christian. Yet in all such nations there is a substantial Christianity among the people, in a greater or less degree, giving character to the national manners, and transfusing its spirit into the civil institutions of the country; whether the Christian religion is established by law, or not. This must ever be the case where the gospel preached among the people, commends its morality to the consciences of all, and wins the approbation of even the rejecters of its supernatural doctrines.

In instituting the comparison, we will not mention the older Christian nations, but point to Greenland, Labrador, the Philippine, and Sandwich islands, Amboyna, Bengal, and Ceylon, which have lately ceased to be heathen communities, and have in the popular sense, become Christian. "Instead of poverty, wars, and plunderings, are found plenty, peace, and security. Instead of murdered infants, neglected children, degraded wives, and burning widows, are seen domestic peace and social endearments. Instead of idleness, are the comforts of intelligent industry. Intellectual cultivation has succeeded brutal insensibility. Rulers and kings laying aside ferocity and selfishness, are seen governing their people by Bible laws, and anxious for the general good. Whenever even nominal Christianity takes root, through Protestant efforts, it produces more energy of character, milder manners, and purer

morals, than ever have been shown under any form of pagan or Mahomedan influence."*

And view the present condition of the older and more enlightened Christian nations, which were formerly pagan. They have become truly great and powerful in proportion as the pure gospel has been fully preached among them, and its maxims of liberty and humanity regarded by their rulers.

Our own nation indeed was never any thing but Christian. For although its constitution unalterably forbids legislative enactments for the establishing of religion; yet that very constitution takes for granted the truth of the gospel, and breathes its spirit of benevolence and equality of rights. To that constitution we are indebted under God, to men of all creeds, and some of none, yet the master minds among them had been disciplined in the rigid school of gospel morality, and all of them had largely imbibed that spirit of true liberty which emanates from the gospel alone. Those principles of morality and equal rights learned from the gospel, and applied to the purposes of government, they have embodied in the constitution of the United States, which bequeathed to their children, a sacred legacy, whose blessings shall be enjoyed by us and posterity, in proportion as we venerate and promulge through the length of the land, the holy principles upon which it is founded.

The gospel, as such, does not directly interfere with the particular form of human government, or the condition of the body politic, but inculcating humanity, benevolence, order, and mutual love, under its influence the despot becomes the father of his people—the oppressor relaxes his iron grasp, and wipes the tear from the bondsman's eye; the haughty conqueror unsheaths the reeking blade, and bids the captive go free without ransom; the legislator and the ruler govern for the people's good, and the people submit to the sovereignty of the laws. Wherever the gospel is received, even as a system of morality, there are enjoyed the fruits of virtue, liberty, peace, prosperity. The gospel like the type of its glorious Author, the bright ruler of the day, not only enlightens, and vitalizes, beautifies, and renders fruitful, all upon whom its rays descend; but also by reflected lumination, enlightens and blesses with temporal good, even those who do not receive it as the light of eternal life.

3. The scriptures have commanded the admiration of men, as containing the purest code of morality. The antiquary values the Bible because it furnishes him with information of the past, to be found in no other book; the philosopher and the legislator have drawn largely from its wisdom, and its laws; thus attesting its great utility for their purposes; and we cheerfully acknowledge that no one need open the word of God without being benefited in some way; yet we prize it chiefly, because it contains the offer of pardon to the condemned, of cleansing to the polluted; the way of reconciliation between the just and holy Creator, and the unholy offending creature; because it bids the prisoners go free; blesses the destitute and the miserable with unsearchable riches, and everlasting consolation

The natural condition of man in the sight of God, is that of

* Missionary Chronicle, vol. 1840, page 197.

guilt and criminality of the most heinous character. Depraved in heart, his life has been one enormous transgression. In consequence of this, divine justice, which at first appointed the wages of sin to be eternal death, has now condemned every soul of man "to drink the burning cup their sins have filled, with everlasting woe," and the unconverted sinner is every moment liable to the execution of the dreadful sentence by which he will be consigned to the worm and the flame of the second death. Whilst thus hastening unconsciously, to the prison house of despair, the gospel meets him by the way, and in accents of deep and moving compassion, warns him to 'flee from the wrath to come'—to 'hasten his escape from the wind and storm and tempest', to 'sport no longer on the crumbling brink of the great gulf.' The sinner recognizes a voice that had oft 'addressed him in the path of worldliness and vanity' and which he had as oft silenced amid the revellings of unholy pleasure, but now there is an awakening energy in the exhortation, which seizes upon his conscience, and by which arrested, he would fain heed the kindly warning; but bowed beneath the weight of accumulated guilt, he realizes at once the fearful extent of his danger, and his utter inability to divest himself of the 'iron' which has been riveted on his soul by the transgressions of a whole life. Again mercy pleads, "Behold my hands, my feet, my side! these bleeding evidences that I have paid your ransom—that justice is satisfied—that your heavenly Father, unwilling that you should perish, has accepted the sacrifice of my life for yours, and is even now waiting to receive you into the number of his reconciled children. Read in these wounds of my body the free pardon of all your transgressions, and your full title to all the inheritance of the saints in light. Come then, poor weary, heavy laden sinner, come unto me and rest in the enjoyment of my love! The sinner trembling and astonished at the wonderful change wrought within him as he beheld the flowing of atoning blood, arises a new creature, and falls into the arms of his compassionate Redeemer, a trophy of sovereign grace. Thus united to Christ the good Shepherd, he shall want no good thing; the same almighty power that redeemed his life from destruction, shall crown him with loving kindness, and tender mercy; and preserve him through faith, unto eternal salvation. When hard pressed in sore temptation, he faints not, for he hears his Saviour's voice—"My grace shall be sufficient for you." But if overtaken in a fault, he is led again to the fountain which has been opened for sin and uncleanness, and he departs not thence till the last crimson stain is washed from his soul. When mourning over the unavoidable afflictions of life; again he hears the language of sweet, sustaining consolation, "Let not your heart be troubled, ye believe in God, believe also in me; In my Father's house, are many mansions; if it were not so, I would have told you; I go to prepare a place for you." Thus the Christian is assured of a future life of immortal blessedness; and his bosom filled with every holy aspiration after that better world, while his soul is sanctified and made meet to inherit the kingdom prepared for the righteous from the foundation of the world. And when he approaches the dark vale which separates him from his eternal home, the rod and staff of the Comforter is with him, and he departs with the triumphant assurance

that he shall dwell forever in that holy presence where are undying pleasures, and fulness of joy.

If this be the gospel, what is it but that "priceless pearl" to obtain which, justifies our parting with all things else! And who that has it in possession, would relinquish it for the honours and the wealth of worlds! What needs there then, another argument to prove that this gospel should be preached to every creature in all the world? This gospel should be preached wherever there is a mourning spirit to be comforted, or a broken heart to be bound up. Wherever are to be found the helpless, the destitute, and the perishing—wherever tyranny sports with its unresisting victim, or the object writhes beneath the oppressor's frown—wherever sin has stamped its broad and deep stain of ruinous pollution—wherever man is in rebellion against his Maker, and as a sinner, destined to reap the reward of his doings amidst the quenchless flame of the second death—wherever there is a heart, or a tongue, which by the grace of God, may be inflamed with love to the sinner's friend, or attuned to swell the loud anthem to the bleeding Lamb—there—in all the world—to every creature, should be proclaimed, this precious gospel of the grace of God.

J. P. C.

NOTICES, RECEIPTS, ACCOUNTS, ANSWERS TO LETTERS, &c.

MARCH 16 TO MAY 14.—*New Subscribers.*—James Ramsay, Clifton, Clinton Co., Illinois, to begin with April; by order of Rev'd James Stafford.—Robert Ritchie, Esq. Petersburg, Va. \$2,50, for 1841, and back numbers sent; by order of J. D., Esq.—P. M. Denmark, Tenn., \$2,50, for Dr. Charles L. Reid, Caroline P. O., Haywood Co., Tenn., whose name is added, and the back Nos. from the beginning of this year sent.—Mrs. Mary Womax, Farmville, Va., from April, '41.—Mr. Edward Reynolds, No. 10, Light street wharf, and Rev'd S. Sewall, Pitt street, Baltimore.—Rev'd D. J. Auld, Plowden's mills P. O., Sumpter district, S. C., name added from January and back Nos. sent.—Rev'd M. D. Fraser, Winborough, S. C. per J. F. M. \$2,50, and name added from April last.

Discontinuances, Changes, &c.—In April, 1840, we were directed to send our Magazine from that time to *P. Loufesty*, St. Charles, Mo., as the name appears on page 246 of the vol. of 1840, and have accordingly sent the numbers regularly to him, until and including the March number of this year, which is returned *refused*; we having never received any thing from Mr. P. L. but the honor of his patronage, and the profit of his having broken and thereby rendered useless, two volumes of our Mag.; for which favors he will be so good as to accept our respectful acknowledgments, with thanks that the case is no worse.—Rev. J. W. Tally's direction changed from Covington to Macon, Georgia, after the April No. had been sent to the former place.—Miss Sarah Jones, Lynchburg, Va., discontinued by order of Rev. W. S. R., to whom she will be so good as to hand \$1, in full.—Mr. McGuffen, by P. M., Washington, Pa., discontinued after the April No. was sent off; subscription for the current year unpaid.—J. S. Havener, Erwinton, Barnwell District, S. C., \$2, and discontinued.

P. M. Harrodsburg, Ky., directs us to discontinue the Magazine sent to *Charles M. Cunningham, Esq.*, who has departed this life; an old friend of our childhood; a man of rare qualities, so combined as to prevent their own force, even though they were themselves preeminent; thus he was, when he could be roused, one of the most eloquent of men, and yet his modesty was so excessive, that he let himself fully out, only on three or four occasions during a career not very short, both in politics and at the bar. He was a son of the venerable and excellent Rev. Robert Cunningham of the south-west, who we believe still lives an ornament to our kind.

Rev. Dr. Morrison, of N. C. \$3, direction changed from Davidson College, to Cottage Home, Lincoln Co., (after sending the May No. to the former place), and Mag. to be stopped at the end of this year.—The copy heretofore sent to Asa D.

Gore, New Orleans, to be sent after May, '41, to Amos Gore, Cincinnati, Ohio, by order of the first named.—Rev. S. Hoge, changed from Shiloh to Trenton, Tenn.

Payments, &c.—George Dunn, Esq., Petersburg, Va., by the hands of Mr. Donnon, \$10, which pays to the end of this year.—John R. Gray, Easton, Pa., \$2,50, for 1841, by the hands of Wm. Gray.—Rev. John Leyburn of Petersburg, Va., \$2,50 for '41, by J. D., Esq'r.—Wm. Chapman, Baltimore Co., \$2,50, which pays for 1840.—Wm. McClannahan, Esq., Baltimore Co., Md., \$2,50, for '41.—Benj. Douglass, Esq., New Orleans, \$2,50, for '41.—P. M. Denmark, Tenn., \$2,50, for Mr. A. Vancourt, for '41.—J. P. McMullen, \$10, which pays all arrears, and for this year and next.—James Wilson, Marietta, Lancaster Co., Pa., \$2,50, for 1841.—Rev. S. H. McDonald, of Cumberland, Maryland, \$7, of which 2,50, for Major John Mitchell, for '41; \$2,50, for Rev. M. Raymond, Springfield, Va., for '41, and the remainder to the credit of Mr. McD. himself.—\$7,50, sent by Rev. Wm. S. White, Charlottesville, Va., by the hands of Col. Bocoock, and for which we receipted to him, paid Mr. W.'s subscription for '41; and that of Rev. S. W. Blane, of Va., for '40 and '41.—Rev. Dr. Duncan Brown, of Maury Co., Tenn., \$5, on account, and the double number for May and June, 1840, sent to him; with thanks for his kind letter of April 7.—Henry McKeen, Esq., Phila., by the hands of Rev'd A. M., \$3,75, in full to the end of this year.—Rev. J. C. Coit, of Cheraw, S. C., \$7,50, on account, per J. F. M.—P. M. Moscow, N. Y., \$3, of which \$2,50 for N. M. Holbrook, for '41, and the rest to the credit of Mr. D. Frazer.

We have received the letter of *Mr. John Kemp*, of New Orleans, dated April 20, remitting \$50, (premium included,) collected from various subscribers to our Mag. in that city; which will be credited as directed; and the changes and discontinuances also made. We are much obliged by this kindness; and venture to commend this sort of active patronage to other friends of this Magazine. Without the kind, voluntary, and efficient aid of our friends, we cannot hold our own, much less advance; for we have no paid agents in the field, and never had; and we seem to have fallen so entirely under the ban of the press, that even the religious newspapers, seldom notice our monthly table of contents. The opinions we hold and the doctrines we defend, are so out of favor with one party and another, in this crooked generation, that our own patrons seem to be our only reliance for support in the advocacy of them. We respectfully suggest the great advantage to our common cause likely to accrue from a decided increase in the circulation of this work; and call their attention to it as to a matter which they alone can accomplish. And they can do it; for we are bold to say, no periodical in this or any other country, can produce a list of eight or nine hundred patrons, more capable of moving and more worthy of directing public sentiment. The *credits, changes and discontinuances*, of Mr. K.'s letter follow.

Collections for subscriptions to Balt. Lit. and Rel. Magazine.

From John Kemp—for his own Subscriptions for 1840 and 1841,	-	\$5 00
“ Master John Kemp, Lawrenceville, 1841,	-	2 50
“ Mrs. Ann Kemp, N. York, 1841,	-	2 50
“ Mr. Mark Walton, N. York, 1841,	-	2 50
“ “ Jss. Clunas, N. Orleans, 1840 and '41,	-	5 00
“ “ G. Z. Relf, do. 1841,	-	2 50
To be stopt after the { “ J. H. Howard, do. 6 mos. of 1841,		1 25
June number. { “ “ Sam'l Locke, do. 6 mos. of 1841,		1 25
To be stopped now, { “ “ John M. Hall, do. - - -		75
“ “ P. N. Wood, do. 1841,	-	2 50
“ “ John A. Marritt, do. “ - - -	-	2 50
“ “ T. D. Day, do. “ - - -	-	2 50
“ “ J. J. Day, do. “ - - -	-	2 50
“ “ T. B. Winston, do. “ (direction to be changed		
to Mary, W. Terrill, Mount Pleasant, Ohio—till end of year, then stopped,)		2 50
To be stopped at the { for Mr. Isaac Bridge, N. O. 1841,		2 50
and of the year. { “ “ J. B. Watton, “ “ - - -		2 50
“ “ S. C. Simmons, “ “ - - -		2 50
“ “ Q. Hadden, “ “ - - -		2 50
“ “ H. O. Ames, “ “ - - -		2 50
“ “ S. Franklin, “ “ (on account, to		
make even sum,)	-	1 75

Total, - \$50 00

By Rev. J. G., \$7,50, for Mr. James Wilson, Col. J. M. Porter, and Thomas McKean, Esq., of Easton, Pa., for 1841.—Rev'd Dr. S. B. Wilson, Fredericksburg, Va., \$5, for '40 and '41; and he will be pleased to accept our thanks for his kind letter.—Rev. John McCluskey, West Alexandria, Pa., \$5, for '40 and '41.—William Myrover, of N. C., \$5, for '40 and '41.

WE PRESENT our respectful salutations to the "*Sisters of the holy Virgin, Ladies of Mount Carmel*," who hold forth in Aisquith street, and have to inform them that we are acquainted with their diligent kindness, in circulating the speech of R. Wickhiffe against the senior editor of this periodical, by means of the pupils of their school; and at present we hold under advisement the question, whether we will, as a mark of our gratitude, dedicate to them the reply we are preparing; or, as a duty to society, cause them to be indicted for uttering a false and malicious libel.

THE PURITAN, a spirited orthodox Congregational newspaper, published at Boston, heads an article (paper of May 6,) '*Congregationalism and Slavery*;' and in it, amongst other odd things, says, "It is worthy of notice, that in those states where slavery exists, there is no Congregationalism." Is there no slavery in S. Carolina? None in Georgia? Let the editors enquire whether there has not long been some Congregationalism in both those states. Moreover what are all the Baptist churches in this country, but strictly Congregational in church order? And do not the editors of the Puritan know that of all denominations of Christians in the slave-holding states, the Baptists are the most numerous and the most connected with slavery?—Try again, brethren.

WE RECEIVE many anonymous letters, but hardly ever take any notice of them. If the one signed "*A Protestant Mother*," and dated Baltimore, May 5th—is genuine and represents a real case—we should be happy to have an interview with the writer. Until we are satisfied on this point, we judge it to be needless to say or do any thing more in the matter.

THE FOLLOWING is from an eye and ear witness of the scene, which he narrates, under date of May 3. "I was walking the streets of P——, and seeing a crowd before the Mayor's office, stepped in. A little boy had just been taken up for begging and stealing. Amongst other questions asked and answers given, were the following: *Mayor*. What does your mother do with the money she gets? *Child*. She pays the rent with it. *Mayor*. What does she do with what is left? *Child*. I mus'nt tell, Sir. *M*. Yes you must, though; tell me directly or I will put you in the house of correction. Does she give it to the priest? *C*. Y-e-s, Sir! *M*. How does he get it from her? *C*. By quarrelling with her. The boy's name is ——; he has two brothers in the penitentiary, and one in the navy. His mother is a poor Irish woman, and pays the priest every cent she can raise, to get her husband out of Purgatory! Oh! what wickedness." So far our correspondent. Well may he say, 'oh! what wickedness.' But it is the natural and common fruit of popery.

THE CONTRAST. "Donnez moi vite L'extreme onction:" *Give me quickly extreme unction*. These were the last words of MR. JEANJEAN, a priest of the Roman church lately deceased in New Orleans; as they are reported with high satisfaction in the "*Catholic Telegraph*," (of Cincinnati,) May 8, 1841.—*Κυριε Ιησου δεξα το πνευμα μου*; *Lord Jesus receive my spirit*. These were the last words of STEPHEN, a Deacon of the church of Christ, as reported Acts vii. 59. There seems to us a difference between these men and these churches.

CONTRADICTORY TESTIMONY. "But Robert J. Breckinridge, seems incapable of writing any thing where abolitionists are concerned, without indulging in a rancorous hostility equally unbecoming his talents, his profession—for he is a clergyman—and his manhood." (*Anti-Slavery Reporter, New York, May, 1841, p. 173*: LEWIS TAPPAN, *Editor*).—"Robert J. Breckinridge, is a thorough Abolitionist." (REV. A. CONVERSE, of Phila.; REV. E. WHITE, of S. C.; MR. SHORE, P. M. Petersburg, Va.; R. WICKLIFFE, Esq., Ky.; &c. &c., *passim*.) "Robert J. Breckinridge, is a thorough paced pro-slavery man." (RALPH WARDLAW, D.D., Scotland; GEORGE THOMPSON, England; W. L. GARRISON, BOSTON; J. G. BIRNEY, U. S. A.; &c. &c.—*passim*.)

THE
BALTIMORE LITERARY
AND
RELIGIOUS MAGAZINE.

VOL. VII.]

JULY, 1841.

[No. 7.

[Continued from page 255.]

MOLINISM.

No. VII.

XII. *Congregations de auxiliiis under Paul V.*

PAUL V., was elected May 16, 1605. He was crowned May 29, 1605, and held the first congregation on the 14th of September, 1605. This was the Pope that forbade the Catholics of England to take the oath of allegiance to James I., of England. The first congregation held by Paul V., was the 79th in the whole series. The interval between the death of Clement VIII. and the first congregation held by Paul, was employed by the Jesuits in efforts to prevent Paul V. from resuming the subject. The Cardinal Du Perron renewed his solicitations in the name of Henry IV. the king of France, that same king who within less than five years fell under the poniard of Ravailiac. Du Perron urged that the affair was too important to be decided without a general council, and suggested the fear that a decision by the pope would not be received in France. Bellarmine for his part proposed twenty propositions which he thought would suffice to keep the faithful not only from real error, but from all appearance of Calvinism or Pelagianism, yet in reality his propositions amounted to about the same thing as the compromise of the Jesuit Gaillard, already mentioned; but Lemos did not think them precise even on the head of predestination, and entirely insufficient as to all other matters in dispute. They allowed the Thomists, however, the liberty to teach the doctrine of efficacious grace, but Lemos and his associates, insisted that the liberty of teaching error should be taken from the Jesuits. In August, the Jesuits presented a petition to Paul V., in which they complained of the examiners, and among other things, said that the whole controversy turned upon a question of fact, viz., what were the sentiments of Augustine and Thomas upon the questions in controversy? and that such a dispute did not concern the faith; thus taking a distinction which the Jansenists shortly afterwards made, though the Jesuits and their party refused to allow

it. Their allegation, however, was in this instance, false. In the mean time, the examiners appointed by Clement VIII., pressed Paul V. to consummate the matter; and Peter Lombard, the archbishop of Armach, who was at their head, presented a writing to Paul V., in which he labored to convince the pope of the necessity of immediate action. Paul V. hesitated a while, but finally resolved at the solicitations of cardinal Monopoli, to finish it. In fact the cardinals assembled in conclave after the death of Clement VIII., agreed solemnly, that whoever of them should be elected, he would bring the matter to a conclusion. Paul then appointed a meeting to be held on the 14th of September, at which and the succeeding congregations he attended in person. He summoned the surviving prelates and examiners who had been employed by Clement VIII. This was the sixth examination. It continued six months, and seventeen congregations were held.

During this examination, the Jesuits contended that the doctrine of efficacious grace and predestination, as taught by their opponents, was in absolute conformity with what they called the errors of the Calvinists. But the examiners came to the same conclusion as before. The discussions being finished, the pope deliberated with twelve cardinals, on the question whether it was expedient to pronounce a definitive judgment. Ten of the twelve thought it expedient. Bellarmine and Du Perron were of the opposite opinion, the first, out of affection for the Society of Jesuits, and the last in obedience to Henry IV., of France, whose minister he was. The Jesuits strove to procrastinate the decision. The pope at length had a bull prepared, upon which a good deal of time and labor was bestowed, but it was never published, for reasons now to be mentioned.

The Senate of Venice had made two decrees which were adverse to the interests of the papal see within their republic. By one of them (adopted in 1603,) the Senate prohibited under severe penalties, the founding of new monasteries, or the establishing of new hospitals without their permission. By the other decree (adopted in 1605,) it was ordered that no person should give or bequeath or sell or alien in perpetuity any real estate in favour of ecclesiastical persons, without the consent of the Senate. Besides *these offences* they had imprisoned a canon named Scipio Larrazina, and an abbot named Brandolino Valdemarino, both of whom were accused of enormous crimes. Pope Paul V., regarding these proceedings as an invasion of his rights threatened the Senate, if they did not revoke these decrees and enlarge these prisoners, he would lay their state under an interdict, that is, he would forbid the performance of any public act of religion. The Senate replied that they could not enlarge the prisoners as they were accused of crimes of secular cognizance, nor revoke laws which they had a right to make, and which they thought necessary for the good of the state. The pope was angry and executed his threat. He also excommunicated the Doge and the Senate. The Doge protested in the name of the Senate, and the senate ordered the prelates and the superiors of the religious communities to continue religious services as they had before the interdict. The Jesuits refused to obey this order. The Senate then

compelled them to withdraw from the states of Venice. This was in May, 1606. The Capuchins and Theatins, who had followed the example of the Jesuits shared their fate. Troubles and seditions followed, which the Senate charged upon the Jesuits, and on the 14th of June, 1606, the Senate decreed, that the Jesuits should not thereafter be received in any place within their states. The Senate added, that the decree should not be afterwards revoked unless upon the reading of the whole proceeding in the presence of the whole Senate composed of at least 180 Senators, nor upon a less majority than five votes to one. When the troubles between the pope and the republic were composed through the mediation of Henry IV., (April, 1607,) the Senate adhered to their resolution not to allow the re-establishment of the Jesuits, and the pope felt himself obliged to indemnify the Society for the losses they had incurred by a blind obedience to his decrees.

Du Perron availed himself of this affair, which had endeared the Jesuits to Paul V., and he endeavored to persuade the pope to suspend his judgment. He urged that it would be very severe to cast so great a slur over the society, by deciding against them in a matter to which the attention of the whole church had been so long turned; at a time too, when they had incurred so great loss for the interests of the court of Rome.

The pope yielded to the motive. He called an assembly of Cardinals on the 28th of August, 1607, and three days after he called the generals of the two orders (Dominicans and Jesuits,) and gave them a writing in which he declared that the disputants and the examiners of the matter *de auxiliis* might return to their homes, and that he would publish his decision when he thought fit. In the mean time he forbade the parties to use harsh or censorious language towards each other, and threatened both Dominicans and Jesuits with severe punishment, in case of disobedience in this particular. This decree was published throughout Catholic Europe. On the 1st of December, 1611, there was also a decree made by the Inquisition, which forbade the printing of any writing upon the matters discussed in the congregations *de auxiliis*, without the permission of the Inquisition, even under pretext of a commentary on St. Thomas.

Thus these celebrated congregations ended. The reader is now desired to collate two points in the system of the Jesuits, which were so presented to the mind of the pope as to test the question whether he cared most for the interests of religion, or the temporal interests of the see of Rome.

The reader remembers that the Jesuits in substance denied that the efficacy of grace depends upon the omnipotence and sovereign dominion of God exercised over the will of man as well as over all other creatures. This was the doctrine (generally stated) which was the principal subject of the protracted discussions in the congregations. Paul V., was convinced that the views of the Jesuits upon this subject were erroneous, and as has been observed, had caused a bull to be prepared by which he condemned them.

The other point in the system of the Jesuits which the reader is desired to recall, and which they carried into practice, in the affair

of the pope with the republic of Venice, was this: They held that the spiritual power of the pope was unlimited, and they held, also, that his power extends even to the temporal affairs of states and kingdoms. These two tenets, then, the one regarding the power of God, over the hearts of men—the other regarding the power of the pope, in matters spiritual and temporal, (so to speak) were placed by the occurrences of the time, in opposite scales, and the latter proved in the judgment of the pope to be the most weighty. He sacrificed—so far as in him lay—the real right and control which God exercises over the hearts of men, to the chimerical rights of the papal see, over the temporal government of states. The issue of this dispute, is an epoch in the downward course of heresy, predicted by the Apostle Paul. In fact, it was the triumph of the Jesuits, and serves as a land-mark to denote the more rapid deflection of the Roman Catholic church, (commencing with the Council of Trent, where, as the reader has seen, this new theology was broached by Lainez,) from the Bible, towards the absolute extinction of truth in utter apostacy. The reader will not suppose, from this remark, that either Baius or any of the Dominicans who opposed the Jesuits so strenuously, or Jansenius, Quesnel, or the men of Port Royal, held the truth in gospel simplicity. On the contrary, these men held to many gross errors, which neutralized to a great extent, the power of the truths which they held; yet as compared with the Jesuits they were much superior, in their religious character, and held in a larger measure the doctrines of grace.

The opponents of the Jesuits were wont to allege that the increasing troubles in their church were to be ascribed to the prevalence of what they called Molinism. They referred to the 10th chapter of Romans to prove that the Jews were rejected of God because they went about to establish their own righteousness, that is because they thought they could find within themselves the source of holiness, and did not look to God for that which alone could make them righteous. In the 11th chapter of Romans, Paul threatened the Gentiles that if they fell into the same infidelity, they should be cut off. On this ground the heresy of the Jesuits came to be regarded by their opponents as a token that the Roman Catholic church might speedily be abandoned, to similar blindness and ruin.

The reader may find very ample information on this subject in the history of these congregations in the work of P. Serri, already referred to (2d edition, published in 1709). He may also refer to a work entitled, *l'Histoire de la Congregation de auxiliis justifie contre l'auteur des questions importantes à Louvain in 1702, and Le correcteur corrigée a Namur, 1704.*

XIII. *The different conduct of the Jesuits and Dominicans after the suppression of the judgment of Paul V.*

The Jesuits rejoiced greatly at the course adopted by Paul V., at the termination of the congregations *de auxiliis*. In Spain especially, they had public rejoicings. They used all means in their power, to prevent Paul V. from afterwards publishing his judgment. The Dominicans, on the contrary, were greatly dejected at the conduct of the Pope, and urged it upon him and his successors to

promulgate the decision which had already been drawn up—a proof that both parties were fully apprized of the conclusions which that pope had adopted. The Jesuits would not have considered a suspension of the judgment of the pope, a victory gained by them, if they had supposed it to be in their favour. Time was what they wanted, in order to acquire credit for their doctrines, and they gained time, and with time, a preponderating influence for their Society. It was the effect of papal politics, and the intrigues of the Jesuits. The more sound portion of that church declared this result to be the execution of a terrible judgment of God.

We may stop a moment to make a single reflection upon the sentiment last expressed; The providences of God are full of instruction, and we must study them arduously and carefully, if we would gain even a small proportion of the knowledge which they are designed to yield. No period in the history of the church is more interesting, in some respects, than that period which includes the reformation. Many persons have supposed that this period is symbolically described in the tenth chapter of the Revelations; but whether this opinion be correct or not, we cannot avoid the conclusion, that God in his kingdom of providence and grace, interposed in a remarkable manner in the transactions of that period. It is also supposed by some, that the reformation, (or the events, whatever they may be, which form the subject of this tenth chapter,) are separated by less than *a time* from the conclusion of the *time, times* and dividing of *a time* spoken of by the prophet Daniel. This opinion is founded upon the literal translation of the last clause in verse 6th, which is not "that time shall be no longer," nor yet "that there shall be no longer delay" but "*that a TIME shall not be yet,*" that is, a time in the prophetic sense, (or 360 years,) shall not be yet to elapse or run from the commencement of the period marked by the descent of the angel before the mystery of God shall be finished. However this may be, the period of time with which we are concerned is the most remarkable in modern history. But the suggestion we were about to make, is this: that until the epoch of the reformation, the church of Rome contained within its bosom a much larger number of true worshippers, than there is reason to believe, it has had at any time since. It is believed that there were multitudes of true Christians who lived until then in secret under the protection of its shield. How else can we account for the sudden, rapid and wide-spread effects of the efforts of the reformers? That church had indeed long before, become exceedingly corrupt. Still it was so ordered, that she should preserve the necessary means of grace for the benefit of the truly faithful within her bosom. But when the reformed churches were established, they became so many depositories in which these means could be stored and preserved for the use and nourishment of the true church. The exigency, so to speak, which until then required restraint upon the progress of error in that apostatizing church, was met and supplied by new providential expedients, and accordingly, (as we have seen,) the sect or Society of Jesuits, was permitted to rise (in the Roman Catholic church), coterminously with the Protestant communions, and to prevail in a most wonderful manner; whose aim it

was to corrupt the doctrines of grace, and to accommodate the religious instructions of that church to the depraved taste of the ungodly world. This was the system, already in some measure, spoken of, and which the first Jesuits described as *his nostris temporibus accommodator*. The Roman church had long been at friendship with the world. It had flourished by aid of the temporal power—was under the guidance of wicked worldly men—and as a judgment for this sin, it seemed to be abandoned to the guidance of a body of men yet more corrupt, whose aim was to obtain the empire of the world by means of religion. Then the dim light of that church, suddenly became much more dim. The Council of Trent enacted idolatries and superstitions into laws, which being forced upon the consciences of men by persecutions and wars, became the means of expelling all at once vast numbers who loved the truth, but would have been willing still to abide within the bosom of that church.

If there could be a doubt then, in the mind of any person, whether the church of Rome was entirely apostate before the Reformation, it is suggested that there is much less reason to doubt upon that question since that event. There may have been sufficient reasons for preserving that church from entire and utter apostacy, until God in his providence should provide new channels for the preservation and the transmission of the means of grace. If this reflection is just, we may see a reason why the Society of Jesuits should come into existence coterminously with the reformed communions—we can see, also, why they should be permitted to become the chief antagonists of the reformation, and why they should be permitted (while receding widely from the essential doctrines of the gospel) to carry with them almost the entire body of the Roman Catholic church. But to resume our narrative.

The Duke of Lerma undertook to mediate between the Jesuits and Dominicans and convened the chief men of the two orders in April, 1612. Terms were agreed upon, which the Jesuits broke in the month of May following; which led the Duke to say that a peace which rests upon the word of the Jesuits, is very tottering. In June, of that year, the Dominicans presented a petition to the Pope to publish his judgment and revoke the prohibition to discuss these matters, and the King of Spain supported their request. In 1622, also, they again petitioned pope Gregory XV. In this petition they declared, "that the subject was highly important, since they were in danger of establishing Pelagianism by authority, which, according to Jerome, contained the poison of all heresies." They urged the subject also upon Urban VIII., Innocent X., and (even 60 years afterwards) upon Innocent XI. The motives by which these petitions were enforced or set forth in the memorial presented to Paul V., in 1612, which had been drawn up by Lanuza, several years before, but was enlarged and corrected by Lemos. This piece may be found in the *History of the Congregations de auxiliiis*. On the other hand, the Jesuits were not inactive. Several anonymous writings were addressed to Paul V., and the reasons urged to prevent the action of that Pope, are worthy of notice. One was that the defenders of Molina had become so numerous,

that it would be difficult to enforce a decision against them—that they had the control of the education of the young, and that the Roman Catholic church being greatly agitated by (what they called) heresies, it was inexpedient to decide the controversy between the Jesuits and the Dominicans at that time. The first two of these reasons, which we take it, were founded in fact, shows the rapid spread of the Jesuitical theology, and the sure means taken by the Society to make it coextensive with the church after another generation. They go also, to fortify the observation just made concerning the rapid apostacy of that church from the origin of that Society, which in general terms may be stated as coeval with the reformation.

Lemos, (a Dominican,) who replied to one of these pieces, said in reference to the last of the reasons above mentioned, that it only showed the more strongly the necessity of condemning Molinism; because God permitted the increase of heresies (meaning the Protestant communions,) only because this heresy (of Molina and the Jesuits) was not condemned; which heresy (viz. Molinism) destroyed the merits and the passion of our Lord Jesus Christ, by annihilating the doctrine of efficacious grace which was the fruit of those merits: for said Lemos, the opinion of Molina ascribes directly to free will, that which is the proper effect of the grace of Jesus Christ.

This sentiment, to a certain extent, coincides with a view already expressed. We do not of course admit the correctness of this author's views concerning the Reformation, yet, as we have already suggested, the rapid spread of Protestant principles, and the formation of new communions out of the *pale* of the Roman church, and the spread of Molinism within the *pale* of it, both occurred by the appointment and permission of God, as already explained.—But to proceed.

In 1613, the University of Louvain renewed their censures against Lessius and Hamelius which induced Aquaviva, then general of the Jesuits, to publish a decree, in which he ordered the Society to maintain the doctrine of *Congruism* to the exclusion of what was commonly called *pure Molinism*. He required them to teach gratuitous predestination, and at the same time to teach the doctrines concerning the efficacy of grace which the Society had maintained in the *Congregations de auxiliis*. "God," said he, "in virtue of his efficacious decree and of the intention which he has infallibly to produce good in us, designedly chooses the means and gives them in a manner and at a time when he sees they will infallibly have their effect. Instead of these means, he would have employed others, if he had foreseen that these would have been inefficacious." That is to say he required the Society to combine or unite the doctrines of gratuitous predestination and efficacious grace by means of the subtleties of the *Scientia media*. In fact, however, the Jesuits taught pure Molinism or rather Pelagianism. They endeavored by false inferences to render both the doctrine of gratuitous predestination and efficacious grace odious.—The Dominicans, though much more sound in doctrine, regarded the pope as almost the only authority in the church. They feared to press

matters to extremeties, and many of them by degrees lost sight of the importance of the doctrines of grace. In short, they were not the men to defend those doctrines worthily, and they fell far short of the Port-Royalists, who at a subsequent period became the chief opposers of the Jesuits, when that Society had greatly increased in numbers and influence, and their opinions had taken deeper root, and of course a successful opposition was much more difficult.

XIV. *The effect of the Papal policy upon the Thomists.*

The Dominicans pretended to adhere to the substance of their doctrine, though most of them did it by expedients which gave great advantage to the Jesuits, at the expense of the doctrines of grace. To mention no other, they obscured these doctrines by adopting expressions in vogue among the Molinists—they even adulterated them by employing subtleties favourable to their opponents. After the termination of the Congregations *de auxiliis*, the Thomists, for the most part, were afraid to speak of doctrines of grace, as Lemos and his companions did during those Congregations. Had they maintained that these doctrines were fundamental and absolutely essential to all religion, and that it was impossible to deny them without falling into the errors of Pelagius, that would have amounted to a condemnation of the popes who refused to condemn the contrary opinion. It would also have been a direct attack on the Jesuits, whose power was becoming more and more formidable every day. For these reasons, they took the lower position of defending their opinion, as one of the schools, and as being more conformable to Scripture and the fathers, but without condemning the contrary opinions.

But another thing which had great influence, was the adoption of the phrase or term, *sufficient grace*. This phrase carries the idea of a grace which *sufficeth* beyond which or over and above which, no one has need of any aid or succour in order to do good. The Molinists maintain that God gives only such graces as do not determine the will of man, but, say they, that is sufficient for man, who find in himself all the rest, and who by the aid of such succour only, succeeds or prevails to do good, by joining to it the determination which comes solely and in the first instance, from his own free will. According to these views, that measure of grace may be called *sufficient grace*, though it does not determine the will to good, because man, in order to do good, has no need of any other or greater gift or grace from God.

But the Thomists had all along maintained that man never does good except by aid of *efficacious grace*, which determines his will to good: they could not, therefore, consistently with their own principles acknowledge any *grace sufficient*, unless it be also *efficacious*, and they ought to have retained the word *efficacious* or *effectual*, as the doctors of Louvain did, when they declared that *grace sufficient* for conversion, is grace which converts, and grace which does not convert, does not suffice. *Gratia ad conversionem sufficiens, ipsa convertit; quæ vero non convertit, non sufficit.*

But by admitting the idea of *sufficient grace* as something different from the idea of *efficacious grace*, they departed from their own

principles; yet the Thomists tried to maintain their consistency, and they did it in this way: they denominated certain feeble emotions which God excites in the soul, inclining it to good, but which the will resists, *sufficient grace*—that is as the men of Port Royal afterwards expressed it—they called exciting grace, *sufficient grace*. At the same time, they maintained, that in order effectually to do that which is good, a man needs grace beyond this; namely, *efficacious grace*;—that is to say, this grace which they called sufficient, does not suffice; because the recipient of this sufficient grace, must have grace over and above such sufficient grace—upon the ground of such phraseology so understood, though absurdly enough, the Thomists could unite with the Jesuits in saying, that “a man who does not do good, yet has sufficient grace to do it,” and in this other expression, that “although a man may have sufficient grace to do good, yet it will not follow from that fact, that he will actually do good.”

The Thomists also admitted another phrase equally repugnant to their system. According to the doctrine of Molina, a man who does not do good may at the same time have a full and complete power to do it, because he may have at the very time, according to that system, such and so much power, that he has none more or further to expect from God. But the principles of the Thomists followed out, led them to maintain that in order to do good *in effect*, every man needs to receive from God, *effectual aid*; that is, aid which in fact determines his will to do good, and without which he never will do it, and consistently, therefore, they could not admit of a next, or full and complete power (*potestas proxima*,) to do good, which should prove ineffectual. In short, the Thomists compromised with error, in this way; while they rejected the error itself, they adopted the language in which it was expressed,—and this idea is very clearly developed by Pascal, in his second Provincial, which the reader is requested to refer to upon this subject.

But the Thomists also adulterated their system, to some extent, with the subtleties of the opposing system—with those, for example, which grew out of the notion of a *status naturæ puræ*. This notion has already been referred to. But it may be proper to add in this place, that in the theology of the Jesuits, nature is represented under many conditions or states, as *status naturæ puræ*, which includes (to use their own phrase,) *duplicem carentiam; primam peccati; quia homo in puris naturalibus creatus, consideratur sine peccato;—secundam, gratiæ et donorum supernaturalium et etiam gratuitarum perfectionum—(2,) status naturæ integræ—(3,) status naturæ elevatæ—(4,) status naturæ, innocentis—(5,) status naturæ lapsæ—(6,) status naturæ reparatæ.*

A consequence of the notion of *pure nature*, (for we shall not transcribe their definitions of all these states,) as above defined, was this, viz., that a man in that condition, would be subject to the infirmities of nature,—such as we now are subject to; but he would not be ordained or appointed to the intuitive and supernatural vision of God; but only to the abstract and natural vision of God.—So the Jesuits express it.—The use which the Jesuits made of this notion has been briefly mentioned: it was used as a covert to Pe-

lagian opinions, yet it has been observed that some of these disputants adopted the notion although they maintained correct opinions concerning the power which God exercises on the hearts of men. Many of the Thomists took up this notion of a *status naturæ puræ*. It is said that the bull of Pius V., against Baius, inclined them to do so.—Pius V., was of their order, and their respect for his bull was extravagant. They regarded it as a rule upon the matters of which it treated. To show an application of this notion of *pure nature*, the reader may be reminded of the opinions of Roman Catholics upon the necessity of baptism. They hold it, as is well known, to be indispensable to salvation; yet Alvarez, who was the coadjutor of Lemos, in maintaining the cause of the Dominicans, carried the consequences of this doctrine of the *status naturæ puræ* so far as to say, that infants who died without baptism, (and who, according to his views, would be, as to all important or essential intents, in that condition,) experience no pain either internal or external in the other life, which, it was said, by the opponents of that doctrine, *destroyed the doctrine of original sin*:—Dupin Hist. du 17 Siecle T. I, p. 186. It is hardly necessary to say that the doctrine of original sin does not depend upon any such considerations. But this notion, considered in connection with the Roman Catholic doctrine concerning the sacraments, purgatory, and the limbo of infants, may, for ought we know, tend to the conclusion above stated. But besides this, the doctrine of the *status naturæ puræ*, adopted by some of the leading Dominicans, was highly favourable and even necessary to the system of the Jesuits, and it was the more advantageous to them in their disputes, because it was adopted by their opponents.

This opinion also tended to depress the standard of moral obligation. The Thomists who embraced it, relaxed their views of the duty of men to refer all their actions to the glory of God, and of the duty of supreme love to God: for let it be believed that a man can be in a condition in which (to use the phraseology of the Jesuits,) he is not obliged to aim at a supernatural end, it may also easily be believed, that there are actions in the life of a man, in that state or condition, which may be sinless and yet performed without reference to the will of God. Still the system of the Thomists was widely different from that of the Jesuits, in respect of Christian morals; for the whole body of the doctrine of the Jesuits tended to laxity in morals.

This doctrine of a state of *pure nature* led also to the conclusion that *sufficient grace* is given to all men; for if men are born in a condition essentially the same as that which they describe the *status naturæ puræ* to be, it follows (so it was said by their opponents) that they are under no obligation to tend or aim after a supernatural end. Grace alone can impose upon them this duty, and hence it follows that grace must be given to all, or else that some men are not obliged to aim after a supernatural end. But the notion which the Thomists had of sufficient grace, differed from that of the Molinists. By *sufficient grace*, the Thomists meant *exciting grace*, (as others called it,) which is *not sufficient* to determine the will to good. In this they departed from Augustine, whom they professed

to follow. He said the opposite, (in Serm. 25, ch. 3). *Communis est omnibus natura; non gratia*—Nature is common to all, but not grace. The Thomists were often greatly perplexed with this theory. They could not give a clear idea of their own views—and this alone gave great advantage to the Jesuits. Finally, this modification of their theology gave a dry, a speculative and a scholastic turn to their writings. They were afraid to treat the doctrines of grace after the manner of Augustin, lest they should be accused of teaching the simple and unlearned polemic theology, and thus incur the displeasure of the Inquisition, which had forbidden all disputation upon the matters in controversy. The doctrines of grace, under such treatment, soon fell into disrepute, and the people learned from these Thomists not much more than they might have learned from Jesuits or Pelagians. This remark, however, is not equally applicable to all of the Thomists—some denied altogether, the notion of the *status naturæ puræ*, and in using the phrase, *sufficient grace*, they explained it in a sense entirely at variance with that of the Jesuits. Yet the foregoing faults were chargeable to the great majority of the Dominicans. They fell into a system of finesse and management in theological controversy, imitating therein their opponents, the Jesuits, of which the reader will find some evidence in the second of Pascal's Provincial Letters, already referred to.—But we have dwelt already too long on this topic, and we shall conclude by requesting the reader to remark, that the result of the fierce collision between these two bodies of the Roman Catholics (the Jesuits and Dominicans,) was decidedly injurious to the latter. Instead of drawing the Jesuits away from their pernicious system, the Dominicans fell by degrees into the errors of their adversaries, and thus tended to accelerate the apostacy of that church, which, as has been observed, received a new *impetus* at the origin and by the efforts of the Society of the Jesuits.

[For the Baltimore Literary and Religious Magazine.]

SKETCHES AND RECOLLECTIONS FROM MY NOTE BOOK.

No. X.

A hierarchy professing infallibility in doctrine and discipline;—governed by an infallible vicegerent of God Almighty, must of necessity either be the most perfect and holy of all institutions out of heaven, or beyond all description or conception, the most atrociously wicked. The claim admits of no neutral or half-way position. Either he who claims to be the "Lord God the Pope"—"God's Vicar-General"—to exercise the functions and occupy the place of the Holy Ghost, among men, as he who wears the tripple crown does, must be of all human beings the most holy and devoted, and in all things likest to him who was "holy, harmless, and separate from sinners," and full of good works, or he must be the most perfidious, base, unprincipled of rational beings next to lost spirits. This position admits of no argument; or if it be a *fact*, notorious, historical facts would substantiate it.

In order to set this question beyond cavil, if not doubt, as well as to exhibit the claim which the papacy has upon the world, we set before your readers in our last number, brief sketches of the personal characters and history of two celebrated popes. That we might do them no injustice, we selected the portion of their memoirs which we presented from a variety of sources, and they all agreed in representing them as *murderous, adulterous, as drunkards and incestuous, without honour, sincerity, fidelity, decency or compunction!*—*In fact, as monsters of iniquity!*

Let us now follow up this subject a little farther, for the purpose of showing that the sample which we gave was both characteristic and fair.

Pope Julius II. The German liberalist, Ranke, whose leaning is evidently popish, says of him—"Old as Julius was, worn by all the vicissitudes of good and evil fortune which he had experienced in the course of his long life, by the toils of war and exile, *enfeebled by intemperance and debauchery*, he yet knew not what fear or caution meant. Age had not robbed him of the grand characteristic of vigorous manhood—an indomitable spirit. He hoped to gain in the tumult of a universal war; his only care was to be always provided with money, so as to be able to seize the favourable moment with all his might; he wanted, as a Venetian aptly said, '*to be lord and master of the game of the world.*'"

Here, even by Ranke, the apologist of the popes, *ambition*, even to lust after the dominion of the world, is alleged against him, as well as *intemperance and debauchery!* Only for a moment think of him who affected to be God's Vicar-General, and to sit as God in the temple of God, being, even in the judgment of his friends, a man of boundless worldly ambition! and in addition, *an intemperate debauchee!*

But hear what another and a more impartial historian says of him: "Julius II., succeeded Alexander in the papacy and in iniquity. His holiness was guilty of simony, chicanery, perjury, thievery, empoisonment, assassination, drunkenness and impudicity.—He bribed the cardinals to raise him to the popedom; and employed on the occasion, all kinds of falsehood and trickery. He swore to convoke a general council, and violated his oath."

His infallibility's drunkenness was proverbial. He was "mighty to drink." He practised incontinency as well as inebriation; and the effects of this crime shattered his constitution.

"Julius offered rewards to any person who would kill a Frenchman. One of these rewards was of an extraordinary, or rather among the popes, of an ordinary kind. He granted a pardon of all sins to any person who would murder only an individual of the French nation. The vicegerent of heaven conferred the forgiveness of all sin, as a compensation for perpetrating the shocking crime of assassination"—So says Edgar, in his *Variations of Popery*.

Bower, another historian, thus describes him: "Julius II., acted more like a Sultan of the Turks, than as the vicar of the Prince of Peace and the common father of all Christians. Two hundred thousand persons are said to have perished in the wars carried on chiefly at the instigation of this furious and blood-thirsty pope.

Julius is charged by *all the contemporary writers* with immoderate drinking. He was a lover of women also, at least before his promotion to the pontificate; and had a daughter named Felice."

Such was the fellow—the drunken, incontinent, murderous fellow—who had the blasphemous audacity to call himself the vicegerent of the Prince of Peace and the God of purity.

Leo X. "Leo X.," says Edgar, "succeeded Julius in the popedom and in enormity. This pontiff has been accused of Atheism, and of calling the gospel, in the presence of cardinal Bembo, a fable. Mirandula, who mentions a pope that denied God, is by some, supposed to have referred to Leo. He was beyond all question addicted to pleasure, luxury, idleness, ambition, unchastity and sensuality, beyond all bounds of decency; and spent whole days in the company of musicians and buffoons."

Bower says, "he was by nature addicted to idleness and pleasure; spending his time with musicians, gesters and buffoons, and inclined to sensual gratifications beyond all bounds of decency."

Waddington speaks of him as "devoted to pleasure, contemptuous of morality—ignorant of the science, careless of the duties, neglectful even of the decencies of religion; vain, extravagant, necessitous and venal."

And yet this *unchaste sensualist*; the infidel who called "the glorious gospel of the blessed God" a fable; nay, but this Atheist who even denied the existence of God, and lived accordingly, "beyond all bounds of decency," among "gesters and buffoons," arrogantly and blasphemously affected to be the vicar general of Him who was not only *holy*, but "separate from sinners!"

Pope Innocent X. Mr. Bower, who wrote the history of this pope at Rome, and had access to authentic documents, says:

"This pope had, before his promotion, an unlawful commerce with his brother's widow, the famous Donna Olympia Maidelchina, a woman of insatiable avarice and boundless ambition; and that commerce he not only continued after his elevation, but suffered her to govern the church, the state, the court, and himself with an absolute sway. All benefices, all employments, whether ecclesiastical, civil, or military, were disposed of by her, and to those only who come up to her price."

Here, then, is another "Lord God, the Pope," raised up to that situation while living in *incest*; and his *holiness* continues this incestuous life, after he was raised to the head of the church universal! And yet this incestuous monster, who subjected the church of the living God to the direction of an incestuous whore, claimed to be *infallible*!

What a frightful picture of human depravity is presented in the history of these atrocious monsters? The reality here leaves imagination even in the rear; for surely no imagination, unless schooled in a brothel, could have ventured half-way towards the declination of such *uncleanness and villany and perfidy and murder*, as sober history records in the lives of a race of men blasphemously assuming the name and attributes and works of Him whom angels and glorified saints call "Holy, Holy, Holy, Lord God Almighty!"

How truly these monstrous and murderous men are represented by the pen of inspiration, as "unclean spirits," coming "out of the

mouth of the dragon?"—As "the false prophet," whose name is a lie; whose pretensions are a lie; and whose lives are a barefaced and impudent lie, in the face of all ages and kingdoms and people! Yes! And whose whole system is at once the grossest fraud and insult that ever was offered to a rational being! When the Duke of Buckingham, on his death-bed, was asked by the Duke of Queensberry, who felt anxious for his spiritual welfare, if he should send him a priest—"No," says he, "those rascals eat their God; but if you know any set of fellows that eat the devil, I should be obliged to you if you would send for one of them."

Can impudence and blasphemy be displayed in a more atrocious and revolting form, than in the exhibition of a poor old man worn out with drunkenness and incest, and putrid with the blood of many murders, making his God out of a bit of dough, and then eating him; and crowning all by calling himself "God's Vicegerent?" Or can credulity and human weakness go farther, or give a more mournful attestation of the reality and depth of the fall be given, than believing in an imposture at once so puerile and blasphemous? Surely such must be given up "to strong delusions to believe a lie."

FOREIGN LABOURS IN THE ABOLITION CONTROVERSY.

No. IX.

*Glasgow Discussion—Fifth Night, concluded—Refutation of Mr. Thompson's charges against the Churches of America.**

FRIDAY, JUNE 17th, 1836.

MR. B. continued—Having now gone through all that the time permitted him to say, of the proof against America, he would lay before them some counter-testimony upon several parts of this great subject. He had at one time greatly feared that he might be obliged to ask them to believe his mere word, perhaps in the face of other proof; but through the goodness of God, he had been put in possession of a very limited file of American newspapers, from the contents of which, he thought he should be able to make out as strong a case for the truth, as he had proved the case against it to be weak and rotten.

There were many denominations of Christians in America. They were of every variety of name and opinion. As to some of the smaller ones, he knew but little, and the present audience perhaps less. He might in general terms say, that the Society of Friends generally, did not tolerate slave-holding among their members; neither did the Covenanters. The Congregationalists, or

* The first part of this article, constituted the latter portion of the speech, which is printed in part on pp. 173—83 of the present volume.

The present article concludes the *Glasgow Discussion*, and our *Foreign Labours* in the Abolition Controversy.

We have it in contemplation, as soon as our controversy with *Robert Wickliffe* of Ky., is brought to a close, to publish in a volume, our principle contributions to the whole *Slavery Controversy*, during the last fifteen years.

Independents, had not, he believed, a dozen churches in all the slave states, and of course, they should be considered as exempt from the charge. It was, however, the less necessary to occupy ourselves in general remarks, inasmuch as Mr. Thompson had laid the stress of his accusations on the three great denominations of America. "He took all the guilt of this system, and he laid it where? On the Church of America. When he said the Church, he did not allude to any particular denomination. He spoke of Baptists, Presbyterians, and Methodists—the three great props—the all-sustaining pillars of that blood-cemented fabric." Such were the words of Mr. T., and it would therefore be needless to trouble ourselves about the minor, if we could settle the major to our satisfaction. As to two of these denominations, he should say but little; his chief and natural business being to defend that one of which he knew most. In regard to the Baptists, he was sorry to be obliged to say, that he believed they were the least defensible of the three denominations now principally implicated; indeed, that some of their Associations had taken ground on the whole case, from which he entirely dissented, and which, he was sure, had given great pain to the majority of their own brethren. He begged leave to refer them to the work of Drs. Cox and Hobby, just through the press, in which he presumed, for he had not seen it, they would find authentic and ample information on this and every other point relating to that denomination in America. In relation to the Methodists, his knowledge was both more full and more accurate. Their discipline denounced slavery, and prohibited their members from owning slaves; and though their discipline itself was not carried into effect with rigid exactness, he did not believe, that there was a Methodist Church in the United States, or upon the earth, which owned slaves, as a church. He believed that very few Methodist preachers owned slaves: and nothing but the most direct proof could for a moment make him believe that one of them was a slave dealer. The whole sect, or at least the great majority of it, might be considered as fairly represented, in the following resolutions passed in the Conference, held at Baltimore; and which could be a set-off to those read by Mr. Thompson, from one of the northern Conferences:—

" METHODIST RESOLUTIONS ON ABOLITIONISM.

At a late meeting of the Baltimore Annual Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, held at Baltimore, the following preamble and resolutions were unanimously adopted, and the names of all the members and probationers present, in number one hundred and fifty-seven, were subscribed and ordered to be published. The Secretary was also directed to furnish the Rev. John A. Collins with a copy, for insertion in the *Globe* and *Intelligencer* of Washington city.

"Whereas, great excitement has pervaded this country for some time past, on the subject of Abolition; and, whereas, such excitement is believed to be destructive to the best interests of the country and religion; therefore,

"1. Resolved, That, 'we are as much as ever convinced of the great evil of slavery.'

"2. That we are opposed, in every part and particular, to the proceedings of the Abolitionists, which look to the immediate, indiscriminate, and general emancipation of slaves.

" 3. That we have no connexion with any press, by whomsoever conducted, in the interest of the Abolition cause:"*

As to his own connection, (the Presbyterian,) he would go as fully as his materials permitted, into the proof of their past principles, and present posture. And, in the first place, he was most happy to be able to present them with an abstract of the decisions of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America. He found it printed in the *New York Observer* of May 23d, 1835, embodied in the proceedings of the Presbytery of Montrose, and transcribed by it no doubt from the Assembly's digest:—

" As early as A. D. 1787, the Synod of New York and Philadelphia issued an opinion adverse to slavery, and recommended measures for its final extinction; and in the year 1795 the General Assembly assured 'all the churches under their care, that they viewed with the deepest concern any vestiges of slavery which then existed in our country; and in the year 1815 the same judicatory decided, 'that the buying and selling of slaves by way of traffic, (meaning, doubtless, the domestic traffic,) is inconsistent with the spirit of the gospel.' But in the year 1818, a more full and explicit avowal of the sentiments of the church was unanimously agreed on in the General Assembly. 'We consider, (say the Assembly,) the voluntary enslaving of one part of the human race by another, as a gross violation of the most precious and sacred rights of human nature: as utterly inconsistent with the law of God, which requires us to love our neighbour as ourselves; and as totally irreconcilable with the spirit and principles of the gospel of Christ, which enjoin, that 'whatever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them.' They add, 'It is manifestly the duty of all Christians who enjoy the light of the present day, when the inconsistency of slavery, both with the dictates of humanity and religion, has been demonstrated, and is generally seen and acknowledged, to use their honest, earnest, and unwearied endeavours, to correct the errors of former times, and as speedily as possible, to efface this blot on our holy religion, and to obtain the complete abolition of slavery throughout Christendom, and if possible, throughout the world.' "

If, said Mr. B., he had expressed sentiments different from these, or if he had inculcated as the principles of his brethren any thing different from these just and noble sentiments, let the blame be heaped upon his bare head. These sentiments they had held from a period to which the memory of man runneth not to the contrary. Here to-night, 3000 miles off, God enabled him to produce a record proving for them an antiquity of half a century, in full maturity! How grand, how far sighted, how illustrious is truth, compared with the wretched and new-born, and blear-eyed fanaticism that carps at her! These are the principles of the Presbyterian Church of the United States. She has risen with them: she will stand, or, if it be God's will, she will fall with them. But she will not change them less or more. The General Assembly is but now adjourned. They have had this question before them—perhaps have been deeply agitated by its discussion. But so tranquilly does my heart rest on the truth of these principles, and on the fixed adherence to them by my brethren, that nothing but a feeling that it would be impertinent in one like me, to vouch for a body like that, could deter me

* Since this was in print, I have seen the *New York Enquirer* of May 26th, 1836, in which it is said, that the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church of the United States, which meets every fourth year, had then recently adopted the Resolution given below, at its session in Cincinnati, Ohio:—"Resolved,—That we are entirely opposed to modern Abolitionism; and wholly disclaim any right, wish, or intention, to interfere with the civil and political relation of master and slave, as it exists in the slave-holding states of this country." The first part of the Resolution was adopted by a vote of 122 ayes to 14 noes; the latter part of it was carried by a unanimous vote. Comment is needless.—(Note to the 2d English edition in pamphlet form.)

from any lawful gage, that all its decisions will stand with our ancient testimony and unaltered principles.

In accordance with these principles, the great body of the members of that church had been all along acting. There were about 24 Synods under the care of the General Assembly,* of which about one-third were in the slave country. The number was constantly increasing, on which account, and in the absence of all records, he could not be more exact. The Synods in the free states stood, he believed, without exception, just where the Assembly stood, on this subject. In the slave states; much had been done—much was still doing—and in proof of this as regarded this particular denomination—in addition to what he had all along declared, with reference to the great Emancipation party, in all of those states, he asked attention to the several documents he was about to lay before them. The first was a series of resolutions appended to a lucid and extended report, drawn up by a large Committee of Ministers and Elders of the Synod of Kentucky—in obedience to its order, after the subject had been several years before that body. That Synod embraces the whole state of *Kentucky*, which is one of the largest slave states in the Union. The resolutions are quoted from the *New York Observer* of April 23d, 1836:—

“ 1. We would recommend that all slaves now under 20 years of age, and all those yet to be born in our possession, be emancipated, as they severally reach their 25th year.

“ 2. We recommend that deeds of emancipation be now drawn up, and recorded in our respective county courts, specifying the slaves we are about to emancipate, and the age at which each is to become free.

“ This measure is highly necessary, as it will furnish to our own minds, to the world, and to our slaves, satisfactory proof of our sincerity in this work; and it will also secure the liberty of the slaves against contingencies.

“ 3. We recommend that our slaves be instructed in the common elementary branches of education.

“ 4. We recommend that strenuous and persevering efforts be made to induce them to attend regularly upon the ordinary services of religion, both domestic and public.

“ 5. We recommend that great pains be taken to teach them the Holy Scriptures; and that to effect this, the instrumentality of Sabbath schools, wherever they can be enjoyed, be united with that of domestic instruction.”

The plan revealed in these resolutions, was the one of all others, which most commended itself to his (Mr. B.'s) judgment. And he most particularly asked their attention to it, on an account somewhat personal. He had several times been publicly referred to in this country, as having shown the sincerity of his principles in the manumission of his own slaves. He was most anxious that no error should exist on this subject, which was one he had not at any time had any part in bringing before the public, and which, as often only as he was forced to do so, had he explained. The introductory remarks of the Chairman had laid him under the necessity of such an explanation, which had not so naturally occurred, as in this connexion.† He took leave, therefore, to say, that this Kentucky plan, was in substance the one he had been acting on for

* This was in June, 1836.

† We beseech the reader to turn to the first article of our last number, and glance his eye over so much of it as relates to Dr. Wardlaw.

some years before its existence; and which he should probably be amongst the earliest, if his life was spared, fully to complete. He considered it substantially the same as their system for West India Emancipation; only more rapid as to adults; more tardy, cautious, and beneficent, as to minors: and more generous, as being wholly without compensation. In plans that affect whole nations, and successive generations, questions of *time* are, of all others, least important; of all others, the most proper to make bend to the necessities of the case. He went on to say farther, that his brother, (the Rev. Dr. John Breckinridge,) of whom Mr. Thompson speaks with such affectation of scorn, had entered this good field before him, and taken one course with his manumitted slaves. That his younger brother, (the Rev. Wm. L. Breckinridge,) whose name along with nine other beloved and reverend names, is attached to this Kentucky report, had also entered it before him; and taken a second course, different still, in liberating his. When he came last of all, he had taken still a third, different from each; while other friends had pursued others still. What wisdom their combined, and yet varied experience could have afforded, was of course useless, now that all the deepest questions of abstract truth, and the most difficult of personal practice, were solved by instinct, and carried by storm.

The next extract related to the great slave-holding state of North Carolina, and revealed a plan for the religious instruction and care of the souls of the slaves, intended to cover the states of Virginia, Georgia, and South Carolina,—all slave states of the first class, as well as the one in which it originated. Its origin is due to the Presbyterian Synod, covering the whole of that state. The extract is from the *New York Observer* of June 20th, 1835:—

“ RELIGIOUS INSTRUCTION OF SLAVES.

“ ‘The Southern Evangelical Society,’ is the title of a proposed Association among the Presbyterians at the South, for the propagation of the gospel among the people of colour. The constitution originated in the Synod of North Carolina, and is to go into effect as soon as adopted by the Synod of Virginia, or that of South Carolina and Georgia. The voting members of the Society are to be elected by the Synods. Honorary members are created by the payment of 30 dollars. All members of Synods united with the Society, are corresponding members—other corresponding members may be chosen by the voting members. Article fourth of the constitution provides, that ‘there shall not exist between this Society and any other Society, any connexion whatever, except with a similar Society in the slave-holding states.’ Several Resolutions follow the constitution—one of these provides that a Presbytery in a slave-holding district of the country, not united with a Synod in connexion with the Society, may become a member by its own act. The fifth and sixth resolutions are as follows:—

“ Resolved, 5, That it be very respectfully and earnestly recommended to all the heads of families in connexion with our congregations, to take up, and vigorously prosecute the business of seeking the salvation of the slaves, in the way of maintaining and promoting family religion.

“ Resolved, 6, That it be enjoined upon all the Presbyteries composing this Synod, to take order at their earliest meeting, to obtain full and correct statistical information as to the number of people of colour, in the bounds of our several congregations, the number in actual attendance at our several places of worship, and the number of coloured members in our several churches, and make a full report to the Synod, at its next meeting; and for this purpose, that the clerk of this Synod furnish a copy of this Resolution to the stated clerk of each Presbytery.”

The next document carried them one state farther south, and related to South Carolina, in which that "horrible Governor," M'Duffie, who seems to haunt Mr. Thompson's imagination with his threats of "death without benefit of clergy," lives, and perhaps still rules. It is taken from the same paper as the last preceding extract:—

"RELIGIOUS INSTRUCTION OF SLAVES.

"We cheerfully insert the following letter from an intelligent New Englander at the South:—

"To the Editor of the New York Observer.

"I am apprehensive that many of your readers, who feel a lively interest in the welfare of the slaves, are not correctly and fully informed as to their amount of religious instruction. From the speeches of Mr. Thompson and others, they might be led to believe, that slaves in our southern states, never read a Bible, hear a Gospel sermon, nor partake of a Gospel ordinance. It is to be hoped, however, that little credit will be given to such misrepresentations, notwithstanding the zeal and industry with which they are disseminated.

"What has been done on a single plantation?

"I will now inform your readers what has been done, and is now doing, for the moral and religious improvement of the slaves on a single plantation, with which I am well acquainted; and these few facts may serve as a commentary on the unsupported assertions of Mr. Thompson and others. And here I could wish that all who are so ready to denounce every man that is so unfortunate as to be born to a heritage of slaves, could go to that plantation, and see with their own eyes, and hear with their own ears, the things which I despair of adequately describing. Truly, I think they would be more inclined, and better qualified to use those weapons of light and love, which have been so ably and justly commended to their hands.

"On this plantation there are from 150 to 200 slaves, the finest looking body that I have seen on any estate. Their master and mistress have felt for years how solemn are the responsibilities connected with such a charge; and they have not shrunk from meeting them. The means used for their spiritual good are abundant. They enjoy the constant preaching of the gospel. A young minister of the Presbyterian church, who has received a regular collegiate and theological education, is labouring among them, and derives his entire support from the master, with the exception of a trifling sum which he receives for preaching one Sabbath in each month for a neighbouring church. On the Sabbath, and during the week, you may see them filling the place of worship, from the man of grey hairs to the small child, all neatly and comfortably clothed, listening with respectful, and in many cases, eager attention, to the truth as it is in Jesus, delivered in terms adapted to their capacities, and in a manner suited to their peculiar habits, feelings, and circumstances;—engaging with solemnity and propriety in the solemn exercise of prayer, and mingling their melodious voices in the hymn of praise. Sitting among them are the white members of the family, encouraging them by their attendance, manifesting their interest in the exercises, and their anxiety for the eternal well-being of their people. Of the whole number, forty-five or fifty have made a profession of religion, and others are evidently deeply concerned.

"Let me now conduct you to a Bible class of ten or twelve adults, who can read, met with their Bibles to study and have explained to them the word of God. They give unequivocal demonstrations of much interest in their employment, and of an earnest desire to understand and remember what they read. From hence we will go to another room, where are assembled eighteen or twenty lads, attending upon catechetical instruction, conducted by their young master. Here you will notice many intelligent countenances, and will be struck with the promptitude and correctness of their answers.

"But the most interesting spectacle is yet before you. It is to be witnessed in the Infant School Room, nicely fitted up and supplied with the customary cards and other appurtenances. Here, every day in the week, you may find twenty-five or thirty children neatly clad, and wearing bright and happy faces. And as you notice their correct deportment, hear their unhesitating replies to the questions proposed, and, above all, when they unite their sweet voices in their touching songs,

if your heart is not affected, and your eyes do not fill, you are the hardest-hearted and driest-eyed visitor that has ever been there. But who is their teacher? Their mistress, a lady whose amiable Christian character and most gifted and accomplished mind and manners are surpassed by none. From day to day, month to month, and year to year, she has cheerfully left her splendid balls and circle of friends to visit her school-room, where, standing up before those young immortals, she trains them in the way in which they should go, and leads them to Him who said, 'Suffer little children to come unto me.'

"From the Infant School Room we will walk through a beautiful lawn, half a mile, to a pleasant grove, commanding a view of miles in extent. Here is a brick chapel rising for the accommodation of this interesting family—sufficiently large to receive 200 or 300 hearers. When completed, in beauty and convenience it will be surpassed by few churches in the southern country.

"On the plantation you might see also many other things of great interest. Here a negro is the overseer. Marriages are regularly contracted. No negro is sold, except as a punishment for bad behaviour, and a dreadful one it is. None is bought save for the purpose of uniting families. Here you will hear no clanking of chains, no cracking of whips, (I have never seen a blow struck on the estate;) and here, last though not least, you will find a flourishing Temperance Society, embracing almost every individual on the premises. And yet the 'Christianity of the South is a chain-forging—a whip-plating—marriage-discouraging—Bible-withholding Christianity.'

"I have confined myself to a single plantation. But I might add many most interesting facts in regard to others, and the state of feeling in general; but I forbear.—

Yours, &c.,

A NEW ENGLAND MAN.

He would now connect the peculiar and local facts of the preceding statement, with the whole community of slave-holders in the same state; and show by competent and disinterested testimony, the real and common state of things. The following extracts were from a letter printed in the *New York Observer*, of July 25th, 1835:—

"I have resided eight years in South Carolina, and have an extensive acquaintance with the Planters of the middle and low country. I have seen much of slavery, and feel competent to speak in regard to many facts connected with it.

"What your correspondent has stated of the condition of one plantation, is in its essential points a common case throughout the whole circle of my acquaintance.

"The negroes generally in this state, are well fed, well clothed, and have the means of religious instruction. According to my best judgment, the work which a slave here is required to do, amounts to about one-third the ordinary labour commonly performed by a New England farmer. A similar comparison would hold true in regard to the labour of domestics. In the family where I reside, consisting of nine white persons, seven slaves are employed to do the work. This is a common case.

"In the village where I live, there are about 400 slaves, and they generally attend church. More than 100 of them are members of the church. Perhaps 200 are assembled every Sabbath in the Sunday Schools. In my own Sunday School are about sixty, and most of them professors of religion. They are perfectly accessible and teachable. In the town of my former residence in New England, there were 300 free blacks. No more than eight or ten of these were professors of religion, and not more than twice that number could generally be induced to attend church. They could not be induced to send their children to the district schools, which were always open to them, nor could they generally be hired to work.—They were thievish, wretched and troublesome. I have no hesitation in saying, and I say it deliberately, it would be a great blessing to them to exchange conditions with the slaves of the village in which I now live. Their intellectual and moral characters, and real means of improvement, would be promoted by the exchange.

"There are doubtless some masters who treat their slaves cruelly in this state, but they are exceptions to the general fact. Public opinion is in a wholesome state, and the man who does not treat his slaves kindly, is disgraced.

“Great and increasing efforts are made to instruct the slaves in religion, and elevate their characters. Missionaries are employed solely for their benefit. It is very common for ministers to preach in the forenoon to the whites, and in the afternoon of every Sabbath to the blacks. The slaves of my acquaintance are generally contented and happy. The master is reprobated who will divide families. Many thousands of slaves of this state give evidence of piety. In many churches they form the majority. Thousands of them give daily thanks to God, that they or their fathers were brought to this land of slavery.

“And now, perhaps, I ought to add, that I am not a slave-holder, and do not intend to continue in a slave country; but wherever I may be, I intend to speak the

TRUTH.”

The next document related particularly to *Virginia*,—the largest and most powerful of the slave states; but had also a general reference to the whole south, and to the whole question at issue. The sentiments it contained were entitled to extraordinary consideration, on account of the source of them. Mr. Van Rensselaer, was the son of one of the most wealthy and distinguished citizens of the great free state of New York. He had gone to Virginia to preach to the slaves. He had every where succeeded; was every where beloved by the slaves, and honoured by their masters. He had access to perhaps forty different plantations, on which he from time to time preached, and which might have been doubled, had his strength been equal to the work. In the midst of his usefulness, the storm of Abolition arose. Mr. Thompson, like some baleful star, landed on our shores; organized a reckless agitation; made many at the north frantic with folly; and as many at the south furious with passion. Mr. Van Rensselaer, like many others, saw a storm raging which he had no power to control; and, like them, withdrew from his benevolent labours. The following brief statements made by him at a great meeting of the Colonization Society of New York, exhibit his own view of the conduct and duty of the parties:—

“The Rev. Cortlandt Van Rensselaer, formerly of Albany, but who has lately resided in Virginia, addressed the meeting, and after alluding to the difference of opinion which prevailed among the friends of Colonization, touching the present condition and treatment of the coloured population in this country, proceeded to offer reasons why the people of the North should approach their brethren in the South, who held the control of the coloured population, with deference, and in a spirit of kindness, and conciliation.

“These reasons were briefly as follows:—

“1. Because the people of the South had not consented to the original introduction of slaves into the country, but had solemnly, earnestly, and repeatedly remonstrated against it.

“2. Because, having been born in the presence of slavery, and accustomed to it from their infancy, they could not be expected to view it in the same light as we view it in the North.

“3. Slavery being there established by law, it was not in the power of individuals to act in regard to it as their personal feelings might dictate. The evil had not been eradicated from the state of New York all at once: it had been a gradual process, commencing with the law of 1799, and not consummated until 1827. Ought we to denounce our southern neighbours if they refused to do the work at a blow?

“4. The Constitution of the United States recognized Slavery, in its articles apportioning representation with reference to the slave population, and requiring the surrender of runaway slaves.

“5. Slavery had been much mitigated of late years, and the condition of the slave population much ameliorated. Its former rigour was almost unknown, at least in Virginia, and it was lessening continually. It was not consistent with

truth to represent the slaves as groaning day and night under the lash of tyrannical task-masters. And as to being kept in perfect ignorance, Mr. V. had seldom seen a plantation where some of the slaves could not read, and where they were not encouraged to learn. In South Carolina, where it was said the gospel was systematically denied to the slave, there were 20,000 of them church-members in the Methodist denomination alone. He knew a small church, where, out of seventy communicants, fifty were in slavery.

"6. There were very great difficulties connected with the work of Abolition. The relations of slavery had ramified themselves through all the relations of society. Many of the slaves were comparatively very ignorant; their character degraded; and they were unqualified for immediate freedom. A blunder in such a concern as Universal Abolition would be no light matter. Mr. V. here referred to the result of experience and personal observation on the mind of the well known Mr. Parker, late a minister of this city, but now of New Orleans. He had left this city for the South with the feeling of an Immediate Abolitionist; but he had returned with his views wholly changed. After seeing slavery and slave-holders, and that at the far south, he now declared the idea of Immediate and Universal Abolition to be a gross absurdity. To liberate the two and a half millions of slaves in the midst of us, would be just as wise and as humane, as it would be for the father of a numerous family of young children to take them to the front door, and there, bidding them good bye, tell them they were free, and send them out into the world to provide for and govern themselves.

"7. Foreign interference was, of necessity, a delicate thing, and ought never to be attempted but with the utmost caution.

"8. There was a large amount of unfeigned Christian anxiety at the South to obey God and do good to man. There were many tears and prayers continually poured out over the condition of their coloured people, and the most earnest desire to mitigate their sorrows. Were such persons to be approached with vituperation and anathemas?

"9. There was no reason why all our sympathies should be confined to the coloured race, and utterly withheld from our white southern brethren. The apostle Paul exhibited no such spirit.

"10. A regard to the interest of the slaves themselves dictated a cautious and prudent and forbearing course. It called for conciliation: for the fate of the slaves depended on the will of their masters, nor could the North prevent it. The late laws against teaching slaves to read had not been passed until the southern people found inflammatory publications circulating among the coloured people.

"11. The spirit of the gospel forbade all violence, abuse, and threatening. The apostles had wished to call fire from heaven on those they considered as Christ's enemies; but the Saviour instead of approving this fiery zeal, had rebuked it.

"12. These southern people, who were represented as so grossly violating all Christian duty, had been the subjects of gracious blessings from God, in the outpourings of his Spirit.

"13. When God convinced men of error, he did it in the spirit of mercy; we ought to endeavour to do the same thing in the same spirit."

The only remaining testimony relates to the states of Louisiana and Mississippi, in the south-west. The letter from which it is taken, is written by a son of that Mr. Finley, who perhaps more than any one else, set on foot the original scheme of African Colonization; and whose name, as a man of pure and enlarged benevolence and wisdom, the enemies of his plans quote with respect. The son well deserves to have had such a father:—

"NEW-ORLEANS, *March 12th, 1835.*

"In my former letter, I gave you some account of the leading characters amongst the free people of colour, who recently sailed from this port, in the brig 'Rover,' for Liberia. I then promised you in my next, to give you some account of the emancipated slaves who sailed in the same expedition. This promise I will now endeavour to fulfil, and I will begin with the case of an individual emancipation, and then state the case of an emancipated family, and conclude with an account of the emancipation of several families, by the same individual.

“The first case alluded to, is that of a young woman, emancipated by the last will and testament of the late Judge, James Workman, of this city, the same who left a legacy of ten thousand dollars to the American Colonization Society. Judge Workman’s will contains the following clause, in relation to her, viz.:—‘I request my *statu liber*, Kitty, a quarteroon girl, be set free as soon as convenient. And I request my executors may send her, as she shall prefer, and they think best, either to the Colonization Society at Norfolk, to be sent to Liberia or to Hayti; and, if she prefer remaining in Louisiana, that they may endeavour to have an act passed for her emancipation, if the same cannot be attained otherwise; and it is my will, that the sum of three hundred dollars be paid to her after she shall be capable of receiving the same. I request my executors to hold in their hands money for this purpose. I particularly request my friend, John G. Greene, to take charge of this girl, and do the best for her that he can.’ Mr. Greene, provided her with a handsome outfit, carefully attended to her embarkation, and the shipment of her freight, and placed her under the care of the Rev. Gloster Simpson.

“The next case, alluded to above, is that of a family of eleven slaves, emancipated for faithful and meritorious services, by the will of the late Mrs. Bullock of Claiborne county, Miss. Mrs. Moore, the sister and executrix of Mrs. Bullock’s estate, gave them 700 dollars to furnish an outfit, and give them a start in the colony.

“The third and last case alluded to above, consisted of several families, amounting in the whole to twenty-six individual slaves, belonging to the estate of the late James Green, of Adams county, Mississippi. The following interesting circumstances concerning their liberation were communicated to me by James Railey, Esq., the brother-in-law and acting executor of Mr. Green’s estate. Mr. Green died on the 15th of May, 1832, the proprietor of about 130 slaves, and left Mr. Railey, his brother-in-law, and his sisters, Mrs. Railey and Mrs. Wood, executors of his last will and testament. Mr. Green’s will, provides for the unconditional emancipation of but one of his slaves—a faithful and intelligent man named Granger, whom Mr. Green had raised and taught to read, write, and keep accounts. He acted as foreman for his master for about five years previous to his death. Mr. Green, by his will, left him 3000 dollars, on condition that he went to Liberia, otherwise 2000 dollars. Provision was also made in the will for securing to him his wife. Granger has been employed since the death of Mr. Green, until recently, as overseer for Mr. Railey, at a salary of 600 dollars per annum. Granger declines going to Liberia at present, on account of the unwillingness of his mother to go there. She is very aged and infirm, and he is very much attached to her. She was a favourite slave of Mr. Green’s mother, who emancipated her, and left her a legacy of 1000 dollars. Granger came to this city with Mr. Railey to see his friends and former fellow-servants embark; and when he bade them farewell, he said, with a very emphatic tone and manner, ‘I will follow you in about eighteen months.’

“The executors of Mr. Green’s estate were by no means slack in meeting the testator’s wishes concerning these people. Mr. Railey accompanied them to New Orleans, and both he and Mrs. Wood, who also was in New Orleans while they were preparing to embark, took a lively and active interest in providing them with every thing necessary for their comfort on the voyage, and their welfare after their arrival in the colony, and placed in my hand 7000 dollars for their benefit; one thousand dollars of which were appropriated towards the charter of a vessel to convey them to the colony, with the privilege of 140 barrels’ freight—1,600 dollars towards the purchase of an outfit, consisting of mechanics’ tools, implements of agriculture, household furniture, medicines, clothing, &c., and the remaining 4,400 dollars, partly invested in trade goods, and partly in specie, were shipped and consigned to the Governor of Liberia, for their benefit, with an accompanying memorandum made out by Mr. Railey, showing how much was each one’s portion.

“I will close this communication by relating one additional circumstance, communicated to me by Mr. Railey, to show the interest felt by Mr. Green in the success of the scheme of African Colonization. The day previous to his death, he requested Mr. Railey to write a memorandum of several things which he wished done after his death, which memorandum contains the following clauses, viz.:—‘After executing all my wishes as expressed by will, by this memorandum, and by verbal communications, I sincerely hope there will be a handsome sum left for benefitting the emancipated negroes emigrating from this state to Liberia, and to that end I have more concern than you are aware of.’

"I am authorized by the executors to state, that there will be a residuum to Mr. Green's estate of twenty or thirty-five thousand dollars, which they intend to appropriate in conformity with the views of Mr. Green, expressed above.—Yours, &c.,

"ROBERT S. FINLEY."

And now I rest the case, and commit the result to an enlightened public. Here are my proofs and arguments, showing, as I believe conclusively, that the slanderous accusations against my country and my brethren, which I have come to this city to repel, are not only false, but incredible. Here are my testimonials, few and casually gathered up, but yet, as it seems to me, irresistibly convincing, that the people and churches of America, in the very thing charged, have been and are acting, a wise, self-denying, and humane part. That they should move onward in it as rapidly as the happiness of all the parties will allow, must be the wish of all good men. That any obstacle should be interposed, through the error, the imprudence, or the violence of well meaning, but ill-judging persons, is truly deplorable. But, that we should be traduced before the whole world, when we are innocent; that we should first be forced into most difficult circumstances, and then forced to manage those circumstances in such a way as to cause our certain ruin, by the very same people; or in default of submitting to both requirements, be forced first into war, and afterwards into a state of bitter and mutual contention, only less dreadful than war itself, is outrageous and intolerable. While we justly complain of these things, we discharge ourselves of the guilt attributed to us, and acquit ourselves to God and our consciences, of all the fatal consequences likely to follow such conduct.

MR. BRECKINRIDGE, in conclusion, said he regretted to be obliged to say any thing more on this subject, which he had wished to consider concluded, so far as he was concerned, at the close of his preceding speech. He felt obliged, however, by the importance of the whole case, to consume a portion of this, his last address—and which he had desired to occupy in a different way—in making a few explanations which seemed indispensable.

It would be observed, first, that the great bulk of the testimonies produced throughout by Mr. Thompson, and especially in his last speech, were individual opinions and assertions, often of obscure persons, and therefore, for aught the world could tell, fictitious; or if known, they were often men of the world, and avowedly acting on worldly principles, and therefore, no more affording a criterion of the state of the American churches, than the immoralities of any public functionary here, could be justly made a rule of judgment of the faith and morals of British Christians. A considerable portion was also taken from the transient and heated declamations of violent party newspapers, which, wrested from their original purpose and connection, might mean what never was meant: or even, if fairly collated, expressed what their authors, perhaps, would now gladly recall. How far would it be proof of the assertions of Mr. T. of America—if in some other land, some bigot should quote as indisputable Mr. Thompson's story of the coloured man in Washington city, whose assertion, at third hand, that he was free, author-

ized the declaration that "*he had demonstrated his freedom,*" and yet, after all, had been sold into everlasting slavery without a trial! And yet many of his proofs are of no more value than his assertions ought to be to any who come after him. It is also, most worthy of note, that so far as all his proofs establish any thing against any portion of the American nation or the American church, they all run upon the assumed truth of all my explanations of their real state and operations. It is the slave-holding portion; it is the comparatively small body of slave-holding professors of religion; it is the minority of the nation, the very small minority of the Christians of it, implicated continually; and therefore if every word produced were true, the sweeping conclusions from them would be a gross fraud and imposition on the prevailing ignorance of all American affairs. But what is most important to observe, and what must be palpable to the capacity of every child who has attended to this discussion, the weightiest of Mr. Thompson's proofs cease to be proofs at all, the moment the facts, cant words, and circumstances connected, are explained. He uses words in one sense which he knows you will understand in another—sporting at once with your good feelings and your want of minute information, while all the result is false as to us, and unhappy as to every thing concerned: except "*Othello's occupation,*" which meanwhile is *not* gone. When decided and perhaps violent terms are used against "*Abolition,*" or "*Abolitionists,*" or "*Anti-Slavery men,*" or "*the Anti-Slavery Society,*" they are adduced to convince you that those who use them are Pro-Slavery men; that they understand the terms as you do; and that it is an expression of rank hostility to all emancipation on the part of the American tyrants, in whose nostrils, according to this gentleman, the slave and freedom equally stink! A metaphor nearly as full of truth as decency. The fact, however, is, that although many would decline the use of the harsh and vindictive language which, caught from Abolitionists has been turned against them; yet the bulk of the real sentiments, as brought forward by Mr. Thompson as proofs of American slavery, on account of American hatred to his peculiar plans, principles, and spirit, in attempting its removal, are true, just, and defensible.—And I am ready to advocate and to defend much that he by a disingenuous citation has made at first odious, and then characteristic of America. He had only proved that he and his coadjutors are most odious to the country, which is a fact never denied except by himself or them. And to what has the whole current of his testimony tended, if not to show that they might reasonably have expected, and did a great deal to deserve, such a conclusion?

But it is now impossible to enter again upon these matters; and upon the case as presented, he was willing for the world to pass its verdict. While he would therefore take no farther notice of any new matter contained in the last speech, there were several remarks necessary to be made, to elucidate subjects that had already been several times before them. The first case was that of Amos Dresser, the Abolitionist, whipped at Nashville. He would pass over what Mr. T. had said relating to his (Mr. B.'s) notice of the discrepancy in the number of elders in the Nashville church. He had

treated that gentleman with great candour in the matter, which he had returned with incivility and injustice: and there he was content to let it rest. But how stood the facts of the case itself? Amos Dresser is reported to have said, there were seven elders of the church; that all of them were on the committee of vigilance at Nashville; that *most* of them were among his triers; and that *some* of them had administered the communion to him the preceding Sabbath. Now, let us admit that this is literally true, (which I believe, however, is not the case, in at least three particulars,) how does it justify Mr. Thompson in asserting, as he did, at London and elsewhere, "that on that Lynch Committee *there sat seven Elders and one Minister, some of whom had sat with the young man at the table of the Lord on the preceding Sunday?*" Mr. Thompson positively contradicts his own and only witness when he says, that all seven sat as triers; he enlarges his testimony, when he insinuates that they not only concurred in his punishment, but were present and active in its infliction; and he infers, without the least authority, and adds it to the words of the witness, that those very elders who administered the Lord's Supper to Dresser on Sunday, "plowed up his back," as Lynch Committee men, on a subsequent day of the same week. Now, in the name of common honesty, is such deceitful handling of the truth to be tolerated in a Christian community? Oh! what a spectacle would we behold, if I had but the privilege before some competent tribunal, to take the published accusations of this man in my hands, and force him to reveal, on oath, the whole grounds on which he makes them!

Mr. B. then stated, that after he had entered the house to-night, two packages had been put into his hands, which he could not examine then, as he was just about to open the discussion. He had snatched a moment during the interval to glance his eyes over their contents, and considered it his duty to say a few words in reference to each. One of them was a little volume from the pen of Dr. Channing, of Boston, on the subject of slavery, just passing through the press of an enterprising bookseller of Glasgow, who had done him the favour of presenting to him, in very kind terms, the first copy of the edition. They who would take the trouble of looking over the printed report of Mr. Thompson's second address to the Glasgow Emancipation Society, would find, that in speaking of the Unitarians of America, he had used the following language:—"One of their greatest men, a giant in intellect, had already taken the right view of the subject, and there could not exist a doubt that, ere long, he would bring over the body to the good cause." In this sentence, as it stands in the speech, at the end of the words, "giant in intellect," stands a star; at the bottom of the page another, before the words "Dr. Channing." Now, it so happens, that in this little book there is a chapter headed "Abolitionism." I have looked at it casually, within the last hour; and I beseech you all to read it carefully, and judge for yourselves of the utter recklessness with which Mr. Thompson makes assertions. The other parcel contained a letter from an American gentleman residing in Britain, and one-half of the *New York Spectator* of October 1st, 1835. Under the head of Editorial Correspondence, is

an article above a column and a half in length, devoted in great part to Mr. Thompson. Amongst other passages, it adverts to his doings at Andover, and the charges made against him there, on such weighty authority; and in that connection has the following explicit paragraph:—

“Mr. Thompson in conversation with some of the students, repeatedly averred, that every slave-holder in the United States OUGHT TO HAVE HIS THROAT CUT; or DESERVED TO HAVE HIS THROAT CUT; although he afterwards publicly denied that he had said so. But the proof is direct and positive. In conversation with one of the theological students in regard to the moral instruction which ought to be enjoyed by the slaves, he distinctly declared, THAT EVERY SLAVE SHOULD BE TAUGHT TO CUT HIS MASTER'S THROAT! I state the fact—knowing the responsibility I am assuming, and challenge a legal investigation.”

On this tremendous document, I make but two remarks—The first is, that Francis Hall & Co., the publishers of the *Spectator*, were in character and fortune, perfectly responsible to Mr. Thompson. The second is, that if Mr. Thompson's rule of judgment was just in that branch of this same case—in the exercise of which he declared on this platform, that another paper in New York could never be got to publish his exculpatory certificates in regard to this very transaction, *because* the publisher knew them to be true—then we are irresistibly bound, on his own showing, to conjecture, that for the same reason, he declined taking up the challenge of the *Spectator*.

There was only one more topic on which he seemed called to remark; and that he had several times passed over, out of considerations of delicacy. It had all along been his aim to use as little freedom as possible with the names of individuals—and he could declare that he had implicated, by name, no one except out of absolute necessity—that he had foreborne to say true, but severe, things of several who had been most unjustly commended during this discussion—and had omitted, of the very few he had censured by name, decidedly worse things than those he had uttered of them—and which he might have uttered both truly and pertinently. Amongst the cases of rather peculiar forbearance, was the oft-cited one of a misguided young man, by the name of Thome, who went from Kentucky to New York, to repeat a most audacious speech, which was no doubt prepared for him, before an assembly literally the most *mixed* that was ever convened in that city: having delivered which, he departed with the pity or contempt of nine-tenths of all the decent people in it, and went, I know not whither, and dwells, I know not where. The victory, as there trumpeted, and now celebrated, of which he was part gainer, consisted of two portions—the destruction of the Colonization cause—and the degradation of Kentucky, his native state. The death of the Society was signalized by a subscription of six thousand dollars on the part of its friends; and the infamy of Kentucky was illustrated by the ready stepping forward of four of her sons, to confront and confound the ingrate who commenced his career of manhood by smiting his parent in the face. Who made the defence, may be surmised from Mr. Thompson's bitterness—I will not trust myself to repeat a name so dear to me. But this, thousands can attest, that never was a great cause more signally successful—never were folly and wickedness more thoroughly beaten into the dust—never

did any community heap more cordial and unanimous applause upon an effort of great and successful eloquence.

And now, Sir, (said Mr. B., addressing Dr. Wardlaw, the Chairman of the meeting,) I repeat the expressions of my regret, that these last moments allowed to me, should have been required for any other purpose than that which so sacredly belonged to them. Exhausted by a series of most exciting, and to me perfectly new contentions, I am altogether unequal to the task, which I should yet esteem myself degraded if I did not attempt, in some way, to perform.

To this large Committee which has so kindly taken up this subject—so considerably provided for every contingency—so delicately considered all my wishes, and even all my weaknesses—to these respected gentlemen surrounding us upon this platform, whose conduct amid very peculiar circumstances, has been towards me, full of candour, honour, courtesy, and Christian kindness, it would have been most gross ingratitude, to have foreborne this public expression of my regard and cordial thanks.

For yourself, Sir, what can I say more, or how could I say less, than that in that distant country, which I love but too fondly, there are scores, there are hundreds, who would esteem all the trials through which this strife has led me, and all the weight of responsibility which my posture has forced me to assume—more than counter-balanced by the privilege of looking upon your venerated face. It is good to live for the whole world—and it is but just to receive, in recompence, the world's thanks.

And you, my respected auditors, whose patience I must needs have taxed so severely, and who have borne with much that possibly has tried you deeply—you who have given me so many reasons to thank you, and not one to regret the errand that brought me here; if, in the course of providence, you or yours, should be thrown on whatever spot my resting-place may be, you need but say, "I came from Glasgow, and I need a friend," and it shall go hard with me, but I will find a way to prove, that kindness is never thrown away.

But even as we part, let us not forget that cause which has chained us here so long. We are free. Alas! how few can utter these words with truth! We are Christian men. Alas! what multitudes have never heard our Master's name! Oh! how horrible must slavery be, when God himself illustrates the power of sin, by calling it its *bondage*! Oh! how sweet should union with Christ be thought, when he proclaims it *glorious liberty*! Freedom and redemption are in our hands—the heritage in trust for a lost world. It is not then our own souls only, but our divine Lord, and our dying brethren, that we sin against and rob, when we mismanage or pervert this great inheritance. We needs must labour; but let us do it wisely. And though we may differ in many things, in this at least we can agree, to importune our Heavenly Father to prosper, by his constant blessing, what we do aright, and over-rule, by his continual care, all that we do amiss. (Mr. Breckinridge sat down amidst great cheering.)

A LETTER OF THE REV. JOHN WESLEY, ON POPERY.

“*To the Printer of the ‘Public Advertiser:’*”

“**SIR,**—Some time ago a pamphlet was sent to me, entitled—‘An Appeal from the Protestant Association to the People of Great Britain.’ A day or two since a kind of answer to this was put into my hand, which pronounces ‘its style contemptible, its reasoning futile, and its object malicious.’ On the contrary, I think the style of it is clear, easy, and conclusive; the object or design, kind and benevolent. And in pursuance of the same kind and benevolent design, namely, to preserve our happy constitution, I shall endeavor to confirm the substance of that tract by a few plain arguments.

With persecution I have nothing to do. I persecute no man for his religious principles. Let there be as ‘boundless freedom in religion’ as any man can conceive. But this does not touch the point; I will set religion, true or false, utterly out of the question. Suppose the Bible, if you please, to be a fable, and the Koran to be the Word of God. I consider not whether the Romish religion be true or false; I build nothing on the one or the other suppositions. Therefore away with all your common-place declamation about intolerance and persecution for religion. Suppose every word of Pope Pius’s Creed to be true; suppose the Council of Trent to have been infallible; yet I insist upon it, that no Government, not Roman Catholic, ought to tolerate men of the Roman Catholic persuasion.

I prove this by a plain argument—(let him answer it who can)—that no Roman Catholic does or can give security for his allegiance or peaceable behaviour, I prove thus: It is a Roman Catholic maxim, established not by private men, but by a public council, that ‘No faith is to be kept with Heretics.’ That has been openly avowed by the Council of Constance, but it never was openly disclaimed—(whether private persons avow or disavow it.) It is a fixed maxim of the church of Rome. But as long as it is so, nothing can be more plain, than that the members of that church can give no reasonable security to any government of their allegiance or peaceable behaviour. Therefore, they ought not to be tolerated by any government, Protestant, Mahometan, or Pagan.

You may say, ‘Nay, but they will take an Oath of Allegiance.’ True, five hundred oaths; but the maxim, ‘No Faith is to be kept with Heretics,’ sweeps them all away as a spider’s web. So that still, no governors that are not Roman Catholics can have any security of their allegiance.

Again.—Those who acknowledge the *spiritual power* of the Pope can give no security of their allegiance to any government; but all Roman Catholics acknowledge this: therefore, they can give no security for their allegiance.

The power of granting *pardons* for all sins, past, present, and to come, is and has been for many centuries, one branch of his spiritual power.

But those who acknowledge him to have this spiritual power can give no security for their allegiance; since they believe the Pope can pardon rebellions, high treason, and all other sins whatsoever.

The power of *dispensing* with any promise, oath, or vow, is another branch of the spiritual power of the Pope. And all who acknowledge his spiritual power, must acknowledge this. But whoever acknowledges the dispensing power of the Pope, can give no security of his allegiance to any government.

Oaths and promises are none; they are as light as air; a dispensation makes them all null and void.

Nay, not only the Pope, but even a priest has the power to pardon sins! This is an essential doctrine of the Church of Rome. But they that acknowledge this, cannot possibly give any security at all; for the priest can pardon both perjury and high treason.

Setting, then, religion aside, it is plain, that upon principles of reason, no government ought to tolerate men who cannot give any security to that government for their allegiance and peaceable behaviour. But this no Romanist can do, not only while he holds that 'No Faith is to be kept with Heretics,' but so long as he acknowledges either priestly absolution or the spiritual power of the Pope.

But the late Act, you say, does not either tolerate or encourage Roman Catholics. I appeal to matter of fact. Do not the Romanists themselves understand it as a toleration? You know they do. And does it not already (let alone what it may do by and by) encourage them to preach openly,—to build chapels (at Bath and elsewhere,)—to raise seminaries, and to make numerous converts day by day to their intolerant persecuting principles? I can point out, if need be, several of the persons. And they are increasing daily.

But 'nothing dangerous to English liberty is to be apprehended from them.' I am not certain of that. Some time since a Romish priest came to one I knew, and after talking with her largely, broke out, 'You are no heretic! You have the experience of a real Christian!' 'And would you,' she asked, 'burn me alive?' He replied, 'God forbid, unless it were for the good of the church!'

Now what security could she have had had for her life, if it had depended on that man? The *good of the church* would have burst all the ties of truth, justice, and mercy. Especially when seconded by the absolution of a priest, or (if need were,) a papal pardon.

If any one please to answer this, and to set his name, I shall probably reply; but the productions of anonymous writers I do not promise to take any notice of.

I am, Sir, your humble servant, .

JOHN WESLEY.

City Road, Jan. 21st, 1780.

LETTER FROM ONE OF THE SCOTCH PEOPLE TO THE RIGHT HON.
LORD BROUGHAM AND VAUX, ON THE OPINIONS EXPRESSED BY
HIS LORDSHIP IN THE AUCHTERARDER CASE.

' MY LORD,—I am a plain working man, in rather humble circumstances, a native of the north of Scotland, and a member of the Established Church. I am acquainted with no other language than the one in which I address your Lordship, and the very limited knowledge which I possess, has been won slowly and painfully from observation and reflection—with now and then the assistance of a stray volume, in the intervals of a laborious life. I am not too uninformed, however, to appreciate your Lordship's extraordinary powers and acquirements; and as the cause of freedom is peculiarly the cause of the class to which I belong—and as my acquaintance with the evils of ignorance has been by much too close and too tangible to leave me indifferent to the blessings of education, I have been no careless or uninterested spectator of your Lordship's public career. No, my Lord, I have felt my heart swell as I pronounced the name of Henry Brougham.

' With many thousands of my countrymen, I have waited in deep anxiety for your Lordship's opinion on the Auchterarder case. Aware that what may seem clear as a matter of right, may be yet exceedingly doubtful as a question of law—aware, too, that your Lordship had to decide in this matter, not as a legislator, but as a judge, I was afraid, that, though you yourself might be our friend, you might yet have to pronounce the law our enemy. And yet, the bare majority by which the case had been carried against us in the Court of Session—the consideration, too, that the judges who had declared in our favour, rank among the ablest lawyers, and most accomplished men, that our country has ever produced, had inclined me to hope that the statute book, as interpreted by your Lordship, might not be found very decidedly against us. But of you yourself, my Lord, I could entertain no doubt. You have exerted all your energies in sweeping away the Old Sarums and East Retfords of the constitution. Could I once harbour the suspicion that you had become tolerant of the Old Sarums and East Retfords of the church? You had declared, whether wisely or otherwise, that men possessed of no other property qualification, and as humble and as little taught as the individual who now addresses you, should be admitted on the strength of their moral and intellectual qualities alone, to exercise a voice in the Legislature of the country. Could I suppose for a moment, that you deemed that portion of these very men which falls to the share of Scotland, unfitted to exercise a voice in the election of a parish minister!—or rather, for I understate the case, that you held them unworthy of being emancipated from the thralldom of a degrading law—the remnant of a barbarous code, which conveys them over by thousands and miles square, to the charge of patronage-courting clergymen, practically unacquainted with the religion they profess to teach. Surely the people of Scotland are not so changed, but that they know at least as much of the doctrines of the New Testament as of the

principles of civil Government—and of the requisites of a Gospel minister, as of the qualifications of a member of Parliament?

'You have decided against us, my Lord. You have even said that we had better rest contented with the existing statutes, as interpreted by your Lordship, than involve ourselves in the dangers and difficulties of a new enactment. Nay, more wonderful still! All your sympathies on the occasion seem to have been reserved for the times and the memory of men who first imparted its practical efficiency to a law under which we and our fathers have groaned; and which we have ever regarded as not only subversive of our natural rights as men, but of our well-being as Christians. Highly as your Lordship estimates our political wisdom, you have no opinion whatever of our religious taste and knowledge. Is it at all possible that you, my Lord, a native of Scotland, and possessed of more general information than perhaps any other man living, can have yet to learn that we have thought long and deeply of our religion—whereas our political speculations began but yesterday; that our popular struggles have been struggles for the right of worshipping God according to the dictates of our conscience, and under the guidance of ministers of our own choice; and that when anxiously employed in finding arguments by which rights so dear to us might be rationally defended, our discovery of the principles of civil liberty was merely a sort of chance consequence of the search. Examine yourself, my Lord. Is your mind free from all bias in this matter? Are you quite assured that your admiration of an illustrious relative, at a period when your judgment was comparatively uninformed, has not had the effect of rendering *his* opinions *your* prejudices? Principal Robertson was unquestionably a great man; but consider in what way. Great as a leader—not as a "Father in the church;" it is not to ministers such as the Principal, that the excellent among my countrymen look up for spiritual guidance, amid the temptations and difficulties of life, or for comfort at its close. Great in literature—not like Timothy of old, great in his knowledge of the scriptures, aged men who sat under his ministry, have assured me, that in hurrying over the New Testament, he had missed the doctrine of the atonement. Great as an author and a man of genius—great in his enduring labours as an historian—great in the sense in which Hume, and Gibbon, and Voltaire were great.*

*Is the writer's estimate of Dr. Robertson's religious character too low? Take then the estimate of William Wilberforce—a name to which even the high eulogiums of Lord Brougham can add nothing.

In the *Practical View*, chapter vi., there occurs the following passage:—

'It has also been a melancholy prognostic of the state to which we are progressive, that many of the most eminent *literati* of modern times have been professed unbelievers; and that others of them have discovered such lukewarmness in the cause of Christ, as to treat with especial good will, and attention, and respect, those men, who, by their avowed publications, were openly assailing, or insidiously undermining the very foundations of the Christian hope; considering themselves as more closely united to them by literature, than severed from them by the widest religious differences. It is with pain that the author finds himself compelled to place so great a writer as Dr. Robertson in this class. But to say nothing of his phlegmatic account of the Reformation (a subject which we should have thought likely to excite, in any one who united the character of a Christian divine with that of a historian, some warmth of pious gratitude for the good providence of God; to pass over, also, the

But who can regard the greatness of such men as a sufficient guarantee for the soundness of the opinions which they had held, or the justice or wisdom of the measures which they have recommended? The law of patronage is in no degree the less cruel or absurd from its having owed its re-enactment to so great a statesman and so ingenious a writer as Bolingbroke; nor yet from its having received its full and practical efficiency from so masterly a historian, and so thorough a judge of human affairs as Robertson; nor yet, my Lord, from the new vigour which it has received from the decision of so profound a philosopher, and so accomplished an orator, as Brougham.

‘I am a plain untaught man; but the opinions which I hold regarding the law of patronage are those entertained by the great bulk of my countrymen, and entitled on that account to some little respect. I shall state them as clearly and as simply as I can. You are doubtless acquainted with that beautiful little piece of antique simplicity, drawn up by Knox, on the election of elders and deacons. It forms an interesting record, by an eye-witness, of the earliest beginnings of reformation in Scotland. At first, pious individuals “brought, through the wonderful grace of God, to a knowledge of the truth, began to exercise themselves by reading of the Scriptures secretly,” and to call the members of their own households around them to join with them in prayer. In the next stage a few neighbouring families of this character learned to assemble themselves together to pray and to exhort, sometimes under the cloud of night in houses, sometimes in lone and sequestered hollows in the fields. Their numbers gradually increased, and that diversity of talent so characteristic of the human family, and so nicely adapted to man’s social nature, began to manifest itself in this first germ of the Reformed Church in Scotland. To assign to individuals among them, by the general voice, that place for which nature and the Holy Spirit had peculiarly fitted them, was but a giving of effect, through the agency of man, to the will of God, and essentially necessary for the maintenance of decency and good order. “And so began that small flock,” says the reformer, “to put themselves in such order, as if Christ Jesus had plainly triumphed in the midst of them by the power of the Evangel; and *they did elect* some to occupy the supreme place of exhortation and reading; and some to be elders and helpers to these, for the oversight of the flock; and some to be deacons for the collection of alms, to be distributed to the poor of their own body. And of this small beginning is that order that now God of his mercy hath given unto us publicly within this realm.”

‘One stage more, and the history is complete. The devotions of the closet had passed into the family; the members of Christianized families had formed themselves into a church. But this process of germination and growth had not been confined to a single locality. The long winter was over; the vital principle was heaving under the clods of separate fields and widely distant valleys; the

ambiguity in which he leaves his readers as to his opinion of the authenticity of the Mosaic chronology, in his *Disquisitions on the trade of India: his Letters to Mr. Gibbon*, lately published, cannot but excite emotions of regret and shame in every sincere Christian.’—p 304. Fifth Edition.

deep sleep of ages had been broken; the day star hath arisen; the Spirit of God had moved upon the face of the waters;—many families had been enlightened; many churches had been formed. How was the “bond of unity” to be best preserved, and wise and equal laws established for the good of the whole? “Wisdom,” saith the Saviour, “is justified of her children.” The churches instructed their best and wisest to deliberate in council,—their learned and strong-minded,—their tried and venerable men,—whom they had chosen to be their guides and leaders, because God had chosen them first,—and these met in assembly—each recognising in each, an equal and a brother, and in Christ, the Head and Governor of the whole. The scriptures were opened, that the “mind of God” might be known; they sought advice of the Reformed churches abroad; conferred with princes and magistrates at home; enacted wise laws; drew up books of order and of discipline; framed Catechisms and Confessions of Faith; the God in whom they trusted breathed a spirit of wisdom into their councils; and the inestimable blessings of a pure and scriptural religion were thus secured to our hand. Is the picture faithfully drawn? Look at it, my Lord.—The Presbyterians of Scotland deem it a picture of their church in her best estate; and believe that the one great object of her saints and martyrs in all their struggles with king and patrons, priests and curates, leaders in the General Assembly, and dragoons on the hill side, has been to restore what of the original likeness had been lost, or to preserve what had been retained.

‘Now, with many thousands of my countrymen, I have often asked, Where is the place which patronage occupies in this church of the people and of Christ? I read in the First Book of Discipline, (as drawn up by Knox and his brethren,) that “no man should enter the ministry without a lawful vocation; and that a lawful vocation standeth in the *election of the people*, examination of the ministry, and admission by them both.” I find in the Second Book, as sanctioned by our earlier Assemblies, and sworn to in our National Covenant, that as this liberty of election was observed and respected so long as the primitive church maintained its purity, it should be also observed, and respected by the Reformed Church of Scotland; and that neither by the king himself, nor by any inferior person, should ministers be intruded on congregations, contrary to the will of the people. I find *patronage* mentioned in this Second Book for the first time, and mentioned only to be denounced as “an abuse flowing from the Pope and the corruption of the canon law;” and as contrary to the liberty of election, the light of reformation, the word of God. Where is the flaw in our logic when we infer that the members of our church constitute our church, and that it is the part and right of these members in their collective capacity, to elect their ministers? I, my Lord, am an integral part of the church of Scotland, and of such integral parts, and of nothing else, is the body of this church composed; nor do we look to the high places of the earth when we address ourselves to its adorable Head. The Earl of Kinnoull is not the church, nor any of the other patrons of Scotland. Why then are these men suffered to exercise—and that so exclusively—one of the church’s most

sacred privileges? You tell us of "existing institutions, vested rights, positive interests." Do we not know that the slave-holders, who have so long and so stubbornly withstood your Lordship's truly noble appeals in behalf of the African bonds-man, have been employed on exactly similar language for the last fifty years; and that the onward progress of man to the high place which God has willed him to occupy, has been impeded at every step by "existing institutions, vested rights, positive interests?" My grandfather was a grown man at a period when the neighbouring proprietors could have dragged him from his cottage and hung him up on the gallows-hill of the barony. It is not yet a century since the colliers of our Southern districts were serfs bound to the soil. The mischievous and intolerant law of patronage still presses its dead weight on our consciences. But what of all that, my Lord? Is it not in accordance with the high destiny of the species, that the fit and the right should triumph over the established?

'It is impossible your Lordship can hold, with men of a lower order, that there is any necessary connection between the law of patronage and our existence as an Establishment. The public money can only be legitimately employed in furthering the public good; and we recognize the improvement and conservation of the morals of the people as the sole condition on which our ministers receive the support of the state. Where is the inevitable connection between rights of patronage (which, as the law now exists, may be exercised by fools, debauchees, infidels,) and principles such as these? Nay, what is there subversive of such principles in the Christian liberty of election, as complete as that enjoyed of old by the first fathers of the reformation, or exercised in the present day by our Protestant Dissenters? I may surely add, that what is good for the Dissenters in this matter, cannot be very bad for us; that I can find none of the much dreaded evils of popular election—the divisions, the heart-burnings, the endless lawsuits, the dominance of the fanatical spirit—exemplified in them; and that there can surely be little to censure in a principle which could have secured to them the labours of such ministers as Baxter, and Bunyan, Watts and Doddridge, Robert Hall, and Thomas M'Crie. Even you yourself, my Lord, will hardly venture to assert that our Scottish patrons could have provided them with better or more useful clergymen than they have been enabled to choose for themselves.

'But on these points, we are not at issue with your Lordship. You tell us, however, that we are protected against the abuses of patronage by the provision, that patrons can present only qualified persons,—clergymen, whose literature the church has pronounced sufficient, and their morals not bad. And when, under the suspension of our higher privileges, we challenge, for ourselves, the *right of rejecting ministers thus selected without assigning our reasons*, you ungenerously insinuate, that we are perhaps anxious to employ this liberty in the rejection of good men, too strict in morals, and too diligent in duty to please our vitiated tastes. "Have a care, my Lord," you are a philosopher of the inductive school. Look well to your facts. Put our lives to the question. Ascertain whether we are immoral in the proportion in which we are zealous for this

privilege;—determine whether our clergymen are lax and time-serving in the degree in which they are popular; and see, I beseech your Lordship, that the scrutiny be strict. We challenge, as our right, *liberty of rejection without statement of reasons*. What is there so absurd in this as to provoke ridicule? or what so unfair as to justify the imputation of sinister design? It is *positive*, not *negative*, character we expect in a clergyman. We are suspicious of the “*not proven*;” we are dissatisfied with even the “*not guilty*;”—we look in him for qualities which we can love, powers which we can respect, graces which we can revere. It matters not that we should have no grounds on which to condemn;—we are justified in our rejection if we cannot approve.

‘But we are aware, my Lord, that there is a noiseless, though powerful under-current of objection, which bears more heavily against us in this matter, than all the thousand lesser tides that froth and bubble on the surface. We are opposed by the prejudices of a powerful party, who see an inevitable connection between the exercise of the popular voice, and what I shall venture to define for them as a *fanaticism, according to the Standards of our Church*. We have but one Bible, and one Confession of Faith in our Scottish establishment, but we have two religions in it; and these though they bear exactly the same name, and speak nearly the same language, are yet fundamentally and vitally different. They belong, in fact, to the two very opposite classes into which all religions naturally divide. The one is popular, and has ever contended for the infusion of the popular principle into the church as a necessary element; the other is exclusive, and has as determinedly struggled against it. The Logans, Homes, Blairs, Robertsons, of the last age, may be regarded as constituting the fit representatives of the latter class. The other recognizes its master spirits,—its beloved and much honoured leaders, in our Thompsons and Chalmerses, our Knoxes and Melvilles, the fathers of the Secession, and the champions of the Covenant. The infusion of the popular principle, while it would mightily strengthen the one class, would assuredly diminish, if not altogether annihilate, the other; and while the thousands which form the one reckon on it as their friend, the hundreds which compose the other hate and oppose it as their enemy.

‘Now, there are important, though perhaps somewhat occult principles couched in this circumstance, regarding which, your Lordship’s opinion, as a philosopher, would be of great value, had you not already foreclosed the question in a very different character indeed. It will be found that all the false religions of past or of present times, which have abused the credulity, or flattered the judgments of men, may be divided into two grand classes—the natural and the artificial. The natural religions are wild and extravagant; and the enlightened reason, when unbiassed by the influence of early prejudice, rejects them as monstrous and profane. But they have unquestionably a strong hold on human nature, and exert a powerful control over its hopes and its fears. They are, like the oak or the chesnut, the slow growth of centuries; their first beginnings are lost in the uncertainty of the fabulous ages, and every addition they receive is fitted to the credulity of the popular mind

ere it can assimilate itself to the mass. The grand cause of their popularity, however, seems to consist in the human character of their gods; for is it not according to the nature of man as a religious creature, that he meet with an answering nature in Deity?

The artificial religions, on the other hand, are exclusively the work of the human reason; and the God with which they profess to acquaint us, is a mere abstract idea—an incomprehensible essence of goodness, power and wisdom. The understanding cannot conceive of Him except as a first great cause—as the mysterious source and originator of all things; and it is surely according to reason that he should be thus removed from that lower sphere of conception which even finite intelligences can occupy to the full. But in thus rendering him intangible to the understanding, he is rendered intangible to the affections also. Who ever loved an abstract idea, or what sympathy can exist between human minds and an intelligent essence infinitely diffused? And hence the cold and barren inefficiency of artificial religions. They want the vitality of life. They want the grand principle of *motive*, for they can lay no hold on those affections to which this prime mover in all human affairs can alone address itself. They may look well in a discourse or an essay, for, like all human inventions, they may be easily understood, and plausibly defended; but they are totally unsuited to the nature and the wants of man.

‘Now, is it not according to reason and analogy, that the true religion should be formed, if I may so express myself, on a popular principle? Is it not indispensable that the religion which God reveals should be suited to the human nature which God has made? Artificial religions, with all their minute rationalities, are not suited to it at all, and, therefore, take no hold on the popular mind. Natural religions, with all their immense popularity, are not suited to improve it. It is Christianity alone which unites the popularity of the one class with the rationality and more than the purity of the other; that gives to Deity, as the man Christ Jesus, his strong hold on the human affections, and restores to Him, in his abstract character as Father of all, the homage of the understanding.

‘Question the principle as you please, but look, I beseech you, to the fact. Who was the most popular of all-preachers, whom the immense multitudes of Judea followed into waste and solitary places, and of whom it is so expressly told, that the “common people heard him gladly?” And what the religion taught by the twelve unlettered men whose labours revolutionized the morals of the world? Christianity, in its primitive integrity, is essentially a popular religion; and what we complain of in the churchmen opposed to the popular voice is, that they have divested it of this vital principle. What God has done in the framing of it, they undo in the preaching of it. They impart to it all the cold inefficacy of an artificial religion; they tell us well-nigh as much of the beauty of virtue as Plato could have done; of the incarnation of the atonement, they tell us well-nigh as little; or tell as if they told it not; and what wonder if they should be left to exhibit their minute and feeble rationalities to bare walls and empty benches; and to dread, in the popular principle, the enemy which is eventually to cast them

out of the church. We are acquainted with our New Testaments, and demand that our ministers give that prominence and space to the peculiar doctrines of Christianity, which we find assigned to them in the epistles of Paul and of Peter, and of James and of John.

‘I have striven, my Lord, to acquaint myself with the history of my church. I have met with a few old books, and have found time to read them; and as the Histories of Knox, Calderwood, and Wodrow, have been among the number, I do not find myself much at the mercy of any man on questions connected with our ecclesiastical institutions, or the spirit which animate them. Some of the institutions themselves are marked by the character of the age in which they were produced: for we must not forget that the principles of toleration are as much the discovery of a latter time, as those principles on which we construct our steam-engines. But the spirit which lived and breathed in them was essentially that “spirit with which Christ maketh his people free.” Nay the very intolerance of our church was of a kind which delighted to arm its vassals with a power, before which all tyranny, civil or ecclesiastical, must eventually be overthrown. It compelled them to quit the lower levels of our nature for the higher. It demanded of them that they should be no longer immoral or illiterate. It was the Reformed Church of Scotland that gave the first example of providing that the children of the *poor* should be educated at the expense of the state. Not Henry Brougham himself could have been more zealous in sending the school-master abroad. But ignorance, superstition, immorality—above all, an intolerance of an entirely opposite character, jealous of the knowledge, and indifferent to the good, of its vassals, were by much too strong for it; and there were times when the church could do little more than testify against the grinding tyranny which oppressed her, and to the truth and justice of her own principles; and not even this with impunity. I have perused, by the light of the evening fire, whole volumes filled with the death-testimonies of her martyrs. Point me out any one abuse, my Lord, against which she has testified oftener or more strongly than that of patronage; or any one privilege for which she has contended with a more enduring zeal than that for which our General Assembly is contending at this day. Moulding her claims according to the form and pressure of the opposition from without—casting them at one time into a positive, at another into a negative form—asserting at one time a *free election*, at another a *non-intrusion principle*—we find her, on this great question, perseveringly firm, and invariably consistent; and we regard the abolition of patronage, and the recognition of the popular right, as entirely a consequence of that dominancy of just and generous principle, which was in part a cause, and in part an effect, of the revolution, as we do any of the other great liberties which the revolution has secured to us; nor does the very opposite opinion expressed by your Lordship weigh more with us in this matter, than if it had proceeded from the puniest sophist that ever opposed himself to the spread of education, or the emancipation of the slave.

‘Twenty-one years passed, during which the church, in the undisputed possession of her hard-earned privileges, was slowly

recovering from the state of weakness and exhaustion induced by her sufferings in the previous period. And well and wisely were these privileges employed. Differences inevitably occur wherever man enjoys the blessings of liberty, civil or ecclesiastical; but during these twenty-one years, there were few heats or divisions, and no schisms, in the Scottish Church. Such, at least, is the view of the matter given us in that life of Wodrow affixed to the late edition of his history; and sure I am, that it tenders its information in a better spirit than that of any of the Acts of Parliament which disgraced the latter years of Queen Anne. But a time had arrived in which no privilege was to be respected for its justice, or spared for its popularity, and in which our governors were to pursue other and far different objects than the good of the people, or the peace of the church. The Union had sunk the Presbyterian representation of Scotland into a feeble and singularly inefficient minority. Toryism, in its worst form, acquired an overpowering ascendancy in the councils of the nation; Bolingbroke engaged in his deep-laid conspiracy against the Protestant succession, and our popular liberties; and the law of patronage was again established. But why established? On this important point your Lordship's great historical knowledge seems to have deserted you at once. There was a total lapse of memory; and all that remained for your Lordship, in the peculiar circumstances of the case, was just to take the law's own word for the goodness of the law's own character. Was it not sufficiently fortunate in its historians? Smollett, ere he composed his English History, had abandoned his Whig principles; Burnet was an Episcopalian, and a bishop; Sir Walter Scott, a staunch Tory, and full of the predilections and antipathies of his party. But all the three, my Lord, were honest and honourable men. Smollett would have told your Lordship of the peculiarly sinister spirit which animated the last Parliament of Anne; of feelings adverse to the cause of freedom which prevailed among the people when it was chosen; and that the Act which re-established patronage was but one of a series, all bearing on an object, which the honest Scotch member, who signified his willingness to acquiesce in one of these, on condition that it should be designated by its right name—*An Act for the encouragement of immorality and Jacobitism in Scotland*—seems to have discovered. The worthy Bishop is still more decided. Instead of triumphing on the occasion, he solemnly assures us, that the thing was done merely "to spite the Presbyterians, who, from the beginning, had set it up as a principle, that parishes had, from warrants in Scripture, a right to choose their ministers;" and "who saw, with great alarm, the success of a motion, made on design, to weaken and undermine their establishment;" and the good Sir Walter, notwithstanding all his Tory prejudices, is quite as candid. He tells us that Jacobitism prevailed in Scotland more among the upper than the lower classes; and that "the Act which restored to patrons the right of presenting clergymen to vacant churches, was designed to render the churchmen more dependent on the aristocracy, and to separate them, in some degree, from their congregations, who could not be supposed to be equally attached to, or influenced by, a minister who held his

living by the gift of a great man, as by one who was chosen by their own free voice." You see your Lordship might have learned a little, even from writers such as these. Historical evidence is often of a vague and indeterminate character; there are disputed questions of fact, which divide the probabilities in directions diametrically opposite: but on the question before us it is comparatively easy to decide. The law which re-established patronage in Scotland—which has rendered Christianity inefficient in well-nigh half her parishes—which has separated some of her better clergymen from her church, and many of her better people from her clergymen—the law through which Robertson ruled in the General Assembly, and which Brougham has eulogised in the House of Lords—that identical law formed, in its first enactment, no unessential portion of a deep and dangerous conspiracy against the liberties of our country.

'There is, my Lord, a statesman of the present day, quite as eminent as Bolingbroke, who is acting, it is said, a somewhat similar part. It is whispered, that not only can he decide according to an unpopular and unjust law, which he secretly condemns, but that he can also praise it as good and wise, and stir up its friends (men of a much narrower range of vision than himself,) to give it full force and efficacy; and all this with the direct view of destroying a venerable institution on which this law acts. Now I cannot credit the insinuation, for I believe that the very able statesman alluded to is an honest man; but I think I can see how he *might act* such a part, and act it with very great effect. At no previous period were the popular energies so powerfully developed as in the present; at no former time was it so essentially necessary that institutions, which desire to live, should open themselves to the infusion of the popular principle. Shut them up in their old chrysalis state from this new atmosphere of life, and they inevitably perish. And these, my Lord, are truths which I can more than see, I can also feel them. I am one of the people, full of the popular sympathies—it may be of the popular prejudices. To no man do I yield in the love and respect which I bear to the Church of Scotland. I never signed the Confession of her Faith; but I do more—I believe it; and I deem her scheme of government at once the simplest and most practically beneficial, that has been established since the time of the Apostles. But it is the vital spirit, not the dead body, to which I am attached. It is to the free popular Church, established by our Reformers, not to an unsubstantial form, or an empty name—a mere creature of expediency and the state; and had she so far fallen below my estimate of her dignity and excellence, as to have acquiesced in your Lordship's decision, the leaf holds not more loosely by the tree, when the October wind blows highest, than I would have held by a church so sunk and degraded. And these, my Lord, are the feelings not merely of a single individual, but of a class, which, though less learned, and may be less wise than the classes above them, are beyond comparison more numerous, and promise, now that they are learning to think, to become immensely more powerful. Drive our better clergymen to extremities on this question—let but three hundred of them throw up their

livings, as the Puritans of England, and the Presbyterians of our own country, did in the times of Charles II., and the Scottish Establishment inevitably falls. Your Lordship is a sagacious and far-seeing man. How long, think you, would the English Establishment survive her humble sister?—and how long would the monarchy exist after the extinction of both?

‘You have entertained a too favourable opinion of the Scottish Church, and she has disappointed your expectations. Scotland is up in rebellion? The General Assembly refuse to settle Mr. Young. Take your seat, my Lord, and try the members of this refractory Court for their new and unheard-of offence. They believe “that the principle of non-intrusion is coeval with the existence of the Church, and forms an integral part of its constitution.” Their consciences, too, are awakened on the subject; they see that forced settlements have done very little good, and a great deal of harm; and that intruded ministers have been the means of converting few souls to Christ, and have, it is feared, in a great many instances, been unconverted themselves. They have, besides, come to believe, with their fathers of old, that God himself is not indifferent in the matter; and are fearful lest “haply they should be found fighting against Him.” And in this Assembly, my Lord, there are wise and large-minded men—men admired for their genius, and revered for their piety, wherever the light of learning or religion has yet found its way. Now, a certain law of the country, which was passed rather more than a hundred and twenty years ago, through the influence of very bad men, and for a very bad purpose, has demanded that this Assembly proceed forthwith to impose on a resisting people a singularly unpopular clergyman. And the Assembly have refused—courteously and humbly, ’tis true, but still most firmly. Give to this unpopular clergyman, they say, all the emoluments of the office. We lay no claim to these—we have no right to them whatever; nay, we hold even our own livings by sufferance, and you have the power to take them from us whenever you please. But we must not force this unpopular clergyman on the people. Our consciences will not suffer us to do it; and as the laws which control our consciences cannot be altered, whereas those which govern the country are in a state of continual change—suffer us, we beseech you, to confer with the makers of those changing laws, that this bad law may be made so much better, as to agree with the fixed law of our consciences. Now, such, my Lord, is the heinous offence committed by these men. You could not believe they were so wicked; you could imagine the crime itself, but not in connection with them; you said it was indecorous, preposterous, monstrous, to believe that *they could* be so wicked. But you did ill to speak of Christ on the occasion; it is against Bolingbroke’s law, not the law of Christ, that these men have offended.

‘Nay, my Lord, you should have known the Church of Scotland better. Consult her history, and see whether she has not as determinedly opposed herself to wicked laws as to wicked men. The very act which first indicated her existence as a church, was her opposition to the law. And fearfully did she suffer for it! The law persecuted her children to death—her Patrick Hamiltons, her

George Wisharts, her Walter Mills—and scattered their ashes to the winds. But there was a law to which she was not opposed—a fixed and immutable law—and God fought for her, and she waxed mighty in the midst of her great suffering; and at length, when her fierce and cruel persecutors had gone to their place, the unjust and intolerant law, against which she had so long struggled in sorrow and great weakness, was expunged from the statute book. History tells me, that in all her after-conflicts it was not the church that yielded to the law, but the law that yielded to the church. Need I remind your Lordship of her struggles in the days of Mary, of James, of Charles? Need I say that subsequent to the restoration she opposed herself to the law for twenty-eight years together; and that the graves which lie solitary among our hills, and the tombs which occupy the malefactors' corner in our public burying grounds, remain to testify of the heavy penalty which she paid. But the curse denounced against Cain of old, fell on the unrighteous shedders of innocent blood. The descendants of our ancient monarchs became fugitive and vagabond on the face of the earth. The law to which our church would not yield, yielded to her; and that better law, which your Lordship so pointedly condemns as unworthy of the revolution, but which thousands among the wise and good of my countrymen, and many, many thousands of humble individuals like myself, have been accustomed to regard as so entirely in its purest spirit, was made to occupy their place. We do not think the worse of our church, my Lord, for her many contests with the law, nor a whit the better of her opposers for their having had the law on their side. The public prosecutor in the time of Charles II., was, perhaps, as able a lawyer as even your Lordship; but we have been accustomed to execrate his memory as "the bloody Mackenzie."

'The church has offended many of her noblest and wealthiest, it is said, and they are flying from her in crowds. Well, what matters it?—let the chaff fly. We care not though she shake off, in her wholesome exercise, some of the indolent humours which have hung about her so long. The vital principle will act with all the more vigour when they are gone. She may yet have to pour forth her life's blood through some incurable and deadly wound; for do we not know, that though *the church* be eternal, churches are born, and die. But the blow will be dealt in a different quarrel, and on other and lower ground. Not when her ministers, for the sake of the spiritual, lessen their hold of the secular—not when, convinced of the justice of the old quarrel, they take up their position on the well trodden battle-field of her saints and her martyrs—not when they stand side by side with her people, to contend for their common rights, in accordance with the dictates of their consciences, and agreeably to the law of their God. The reforming spirit is vigorous within her, and her hour is not yet come.—I am, my Lord, with profound respect, your Lordship's most humble, most obedient servant,

'HUGH MILLER.'

'Cromarty, June, 1839.'

PAPAL PRINCIPLES EXEMPLIFIED,

In Persecuting Bible-Annotatians, and an exposure of the Jesuitism of Mr. Troy, Primate of Ireland, denying his own recommendation of the same.

No. I.

“If it be proved that Catholics are bound by their principles to persecute and extirpate persons of a different religion from themselves, it is absurd in them to look up to a Protestant Legislature for any extension of their civil privileges; they may rather expect to see their former chains rivetted upon them.”—BISHOP (Roman Catholic,) MILNER’s *Letters to a Prebendary, Postscript to Letter IV.* p. 135, 4th edit. Cork, 1807.

ABOUT four years ago, a certain “Correspondence on the Roman Catholic Bible Society” was published by Mr. Blair, in which select notes appeared, taken from the Doway and Rheims Bible, purporting to exhibit “the genuine principles of Roman Catholics.” We do not forget the clamour which was then raised; for it was observed, by Mr. Butler, in his reply, “When the harsh expressions of the Rheimish annotators are brought forward, the dungeons too, the racks, the gibbets, the fires, the confiscations, and the various other modes of persecution, in every hideous form, which the Catholics of those days endured, should not be forgotten.”—“That these,” says Mr. Butler, “should have produced some expressions of bitterness from the writers in question, cannot be a matter of surprise; if something of the kind had not fallen from them, they would have been more than men.”

This was the apology made for such disgraceful annotations, first published in 1582 (see *Gent. Mag.* for Feb. 1814, p. 123); and it was asked, “*Why the Roman Catholics of the present day should be criminated for an alleged intemperance of some of the Rheimish notes?*” The plain answer is, because such notes are approved and circulated by “Roman Catholics of the present day;” and of this fact English Protestants have now an undoubted right to complain; because there is no such palliating provocation in the nineteenth century; and indeed there never was a period when greater forbearance and religious toleration were shown to our bitterest opponents.

The following information on this subject is copied from the *Courier* of October, 1817; since which time we have seen an advertisement in the *Dublin Correspondent*, announcing that this Bible (with *infallible* annotations) is publishing in numbers at Cork, under the sanction of “Their Graces Archbishop Troy and the Lord Primate of all Ireland, with the President of the Royal College of Maynooth,” and several of the other Popish Prelates, &c. &c.

“SIR,—Many complaints have been made, that the principles maintained by the Roman Catholic Priesthood have been calumniously misrepresented, in Parliament and out of Parliament, by the opponents of the measure so delusively termed ‘Catholic Emancipation.’ The following extracts from the New Roman Catholic Bible, published at Dublin, in the last year, under the express sanction of Dr. Troy, the titular Archbishop, do not, it is to be supposed, contain any misrepresentation of the principles of the Romish Priesthood. My attention has been directed to this very important work, containing a republication of all the persecuting principles

of the Rhemish, Priests, by an article which appeared in the last number of the British Critic.

“In the Annotations of Dr. Troy’s Bible, the authority of which, as being ecclesiastical *tradition*, stated and expounded by the Pastors of the Roman church, is maintained to be no less binding on the conscience of a Roman Catholic, than the text itself of the sacred Scripture, the Romanists are informed, that *Protestants* are *heretics* and *schismatics*—‘the bane and disease of *this time*’ (note on John xvi. 28); that ‘all the definitions and marks of an *heretic* fall upon them’ (Tit. iii. 10); and that ‘*the church* of God, calling the *Protestants*’ doctrine *heresy*, in the worst part that can be, and in the *worst sort that ever was*, doth right and most justly’ (Acts xxviii. 22): that ‘the *new pretended Church Service of England* is in schism and heresy; and, therefore, not only unprofitable, but also *damnable*’ (Acts x. 9); that, as the Jewish temple was made a den of thieves, the church, or ‘the house appointed for the holy sacrifice, and sacrament of the body of Christ, is *now* much more’ made a den of thieves, being made ‘a den for the ministers of Calvin’s breed’ (Mark xi. 17); and that, if our divine Redeemer could ‘not abide to see the temple of God profaned’ by the secular business of money-changers, he can ‘much less abide the profaning of the *churches now* with *heretical* service and preaching of *heresy and blasphemy*’ (Mark xi. 17): that the prayer of a schismatic (i. e. a Protestant) cannot be heard by Heaven (John xv. 7); that ‘the speeches, preaching, and writings of heretics (Protestants) are pestiferous, contagious, and creeping like a canker; therefore *Christian* men must never hear their sermons, nor read their books’ (2 Tim. ii. 17): that, ‘as the devil acknowledging the Son of God, was bid to hold his peace,’ ‘therefore, neither heretics’ (Protestants) sermons must be heard, *no, not though they preach the truth*: so is it of their prayer and service, which, being *never so good in itself*, is not acceptable to God out of their mouths; yea, it is no better than the howling of wolves’ (Mark iii. 12): that ‘a *Christian* man is especially bound to burn and deface all heretical books’ (and therefore Protestant Bibles, Prayer Books, &c. Acts xix. 19): that the translators of the English Protestant Bible ought ‘to be abhorred to the *depth of hell*’ (Heb. v. 7); and, as it is remarked in the British Critic, not only are the memoirs of the dead to be held in detestation, but the same abhorrence is to be extended to the persons of the living. The Roman Catholics are enjoined to ‘*abhor* those new Manichees of our time, both *Lutherans* and Calvinists’ (Acts ii. 23): and they are informed that, ‘though in such times and places, where the community or most part are *infected*, necessity often forces the *faithful* to converse with such in worldly affairs, to salute them, eat and speak with them; and the church, by decree of Council, for the more quietness of timorous consciences, provides that they incur not excommunication or other censures for communicating, in worldly affairs, with any in this kind, *except they be by name* excommunicated, or declared to be heretics; yet, even in worldly conversation and secular acts of our life, *we* (viz. the Roman Catholics) must avoid them as much as *we may*, because their familiarity is in many ways contagious and noisome to good men, namely, to the simple; but in matter of religion, in praying, reading their

books, hearing their sermons, presence at their service, partaking of their sacraments, and *all other communication with them in spiritual things*, it is a *great, damnable sin* to deal with them.' (John ii. 10.)

"Thus, though the Roman Catholic Church commands her members to avoid all communication in *spirituals* with Protestants, as a *great and damnable sin*; yet, where the community is generally infected by Protestantism, she *permits* them to converse with their Protestant fellow-subjects in worldly affairs, *unless they shall be by name declared to be heretics*: but even such conversation must be avoided as much as possible, being contagious and noisome to good Roman Catholics, and is permitted by their church, only because *necessity forces it!* Such is the tolerant spirit of that church, whose members now clamour for admission to the political power of the state, on the alleged ground of the duty of toleration!

"But how long would Dr. Troy, and his brethren, the Romish priests, consider even *such toleration* justified by *necessity*? We are informed in the following annotations: 'The *good* (i. e. the Roman Catholics) must tolerate the *evil* (i. e. the Protestants, &c.), when it is so strong that it cannot be redressed without danger or disturbance of the whole church, and commit the matter to God's judgment in the latter day; *otherwise*, where evil men, be they *heretics or other malefactors*, may be punished and suppressed, without disturbance and hazard of the good, they may and *ought*, by public authority, either spiritual or temporal, to be *chastised or EXECUTED*' (Matt. xiii. 29): and, again, 'all heretics,' though in the beginning they may appear 'to have some show of truth,' yet, in due time their *deceits and falsehood* shall be known by all wise men; 'though for troubling the state of such commonwealths where unluckily they have been received, they cannot be *so suddenly EXTIRPATED*' (2 Tim. iii. 9). **SO SUDDENLY EXTIRPATED!**

"In another part of this newly published and sanctioned Roman Catholic Bible, *the words of Hierom are perverted*, in order to convince the Romanists that their 'zeal ought to be so great toward' *all Protestants* and 'their doctrines, that they should give them the anathema, though they were never so dear to them,' and '*not spare even their own parents*' (Gal. i. 8). And at the same time, the Roman Catholics are informed that 'the Church and holy Councils use the word anathema for a *curse* against *heretics*,' &c.; and, that to say 'Be he anathema,' means, 'Beware you accompany not with him—accursed be he—*away with him!*' Such are the exhortations now addressed to the Roman Catholics of Ireland, and addressed to them in their Bible, as the authorized exposition of the word of God!

"The expression, '*away with him*,' may be found four times in the *text* of the New Testament; on every occasion it is stated as the expression of a furious rabble, having uniformly for its meaning, that the object of their rage should be put to death; it occurs twice, as used against our Saviour; and twice as used against St. Paul (Luke xxiii. 18; Acts xxi. 36; John xix. 15; Acts xxii. 22). But it remained for the contrivers of the Rheimish perversion of Scripture, and for Dr. Troy and the other popish doctors, who have republished that mischievous work, to inform the Roman Catholics that the *murderous cry* of the Jewish rabble, is a divine command which *they* are bound to obey and execute, in due season, against their Protestant countrymen.

“ The Roman Catholics are also informed in Dr. Troy’s Bible, that the *Protestant clergy* are seducers of the people, intruders into the fold of our Redeemer’s church, usurpers of the *rightful possession* (passim), and leaders of a *rebellion* against the *lawful authority of the Roman Catholic priests*. The Protestant clergy of all denominations are farther described in this authorized Bible, as ‘*thieves, MURDERERS, and ministers of the DEVIL*’ (John x. 1, and Heb. v. 1). They and their flocks, as supporters of the Protestant ‘*heresy*,’ are declared to be engaged in a ‘*rebellion and damnable revolt against the priests of God’s church*,’ that rebellion ‘which is the bane of our days, and especially of our country’ (Heb. xiii 17): and the Roman Catholics are warned from this, their authorized divine Oracle, that ‘*Christian people (especially Bishops)*’ (meaning the Romish Bishops and their adherents) ‘*should have great zeal against heretics*’ (meaning Protestants, &c.) ‘*and hate them; that is, their wicked doctrine and conditions, even as God hateth them:*’ and the Popish *Bishops* are further told to be ‘*zealous and stout against false prophets and heretics of what sort soever*’ (of course meaning the Protestant clergy and their flocks; &c.); and to be thus zealous, remembering ‘*the example of holy Elias, that in zeal killed four hundred and fifty false prophets.*’ (Rev. ii. 6, 20.)

“ The Roman Catholics are also assured that, ‘*when Rome puts heretics to DEATH, and ALLOWS THEIR PUNISHMENT IN OTHER COUNTRIES, their blood*’ (the blood of Protestants, &c. shed on account of alleged heresy by Papists) ‘*is not called the blood of saints, no more than the blood of thieves, man-killers, and other malefactors; for the shedding of which, by order of justice, no commonwealth shall answer*’ (Rev. xvii. 6). They are reminded, that though the Son of God rebuked his disciples for proposing to invoke fire from heaven against the Samaritans, as Elias had done; ‘*yet that Elias’s fact was not reprehended, nor the church, nor Christian princes blamed, for putting heretics to DEATH*’ (Luke ix. 55): and in another annotation, Dr. Troy adopts and sanctions the exclamation of Queen Mary’s Rheimish Priests, ‘*If St. Paul appealed to Cæsar not yet christened, how much more may we call for the aid of Christian princes for the punishment of heretics!*’ (Acts xxv. 11.)

“ Now, if for the aid of popish *princes*, why not also for the aid of popish *magistrates*, whenever a favourable opportunity may arrive ?

“ Even to those who profess obedience to a priesthood maintaining *such principles*, our free and happy Constitution grants the fullest toleration; and I rejoice at it: but how far it may be *wise* to subject the executive powers in Ireland to the influence of *such principles*, or to permit them to have a share in directing the proceedings of the British Parliament, I leave to the judgment of an enlightened public.

“ I propose addressing you soon again on this important subject, and will not, at present, trespass longer on your valuable columns.

“ Your obedient servant,

“ FABRICIUS.

“ P. S. The annotations in Dr. Troy’s New Testament are considerably longer than the text; and almost all the annotations, at least three-fourths of them, breathe the same spirit of charity and toleration towards Protestants, which the specimens quoted in this letter evince.”

THE LATE LORD ELLENBOROUGH,

In the debates which had taken place on the Catholic Petitions, expressed the following clear and forcible opinion on their principles and the inherent rights of all civil governments :

“CATHOLIC Emancipation (as it is improperly called, if that term is meant to designate any slavish subjection as still subsisting on their part, either in respect of person, property, or the profession of religious faith, or the exercise of religious worship) has been fully attained. The only remaining emancipation which they are capable of receiving, must be acquired by an act of their own ; by redeeming themselves from the foreign bondage under which they and their ancestors have long unworthily groaned, and from which the state, as it has neither imposed nor continued it, has no adequate means of relieving them, consistently with the duty of self-preservation which it owes to itself. Every state, claiming and exercising independent powers of sovereignty, has incidentally belonging to it, as such, the power of binding its subjects by laws of its own ; not only paramount to, but exclusive of, any authority or control to be exercised by any other state whatsoever. In so far as any foreign state or person is allowed to exercise an authority, breaking in upon this exclusive and independent power of legislation, and enforcement of authority in another state ; to that extent such state, so entrenched upon, is not *sovereign* and *independent*, but admits itself to be *subordinate to*, and *dependent upon* the other. The declaration contained in the Oath of Supremacy, which expresses a denial and renunciation of the existence of any power and authority, in respect of ecclesiastical and spiritual matters, in any foreign state, potentate, or person whatsoever, is but the affirmance of a proposition, which is logically and politically true, as an essential principle of independent sovereignty, applicable not to this government only, but to every other government under the sun, which claims to possess and exercise the powers of independent sovereignty.

“It is not only true, as a maxim of government, but essentially necessary to be insisted and acted upon also, in all cases in which obedience may be questionable, in order to give the state that assurance and test which it has a right to require and receive from its subjects, of their entire submission and fidelity in all matters to which the power and authority of the state can extend.

“But, it is said, that what is prayed by this Petition is not a matter which impugns the authority of the state in matters to which its authority extends ; that the reserve made by our Roman Catholic brethren is only in favour of matters which concern God and their own consciences ; matters of mere abstract faith, and mental persuasion.

“*That*, however, is not so : the Pope, in virtue of his general spiritual authority, claims authority in matters of *morals* (*i. e.* of moral conduct, and which extends to all the acts of man), as well as in matters of *mere faith* : he claims and habitually exercises, on some subjects, a power of dispensing with *OATHS*, and in that respect of nullifying all human sanctions whatsoever, as far as they affect the conscience through the medium of oaths. He claims and exercises by himself, and delegates to others, an effectual, or supposed effectual power of absolution. What fatal effects that power, as exercised by the Roman Catholic priesthood, and applied to a credulous multitude, is capable of producing upon the civil and political condition of that community in which it is allowed to prevail, let the recent experience of Ireland during the late rebellion attest ; where wretches, reeking with the blood of their murdered countrymen, have been purified from the guilt of past atrocities, and prepared for the commission of new, by the all-atoning virtues of Popish absolution ! Such a power as this over the conscience, engrosses and directs more than half the faculties and energy of the entire man, &c.

“But, besides the spiritual power thus capable of being, and thus being in fact abused, the ecclesiastical power of the church of Rome over its obe-

dent sons is enormous. It establishes and sustains, in the instance of Ireland, an hierarchy dependent on the See of Rome, as to the original nomination and subsequent control of its bishops and pastors, through the medium of which it enforces an obedience not in *matters of faith only*, but in *temporal acts and concerns* immediately connected with the duties and habits of ordinary life; not only in the payment of money for the maintenance of the local ecclesiastical establishment, or for such other purposes connected with their political economy as may be thought fit by the same authority to be enjoined, but in the performance also of rites and ceremonies, particularly that of marriage, from which all civil rites originate, and which they enjoin to be performed by their own ministers exclusively,—thereby *ousting the law of the land, and endangering or destroying the legitimacy of its subjects, and all rights of descent, inheritance, and representation founded thereon.* The power of excommunication is, in the hands of their clergy, a most powerful and dangerous engine, not of *spiritual and ecclesiastical only*, but of *temporal power.* It acts at once upon all the comforts of domestic and social life in this world, and upon all the hopes and expectations of happiness in that which is to come. With what harshness and rigour, and with what daring defiance of the established law of the land, this most operative power of interdiction has been recently applied, not to a few individuals only, but to large multitudes of people, a noble and learned lord detailed to us on a former evening.

“These are a few, and but a few, of the practical civil inconveniences which might be instanced, as derived to the state and its subjects from the authority of the See of Rome, spiritual and ecclesiastical, as it is exercised over the sons of its church; producing, as it does, a distracted allegiance in the same person, acknowledging and living under the temporal power of one sovereign, and bound in faith and morals by the authority of another, claiming to be his spiritual guide and governor, his ecclesiastical sovereign, and in effect, in all matters of supreme conscientious concernment, God’s vicegerent and representative on earth.”

NOTICES, RECEIPTS, ACCOUNTS, ANSWERS TO LETTERS, &c.

MAY 15 TO JUNE 24. *New Subscribers.* Richard P. Snowden, Laurel P. O., Prince Geo.’s Co. Md.—Sam’l L. Hughes, Canonsburg, Pa., from June.—Rev. Dr. McCartee, Goshen, N. Y., \$5, for ’41 and ’2, and back Nos. since Jan. sent.—Rev. E. L. Graham, Pa., name added from Jan’y, ’41, and back Nos. delivered; and delivered to him the six bound Vols. for Rev. Mr. Marshall.—Rev. R. S. Staunton, Woodville, Miss., from June, and gave receipt to Mr. K.—Miss De-Bartholt, Lagrange, Ten., from Jan. ’41, back Nos. sent, and \$2 paid by Rev. W. W. R.—Rev. D. Dervelle, Washington, Pa., name added, paid, and back Nos. from Jan. sent.—Dr. M. A. Finley, Williamsport, Md., from June.

Discontinuances, Changes, &c. P. M. Eutaw, Alabama, to stop the copy sent to Rev. J. H. Grey, removed.

Payments, Orders, &c. Nota Bene. When we give receipts for payments, or when they are given by our agents,—as a general rule, we do publish such payments; the publication being intended merely as a receipt in cases where none can be otherwise conveniently given.

Thomas L. Sanford of N. Y. city, \$5, for himself and Mr. James Hunter, for 1841.—John Graham, Louisville, Ky., \$5, paid W. L. B.—P. M. Paris, Ky., \$10, of which \$2,50 for Mrs. Brant, and the rest for Mr. J. R. Lyle; the latter discontinued at the end of the year.—The payment for which we gave a receipt to our friend, Rev. J. C. Watson, of Gettysburg, we state now at his request, was in full to the end of 1840.—Sent No. for Feb., 1840, to Rev. J. C. Barns, Dayton Ohio.—Rev. Dr. McElroy, city of N. Y., \$5, which pays till the end of 1842.—Mr. Wm. Marshall, Hagerstown, \$2,50, for ’41.—Mr. John Stewart, Easton, Pa., \$5, for this year and next, with thanks for his obliging letter of June 4th.

THE
BALTIMORE LITERARY
AND
RELIGIOUS MAGAZINE.

VOL. VII.]

AUGUST, 1841.

[No. 8.

[For the Baltimore Literary and Religious Magazine.]

BIOGRAPHICAL NOTICE OF JONATHAN DICKINSON.

JONATHAN DICKINSON was a native of Hatfield, in Massachusetts. His parents were Hezekiah and Abigail Dickinson, of English descent.* The tradition of the family is, that his mother was early left a widow; that she married again, and removed to Springfield, where she was enabled to educate her two sons, *Jonathan* and *Moses*, by the aid of her second husband's estate. These brothers were both alumni of Yale College. *Jonathan*, the elder, was graduated in 1706, while the location of the College was still at Saybrook, where it was first established. His brother *Moses*, was not graduated until 1714.—The latter was a clergyman of much distinction in his day, and was the pastor of a Congregational church at Norwalk, in Connecticut, for many years. He was one of the Corporation of Yale College from 1758, until 1777, when he died, having survived his elder brother about thirty years.

Jonathan Dickinson, in one, or, at most, two years after his graduation, was settled as pastor of the First Presbyterian Church, in Elizabeth-town, New-Jersey, where he remained, beloved, honored, and eminently useful about forty years. His death took place, October 7th, 1747, in the 60th year of his age.

This great and good man took a very active and conspicuous part in the ecclesiastical concerns of his day. He was undoubtedly the leading man, in that portion of the Presbyterian Church which was called the "New Side," and which formed the *Synod of New York* in 1741, and wrote much in defence of the part which he thought it his duty to take in that conflict. He was the friend of *Whitfield*, and of the great revival which took place under the ministry of that far-famed evangelist, and made several publications of great value in vindication of the work of divine grace which distinguished his day.

Soon after the constitution of the Synod of New York, it became apparent to the leading members of that body, that a new college

*He was born, April 22d, 1688.

was urgently needed for the special purpose of training up young men for the Gospel ministry in the Presbyterian church. To this end, a charter for a college was obtained, under the administration of *John Hamilton*, Esq'r, President of his Majesty's Council, and Commander-in-Chief of the Province of New-Jersey, which bore date October 22d, 1746. Of this institution, Mr. Dickinson was elected the chief President, and a location was assigned to it in Elizabeth-town, where he resided.

This excellent man lived scarcely a single year after his election to the Presidentship. In the month of October following the date of the charter, he was removed by death, to the great grief not only of his more immediate congregation, but of the whole Presbyterian church on this side of the Atlantic. He was a man of learning, of strong mind, of uncommonly sound judgment, and of ardent piety; and had probably more influence, for a number years, than any other individual in the ecclesiastical body to which he belonged. The publications which he made, were numerous and of much value. They would, probably, if collected, form three large octavo volumes. A wish that such a collection might be made, has often been expressed.

The Rev. Dr. *Green*, in speaking of the important and happy influence of those men in whom learning, talents and piety are united, expresses himself thus concerning the eminent man who is the subject of this brief biographical sketch: "Of these attainments, our own *Dickinson* and *Edwards* were illustrious examples. Among the very first men of their time, in this country, for intellectual strength and furniture, they were still more distinguished for piety than for learning. In their day enthusiasm appeared in the church to which they belonged. Few other men could gain an audience of the deluded; but these men obtained it, because the reality and the eminence of their piety were questioned by none. They spoke and wrote so as happily to correct the spreading evil, and the good which they effected was great and lasting."—*Discourses delivered in the College of New-Jersey*, p. 13.

The person of Mr. Dickinson was tall and commanding, and his manners uncommonly grave, dignified and impressive. The late Dr. *Rodgers*, of New York, has been often heard to say, that he was one of the most venerable and apostolical looking men he ever saw.

It has been already remarked, that the publications made by Mr. Dickinson, were numerous and valuable. Among the most important, were the following: 1. "The Reasonableness of Christianity in Four Sermons." 2. "The True Scripture Doctrine concerning some Important Points of Christian Faith, particularly Eternal Election, Original Sin, Grace in Conversion, Justification by Faith, and the Perseverance of the Saints, in Five Discourses." 3. "Familiar Letters upon various important subjects in Religion." 4. "A Display of God's Special Grace, in a Familiar Dialogue." 5. "The Nature and Necessity of Regeneration, with Remarks on Dr. Waterland's Regeneration, stated and explained, &c." 6. "A Defence of Presbyterian Ordination, in answer to a pamphlet entitled, A Modest Proof, &c." 7. "A Vindication of God's Sovereign Free Grace, &c." Besides these, he published a number of

detached Sermons, which were deemed of much interest and value at the respective dates of their publication. Dr. Green thinks that, "In addition to the excellence of the matter in these publications, their style is, perhaps, superior to that of any other writer, in this country, at the period of their first issuing from the press. It is remarkably easy and perspicuous. And, except that it is a little blemished by the colloquial abbreviations then in vogue, it is, in general, neat and pure."

President Dickinson left three daughters; one of whom was married to Mr. Jonathan Sergeant, of Princeton, and became the mother of Jonathan Dickinson Sergeant, an eminent counsellor at law, of Philadelphia; another was married to a Mr. Cooper, of whose residence nothing is now known to the writer of this notice; and the third to the Rev. Caleb Smith, a clergyman of distinguished talents and piety, pastor of a church in that part of the township of New-Ark, now called *Orange*, who died many years since, in the vigor of life, much beloved and lamented.

We follow this sketch with one of two Sermons preached by him, under the title of *The True Churchman*. The reader will perceive on their examination, that the writer was not ashamed nor afraid to declare the whole counsel of God, —to vindicate and declare the sovereignty of God in the salvation of sinners. He will also see, in what decided language the church of England has spoken upon those doctrines which so many of her ministers think are not taught in her articles or received by the church in time past.

[For the Baltimore Literary and Religious Magazine.]

THE TRUE CHURCHMAN.

BRING A DEMONSTRATION, that those Essential Articles of Christianity, the Doctrines of Predestination, and the Sovereign Free Grace of God— are confirmed, not only by the Sacred Scriptures, and the Rules of Right Reason; but also by the approved Doctrines of the Church of England. In two Sermons, preached at Elizabeth-Town—in New-Jersey. By JONATHAN DICKINSON, A. M.,—Pastor of a Church of Christ at Elizabeth-Town.

2 TIMOTHY i. 13.—"Hold fast the form of sound words, which thou hast heard of me, in faith and love which is in Christ Jesus."

"I will not have him for my God, who hath no power over my will; I will not have him for my God, whom I, miserable sinner, can necessitate to permit evil; I will not have him for my God, from whom all good descendeth not."—Bradwardine.

THE DEDICATION.

To the Church and inhabitants of Elizabeth-Town, in New-Jersey:

Dearly beloved in our Lord Jesus. The dreadful bonds of office, whereby I am indebted unto you; make it my duty to neglect no means, either by word or pen, that may advance the welfare of your precious souls. The shipwreck that is daily made of our most precious faith, makes me with less reluctance, publish these plain discourses. Let carping critics, (as I expect they will,) find fault. I am sure the subject is weighty and seasonable, and I study to advance your welfare, to establish you in your holy faith, to show the old paths that you may walk therein, not gadding about to change your way; and endeavour not to tickle itching ears.

I am sure these doctrines here treated of, are the turning points of your salvation.

You can't with safety, lay the hopes of your salvation upon any other bottom. Therefore, be careful that (in an affair whereon an eternity depends) you build sure. Let none cajole you out of, but earnestly contend for the faith once delivered to the saints. Lest by compassing yourselves about, with sparks of your own kindling, you receive this at the hands of God, to lie down in sorrow. Accept this pledge of greatest respect, from him, who above all things covets to see Christ formed in you.

J. DICKINSON.

SERMON ONE.

THE TRUE CHURCHMAN.

Being a Vindication of the Doctrine of Predestination.

EPHESIANS i. 4, 11.—“According as he hath chosen us in him, before the foundation of the world, that we might be holy and without blame before him in love.”—“Being predestinated according to the purpose of him who worketh all things after the counsel of his own will.”

THE divine oracles contain many *δυστοκεια* things hard to be understood. There is much of mystery must be left to the sacred pages, as a depth unfathomable by the most penetrating understanding and sagacious wit of short-sighted mortals. Perfection of knowledge is reserved to a state of glory. Revelation, therefore, and not reason, must be the standard of our faith. Though it is true that there is no part of the book of God but what is most reasonable; yet much of it is the object of faith, that is far beyond our comprehension. We must believe what purblind reason can't perceive, and not call in question the dictates of the unerring Spirit of God because not quadrating with our depraved as well as infirm reason. Yet alas! such is the defection and degeneracy of a great part of the professing world, that the very foundations and vitals of our religion are struck at, by the idolized reasonings of men of corrupt minds.

The everlasting truths that my text leads me at this time to treat of, are such, as are most opposed and impugned, by the prevailing heresy of this evil age; as though no doctrine more dangerous, nor more repugnant to the free grace of God, and comfort of the saints.

It is my design, therefore, (God assisting,) to handle the subject before me, with such clearness and plainness, as to undeceive such, that (by the crafty wiles of seducers,) have been led aside from the purity of the gospel; and to remove those stumbling-blocks, that ignorance or prejudice has thrown in our way. In order hereunto, I shall first take notice of several things, that the words (duly weighed) will be found to contain in them.

We may then note,

1st. The eternal date of the divine decree, (Before the foundation of the world). The Infinite and Omniscient God, must needs comprehend all things, and all events together, in one moment of eternity. As God is an eternal being, so the decree must needs bear equal date with his essence; for the decree is God himself decreeing. The plain meaning of the words is, that the elect were heirs of salvation, in God's eternal counsel, before either they or the world had a being.

Note 2d. The mean whereby God decreed salvation unto the elect, viz., by Christ. (You hath he chosen in him.) Not that the merits of Christ are the cause of election; (that is the sovereign

pleasure of God,) but the merits of Christ are the cause of salvation, which is the consequence of election; this is clearly illustrated in the 5th verse of the context. Having predestinated us unto the adoption of children, by Jesus Christ unto himself, according to the good pleasure of his will.

Note 3d. That foreseen holiness is not the cause of election. We are elected that we may be holy, and not because God foresaw we should be holy. (That we should be holy and without blame.) Holiness is not the cause, but effect, or rather consequent, of our election.

Note 4th. The arbitrariness and absolute sovereignty of the divine decree. (According to the purpose of him who worketh all things after the counsel of his own will). Nothing could be a motive unto the eternal predestinating counsel of God; but his free, arbitrary and sovereign pleasure. There is nothing foreseen in the creature; nor any thing out of God himself, that could be a motive unto the divine decree. For who hath known the mind of the Lord, or who hath been his counsellor?

These things considered, this doctrine of eternal truth, offereth itself from the words.

Doctrine. That the eternal God, hath eternally, freely, arbitrarily, sovereignly, and infallibly foreordained our future and final state. We ought indeed to treat of, and handle this doctrine, with greatest modesty, and with most imaginable caution, and not launch too far into the deep abyss, least we plunge and drown ourselves in confusion: and that which is worse, cause the truths we are treating of, to suffer ship-wreck, upon the rocks of our perplexing distinctions, as some of the schoolmen have done. But since our glorious Lord, and his inspired apostles have frequently proposed and inculcated this doctrine, of predestination; must we be silent, (whose duty it is to declare the whole mind and counsel of God), and not do our endeavour, to free from calumniating exceptions of erring and ignorant, as well as prejudiced persons, this doctrine of our blessed Lord? No, surely! It is high time to stand up in the defence of this important article of Christianity; for if we let go this, we shall lose every considerable part of our most holy faith. I shall endeavour to be something particular, but more plain, in the prosecution of this observation, in these two propositions.

Proposition 1st. We are infallibly predestinated to our future and final state, in God's eternal counsel. Predestination was an eternal act in God. It is not less unreasonableness, than irreligion, (if not blasphemy,) to dream, that the Omniscient God, must wait to see our behaviour, ere he determines how he will glorify himself in us. Every rational agent propounds some end unto any considerable undertaking, ere he commence it. How much short of madness, would that artificer be deemed, that would undertake a magnificent building, and not know why? And shall we entertain such base, low conceptions of infinite wisdom, as to attribute that to him, as would be chargeable with highest folly and madness in imperfect mortals?

Could the Most High so far forget himself, as not to pre-deter-

mine his glory, in so noble a part of the creation, as the rational world? No, surely! His predestinating counsel, respecting the eternal display of his glory from us, must forego our creation. For does infinite wisdom act precipitately and without counsel? God forbid! The words of our text give a clear and radiant light to this cause, as written with a sunbeam. You hath he chosen in him, before the foundations of the world. And the 17th Article of the Church of England, is very express, "Predestination unto life, is "the everlasting counsel of God, whereby before the foundations "of the world were laid, he hath constantly decreed," &c.

I shall endeavour to set this in a clear light, by these following considerations.

It must be acknowledged by all, that have any reverential regard to God's eternal majesty, 1st. That the flaming eyes of God's omniscience, eternally foresaw, and foreknew all things future. All things, and all events, that have, or ever shall have being, were foreseen of God by one single view, before the worlds were made. To deny God's eternal foreknowledge, is to deny his essence. He can as soon cease to be as to be omniscient. To suppose any thing future not foreknown of God, implies the destruction of that essential attribute, his omniscience, and all other his attributes, must be buried under the ruins thereof. We read of elect according to the foreknowledge of God. 1 Pet. i. 2.—It must needs be that his knowledge extends to every thing future, for his understanding is infinite. Ps. cxlvii. 5. The forecited 17th Article of the church of England, bears testimony to the truth of this particular; for if before the foundations of the world, he hath constantly decreed, he must have infallibly foreknown whatsoever will come to pass.

2d. That the prescience and foreknowledge of God, can be no ways repugnant unto, (nay it must be most agreeable with; it must be founded upon), his will. Do any grant a foreknowledge and not a prevolition (or fore-will) in God? Do they suppose that he knew what he willed not—that he saw the futurition of those things whose being he had not determined? They not only lay the glory of divine perfection in the dust; but also run themselves into inextricable confusion. Shall we entertain such base, low sentiments of the Almighty, as to suppose him a composition of parts, powers and faculties: his knowledge one act, and his will another? By no means! Let us beware of harbouring such blasphemous conceptions! It must be a received principle, *Quisquid in Deo est, est ipse Deus*. Whatsoever is in God, is God himself. God is but one pure act. Though he makes himself known unto us by several attributes; it no-wise contradicts his simplicity. It helps only our understanding, who can behold only his back-parts; who can conceive nothing of him, but by his communicative attributes.

But there being admitted a distinction, in our conception, (tho' not in time,) between the knowledge and will of God, his will must forego his knowledge, his foreknowledge must be founded upon his will. For what is contrary to his will, he would never suffer to be—and therefore could not foreknow that it should be. For God to foreknow what he does not will, is to foreknow what will never be, for nothing can be contrary to his will. His counsel shall stand,

and he will do all his pleasure. Is. xlv. 10. "Predestination to life," (says the Church of England, in her 17th Article,) "is the everlasting purpose of God."

3d. This foreknowledge and will of God, (which, if you please, I'll style his eternal counsel,) respects the future and final state, of every particular person. All things, and all affairs, (though of the most minute and inconsiderable value,) were all foreknown, and ordained to their appointed end, in God's eternal counsel. The very sparrows are under the influence of divine Providence. The hairs of our head are all numbered. Matt. xxix. 30. And can God's flaming eyes overlook the least member of the rational creation, and not foresee both his actions and end? Where, then, is his omniscience? Can he neglect the consultation of his own glory, in any one immortal soul? Where, then, is the perfection of his counsel?

There is not one of the children of God, but may be addressed with the language of our text, *You hath he chosen in him, &c.* There is not one that shall remain finally impenitent, and by their sins make themselves the eternal monuments of God's revenging justice; concerning whom that language, *Jude iv.*, is not true. That they were of old ordained to this condemnation. This is most agreeable to the doctrine of the Church of England, in the 3d Article of Lambeth—"That there is a certain, and fore-determined number of the predestinate."

4th. That the eternal knowledge and counsel of God, admit of no mutation and change. It is one of the glorious attributes of the Almighty, that he is without variation or shadow of change; *James. i. 17.* Immutability is his very essence. *I am the Lord, I change not; Mal. iii. 6.* The change of his counsel must imply, either imperfection of wisdom, or want of power, (either of which, I hope none would be so blasphemous as to suppose). If his wisdom were infinite, all his affairs would be so well adjusted in his breast from eternity, as to need no alteration, as to admit of no amendment. If his power were unlimited, what should bar the execution of his counsel; or what should necessitate him to change his purpose? In this the 3d Article of Lambeth is both plain and true, "That the number of the predestinate, can neither be increased nor diminished."

5th. That the accomplishment of the divine predestination is infallibly necessary. The eternal counsel of God shall no-wise fail of an exact, complete and full accomplishment. His counsel shall stand, and he will do all his pleasure. It must needs be so; for how can it be within the power of any created being, to bar the execution of the omnipotent will of God? To suppose such shortsightedness, inconsiliatness, impotency, or any other imperfection in the Almighty, as to make it possible that his counsel should fall to the ground; is in the highest degree irreligious. Nay, the supposition of the contingency, and fallibility of the divine counsel, does no less labour of highest unreasonableness, which I refer to the judgment of all the judicious, that have any suitable conceptions of the omniscience, omnipotence, immutability, and perfection of a glorious God. Nothing can be more plain and express, than that

—Rom. viii. 29, 30—Whom he did foreknow, he also did predestinate. . . . Moreover whom he did predestinate, them he also called—and whom he called, them he also justified—and whom he justified, them he also glorified. This golden chain is irrefragably linked together, not one link of it shall ever be broken. Thus the 4th Article of Lambeth,—“Those that are not predestinated to “salvation, shall necessarily be condemned for their sins.”

Objection. It is ordinarily objected, if this doctrine be true, that God’s decree is infallible, and that there is an infallible necessity of its accomplishment, Who can resist his will? Who can overthrow his counsels? To what purpose is it to do any thing toward our salvation, since the event will be according to the Divine determination? What need of ministers? Or to what purpose are the promises of the Gospel?

To this I answer,

1st. The decree of God neither brings salvation nor damnation upon any man. The decree of election compels no man to comply with the terms of salvation. No man is constrained by the decree of reprobation to bring damnation upon himself. The decree of God no-wise infringes upon, or robs us of our utmost freedom and liberty; no-wise disables us from accepting the tenders of salvation, no-wise constrains us to go on in the way of death and ruin. There is no such decree that will save the elect though they go on in their trespasses; that will damn the reprobate though they accept of a tendered Christ. It is a compliance with the terms of the Gospel, and embracing an offered Saviour, that will procure salvation; Mark xvi. 16. It is sin that will purchase damnation; Hos. xiii. 9. In a word, our eternal weal or woe depends, not upon the decrees of God, but upon our improving or neglecting the means of salvation. I have frequently seen this illustrated by familiar instances.

The term of our natural life is ordained of God, we can’t outlive our appointed time, Job vii. 1, but would it not be an unreasonable madness to neglect all the means of our life’s preservation, as good apparel, sleep and every thing that would yield refectation and nourishment to nature, and depend upon the decree of God to keep us alive? Again; the eternal God has known from everlasting, whether we, the next season, shall have any harvest, and thence the foreknown event is necessary. Shall we, therefore, neglect cultivating and sowing our ground, and depend upon the Divine decree for a crop? No! He that does not sow, neither shall he reap. Once more; if you were fallen into the water and ready to drown, would you refuse offered relief, and say, if it was appointed you should escape, there is no danger; if not, there is no help? No, no! In matters of this kind, none are such prodigies of stupidity as to make such improvement of the Divine predestination. And yet in affairs of infinitely greater consequence, such corrupt reasonings are heard among us. Strange indeed!

The 17th Article of the Church of England, most truly says, “That for curious and carnal persons, lacking the spirit of Christ, “to have continually before their eyes, the sentence of God’s pre-

“destination, is a most dangerous down-fall, whereby the Devil
“doth thrust them either into desperation, or into wrecklessness of
“most unclean living, no less perilous than desperation.”

2d. I may add, he that will accept of the tenders of salvation may make sure his election.* He that will reject the tenders of salvation, will make sure his reprobation and damnation. It is not an unreasonable exhortation, 2 Pet. i. 10, Make your calling and election sure: No, make sure your vocation and your election is sure. Make sure your love to Christ, and it is sure he has first loved you; 1 John iv. 19. Make sure your faith in him, and it is sure that you are ordained to eternal life; Acts xiii. 48. But by your neglecting the means of salvation, by going on in continued courses of impenitence, you seal damnation to yourself. Thus the Church of England, in the last paragraph of the 17th Article.— Furthermore, we must receive God’s promises in such wise as they be generally set forth to us in the Scripture, and in our doing that will of God is to be followed, as we have expressly declared unto us in the word of God. Thus I come to the

Proposition 2d. That the predestinating counsel of God, was free, arbitrary and sovereign. This proposition is very clearly illustrated, by that, Rom. ix. 21, 22, 23, Has not the potter power over his clay, to make one vessel to honour and another to dishonour? What if God, willing to show his wrath and make his power known, endured with much long-suffering, vessels of wrath fitted to destruction; and that he might make known the riches of his glory on the vessels of mercy, which he had afore prepared unto glory.

For the setting this proposition in a true light, take these following particulars:—

1. The eternal counsel of God, was free, arbitrary, and sovereign from any necessitation. He was under no necessity to give being unto any creature. If it had consisted with the sovereign pleasure of the Almighty, to have left the whole created world forever, in the dark grave of their first nothingness; or to have made the souls of the rational world like the brutes, as fading and mortal as their bodies, who could have gainsayed? Who could have resisted his will? for who hath been his counsellor? Rom. xi. 34.

2. His eternal counsel was free and arbitrary, from any moral obligation. If the Sovereign God had eternally determined, to leave all the posterity of Adam, in that abyss of misery, that he foresaw us casting ourselves into by the fall of our first parents, without any possibility of escape, none could have found fault, it would have been the display of unspotted sovereignty; for how can the Most High be a debtor unto his creatures? Who hath first given unto him, and it shall be recompensed unto him again? Rom. xi. 35.

3. His eternal counsel was arbitrary and sovereign, in that it was free from any motive out of himself. The only original and fountain of, the only motive and inducement unto, the predestinating counsel of God, is his *ωδοκια*, the meer good pleasure of his will.

Particularly, 1st. It was not any merit, faith, or good works fore-

*See Mr. Mathers’s Free Grace Maintained, pp. 8. 9.

seen in one creature, more than another, that was, or could be, any motive unto the distinguishing decree of God. It was not that God foresaw one better than another, that moved him to make choice of one rather than another. We are all hewed out of the same rock; all descended from the same corrupted stock; all of the same viperous brood; all the offspring of the same ungrateful rebel. There was no merit in any, and therefore that could be no motive to a sovereign God, to distinguish his love to any, in his eternal counsel. How could one deserve his electing love more than another, when we are all by nature children of wrath; Rom. iii. 23; Eph. ii. 3.

What motive but his arbitrary pleasure, can the potter have to make one vessel to honour, and another to dishonour, out of the same lump of clay? What excellency is there in this part of the lump, more than in that, that should move him to make a distinction? Is not all the preference both for beauty, honour and use, of his donation and efficiency, and not intrinsical or connatural? And thus how can any thing in the creature, or any thing performed by it, be any motive to the distinguishing decree of God? since all receive their very being from him, and all the good they have or can perform, is of his arbitrary, free and distinguishing gift, and grace; not from any natural excellence, or peculiar goodness, that is in or from themselves.

Excellent is the saying of Mr. Bolton, in this case. "And therefore to hold that election to life, is made upon foreseen faith, good works, the right use of free will, or any created motive, is not only false and wicked, but also an ignorant and absurd tenet. To say no more at this time, it robs God of his all-sufficiency; making him go out of himself; looking upon this or that in the creature, by which his will may be determined to elect." The sole and only motive to God's eternal predestination, is recorded, Rom. ix. 15, "I will have mercy on whom I will have mercy—I will have compassion on whom I will have compassion."

2d. The merit of Christ was not any motive unto, nor the cause of the decree. The merit of Christ was the cause of the application of the good of election; the mere good pleasure of God, the cause of the decree itself. Thus we are chosen in him, i. e., we are chosen to be made partakers of salvation, by and through him; but (as was before noted,) the whole foundation of (and motive unto) the decree, must be resolved into the sovereignty of God. To this whole proposition the 2d Article of Lambeth gives in full evidence "That the efficient cause of predestination, is not foreseen faith, or perseverance, or good works, or any thing in the person predestinated, but only the absolute and simple will of God."

APPLICATION.

I. Here is matter of wonderful comfort, and refreshing consolation, unto the children of God, for

1st. You hence learn that your salvation depends not upon your own stability, but upon a more sure foundation; 2 Tim. ii. 19. The foundation of God standeth sure, having this seal—The Lord knoweth them that are his.

Should we ground the hope of our salvation upon our own stability, we should have room for nothing but desperation; for are we not hourly guilty of violations of God's sacred law? What comfort can remain to the children of God, if that doctrine (frequently broached among us) was true, that our salvation depended upon our own steadfastness? Who, then, among the sinful children of men, would not be hourly exposed to the revenges of Divine wrath? What, then would have been the state of Noah, of Lot, of David, of Peter, &c.

It is true, the more we are exposed to fall, the more need to give diligent heed to that exhortation of the Apostle, 1 Cor. x. 12, Let him that thinketh he standeth take heed lest he fall: and to that, Rom. xi. 20, Be not high minded, but fear. But yet, (though whilst in an estate of imperfection, we are liable to numberless and wrath-deserving transgressions,) we may find unspeakable comfort from that, Rom. viii. 29, 30, forecited, "whom he did foreknow, he also predestinated—and whom he predestinated, he also called—and whom he called, he also justified—and whom he justified, he also glorified. Though heaven and earth pass away, God's purpose of your salvation can't change.

2d. Here is unspeakable comfort in that you hence may learn that all the fierce and mortal enemies of your salvation shall not be able to hinder your eternal welfare. The enemies you have to encounter with, are both many and mighty; with whose furious assaults, hellish malice, and hostility, you must conflict, while in this militant state: from thence you are exercised with many sorrows, temptations and afflictions; but (through the assistance of your Great Captain), you shall carry the field, maugre all their attempts; Rom. viii. 38, 39. Neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, &c., shall be able to separate from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord. God will quickly sound you a retreat from the war, and then you shall be more than conquerors, through him that hath loved you.

Upon the whole, most excellent and sound is that 17th Article of the Church of England; "That the Godly consideration of predestination, and our election in Christ, is full of sweet, pleasant, and unspeakable comfort to Godly persons, and such as feel in themselves the workings of the Spirit of Christ."

II. Hence the children of God have abundant occasion, to be filled with rapturous praises, and to cant their hallelujas unto him, that with such eternal loving kindness has loved them.

1. Consider that God freely made the difference in his eternal counsel. You were but clay in the hands of the potter, and it was only God's sovereign goodness, that has made you vessels of honour; Rom. ix. 21. Think of the fallen angels, that are reserved in chains under darkness, until the judgment of the great day: and how have you deserved the saving goodness of God more than they? Think of many of your fellow creatures under a necessity to perish for lack of vision; and you, (though deserving no better than they) the distinguished monuments of God's redeeming love. O, let your ravished souls, continually breathe forth that language, Ps.

cxv. 1. Not unto us, Lord, not unto us, but unto thy name, belong glory and praise!

2. Consider how adorable and worthy of highest return of praise, is that distinguishing special grace of God—to you magnified, why such hell-deserving sinners as you made the objects of God's special grace and kindness? All the reason is, even so Father, for so it seemeth good in thy sight! Matt. xi. 26.

N. 3. Be exhorted in the language of the Apostle, 2 Pet. i. 10, Wherefore the rather, brethren, give diligence, to make your calling and election sure. Nothing (syrs) of such unalterable concernment, as to lay in a sure foundation against the time to come. But how shall we do this?

1. Keep close with God, in a constant, diligent course of duty. The more you are with God in ways of nearest intimacy, the more likely to meet with the evidences of his redeeming love. The way to assurance, (says Dr. Preston,) is painful duty.

2. Above all things, seek after Christ as your portion and trust. Let your constant breathing of soul be, as in Phil. iii. 9, That you may be found in Christ, not having your own righteousness, which is of the law, but that which is through the faith of Christ?—FINIS.

[For the Baltimore Literary and Religious Magazine.]

PSYCHOLOGY;

Or a View of the Human Soul: including Anthropology, by Frederick A. Rauch.—New York, M. W. Dodd.—1840.

THE study of German literature has become quite the rage in our country. In most of our northern colleges, the German Grammar is as common as the Latin and Greek. But, as yet, the knowledge of the German language is confined to so few, that most readers have acquired all their knowledge of German literature through the medium of translations. It must be quite refreshing to this class of readers, to have a work on the German philosophy, original in the English language, as is presented in the work before us. They can now have a knowledge of the German philosophy, without the loss occasioned by the evaporation of the spirit and the wasting of the sense, which always takes place, more or less, in translating an author from one language into another. They can now see the German philosophy clothed in a dress made for it by a German mind; and can converse with it, without the intervention of an interpreter. But still, we think that the German philosophy cannot be fully appreciated, without reading it in the German language. The English language cannot be cut into a fashion that will exactly fit it. It has some peculiar conformations which cannot be fitted, except by a dress made of cloth expressly woven for it. Still, however, enough of its peculiarities can be seen, in an English dress, to satisfy the tastes of those who are in any-wise imbued by the noble spirit of the Baconian philosophy.

We will here at once say—in order that our readers may be prepared for the sequel—that we are sorry to see so many of our young

men and old, cultivating this exotic literature, which, springing up in imagination, has a soil that will produce a luxuriant growth, all trunk and branches, and leaves and blossoms, but no fruit; and neglecting our own noble literature, which, casting its strong roots wide and deep into common sense, has a soil able to sustain its robust trunk, and softly and wide-spreading branches laden with all their rich fruits. We, of course, rejoice to see the youth of our country cultivating the literature of a country so distinguished for its ripe scholars, as Germany: but what we oppose—and it is against this, that we warn our young men; for we dread the influence of it upon their minds—the methods and spirit of the German philosophy. Its legitimate fruits, are neology, transcendentalism, pantheism, and all sorts of mystical nonsense. Germany is the hot-bed of all imaginable strange doctrines. Where did animal magnetism come from, and phrenology, and homeopathy? These things are the inevitable results of the German methods of investigation; which are admirably described by that great master-workman, who laid the foundations of our English philosophy on the basis of common sense, the only foundation strong enough to sustain the vast and glorious superstructures in astronomy, in chemistry, in medicine and the other sciences which have been reared upon it, by the illustrious men of England, as well as the successful cultivators of science on the continent, Lavois, La Place, Cuvier, Berzelius and others. This great master-workman is Lord Bacon, the first true interpreter of nature, the great democratic philosopher of the world, who rejecting the notion that there should be one set of doctrines for philosophers and another for the people, threw wide open the doors of the temples where the false philosophy had been taught, and told the people to go in and examine for themselves the things there taught by philosophers, and then to go out and survey creation through all its extent, and read the doctrines taught by nature, and judge for themselves; and no longer to bow down to authority in matters of opinion. In a word, he taught the doctrine of private judgment in philosophy. And the Anglo-Saxon race have adopted this doctrine; and where upon the face of this earth, has science achieved such triumphs, and administered so much to the comforts of man, as in all the climes which this people inhabit. Their arts, the useful ones at least, are the most perfect; their literature the most robust, and laden with the most masculine beauties; their political institutions the freest, personal rights being limited by no other restraint than the beautiful maxim of their law, *sic utere tuo, ut alienum non laedas*; their religion the purest, teaching that no man's merits can entitle him to heaven; and all that ennobles human nature is more fully exemplified in their history, than in that of any other people. The sacredness of the marriage tie, the purity of private life, the sincerity of friendship, charity towards the poor, and general love of mankind exemplified in missions to Christianize the heathen, are the distinguishing traits of Anglo-Saxon civilization. And we believe that all is owing to the influence of the Baconian method of investigation, which gives a practical and common-sense turn to the mind, enabling men to look at every thing, religion as well as phi-

losophy, in simplicity and truth, and thus to realise them, and not waste their efforts in wild speculations. Lord Bacon thus describes the method of philosophising which the Germans have adopted, "Another error hath proceeded from too great a reverence, and a kind of adoration of the mind of man; by means whereof men have withdrawn themselves too much from the contemplation of nature, and the observations of experience, and have tumbled up and down in their reason and conceits." Upon these intellectualists, which are notwithstanding, commonly taken for the most sublime philosophers, Heraclitus gave a just censure, saying "Men sought truth in their own little worlds, and not in the great and common world; for they disdain to spell, and so by degrees to read in the volume of God's works; and contrariwise, by continual meditation and agitation of wit, do urge, and as it were, invoke their own spirits to divine and give oracles unto them, whereby they are deservedly deluded—for the wit and mind of man, if it work upon matter, which is the contemplation of the creatures of God, worketh according to the stuff, and is limited thereby; but if it worketh upon itself, as the spider worketh his web, then it is endless, and brings forth indeed cobwebs of learning, admirable for the fineness of thread and work, but of no substance or profit."

We think the reader will see this method clearly exemplified in the work before us; and as our limits will not permit us to make application of it to particular instances, we must request the reader to bear the matter in mind as we proceed through the sequel.

The work before us is divided into two great parts, Anthropology and Psychology. Anthropology treats of the mind of man in its connection with the body, its dependence upon it, and through it, upon nature. Psychology treats of the mind in its relations to itself.

Our author divides Anthropology into three parts:

"1st. Of the *permanent* influences of nature, of race, sex, &c., upon the mind.

"2d. Of the *transient* influences of age, sleep, dreaming, &c.

"3d. Of the power of the mind over the body."

In treating of the influence of nature upon man, he makes the development of man's intellectual and moral nature depend too much upon physical circumstances. On page 51, he says, "The West is the proper field for science, art and history, for there alone man obtains full possession of himself, and a clear consciousness of the world around him. It is remarkable, that as the sun rises in the East, so many sciences have originated there, and even religion was there first revealed to man. But nothing gains its full maturity in the East." The conclusion here is too general; and reaches too far down the civilization of man. It seems to pre-suppose that the civilization of the East is as perfect as physical nature will allow. This is the doctrine of philosophy, falsely so called, which derives all its powers from nature. But Christianity teaches a far different doctrine; for though man in himself is not able to overcome the influences of external physical circumstances, and raise himself in the scale of civilization, as history amply testifies, yet Christianity, by its purifying influences—the ennobling hopes

it inspires, the elevated purposes it begets in the human breast—borrowing its powers from heaven, it proclaims the doctrine which philosophy never dreamed of—the civilization of Jew and Gentile, the moral and intellectual emancipation of all races of men throughout all regions of the earth. This is the doctrine of revelation; and the philosophy that contradicts it, must be false to us, who recognise other agencies in the civilization of man than mere natural causes, whether physical or moral—who enlighten our philosophy with revelation.

Our author seems to have been aware of this tendency of his doctrine; and therefore has added at the end of his remarks upon the subject, the following cautionary observation, "Considering such facts, we must acknowledge, that it is not climate alone, nor soil, nor the food, nor the manner of living, which causes such differences in mankind, but that there must be some cause in man himself, a cause which will incline him to form certain habits, to seek for a home that will correspond with their feelings and desires. Correct as it is, to consider customs and habits as dependent on the natural influences of a region, it is also certainly true, that a prevailing inclination attracts man to a particular region"—p. 59. But this merely shifts his error from one point to another.

Under the second division of Anthropology, our author, among other topics, treats of prophetic dreams, pre-sentiment, vision and second sight. Relative to each of these topics, many strange tales are told, and an attempt is then made to explain their seeming supernatural character upon philosophical principles. We shall confine our remarks to what is said about pre-sentiment; as the reader can get an idea of what is said about the other topics, from what is said relative to this; and as our design is to exhibit the manner and spirit of the work, and not to give a detailed review. On page 118 it is stated that, "Jung Stilling, in his Almanac of 1808, relates a remarkable pre-sentiment of a minister, who was taking a walk with the intention of visiting a rocky mountain near his house, and of enjoying the beautiful view from it. While approaching the summit of the mountain, he felt restless and uneasy; unable to explain this feeling, he asked himself, whether it was right for him to spend his time thus idly, and busied in such thoughts, he stepped aside for a moment to seek a cool place under a wall formed by the rock. He had scarcely left the narrow path leading to the top of the mountain, when a large stone, breaking loose from the rest of the rock, with great vehemence struck the spot, where one moment before he was standing. The Reverend John Dodd, one evening, when already undressed, felt a great agitation in his mind, which was wholly unaccountable to him. It seemed to him, that he ought to go and visit a friend, who lived a mile or two off from him. His family tried to dissuade him from going that night, but their efforts were in vain. Mr. Dodd went, dark as it was, and on arriving at the house of his friend, he found him ready to commit suicide. His unexpected visit and counsel, prevented the deed forever, and his friend became converted to divine grace." Now, the mystery of these two tales is unraveled by the doctrine of pre-sentiment, which is defined by our author

to be, "the dark foreboding of something taking place either in ourselves or around us. Its possibility must not be considered as a privilege of the mind, to dive into futurity or distance, but as a disease and weakness, by which it sinks from its state of clear waking into that of dreaming and drowsiness, or from its state of human life into that of animal existence. For animals, whose life is more or less plunged into the general life of nature, and penetrated by it, and whose feeling is that of sympathy with the elements in which they live, have a high degree of pre-sentiment.—When the inhabitants around Vesuvius feel secure, the nightingale prophesies a near eruption, and flutters about, sending forth heart-rending notes." Now this is philosophy with a vengeance to it. A man is enabled to get some foreboding of future events, or events happening at a distance, "by sinking from a state of clear waking into that of dreaming and drowsiness, or from his state of human life into that of animal existence;" and the rationale of all this, is that animals have great sympathy with the elements of nature, and can thereby ascertain the coming of some natural phenomenon, as for instance the eruption of Vesuvius. So then the minister got into a state of dreaming and drowsiness, (but the statement does not say so; and therefore, the facts do not come up to the hypothesis,) and sunk from his state of human life into that of animal existence; or in other words, got very near to being a nightingale, and thus ascertained by sympathy with the natural elements that the rock was about to fall from the mountain on the spot where he was standing. On page 121, our author says, "On a similar ground we must explain pre-sentiment concerning friends; they rest on deep sympathy with them, or a kind of polar relation." So then, the Rev'd Mr. Dodd was possessed of the notion that something was about to befall his friend, on account of a kind of polar relation to him. Now, is it not extraordinary, that the human mind can be so perverted by false methods of philosophising, as actually to practice upon itself such self-delusion, as is evinced by any one supposing, that he was really writing sense, and show what he meant, when he talked of sinking from human life into that of animal existence, and of a man's having a kind of polar relation to his friend. But as extraordinary as these notions may appear, we will now introduce to our readers, doctrines so extravagant, as to give even to these an air of reasonableness.

Our author, amongst other important topics, which he has thought worthy of philosophical disquisition, has, under the division of Anthropology which we have been considering, discussed the subject of Somnambulism. On page 133, he says, "Somnabulists, as has been seen, speak, act, and walk, while the four senses of the head are asleep." This our author accounts for, upon the following theory: "Here we must remember what has been said on the nature of sleep and dreaming in general, that the life of the soul is merged into that of the body, and rests principally in the glanglion nervous system. This now is so much excited in its activity, that to some degree it may be substituted for the upper senses. The sense of feeling as spread over the whole skin, is the source of the four senses of the head, as may be easily seen from comparative anatomy.

With the crab, for instance, the ear is nothing else than a skin softer than the rest, below which lies a bag filled with moisture and nerves. The eye of flies consists only of a thin skin, to which runs a filament of a nerve.—Flies have undoubtedly a good scent, and yet they have no nose. Some have, therefore, thought that they smell with their wind-pipes, others, with a soft place behind their lips, and others, with their feelers. These remarks fully establish the truth, that our common way of perceiving things, is not the only one; and therefore, what is not analogous to it, deserves not to be rejected for that reason merely. In Somnambulism, feeling as spread over the whole body, is heightened and changed into a capacity of *perceiving*. The mere feeling of any thing within or without becomes a sensation or perception; hence Somnabulists see their own viscera, and especially those which are much excited during the state of somnambulism." It is really humiliating that the human mind should be so easily deluded as to render a serious refutation of such doctrines as these necessary. But as we have seen some of our public critical journals notice the work under consideration, in a favourable manner, without saying any thing about these doctrines, we feel constrained to expose their futility. These doctrines are wholly at war with the best established principles of physiology. The discoveries of Sir Charles Bell, have established the doctrine that sensibility and motion are distinct faculties, and are the peculiar endowments of different nerves. If the nerve of motion in the lips be cut, and lose its function, the animal cannot gather its food with them; and if the nerve of sensation be injured, the animal presses its lips to the food, but wants the sensibility by which the motions of the lips should be directed; and the mouth loses its functions. The tongue is endowed with both the faculties of taste, touch and motion, and all these are seated, each in its peculiar nerve, or nerves; and either may be destroyed by injuring its proper nerve, without impairing the others. There must always be a nerve endowed with the susceptibility of the sense of sound, or taste, or touch, or smell, or sight, in order to give the animal the corresponding faculty. These physiological doctrines of the English school are put beyond controversy by the many and various experiments by which they have been attested.

The doctrine of Anthropology, based upon these physiological principles, is that certain ideas originate in the mind through the operation of corresponding nerves; and that one organ of sense can never become a substitute for another, so as to convey to the mind the same idea. Every impression made upon the nerve of vision will excite in the mind, the idea of vision, and not of smelling, or hearing, or tasting, or any other idea but that to which it is appropriated. Destroy the optic nerve, and the other senses can never supply its place: the sun, moon, and stars can never be seen again. If the optic nerve were placed in the ear, it would not convey to the brain the impression of sound; nor, if the nerve of hearing were placed in the bottom of the eye, would it convey to the brain the impression of light.

Such is the law of the senses in their healthy condition. Can disease or an undue excitement change these laws, or cause the

senses to operate without subordination to them? Surely not! Universal experience, and universal analogy are against it. In all their diseases, the senses are subordinated to the law, that every nerve is appropriated to its peculiar functions; and hence, "the false sensations, says Sir Charles Bell, which accompany the morbid irritation of them from external causes, when there is in reality nothing presented externally; such as flashes of light, ringing of the ears, and bitter tastes or offensive smells. These sensations are caused through the excitement of the respective nerves of sense by derangement of some internal organ, and most frequently of the stomach."—Bell on the hand, p. 134. Now, these are very familiar phenomena of disease in the senses. Did any one ever hear a patient complain of fire flashing from his nose or ears, or of a ringing in his eyes, or of a bad smell in his ears, or of a bitter taste in his eyes? We rather suppose not.

If these views be correct, (and who can doubt them?) what becomes of our author's doctrine, that "feeling, as spread over the whole body, is heightened and changed into a capacity of perceiving?" Our author has been led into this error by the doctrine which he lays down relative to the senses—"The sense of feeling as spread over the whole skin, is the source of the four senses of the head, as may be easily seen from comparative anatomy." This doctrine, that all the senses are but a modification of the sense of touch, or of common sensibility, is thus refuted by Sir Charles Bell, in his treatise of the mechanism of the hand—"I have used the term common sensibility in conformity with the language of authors, and with customary parlance; but the expressions, the "common nerves," and the "common sensibility" in a philosophical inquiry are inadmissible. Indeed these terms have been the cause of much of the obscurity which has hung over the subject of the nervous system, and of our blindness to the benevolent adaptation of the endowments of that system to the condition of animal existence. Thus, it has been supposed that some nerves are more coarsely provided for sensation, and that others are of a finer quality, adapted to more delicate impressions. It is assumed that the nerve of the eye is finer than the nerve of the finger—without considering that the retina is insensible to that quality of matter of which we readily acquire the knowledge through touch. Nerves, are indeed, appropriated to peculiar senses, and to the bestowing of distinct functions, but delicacy of texture has nothing to do with this. The nerve of touch in the skin is insensible to light or to sound, not because it has a coarser or more common texture: The beauty and perfection of the system is, that the nerve is made susceptible to its peculiar impression only. The nerve of the skin is alone capable of giving the sense of contact, as the nerve of vision is confined to its own office. If this appropriation resulted merely from a more delicate texture; if the retina were sensible to the matter of light, only from possessing a finer sensibility than the nerve of touch, it would be a source of torment; whereas it is most beneficently provided that it shall not be sensible to pain, nor be capable of conveying any impressions to the mind but those which operate according to its proper functions, producing light and colour. The

pain which we experience in the eye, and the irritation from dust, are owing to a distinct nerve from that of vision, and are consequent on the susceptibility of the surface to a different kind of impression."

We feel pretty well assured, that by this time, the reader is convinced, that true philosophy teaches what his common sense had before told him, that flies do not "smell with their wind-pipes," and that the somnabulist cannot "see his own viscera." Charles the Second, of England, once propounded to the Royal Society, the question, why it was, that if a fish were put into a tumbler full of water, the water could not run over, and the tumbler would not be increased in weight. None of the wisecracs, after the most assiduous study, could solve the difficulty, and so reported to the king. The wagghish Charles then, to the great mortification of the learned book-worms, told them, they should have inquired whether the fact was, as stated to them, before they attempted a solution. So the Baconian philosophy tells the writer on Anthropology to ascertain the truth of his philosophical facts, before he attempts to account for the supposition that a somnabulist can see his own viscera. Prove your facts, is the great doctrine of the Baconian philosophy. It was this precept which drove philosophy from the cloister, where it sat clothed in its monkish garb reading musty books, by candle-light in the day-time, and led her forth over the earth to see nature as it is, and among the daily avocations of men, in order that she might see the realities of life.

We will now exhibit to our readers, samples of what our author has said upon Psychology, the main subject of his work. Among other topics discussed under this division of his work, our author treats of "the mutual relation of body and soul;" and in order to exhibit the matter clearly, he first discourses of the nature of the body. On page 171, he says, "We seem to have gained, then, this one idea, that the external frame is not the body, and that it is not to be opposed to the soul, but that the life and power which connect the elements is the body." The reasons which lead our author to this singular conclusion, is that the external frame is continually changing: "If, then," says he, (p. 170,) "the particles of the external frame are incessantly changing, they cannot be the body itself, since new settlements are every moment received, and old ones excluded, and all of them are but dust. The true and genuine body must be that which retains and preserves its *organical* identity in all these changes, which remains the same in the never-ceasing stream of matter. But what is this original identity? The life or power which connects the gases, earths, metals and salt (of which the body is composed) into one whole, which penetrating them, keeps them together, or dismisses some and attracts others. No sooner does this penetrating power retire, than the body becomes a corpse, and the elements fall asunder; this power is the true body—it is invisible, but connecting the elements according to an eternal and divine law, it becomes manifest by its productions." To those who have been accustomed to the common sense methods and the sober realities of the Baconian philosophy, such philosophy as this, seems the veriest trifling imaginable. What further insight into the nature of the subject, do we gain by such argu-

mentation? Do we not, when we accustom ourselves to such methods of investigation, deceive ourselves into the belief that we really know more about the nature of the body, when we, by a mere string of words, a mere substitution of one form of expression for another, instead of stepping from one point of real knowledge to another, arrive at the conclusion, "that the external frame is not the body—but that the life and power which connects the elements, is the body?" Our author starts from this conclusion, and pushes his investigation into the nature of this power which he has determined is the body; and concludes that it is life. "That which (page 171,) is permanent in these changes, and combines the elements in this manner, is *life*. The idea of life is, therefore, to be next considered." Our author then proceeds to investigate the nature of life; and concludes, that "life being formed, does not proceed from matter; but is a thought of God accompanied by the divine will, to be realised in nature, and to appear externally by an organized body." From this last proposition, he deduces the conclusion, that "the animal with its members and senses, is a divine thought exhibited in an external form." Does any human being know more about the question discussed, viz., "What do we understand by body," than he did before he read this? What then is such a method of investigation worth? The end of all rational energies, is knowledge: but this leaves us where it found us, with our heads rendered giddy by a continual round of words.

Our author having settled to his own satisfaction, what the body is, turns to the consideration of the soul, and applies to it, the foregoing proposition, that the animal is a divine thought exhibited in an eternal form. In applying this to man, (page 172), to the union of soul and body, we may say, the soul of man is likewise a divine thought, a creation of God, filled with power to live an existence of its own. But it is *soul*, for it comprehends itself and all that is; and not only does it comprehend itself, but it is also able to produce new thoughts in accordance with its laws of thinking. Again, it develops itself like all other life in nature; and develops itself in a two fold direction; outwardly and inwardly. There can be nothing *merely* internal, but it must be so only in reference to itself as external. The flesh of the apple is internal only in reference to its skin, which is external. The internal or thinking life of the soul has its external, and this the sensitive life of the body, by which the soul is connected with the world. The life of the soul and the body is therefore *one* in its origin; a two-fold expression of the same energy." What sort of insight does all this give us into the nature of the union of soul and body? Does the mind ascertain any substantial fact?

As most of the apparent reality of the German philosophy consists in its peculiar forms of expression, we will sum up this last argument in our own language; so that the reader who is not familiar with German modes of expression, may see what the argument appears, when stated in our common-sense phraseology. The first position, is that the external frame is not the body; the next is, that the life is the body; the third is, that nothing can be external, without being internal. From this last proposition, it is argued,

that the soul must have its external; and that "the sensitive life of the body" is that external: and, as it had been before proved, that the life is the body, and it is now proved, that the life is the external of the soul, therefore, it is proved, that soul and body are one—"a two-fold expression of the same energy;" and the union of soul and body is no longer a mystery, but a plain philosophical truth. We imagine that the reader is pretty well convinced by this time, that the German philosophy has no line long enough to sound the bottom of this mystery: and that he knows no more about the union of the soul and body than he did before the light of the German philosophy was shed upon his mind.

Our author next gives an exposition of personality. "Personality (p. 175) is likewise a centre and union of the manifold, but one that is awake in itself, and having once found, cannot again lose itself, but will enjoy itself forever." And on page 177-8, "The *person* is not only the centre of man, whose radii and periphery are all the activities of body and soul, and by which all of them are *pronounced*, that is, through which they sound *personant*, but it is also,

1st. The centre of nature, the echo of the universe. What nature contains scattered and in fragments, is united in the person of man. Every isolated feeling—every solitary sound in nature is to *pass through* man's personality and to centre in it. His personality is the great, beautiful, and complete *bell*, that announces every thing, while nature contains only parts of it, the sound of which are dark and dull."

We will interrupt the amazement, which these quotations must produce in the minds of our readers, who are not familiar with German philosophy, and ask, if all this does not sound a good deal like counsellor Philips's speeches.

We will now turn to the 256 page, where our author treats of "pure thinking," and select a proposition to cap the climax to which we are hastening: "The law of gravity which attracts all particles to a common centre, and the law according to which in times of danger, all citizens incline to one great individual, as for instance, Washington, is the same."

Can such notions as we have exhibited to our readers be dignified with the name of philosophy? If it were not for the high respect which we entertain for the memory of so cultivated a scholar and so urbane a Christian gentleman as was Dr. Rauch, our candour, as reviewers, would constrain us to pronounce them sheer nonsense. It is fearful how the German mind is enslaved by the methods of the transcendental philosophy. Though Dr. Rauch came to our country, a young man, and had, therefore, been, at an early period of his life, conversant with the strong common-sense of the English philosophy, and with its practical methods, and was a man of fine natural endowments, and of a high order of scholarship, still so biased was his mind by his German education, that in this his "attempt to unite German and American mental philosophy," he has put forth some as wild vagaries as the transcendentalism of Germany can furnish. We felt, that the study of the work, was calculated to beguile the young men of our country, from the practical paths of our philosophy, and were therefore impelled to put forth this warning.

[Continued from page 299.]

MOLINISM.

No. VIII.

XV. *Some Notices of Port Royal.*

PORT ROYAL was the name of an Abbey of the order of Citeaux, which was situated about six leagues from Paris. Its history is closely connected with these disputes in the Roman Catholic church. This abbey was given, in the year 1602, by the king, at the solicitation of her maternal grand-father, then advocate general to Marié Angelique de Sainte Madelaine Arnauld, who was only eleven years old at the time she was thus made Abbess; and her own mother, having become a widow, became also an inmate of the convent, and, it is said, lived with the docility of a child under the guidance of her own daughter, who was in truth, a child. The mother Abbess (child as she was, however,) conceived, in 1608, the design of reforming the Abbey, which was only a few months after the conclusion of the Congregations *de auxiliis*. Francis de Sales, was well acquainted with her, and esteemed her greatly. The mother, Angelique, extended her efforts of reform to several Abbeys of her order. In 1629, she relinquished her charge, and by order of the king, the house of Port Royal returned to the usage, (which it seems had previously obtained) of electing the Abbess every three years. These efforts of the Abbess made her acquainted with the famous Abbé de St. Cyran, who figures considerably in the history of Port Royal. His name was Jean du Verger de Hauranne. He was a native of Bayonne, and he studied theology in the Faculty of Louvain with the celebrated Jansenius. On the occasion of an accession of thirty nuns to Port Royal, it was found necessary, on account of the badness of the air and the scantiness of their accommodation, to remove them to Paris, where they established what was called the Port Royal of Paris. But this new establishment did not continue very long, and the nuns, after a temporary absence, returned to Port Royal *des Champs*. By means of the Abbé St. Cyran Anthony le Maistre, a lawyer and counsellor of state, renounced his profession, and retired to a small establishment near Port Royal de Paris. Sericour, a brother of le Maistre, who was in the army, soon after joined him in his retreat. De Sacy, who was their youngest brother, also retired to the same place, as did several other persons through the influence of the Abbé de St. Cyran. In May, 1638, S. Cyran was imprisoned, as it is said, by order of Cardinal Richelieu. Notwithstanding this, the number of *solitaries* increased, and they were obliged to retire from Paris to Port Royal des Champs. This occurred during the time that this latter Abbey was unoccupied by the nuns as before mentioned. These persons pursued at that place the life of anchorets, in regard to dress, diet, and fastings. S. Cyran, though in prison, was their spiritual guide. These *solitaries*, repaired the establishment by their own labour, but on the return of the nuns from Paris, they retired to the farm or place *des Granges* which was quite near. During the imprisonment of S. Cyran, the famous Anthony Arnauld, the youngest,

brother of the mother Angelique, joined the solitaries. Thus a body of men was formed which, on account of its connexion with the monastery, took the name of *Port Royal*, but with the Jesuits they passed under the name of *Jansenists*.

The attack which was made upon a work of Jansenius, which will be mentioned hereafter, gave occasion to Arnauld to defend the doctrine of Augustine and Thomas, on the subject of grace—which was what the Dominicans undertook to do in the Congregations *de auxiliis*. Jansenius, who was taught theology at Louvain, composed his book on the same subject with the aid, it is said, of S. Cyran. It is worthy of remark, that when the controversy waxed warm between the Jesuits and the men of Port Royal, and the latter were objects of calumny and violence, the Dominicans who had shown so much zeal in the same controversy previously to, and during the Congregations *de auxiliis*, now seemed chiefly anxious to separate themselves and their interests as a sect, from the persecuted Jansenists. This was another and not an insignificant token of the declension of that large society from truth and piety.—Yet the difficulty of the contest was greatly enhanced. The Jesuits had multiplied in numbers and influence.—They had had the benefit of time and controversy, to consolidate their system, and guard it by new inventions, at its more valuable points; and their system being, as it was, an assemblage of almost all the false opinions and dangerous practices which had from time to time, and at different times prevailed in the church, commended itself to the inclinations of the multitude. The Port Royalists were unable to stem the torrent. At the beginning of their society, they were scarcely known at Paris. Few, if any of them, attained to high places in the church. Few of the prelates formed any connections with them, and still fewer espoused their side of the questions in dispute. As they advanced in their controversies they were thwarted by many of the dignitaries of church and state. The Port Royalists were sensible how far short they fell of success and consoled themselves by saying “that the design of God was not to renew his church at that time.” Yet their learned labours were considerable and embraced a variety of subjects. They managed their controversy with the Jesuits with more boldness and honesty than the Dominicans had done, and avoided the use of expressions which might be perverted to the advantage of Molinism.

It was their aim to employ, as far as they could, the expressions of the fathers; and when they were obliged to make use of scholastic expressions, they were cautious to guard them by explanations against perversion or abuse. They had a higher sense of the importance of the doctrines of grace, than the Dominicans appear to have had, and they saw more clearly the influence of their doctrines upon Christian morals. And although the popes, as we have seen, at first tolerated and afterwards favoured the errors of Molina, and forbade discussions of the doctrines of grace and predestination during the suspension of the Papal decree prepared at the conclusion of the Congregations *de auxiliis*. Yet this did not deter them from maintaining these doctrines (according to their views of them), openly and boldly—a fact which no doubt tended greatly to their disadvantage at the Court of Rome.

S. Cyran who, as we have seen, was the spiritual guide of this society at its formation, lived to see the commencement of their controversies with the Jesuits; in fact it was he who engaged Arnold to come out in defence of the doctrines of grace. He died on the 11th of Oct., 1643, about eight months after his liberation from prison.

The reader must not suppose from these observations, that the Society of Port Royal held the truth in Gospel purity. They were the subject of some deplorable errors; yet comparatively with the Jesuits, or even the Dominicans, they were pure in doctrine and morals. The character of Blaise Pascal, for talents, learning and piety are too well known not to be highly respected—yet he was a decided Romanist, and his religious opinions were adulterated by some of the gross errors peculiar to that church. But so far, however, did he differ from the Jesuits, that they disown him as a Catholic. "Pascal," said the Rev. John Hughes, "was a Jansenist, and as such was not a Romanist, nor even a Catholic. This mistake is common among Protestants; even those who ought to be acquainted with the difference." The reader is by this time prepared to see in what sense this observation of Mr. Hughes is true. Pascal belonged to a body of men who did not allow themselves to be swept away, (or we should rather say, who were prevented by Divine grace from being swept away,) by that strong and wide spreading tide of corruption which began to act upon the Catholic church at the Reformation, and the influence of which begins to be clearly discernible at the origin of the Society of Jesuits; and the progress and effects of which are indicated by the growth and influence of that Society. This influence extended so far as to affect and vitiate by new errors that church generally. The whole Roman Catholic body was turned out of its former course. There were indeed some exceptions, and Pascal and the Society of Port Royal were among them. These men ought to have become Protestants, but by refusing to be so, and also by refusing to follow the lead of the Jesuits, they soon came to stand alone. They adhered, however, to the Roman Catholic church, and were treated by the popes as subjects of their discipline, while between them and the Jesuits there was as little unity of doctrine on the fundamental truths of religion as there was between Augustin and Pelagius.

XVI. Jansenius and the character of his book—and Controversies of which it was the occasion.

Cornelius Jansenius was a doctor of Louvain, and afterwards bishop of Ypre. He was born in Holland in the village of Acquoi, near Leerdam and Rotterdam, in 1585. His father's name was John Otto. Holland was at that time a Protestant country; but John Otto and his family, were Roman Catholics. Young Otto, studied at Louvain, where he took the name, *Jansenius*, that is *Son of John*. At Louvain, Jansenius imbibed the sentiments of St. Augustine upon the doctrines of Grace. His first teacher in theology was James Jansenius, and it was there he became acquainted with the Abbè of S. Cyran. He afterwards went to France on account of his health, and then he formed an intimate friendship with the

Abbè of S. Cyran. They studied together at Bayonne, during six years, and their attention was devoted to the Scriptures, the fathers, and particularly the writings of St. Augustine. Jansenius returned to Louvain, where he was professor of theology. He was made bishop of Ypre, in 1636, and died of the plague, May 6, 1638. He composed several works, but his *Augustinus*, upon which he expended much labour, was finished only a short time before his death. It was printed after his death. This was the book that caused so much agitation in the Roman Catholic church.

Jansenius was induced (it is said) to undertake the composition of this work by observing the controversies between the Protestants and the Roman Catholics. The Jesuits took the lead in the cause of the Papacy, and they were accused by the Protestants of abandoning the doctrine of St. Paul, and even that of Augustine, and of teaching that of Pelagius. Jansenius saw the force of this accusation—he perceived, also, the embarrassments in which most of the Thomists were involved by the admixture of Molinism with their system. He therefore undertook the composition of the work just mentioned, and professed to make St. Augustine his guide. His book is said to be little else than a tissue of texts taken from the writings of that father, and systematized so as to show the coherence and bearings of that father's principles. It is said that Jansenius had read the entire works of Augustine, *ten times*, and his writings against the Pelagians, *thirty times*. He undertook to prove that the ideas of the Molinists, upon the subject of grace, were directly opposed to those of Augustine—and at bottom were nothing else but Pelagianism. He attempted to show, also, that to a certain extent, the Thomists obscured the doctrines of grace by their manner of treating of them—that they lessened the importance of these doctrines, and withal did not follow, as they ought, the principles of the fathers; although he said that his views accorded, in all essential points, with the Thomists. Jansenius had the aid of the Abbè of S. Cyran, in the composition of this work.

The difference between Jansenius and the Thomists, has been thus stated: "The Thomists explained the manner in which God works good in men, in a dry scholastic way. They insisted only on the consent of the will which God produces; but they paid little or no attention to the inclinations of the heart; which are the ground of consent. They did not insist upon the manner in which the consent of man is wrought, *namely*, in overcoming his corrupt inclinations, by a celestial pleasure, which is nothing else than a love of righteousness: Jansenius makes great use of this last idea, and in that, he follows Augustine. The Thomists, by omitting to do so, denuded the subject of its proper interest, and rendered their doctrine unintelligible." It is said, also, that after the disputes occasioned by this book of Jansenius, several celebrated Thomists (such as Serry Contenson Massoulie) adopted the method of Jansenius in explaining these doctrines—Jansenius differed from the Thomists in another point relative to the state of angels and of man in the state of innocence. He held that in that state it was the will of the creature which decided its condition; *that is to say*, he held that man in the state of innocence was in the same condi-

tion which the Molinists say that fallen man now is: in other words, the fall of man is the cause or origin of the need that man now has of grace, not only to give him the power to do good, but to determine his will to do good. He professed to find authority for this opinion in Augustine. The Thomists, on the contrary, held that the creature, in consequence of *its quality or condition as creature*, or of its being a creature, must of necessity, always have depended entirely on the Creator, and that too, in the state of innocence. Adam, they said, could not do any good which God did not efficaciously create in him, by determining his will to do it. Those who adopted this sentiment of Jansenius, were called Augustinians.

The point was purely *speculative*, since the condition of innocence ceased at the fall. But the Jesuits endeavoured to magnify the difference between the Thomists and Jansenius, in order to diminish the weight of these two opponents and some of the Thomists affected to consider the difference as important, in order to escape the persecutions which fell upon the defenders of Jansenius. The Society of Port Royal adopted this sentiment of Jansenius—subsequent discussions of that question had the effect of bringing back the major part of the Jansenist theologians to the sentiment of the Thomists.*—(See Hexaples, part 8th, *Grace d'Adam*, column 4th, *Premotien Physique*, section 4th. The doctrine of the Presbyterian church, on this subject, is contained in the Westminster Confession, chap. 9.)

Jansenius committed the publication of his book to Fromond and Calenus, and from the moment they set about the execution of the trust, the Jesuits took measures to prevent it. They set the Court of Rome in motion, and the prohibition to write upon the doctrines of grace was renewed.

Yet the book was published, first at Louvain, then at Paris, with high testimonials to its excellence—enough, in bulk, to form a volume. The Jesuits attacked it, by many writings, which the doctors of Louvain undertook to refute. On the 1st of August, 1641, the Inquisition at Rome, by a decree, forbade the reading of the *Augustinus* of Jansenius, and the books written in support of and against it. The University of Louvain were disinclined to obey this decree, and applied to the civil magistrates to suspend the execution of it, till the book should be judicially examined. Pope Urban VIII., was irritated at this resistance, and published a bull on the 6th of March, 1642, in which he not only renewed the constitutions of Pius V., Gregory XIII., the decrees of Paul V.,

* "The theology of Augustine was the best that was found in the monasteries during the middle ages. It was a light compared with that of the Aristotelian scholastics, but compared with that of Paul, it was but as the twilight to noon-day. It was not until the Reformation, that justification by faith was clearly preached as it had been before the church was corrupted. A believer of the school of Augustine who does not distinguish between the grace which justifies the sinner and the grace that sanctifies him, cannot rejoice always. He may be a real Christian, but he is shut up under the law—he is still under tutors, though he be an heir. He is a child in the faith but under the slavery of the rudiments of the world; Gal. iv. 1, 2, 3. It was impossible for the Jansenists to learn this new song of Protestantism which in its doctrines, takes its date long before the time of Augustine. Jansenism, therefore, languished from the first, and has become all but extinct."

and others which forbade the discussion of the doctrines of grace, but he undertook to declare that the book of Jansenius contained and maintained several propositions which had been already condemned. The University of Louvain, in concert with the Archbishop of Malines and the Bishop of Gand, sent agents or deputies to Rome: but (to cut short a long story, the details of which would not be interesting) though they obtained an audience, they were unable to obtain any explanation of the bull in favour of the doctrine of Jansenius. This conduct of the Court of Rome was of a piece with its previous policy; Jansenius's book was condemned in general terms without an examination. The Jesuits knew how to turn to their own account, the inclination of that Court to hold whatever they had done as an irrefragable law. Yet there was great difficulty in getting this bull published in the Netherlands, and when it was done, a qualification, saving the rights and customs of that country, was annexed, which greatly displeased the Court of Rome.

At Paris, the *Augustinus* of Jansenius excited a commotion.—Cardinal Richelieu disliked Jansenius. He excited Habert to attack the book of Jansenius, which the latter did publicly in 1642. He found, according to his judgment, forty heresies in it. Those who thought that Jansenius had fairly exhibited the doctrines of St. Augustine—and of these there were many, and among them the Society of Port Royal—considered the charge of Habert calumnious. It has already been stated, that Jansenius undertook the composition of this work in concert with the Abbé of S. Cyran. The latter, though still in prison, where he had been more than four years, urged Arnauld to undertake the defence of Jansenius. He exhorted him not to be silent or to dissemble through fear of preventing his liberation. He advised him to act in concert with the Archbishop of Sens, who had great zeal on the subject. Six days after writing the letter containing these exhortations, he was discharged from prison. He died about seven or eight months afterwards. Arnauld published his first apology for Jansenius in 1644. He charged Habert with imputing to Jansenius, opinions which he did not maintain, and with taking for errors the principles of Augustine himself. He also charged Habert with the errors of Pelagius. Habert replied, and in his reply diminished the *forty heresies* which he pretended to have found, to *twelve*. Arnauld rejoined, but Habert did not proceed any farther in the controversy. Afterwards these twelve heresies were still farther reduced to *five*, which were made famous by the bull of Innocent X., of 1653. The Sorbonne, at first, took no part against the doctrine of Jansenius, on the contrary, maintained it; but on the 1st of July, 1649, Cornet, the syndic of the faculty, who had belonged to the Society of Jesuits, presented to the faculty, five propositions upon which he asked their judgment, with a view, as he pretended, to guide him in examining the *Theses* of the Bachelors. He did not inform them where these propositions were taken from, and upon its being suggested that Jansenius was aimed at, the Syndic informed them, that Jansenius was not involved in the question. Cornet acted in concert with the Jesuits, and he had the address to get the examination of these propositions referred to certain doctors, who had

adopted the sentiments of Molina. They drew up a censure which however, they did not dare to publish. On the 20th of August, of the same year, sixty doctors appealed from this proceeding to Parliament, on the grounds that it was irregular to censure propositions not taken from any author—which no body maintained—which were ambiguously expressed, and that too, without designating the sense in which they were condemned; because such a course would jeopard the truth. The affair was adjusted by remitting things to the condition in which they were, before the propositions of Cornet; and by removing from the registers of the faculty, whatever had been recorded in relation to those propositions.—Yet the censure of these doctors was afterwards published.

As these propositions became quite famous, it may not be improper to copy them. They are expressed as follows, in the Bull of Innocent X.

(1.) *Aliqua Dei præcepta hominibus justis volentibus et conantibus secundum præsentem, quas habent vires, sunt impossibilia, deest quoque illis gratia, qua possibilea fiunt.* (Some commandments of God were impossible to righteous men, even when they desire and endeavour according to the strength they have, [to perform them] and the grace by which they become possible is wanting to them.)

(2.) *Interiori gratiæ in statu naturæ lapsæ nunquam resistitur.* (In the state of corrupted nature man never resists interior grace.)

(3.) *Ad merendum et demerendum in statu naturæ lapsæ non requiritur in homine libertas à necessitate, sed sufficit libertas à coactione.* (To deserve well and to deserve ill in the state of corrupted nature, man does not need to have liberty which exempts him from the necessity to will or to act; but it is enough if he has a liberty which exempts him from constraint.)

(4.) *Semi-Pelagiani admittebant prævenientis gratiæ interioris necessitatem ad singulos actus, etiam ad initium fidei; et in hoc erant hæretici, quod vellent, eam gratiam tatem esse, cui posset humana voluntas resistere vel obtemperare.* (The Semi-Pelagians admitted the necessity of interior preventing grace for all good works, even for the commencement of faith; and they were heretics in this, that they maintained that this grace must be such that the human will could resist or obey it.)

(5.) *Semi-Pelagianum est, dicere, Christum pro omnibus omnino hominibus mortuum esse, aut sanguinem fudisse.* (It is Semi-Pelagian to say, that Christ died, or that he shed his blood for all men, without any exception.)

There was a great dispute among the Romanists whether these propositions were contained in the book of Jansenius. It is said, that only the first of them is contained *in words*, and as to that the Jansenists maintained, “that if it be considered in connexion with the context of the place where it occurs, it means nothing more than that they just need efficacious grace to keep the commandments of God—that this grace is not due to them, and that if it be not given, they have not that kind of power to fulfil the commandments by which they will fulfil them effectually, although we may say, and ought to say, that they have a real power to accomplish them, and

that they are guilty, when they do not fulfil them." This, it was said, was also the general doctrine of the Thomists. The Jansenists in general, however, admitted that these propositions taken in their obvious sense were contrary to the doctrine of the ancient church. One of the professors of the Sorbonne, who took part with the Jansenists, pronounced them *heretical, Lutheran, fabricated at random, not to be found in Jansenius, nor in the writings of his defenders*. Yet, as they said, these propositions might be understood in an orthodox sense, they (viz. the Jansenists) objected to a general, vague condemnation of them, because they said, that as soon as that should be done, the Jesuits would apply the condemnation to the orthodox sense, instead of the more obvious and natural sense which, it was said, was the heretical sense, and in this, it was said, the artifice of the Jesuits consisted; the artifice, however, (if it was one,) was defeated for a time, but the Jesuits did not for all that, lose sight of their object.

The sense in which the Jansenists were willing to maintain these propositions, has been thus expressed by one of their defenders: viz., "The just have need of efficacious grace, to keep the commandments, and that without it, they will not keep them—that efficacious grace has always the effect, for which it is given—that by it God infallibly produces good in men—that it is not the human will, which determines in the first instance the effect which grace shall have—that although the Lord Jesus Christ died for all men, yet all do not receive the fruit of his death.

The heretical sense was said to consist in false consequences from the doctrines of grace, which tend to the destruction of liberty and also to the conclusion that man who sins, is not guilty, "God produces (said the Jansenists,) all the good there is in man, and man left to himself will infallibly do evil. This is the first truth. Another truth is, that God in producing good in man, does it by causing man to act freely without taking from him the power to do evil—but that God through love of good which He inspires man with, so influences the man that he does not wish to make use of the power which he has to do evil—or as Augustine says, *à Deo factum est ut vellent quod et nolle potuissent*. Also, (they say,) a man destitute of grace, will infallibly do evil, but he will do it freely; by the choice of his will, and even while preserving a power to do good, which is not less real, although it is very true, he will never make use of it without grace. Thus man is guilty while he does evil." The Jansenist author (whose views we are now expressing) admitted that it was very difficult to reconcile these truths, though he contended they did not destroy each other. The error, then, which the Jansenists admitted to be contained in the first three of these propositions, was, that they established the first of these truths at the expense of the second; for (said they,) if he to whom God does not give efficacious grace, has no power to do good, it follows that the commandments of God would be impossible to him, even though he be a just person, (which is the first proposition). And if God causes a man to do good in such a way as to take from him the power of doing evil, it follows that the human will cannot resist interior grace, (which is the fourth proposition,) and in either

case, man will be delivered from constraint, but he will not be delivered from necessity—that is to say, he will be borne through the whole extent of his will to good or to evil; and grace and concupiscence will be necessitating (which is the third proposition).

The second proposition (they said) respected an error which consists in saying, that there are no graces which on the one hand excite the will to do good, and on the other, fail in producing the accomplishment of good—in other words, that there are no such graces as Augustine called *exciting*, and which the new Thomists called *sufficient*; from which it would follow that a man never resists (effectually) interior grace, and that interior grace has always the effect towards which it tends. Jansenius, indeed, rejected the notion of the Molinists, concerning *sufficient grace*, and he did not concur with the Thomists in applying that phrase to *exciting grace*, though he admitted the fact of such grace.

It has already been said, that the Jansenists accused the Jesuits of artifice in getting up these propositions in this way, and that for a time the Jesuits failed of their object, which was under cover of these propositions, to get an approbation of their peculiar doctrines. Their intention specifically was to get a papal censure of what the Jansenists held for truth, under pretence of getting these propositions condemned in general terms, on the specific ground of a sense which they would bear, but which the Jansenists rejected. They did not succeed at that time; but at length they accomplished their object by procuring the papal bull, *Unigenitus*, which in pointed terms, condemns the doctrines maintained by the Jansenists. But we have dwelt rather too long, perhaps, on this particular subject; it was, however, necessary to state with some minuteness the questions in dispute between these two bodies of Roman Catholics. The Jansenists, it will be perceived, held doctrines approximating much more nearly to those of Evangelical Protestants, than did the Jesuits. Our object, however, is merely to present the state of the question between these contending parties, and not to justify in all points the doctrine of the Jansenists. From what has been said, then, it must be apparent that there could not be any real unity of faith between them.—But the Jansenists gave an undue importance to external unity with the see of Rome, and the succession and order of that church and this, kept the two parties from open schism. The result, however, was unfavourable to the Jansenists. The worldly policy of the popes, and the intrigues of the Jesuits, prevailed, and carried the body of that communion with them. The Jansenists, after a resistance which was highly honourable to them—after suffering bitter persecutions, were forced, if not to yield their opinions, yet to give over oppositions. They have long since ceased to be cared for, by their opponents;—but while they continued in considerable numbers, they contributed to relieve the darker shades of that rapidly apostatizing church;—They were like a branch upon a withering tree, showing some signs of life while the surrounding branches were leafless and lifeless.

[To be continued.]

[For the Baltimore Literary and Religious Magazine.]

SKETCHES AND RECOLLECTIONS FROM MY NOTE BOOK.

No. XI.

THAT the Pope is "the man of sin" and "the son of perdition," is, we think, abundantly and beyond controversy proved, and that too by arguments altogether irresistible, viz. their own unholy lives. When we see a man who claims to be styled "his holiness," rioting in drunkenness and debauchery until he literally becomes *rotten*, and dies a putrid and loathsome victim of sensuality!—When we see a man blasphemously assuming the name and character of the Prince of peace, gaining his bad eminence by assassination and preserving it by murder, and so boundlessly ambitious as to deluge the nations in blood, to gratify his lust of power!—When we see a man, calling himself "God's vicegerent," living in incest, establishing brothels in order to raise a revenue, and then squandering that revenue in promoting all manner of abomination, can we have any doubt that he is that personification of iniquity called by inspiration "the man of sin" and "son of perdition?"

In addition to the awful vices of their private character which exhibit the popes as monsters of iniquity, and identify them as "the sons of perdition," we have their public administrations as temporal magistrates to give corroboration to this awful fact. God represents that unholy power denominated "the false prophet," as of necessity and essence a persecuting power! And not only essentially a persecutor, but a persecutor of Jesus! "Drunken with the blood of the saints."

Three things must meet in the character of him who is "the man of sin and son of perdition."—1st. *Drunkenness*; that is, he must be full of iniquity; publicly and wantonly and outrageously guilty. Like an intoxicated man, at once deprived of shame and reason, who wallows and spews in the gutters, so this "beast and false prophet," must be identified by the shameless enormities and public atrocities of his character, which we have abundantly shown in the private character of the popes of Rome. Literal drunkenness and whoredom and murder and all manner of impiety is characteristic of these men.

2dly. They are *drunken with blood*, that is they are men of boundless ambition—mad with the lust of power. And have we not shown that it is not unusual for the pope to ascend the throne by assassination, and to commit murder in order to escape assassination by others who desire to occupy his place? Does not all history record the murderous and bloody wars in which these men have drenched the nations? Not satisfied with these, look at their systematized cruelty by which bloodshed has been made a part of their system, so that as a church she is literally "drunken with blood."

3dly. This blood must be, to a great extent, "the blood of the saints"—*Drunken with the blood of the saints!* And has not this been most abundantly verified? From the mount of history look down upon her in the vallies of Piedmont, and see her wallowing in the blood of God's dear children! Look at her in France, rev-

elling in the blood of God's saints until her intoxication became so great that this drunken mother of harlots actually sung a "te Deum" to the God of peace for her success in blood and rapine! Follow her through all the earth where God ever had a child holy enough to resist the seductions of her sensuality, and you will see the old harlot reeling under the intoxication of her bloody drunkenness! Look at her drinking up the blood of martyrs dying for the truth, as she presided at the "auta de fes" in her Spanish dominions! And see her in the midnight silence and secrecy of the bastile, that miniature of hell upon earth, which she devised and erected, that when she desired it, she might swell her bloody potations and spew and swell again, unseen of all but God! And in all these sickening scenes of groans and blood and death in which history represents the popish power as revelling, you will find that she had a method in her madness—a taste peculiar and unchangeable, from which she never deviated even in the moments of her deepest drunkenness, for the blood upon which she feasted, and the groans which made music to light up her drunken features and frolics were invariably the blood and groans "of the saints!" Murderers and drunkards and adulterers and thieves—Infidels and Atheists—Pagans and Mahommedans—In a word, all that were directly or indirectly in the pay and service of Satan, she took under her patronage, and made her boon companions while there was no room in her mercy for any who followed the Lamb!

But some say she is now changed, and that she no longer reels under her bloody intoxication. This, were it true, would unchurch and destroy her. Is it not her boast and the very essence of her vitality, that she is *unchangeable*, and must ever be the same? That she is *infallible*, and consequently never did or can do what is not right? Yes, this great ecclesiastical vampire is unchangeable, and her food is still blood—the blood of saints! She is still infallible, and must continue to repeat her orgies of murder and rapine and uncleanness! True, it may not at all times and in every place be her policy to persecute and be drunken with the blood of the saints, nor has she always and in every place the physical power so to do, but have we not even now manifest tokens that the desire lives—that the voracious vampire is still instinct with all its former lusts and propensities? Look at the recent persecutions in Europe—at the successful effort to *force brandy and popery* upon the inhabitants of one of the south-sea islands!—See the popish effort which was made but a few weeks ago, to break up Protestant meetings on the Sabbath day, even in this country, and that too in the peaceful Protestant city of Philadelphia! And has it come to this, that Americans—Pennsylvanians—Philadelphians, must ask the poor old bloated and incestuous king of Rome for permission to occupy their own churches and hear the truth as it is in Jesus, or in failing so to do, to be stoned and massacred! Truly the time of trouble is at hand—surely this Roman vampire begins to thirst for the blood of American freemen; and in so doing is evidently rousing, once more, her boundless ambition for the conquest of the world. And as a proof, she has dared, in the face of heaven and earth to revive the bloody order of Jesuits, and is ship-

ping them to this land,—and she has once more erected the Bastile for the Jesuits' use, as the butcher erects his shambles, and soon we may expect to see the flow of blood! Soon! We have seen it already! Look at the scenes of

POPIISH PERSECUTION AT DAMASCUS.

Padre Thomaso, a popish priest, in a quarrel with a Mahomedan muleteer, cursed the mussulman's faith, which so irritated him, that he swore that the papist should not die but by his hands. In a short time the priest disappeared and the suspicion of his murder was laid upon the Jews. The chief agent in this was M. de Cochelet, the French Consul, aided by the resident papists. Without waiting even to ascertain whether the priest was dead or alive, they made his disappearance an excuse for persecution, that their native thirst for blood might be gratified, and without even examining the infidel muleteer who had sworn to destroy him, true to the instincts of their nature, they seize upon those who approximate nearest to the character of God's people, the unprotected descendants of Abraham, as the best material upon which to glut their popish vengeance. In pursuance of this purpose, several of the more distinguished Jews were apprehended, and by the orders and in the presence of the French Consul, had a confession wrested from their mouths by the following means;—1st, Flogging.—2, Soaking them in large tanks of cold water, in their clothes.—3, The head machine, by which the eyes were pressed out of their sockets.—4, (This one is too horrible and indelicate to disclose.) 5. Dragged about in a large court by the ears, until the blood gushed out.—6, Having thorns driven in between their nails and the flesh of their fingers and toes.—7. Having candles held under their noses, so that the flame arises up into their nostrils. This last brutality of the persecuting church of Rome was one night carried so far by the pope's officer, that the Mahomedan Pasha, whose duty it was to be present, could no longer endure the sight—and went away leaving the miserable victims to the tender mercies of the French Consul.

From the account of this recent popish persecution, by David Salomons, Esq., we extract the following paragraph:—"Sunday, March 1st.—The two brothers, David and Fetekhach Arari, were again brought up for further trial, when they again deny their last day's confession of guilt, which, they say, was extorted from them by torture, and made in the hope of a speedy execution, instead of an excruciating and lingering death. The remaining five were now also brought up; and now let humanity shudder and turn her eyes from the refined bloodshed that was now executed—a bloodshed, however, not by quickly dispatching, but by demoniacly extracting the life of innocent men by torments not inflicted on the most guilty—and more than a brute could bear. Yetshack and David Arari are again reduced to make their former confessions. Mussa Abulafia, is now tortured to give up the blood: he then said I have secreted it in my own house. The French Consul, always alive to cruelty, then accompanied him to his house, followed, as usual,

by large crowds, and *Mussa Abulafia*, having now undertaken to give up what he never possessed, unlocked a cupboard and feigned to examine it. He then asked his wife, who was in despair all this while to see her husband so lacerated, and apparently quite beside herself, 'What have you done with the blood?' The poor woman as in a fit of frenzy, exclaimed, 'What blood had you?' He answered, 'I have blood—only give me a knife, and you can take my life's blood, and then say—this is it.' It is stated that when the French Consul heard this, he, like a madman, attacked both *Abulafia* and his wife. He then laid a rope around his neck, threatening to strangle him; and in the attempt to pull the rope, he laid his poor victim prostrate at his feet; and not satisfied with this, it is related that he dragged him about in the court-yard, with a rope around his neck!" The Turkish Pasha said that he would willingly have put a stop to the atrocious cruelties thus practiced under the eyes and by the direction of the pope's servant, had he possessed the power to counteract the influence of the papists. Read the whole account of this recent, bloody, popish persecution, and then say, has this *unchangeable* church changed her system of butchery which she has even carried on in the name of Christ? Has this *infallible* hierarchy done in days past, or in other lands, what she is not in spirit prepared to do in this, had she only the power? All readers of history recollect the horribly atrocious massacre of *St. Bartholomew*, in which the papists waded in the blood of the saints; but perhaps it is not so well known, that the present pope, only a little more than one year since, has endorsed that bloody transaction as a most glorious event, worthy of popery and a true exhibition of her present spirit, by having a re-cast made of the medal commemorating that bloody scene! By this action his present "holiness," proves himself a legitimate heir to that power celebrated for being "drunken with the blood of the saints." The very contemplation of past deeds of blood is so intoxicating that in despite of all motives of prudence and policy she orders a re-cast of a medal commemorating one of the most atrocious and barbarous acts which the devil ever instigated or wicked man ever performed! This *unchangeable and infallible* power, true to herself, to the very instincts of her nature is and was, and of necessity ever must be a bloody and persecuting power.

LORD BROUGHAM'S SPEECH IN THE HOUSE OF LORDS, MONDAY,
JANUARY 29, 1838, UPON THE SLAVE TRADE.

CASH FOR NEGROES. The highest cash prices will at all times be given for Negroes of both sexes, that are slaves for life, and good titles. My office is in Pratt street, between Sharp and Howard streets, and opposite to the Repository—where I or my agent can be seen at all times. All persons, having Negroes to sell, would do well to see me before they dispose of them, as I am always buying and forwarding to the New Orleans market. I will also receive and keep Negroes at twenty-five cents each, per day, and forward them to any Southern port, at the request of the owner. My establishment is large, comfortable, and airy, and all above ground; and kept in complete order, with a large yard for exercise; and is the strongest and most splendid building of the kind in the United States. And as the character of my house and yard is so completely established, for strength, comfort, and cleanliness, and it being a place where I keep all my own, I will not be accountable, for the future, for any escapes of any kind from my establishment.

HOPE H. SLATTER.

CASH FOR NEGROES. I wish to purchase immediately, 50 or 60 likely Young Negroes of both sexes, from 12 to 30 years of age, for which I am disposed to pay the highest market prices in cash. Persons having negroes to sell, will do well to see me before they dispose of them. Myself or agent can at all times be found at my office, No. 2, South Calvert street, or at Whitman's Eagle Hotel, opposite the Baltimore and Philadelphia Rail Road Office, or at my Dwelling, Harford Avenue. Slaves received and provided with good provisions and bedding, and every care and attention paid to their comfort, and shipped to any order. All communications will be promptly attended to, if directed to me.

JAS. F. PURVIS.

[From the Baltimore Clipper of July 16, 1840.]

WHEN the act for abolishing the British Slave Trade passed in 1807, and when the Americans performed the same act of justice by abolishing their traffic in 1806, the earliest moment, it must, to their honour, be observed, that the Federal Constitution allowed this step to be taken; and when, at a later period, treaties were made, with a view to extinguish the traffic carried on by France, Spain, and Portugal, the plan was in an evil hour adopted which up to the present time has been in operation. The right of search and seizure was confined to certain vessels in the service of the state, and there was held out as an inducement to quicken the activity of their officers and crews, a promise of head-money,—that is, of so much to be paid for each slave on board the captured ship, over and above the proceeds of its sale upon condemnation. The prize was to be brought in and proceeded against; the slaves were to be liberated; the ship, with her tackle and cargo, to be sold, and the price distributed; but beside this, the sum of five pounds for each slave taken on board was to be distributed among the captors. It must be admitted that the intention was excellent; it must further be allowed that at first sight the inducement held out seemed likely to work well, by exciting the zeal and rousing the courage of the crews against those desperate miscreants who defiled and desecrated the great high way of nations with their complicated occupation of piracy and murder. I grant it is far easier to judge after the event. Nevertheless, a little reflection might have sufficed to shew that there was a vice essentially inherent in the scheme, and that by allotting the chief part of the premium for the capture of slaves, and not of slave-ships, an inducement was held out, not to prevent the principal part of the crime, the shipping of the negroes, from being committed, but rather to suffer this in order that the head-money might be gained when the vessel should be captured with that on board which we must still insult all lawful commerce, by calling the cargo—that is, the wretched victims of avarice and cruelty, who had been torn from their country, and carried to the loathsome hold. The tendency of this is quite undeniable; and equally so is its complete inconsistency with the whole purpose in view, and indeed the grounds upon which the plan itself is formed; for it assumes that the

head-money will prove an inducement to the cruisers, and quicken their activity; it assumes, therefore, that they will act so as to obtain the premium: and yet the object in view is to prevent any slaves from being embarked, and consequently any thing being done which can entitle the cruiser to any head-money at all. The cruiser is told to put down the Slave Trade, and the reward held out is proportioned to the height which that trade is suffered to reach before it is put down. The plan assumes that he requires this stimulus to make him prevent the offence: and the stimulus is applied only after the offence has been in great part committed. The tendency, then, of this most preposterous arrangement cannot be questioned for a moment; but now see how it really works.

The slave vessel is fitted out and sails from her port, with all the accommodations that distinguish such criminal adventures, and with the accustomed equipment of chains and fetters, to torture and restrain the slaves—the investment of trinkets wherewith civilized men decoy savages to make war on one another, and to sell those nearest to them in blood—with the stock of muskets too, prepared by Christians for the trade, and sold at 16 pence a piece, but not made to fire above once or twice without bursting in the hand of the poor negro, whom they have tempted to plunder his neighbour or to sell his child. If taken on her way to the African Coast, she bears internal evidence, amply sufficient, to convict her of a slave trading destination. I will not say that the cruisers having visited and inspected her, would suffer her to pass onward. I will not impute to gallant and honourable men a breach of duty, by asserting, that knowing a ship to have a guilty purpose, and aware that they had the power of proving this, they would voluntarily permit her to accomplish it. I will not even suggest that vessels are less closely watched on their route towards the coast than on their return from it. But I may at least affirm, without any fear of being contradicted, that the policy which holds out a reward, not to the cruiser who stops such a ship and interrupts her on the way to the scene of her crimes, but to the cruiser who seizes her on her way back when full of slaves, gives and professes to give the cruiser an interest in letting her reach Africa, take in her cargo of slaves, and sail for America. Moreover, I may also affirm with perfect safety, that this policy is grounded upon the assumption, that the cruiser will be influenced by the hope of the reward, in performing the service, else of what earthly use can it be to offer it? and consequently I am entitled to conclude, that the offering this reward, assumes that the cruiser cares for the reward, and will let the slaver pass on unless she is laden with slaves. If this does not always happen, it is very certainly no fault of the policy which is framed upon such a preposterous principle. But I am not about to argue that any such consequences actually take place. It may or it may not be so in the result; but the tendency of the system is plain. The fact I stop not to examine. I have other facts to state about which no doubt exists at all. The statements of my excellent friend, Mr. Laird, who with his worthy coadjutor, Mr. Oldfield, have recently returned from Africa, are before the world, and there has been no attempt made to contradict them. Those gallant men are the survivors of an expedition full of hardships and perils, to which, among many others, the learned and amiable Dr. Briggs, of Liverpool, unhappily fell a sacrifice—an irreparable loss to humanity as well as science.

It appears that the course pursued on the coast is this:—The cruiser stationed there to prevent the slave trade, carefully avoids going near the harbour or creek where the slavers are lying. If she comes within sight, the slaver would not venture to put his cargo on board and sail. Therefore she stands out, just so far as to command a view of the port from the mast-head, but herself quite out of sight. The slaver believes the coast to be clear; accomplishes his crime of shipping the cargo, and attempts to

cross the Atlantic. Now, whether he succeeds in gaining the opposite shores, or is taken and condemned, let us see what the effect of the system is first of all, in the vessel's construction and accommodation—that is, in the comforts, if such a word can be used in connexion with the hull of a slave ship—or the torments rather prepared for her unhappy inmates. Let us see how the unavoidable miseries of the middle passage are exasperated by the contraband nature of the adventure—how the unavoidable mischief is needlessly aggravated by the very means taken to extirpate it. The great object being to escape our cruisers, every other consideration is sacrificed to swiftness of sailing in the construction of the slave ships. I am not saying that humanity is sacrificed. I should of course be laughed to scorn by all who are implicated in the African traffic, were I to use such a word in any connexion with it. But all other considerations respecting the vessel herself, are sacrificed to swiftness, and she is built so narrow as to put her safety in peril, being made just broad enough on the beam to keep the sea. What is the result to the wretched slaves? Before the trade was put down by us in 1807, they had the benefit of what was termed the Slave Carrying Act. During the twenty years that we spent in examining the details of the question—in ascertaining whether our crimes were so profitable as not to warrant us in leaving them off—in debating whether robbery, piracy, and murder, should be prohibited by law, or receive protection and encouragement from the state—we, at least, were considerate enough to regulate the perpetration of them, and while those curious and very creditable discussions were going on, Sir William Dolben's Bill gave the unhappy victims of our cruelty and iniquity the benefit of a certain space between decks, in which they might breathe the tainted air more freely, and a certain supply of provisions and of water to sustain their wretched existence. But now there is nothing of the kind; and the slave is in the same situation in which our first debates found him above half a century ago, when the venerable Thomas Clarkson awakened the attention of the world to his sufferings. The scantiest portion, which will support life, is alone provided; and the wretched Africans are compressed and stowed into every nook and cranny of the ship, as if they were dead goods concealed on board smuggling vessels. I may be thought to have said enough; but I may not stop here. Far more remains to tell; and I approach the darker part of the subject with a feeling of horror and disgust, which I cannot describe, and which three or four days gazing at the picture has not been able to subdue. But I go through the painful duty in the hope of inducing your Lordships at once to pronounce the doom of that system which fosters all that you are about to contemplate.

Let me first remind you of the analogy which this head-money system bears to what was nearer home called blood-money. That it produces all the effects of the latter, I am certainly not prepared to affirm; for the giving a reward to informers on capital conviction had the effect of engendering conspiracies to prosecute innocent men, as well as to prevent the guilty from being stopt in their creer, until their crimes had ripened into capital offences; and I have no conception that any attempts can be made to capture vessels not engaged in the trade—nor indeed could the head-money, from the nature of the thing, be obtained by any such means. But in the other part of the case the two things are precisely parallel, have the self-same tendency, and produce the same effects; for they both appeal to the same feelings and motives, putting in motion the same springs of human action. Under the old bounty system no policeman had an interest in detecting and checking guilt until it reached a certain pitch of depravity; until the offences became capital, and their prosecutor could earn forty pounds, they were not worth attending to. The cant expression, but the significant one, is well known. "He (the criminal) is not yet weight enough—he does not yet weigh his forty pounds"—was the saying of those

who cruised for head-money at the Old Bailey. And thus lesser crimes were connived at by some—encouraged, nurtured, fostered in their growth by others—that they might attain the maturity, which the law had in its justice and wisdom said they must reach, before it should be worth any one's while to stop the course of guilt. Left to itself wickedness could scarcely fail to shoot up and ripen. As soon as he saw that time come, the policeman pounced upon his appointed prey, made his victim pay the penalty of the crime he had suffered, if not encouraged him to commit, and himself obtained the reward provided by the state for the patrons of capital felony. Such within the tropics is the tendency, and such are the effects of our head-money system. The slave-ship gains the African shores; she there remains unmolested by the land authorities, and unvisited by the sea; the human cargo is prepared for her; the ties that knit relatives together are forcibly severed; all the resources of force and of fraud, of sordid avarice and of savage intemperance, are exhausted to fill the human market; to prevent all this nothing or next to nothing is attempted; the penalty has not as yet attached; the slaves are not yet on board, and head-money is not due; the vessel, to use the technical phrase, does not yet weigh enough; let her ride at anchor till she reach her due standard of five pounds a slave, and then she will be pursued! Accordingly, the lading is completed; the cruiser keeps out of sight; and the pirate puts to sea. And now begin those horrors—those greater horrors—of which I am to speak—and which are the necessary consequences of the whole proceeding, considering with what kind of miscreants our cruisers have to deal.

On being discovered, perceiving that the cruiser is giving chase, the slaver has to determine whether he will endeavour to regain the port, escaping for the moment, and waiting for a more favourable opportunity, or will fare across the Atlantic, and so perfect his adventure and consummate his crime, reaching the American shores with a part at least of his lading. How many unutterable horrors are embraced in the word that has slipped my tongue? A part of the lading! Yes—yes—For no sooner does the miscreant find that the cruiser is gaining upon him, than he berths him of lightening his ship, and he chooses the heaviest of his goods, with the same regard for them as if they were all inanimate lumber. He casts overboard, men and women and children! Does he first knock off their fetters? No! Why? Because those irons by which they have been held together in couples, for safety—but not more to secure the pirate crew against revolt, than the cargo against suicide—to prevent the Africans from seeking in a watery grave an escape from their sufferings—those irons are not screwed together and padlocked, so as to be removed in case of danger from tempest or from fire—but they are rivetted—welded together by the blacksmith in his forge—never to be removed, nor loosened until after the horrors of the middle passage, the children of misery shall be landed to bondage in the civilized world—and become the subjects of Christian kings! The irons too serve the purpose of weights, and if time be allowed in the hurry of the flight, more weights are added, to the end that the wretches may be entangled, to prevent their swimming. Why? Because the negro with that Herculean strength which he is endowed withal, and those powers of living in the water which almost give him an amphibious nature, might survive to be taken up by the cruiser and become a witness against the murderer. The escape of the malefactor is thus provided both by lightening the vessel which bears him away, and by destroying the evidence of his crimes. Nor is this all. Instances have been recorded of other precautions used with the same purpose. Water-casks have been filled with human beings, and one vessel threw twelve overboard thus laden. In another chase, two slave ships endeavoured, but in vain, to make their escape, and my blood curdles when I recite, that in the attempt, they flung into the sea five hundred human beings of all ages

and of either sex!—These are things related not by enthusiasts of heated imagination—not by men who consult only the feelings of humanity, and are inspired to speak by the great horror and unextinguishable indignation that fills their breasts—but by officers on duty—men engaged professionally in the Queen's service. It is not a creation of fancy to add, as these have done to the hideous tale, that the ravenous animals of the deep are aware of their prey, when the slave ship makes sail; the shark follows in her wake, and her course is literally to be tracked through the ocean by the blood of the murdered, with which her enormous crimes stain its waters. I have read of worse than even this! But it will not be believed! I have examined the particulars of scenes yet more hideous, while transfixed with horror, and ashamed of the human form that I wore—scenes so dreadful as it was not deemed fit to lay bare before the public eye! Scenes never surpassed in all that history has recorded of human guilt to stain her pages,—in all that poets have conceived to harrow up the soul! Scenes compared with which the blood-stained annals of Spain—cruel and sordid Spain—have registered only ordinary tales of avarice and suffering—though these have won for her an unenvied pre-eminence of infamy! Scenes not exceeded in horror by the forms with which the great Tuscan poet peopled the hell of his fancy—nor by the dismal tints of his illustrious countryman's pencil, breathing its horrors over the vaults of the Sistine Chapel! *Mortua quin etiam jungebat corpora vivis!* On the deck and in the loathsome hold are to be seen the living chained to the dead, the putrid carcase remaining to mock the survivor, with a spectacle, that to him, presents no terrors—to mock him with the spectacle of a release which he envies! Nay, women have been known to bring forth the miserable fruit of the womb surrounded by the dying and the dead—the decayed corpses of their fellow victims. Am I asked how these enormities shall be prevented? First ask me to what I ascribe them—and then my answer is ready—I charge them upon the system of head-money, which I have described, and of whose tendency no man can pretend to doubt. Reward men for preventing the slaver's voyage, not for interrupting it—for saving the Africans from the slave ship, not for seizing the ship after it has received them—and then the inducement will be applied to the right place, and the motive will be suited to the act you desire to have performed.

But I have hitherto been speaking of the intolerable aggravation which we superadd to the traffic. Its amount is another thing. Do all our efforts materially check it? Are our cruisers always successful? Are all flags and all the slavers under any flag subject to search and liable to capture? I find that the bulk of this infernal traffic is still undiminished; that though many slave-ships may be seized, many more escape and reach the New World; and that the numbers still carried thither are as great as ever. Of this sad truth the evidence is but too abundant and too conclusive. The premium of insurance at the Havannah is no higher than 12½ per cent., to cover all hazards. Of this 4½ per cent., is allowed for sea risk and under-writer's profits, leaving but eight for the chance of capture. But in Rio it is as low as 11 per cent., leaving but 6½ for risk of capture. In the year 1835, eighty slave-ships sailed from the Havannah alone; and I have a list of the numbers which six of these brought back, giving an average of about 360; so that above 28,000 were brought to that port in a year. In the month of December of that year, between 4,000 and 5,000 were safely landed in the port of Rio, the capital of our good friend and ally, the Emperor of Brazil. It is frightful to think of the numbers carried over by some of these ships. One transported 570, and another no less than 700 wretched beings. I give the names of these execrable vessels—the Felicidad and the Socorro. Of all slave traders, the greatest—of all the criminals engaged in these guilty crimes the worst—are the Brazilians, the Spaniards and the Portuguese—the three nations with whom our com-

mercy is the closest, and over whom our influence is the most commanding. These are the nations with whom we (and I mean France as well as ourselves) go on in lingering negotiation—in quibbling discussion—to obtain some explanation of some article in a feeble, inefficient treaty, or some extension of an ineffectual right of search—while their crimes lay all Africa waste, and deluge the seas with the blood of her inhabitants. Yet if a common and less guilty pirate dared pollute the sea, or wave his black flag over its waves, let him be of what nation he pleased to libel by assuming its name, he would in an instant be made to pay the forfeit of his crimes. It was not always so. We did not in all times nor in every cause so shrink from our duty through delicacy or through fear. When the thrones of ancient Europe were to be upheld, or their royal occupants to be restored, or the threatened privileges of the aristocracy wanted champions, we could swiftly advance to the encounter, throw ourselves into the breach, and confront alone the giant arm of republics and of emperors wielding the colossal power of France. But now when the millions of Africa look up to us for help—when humanity and justice alone are our only clients—I am far from saying that we do not wish them well. I can believe that if a word could give them success—if a wave of the hand sufficed to end the fray—the word would be pronounced, the gesture would not be withholden; but if more be wanted—if some exertion is required—if some risk must be run in the cause of mercy—then our tongue cleaves to the roof of our mouth; our hands fall paralyzed; we pause and falter, and blanch and quail before the ancient and consecrated Monarchy of Brazil, the awful might of Portugal, the compact, consolidated, overwhelming power of Spain! My Lords, I trust—I expect—we shall pause and falter, and blanch and quail no more! Let it be the earliest and it will be the most enduring glory of the new reign to extirpate at length this execrable traffic! I would not surround our young Queen's throne with fortresses and troops, or establish it upon the triumphs of arms and the trophies of war—no, not I! I would build her renown, neither upon military nor yet upon naval greatness; but upon rights secured—upon liberties extended—humanity diffused—justice universally promulged. In alliance with such virtues as these I would have her name descend to after ages. I would have it commemorated forever, that in the first year of her reign, her throne was fortified and her crown embellished, by the proudest triumph over the worst of crimes—the greatest triumph mortal ever won, over the worst crime ever man committed!

A ROMAN CATHOLIC BISHOP REMOVED FROM THIS COUNTRY AND IMPRISONED BY THE POPE; IN THE INQUISITION AT ROME.

VERY few things can happen in the progress of the papacy in a free country without exhibiting its enmity to the principles upon which such a country is founded, and its interference with the liberties of man. Toleration in its broad and full extent is the result of those free principles that have their existence only in enlightened and protestant countries. Intolerance and an invincible bondage, degenerating into a state of absolute servitude, is the fruit of the papal system. The two are the growth of entirely opposite systems—we look as naturally for freedom in one, as we do for slavery in the other. The one proclaims to every man, that he is free to think, to speak, to act, and secures to him these rights; the

other forbids thought, speech, action, and fortifies herself with ways and means by which to carry out her slavery over the bodies and souls of men.

The history of this country, and the papal church in it, has repeatedly shown, that the principles and institutions of the one are at entire enmity with the other. The *orphan asylums* which have from time to time been the traps or prisons into which orphan children have been taken, through the artful seducers who have gone forth their pretended friends, have exhibited somewhat of the truth of this statement. The necessity of arraigning the party to these plans before our lawful authorities at times, to secure the rights to those who have been thus entrapped, has very clearly exhibited their spirit. The *nunneries* into which weak, ignorant or deceived females have been tempted, and from which when their eyes have been opened they desire to escape, yea to which when escaped they are by force taken back, and in which against their will and desire, having been forced back, they are compelled to stay, are so many institutions spread over the land as the prison-house for freedom, as the burial places of liberty, the dens of despair.

The institutions of the papacy are most perfectly prepared to be the dwelling places of tyranny and oppression. The rules and regulations are fitted to carry out in the largest sense the practice of oppression. No man, woman or child who is called, who really is a papist, can escape from this servitude. To renounce the bondage, to cast off the restraint, yea to desire it, is to be heretical, rebellious, and makes the object, in the eyes of the church, deserving of the severest punishment, and subject, as opportunity may offer, to incur the indignation and the penalty which is in their power.

We will not at present speak of the extent to which these papal principles are or have been carried out.—Many instances have occurred in this country—many more in others.—In some countries the history of the Inquisition, in others the cold and inhuman massacres of which they have been guilty, would be measuring it out—but alas, who can tell its extent!! The deeds of night—the work in secrecy—the victims incarcerated in cells—shut up in dungeons—buried alive—added to the almost innumerable victims of their rage that have publicly, or openly been the objects of their hate and vengeance, would be a history to astonish the earth—men would shudder at such a picture, but we pass it.

A letter-writer from the city of Washington has communicated to one of the public papers, the following intelligence concerning a Roman Catholic Bishop. We extract from the Baltimore Clipper of July 20, with the editor's comment :

“ We take the following from the Philadelphia Chronicle; and must express our doubts as to the correctness of the statement therein made; for we cannot believe it possible that the authorities of Rome have undertaken to incarcerate an American citizen who had not been guilty of a violation of the civil law. Should it however prove true that Mr. Webster has received the letter mentioned, it will become necessary for the American government to interfere without delay—for we would enforce proper respect to the American character in all places. But we cannot believe that the outrage has been perpetrated. It is hardly possible that the occurrence could have taken place without its coming to the knowledge of the American

Consul, or being known to some of the resident agents of other governments. This is the first intimation which we have seen, that such a letter has been received by Mr. Webster, which strengthens our belief that there is some mistake or misrepresentation."

"*Imprisonment.* A letter has been received by the Hon. Daniel Webster, signed "Bernardius Castelli," stating that the Catholic Bishop of Detroit, Mich., Mr. Reese, "is confined in a dungeon of Rome without communication with any living person, and consequently without the knowledge of the American Minister resident there—a target of the blackest calumnies, and a victim of the most atrocious persecutions from his colleagues here in religious matters. He was summoned to Rome towards the end of 1838, if I am not mistaken; and in 1839, when I made his acquaintance, he was confined in a convent under an ecclesiastical prosecution. On the process being completed, he was ordered to resign. This he refused to do; and then he was thrown into a dungeon, perhaps of the Inquisition, where three other Bishops are lying. There he is overwhelmed with sufferings, and tortured to oblige him to resign, and all possible measures were taken to prevent him from invoking the protection of the diplomatic agents of his own country. A similar case had happened to the Bishop of Philadelphia, Mr. Conwell. But this prelate, whilst in the same position of Mr. Reese, was fortunate enough to make his escape from Rome, and, arrested in Paris, under Charles the Xth, by order of the Pope, was set at liberty through the intervention of the American Minister." "

With the correctness of the information, or the certainty of the facts in the case, we have nothing to do—we publish it as we find it in one or two daily papers. Our remarks have to do with the probability of its truth and the exhibition which we have in the case of the absolute, intolerant, and slavish spirit that has its being in and is inseparable from the papacy. The obedience of the priests and bishops to the pope is a settled point—the inferiors to their superiors, placing them in a most abject condition. The oath of membership—then the oath of office, is a yielding up all that a man has to entitle him to the name of freeman; it is a swearing away of his rights and liberties.

A priest or bishop in the church of Rome, is a servant sworn in implicit and unwavering obedience to the pope. His office and the powers connected with it come from the pope. Whenever he is in office regularly, by the prescribed rules of the church, he is a citizen, a subject of no other government—his profession of allegiance is a fiction, he is held by none and looks to none but to his holiness, his supreme master. This is the case with every Bishop. Read the bishop's oath of allegiance. Look at its binding character, and remember it is one of conscience and of a religion which teaches that it is lawful to keep no oath conflicting with that—and that if they refuse obedience to him, in subjection to any other government, they are guilty of perjury.

According to the doctrine of his church, the position in which the bishop has put himself, he is guilty of perjury to his holiness, in refusing to do his will. As to the propriety of his holding his office—whether the pope should interfere—or whether the other bishops in this country have interfered, we have nothing to say.—The fact that the pope called him to appear before him in Rome—that there he required of him to renounce his bishoprick, is all strictly according to infallible authority—then if he has refused to resign, on his holiness requiring of it, and the pope has cast him into the

inquisition, he has only been placed by authority of the supreme head of the papacy in the position of a rebel to his lord and master the pope, and has had visited upon himself the mark of his displeasure. He was a slave called from a far distant part of our distant heathen land, into the presence of the assumed monarch of the earth, and punished for his disobedience. It is probable—it does exhibit the most abject state of slavery.

But a very serious question presents itself in a political and civil point. Is Bishop Reese, in the understanding of our laws, and according to the current exposition of these laws, *an American citizen*? Did he claim that honorable, and noble name and its privileges? Is he imprisoned for acts done in our confederacy? Has he been punished through the interference of his rival bishops in this country? Is his appeal to Cæsar's court baptized with the name of Christian, though retaining nearly all its heathenism, with much additional corruption—or is his appeal to a court in the land in which he claims his citizenship? If here, then is there a question to be settled which Rome will dread to meet.—Is the ecclesiastical above the civil? Does Rome claim her subjects here? Can she call them away and punish them, they claiming the privilege of American citizens? If she can, we are literally under her; she may exercise her jurisdiction to an unlimited extent. We are not of those who are prepared for this state of things. There are very many Catholics in this country who are not prepared for it. We are aware that matters have been growing on to this for a long time; that the bishops have been endeavouring to alienate all the property of the Catholic churches, from the hands of trustees and put it in the hands of the pope, by placing it in the name of the archbishop, who will be and who is the veriest tool of the pope.

Are Roman Catholics prepared for this? Are American citizens ready to yield to it? Shall a man say he is an American citizen, and claim the protection of one, and not be heard? Will our government, on the presentation of such a case, look on with indifference?

PAPAL PRINCIPLES EXEMPLIFIED,

In Persecuting Bible-Annotations, and an exposure of the Jesuitism of Mr. Troy, Primate of Ireland.

No. II.

A FURTHER ACCOUNT OF THE ROMAN CATHOLIC BIBLE, PUBLISHED IN 1816, AT DUBLIN.

"SIR,—An unquestionable and decisive evidence of the principles maintained by the Roman Catholic Priesthood in Ireland, is at present of such great *political* importance to the whole United Kingdom, that some additional particulars respecting their new Dublin Bible may appear to you to be entitled to the serious attention of the British public, and proper to be inserted in the *Courier*.

"In the letter which appeared in your paper of Saturday the 11th inst., it was stated that the authority of Annotations on the Scripture, sanctioned by the Roman church, is held to be no less binding on the conscience of a Roman Catholic, than that of the Sacred Text itself.

"This Tenet is thus declared in the Dublin Bible: 1 Thess. ii. 12, 'The word of God.'—Annotat. 'The adversaries' (meaning the Protestants) 'will have no word of God, but that which is written and contained in the Scripture: but here they might learn, &c.: also, that *whatsoever* the lawful apostles, pastors, and priests of God's church, preach in the unity of the same church' (meaning the church of Rome) 'is to be taken for GOD'S OWN WORD.'

"The Annotations in Dr. Troy's Rhemish New Testament, containing *this divine word*, are of a length nearly twice that of the whole-text; and in almost every instance they exhibit the same irreconcilable hostility and persecuting spirit against protestants.

"It is to be wished that the history of this perversion of the sacred Scripture were known to the public.

"While the ministers of Romish vengeance were inflicting on the innocent dissenters from popery, in the valleys of Piedmont, the severest, tortures that inventive cruelty could devise—sparing neither age nor sex;* while France was stained with the blood of murdered Protestants, and England yet mourning for her Cranmers, her Ridleys, and her Latimers; within a few years after the Guises had led their band of assassins, with their *white crosses* on their hats, to the massacre of Paris; and Pope Gregory the Thirteenth had ordered a solemn thanksgiving and general jubilee for the dreadful murders they had committed;† under the immediate patronage of the Guises and of Gregory, some of Queen Mary's bigotted Romish priests, who, after the accession of Queen Elizabeth, fled from their indignant country, published at Rheims their translation of the New Testament with annotations: they artfully perverted the expressions of some of the early Christian writers, in order to give an apparent sanction to their own pernicious tenets: and, under the name of an exposition of the word of God, circulated all the exterminating principles which, in that age of Romish bigotry, spread over so great a portion of Europe the horrors of a sanguinary persecution. But it would swell this letter beyond reasonable limits, to give a *particular* account, either of the Rhemish Doctors, or of their pernicious productions. Suffice it to say, that they have been described, by the authentic historians of that melancholy period, as plotters and zealous supporters of Romish conspiracies and rebellions‡—as authors of publications, exhorting Romanists to insurrection against their Protestant governors—and even encouraging and justifying *assassination*. The general character of their principal work, the Rhemish Exposition of the New Testament, may be estimated from the Annotations cited in the Courier of the 11th October. This *chef d'œuvre* has been repub-

* See Leger's *Vandois*.

† Mezeray, De Serres, Thuanus, &c.

‡ Stow, Speed, Fuller, Strype, Camden; all the authentic historians confirm this account.

lished at different periods; but, in the *later* publications of it, from the middle of the last century, at least in those which are generally known, that of 1750, and of 1752, the the *persecuting* notes were omitted. They have now been unhappily revived, and under what circumstances? In the year 1816, when the Roman Catholics confidently expected legislative concession to their demands, and the *speedy* approach of their *day of power* in Ireland, and of influence in England.

“Sir, upon this I shall make no comment; but proceed to state a few more specimens of the principles maintained in those Annotations, now sanctioned by Papal Archiepiscopal authority, and again proclaimed to the Roman Catholics as the *DIVINE WORD*.

“The unfounded and dangerous claim of the Roman church, to jurisdiction over all Protestants, which has been so fully exposed by Dr. Herbert Marsh, Bishop of Laudaff,* is asserted in various parts of Dr. Troy’s Annotations.

“It is stated in the note on Matt. xvi. 19, that, to the church of Rome has been committed ‘*all kind of discipline and punishment of offenders, either spiritual, which is directly meant, or CORPORAL, so far as it tendeth to the execution of the spiritual charge: of which sort are excommunications, ANATHEMAS, &c. &c., for punishment——especially of heresy and rebellion against the church, and the chief pastors thereof*’ (of course of Protestantism, which is described in these Annotations, as the worst of heresies, and a most wicked rebellion against the Romish church and her chief pastors). Now, let it be remembered, that when the popish authorities shall think proper to issue their ANATHEMA against any body of Protestants, the effect is to be the same, as if the divine voice proclaimed ‘*Accursed be they—AWAY WITH THEM!*’ (See note on Rom. ix. 3) Even the appellation of *Roman Catholic*, it seems, is not to be accounted for, without reminding the Romish authorities of their jurisdiction over Protestants, and of their obligation to punish them, whenever the proper occasion may arrive. The word ‘*Roman,*’ they are informed, ‘*is added to Catholic in many countries where sects abound, for the better distinction of true believers from heretics*’ (Protestants, &c.); ‘*who, in all ages, did hate and abhor the Roman faith and church, as ALL MALEFACTORS do their JUDGES and CORRECTORS.*’ (Rom. i. 8.)

“The claim of the Romish church to the exclusive right to the spiritual offices and privileges, and to the temporal possessions of our ecclesiastical establishments, is plainly asserted; and, in order to justify it, the words of Tertullian are perverted, and used against the Protestant clergy: ‘*Who are you, and from whence came you? What do you in my possession, that are none of mine? Why do you sow and seed for these companions, at your pleasure? It is my possession—I possess it of old—I am heir of the apostles. As they provided by their Testament, as they committed it to my credit, as they adjured me, so do I hold it. You surely they disinherited always, and have cast you off as enemies.*’—Preface, p. 16. The Protestant clergy and their flock are not to be allowed even

* In his *Comparative View of the Churches of England and Rome.*

the possession of the sacred Scriptures: 'No heretics' (Protestants, &c.) 'have right to the Scriptures, but are usurpers; the Catholic Church, (the Roman Catholic) 'being the *true owner* and faithful keeper of them.'—Preface, *ibid.*

"To take leave of the Notes in Dr. Trow's Bible, with two or three more quotations. 'It is declared that heretics' (Protestants) 'follow in hypocrisy and show of virtue, the pernicious doctrine of DEVILS, who are lying spirits in the mouths of all heretics and *false teachers*,' 1 Tim. iv. 1 (of course in the mouths of the Protestant clergy especially). That they have '*no conscience*,' *ibid.* (This may explain the well-known Popish interpretation of 'Liberty of conscience' under James II.) That they resemble 'Judas in apostacy' (John iv. 68), 'and Cain, in having, for envy that his brother's sacrifice was accepted, and his rejected, slain his brother, and become a fugitive from the face and city of God, i. e. the church' (meaning the Roman Church); and that 'to all such the apostle giveth the curse and telleth them that the storm of darkness and eternal damnation is provided for them.' Jude: 11. That 'no heretics' (Protestants) 'can possibly be saved, though they shed their blood for Christ's name'—'though they die among Heathens or Turks, for defence of TRUTH, or some article of Christ's religion?' and that 'Calvinists, who *now-a-days* die in defence of their *heresies*,' are, on that account, only 'more damnable.'—1 Cor. xiii. 3.

"This Annotation appears to have been introduced by the persecuting priests at Rheims; because, when they wrote, their patrons, the Guises, at the head of the *League* for the extirpation of French Protestants, who were generally Calvinists, were executing their sanguinary projects. Why it has been revived and sanctioned by the Popish Archbishop of Dublin, I cannot pretend to say; but certain it is, there never existed a sect (I speak not of the pure Christian Church, at any time); but there never existed a sect fancying themselves the peculiar favourites of Heaven, excluding all the rest of their countrymen from salvation, and consigning them to the vengeance of an offended God, who were not of an *intolerant* spirit.

"The fanatics in the days of Cromwell-exclaimed against *toleration* for '*soul murder*.' And an English popish priest, in a late work of celebrity, describes the '*toleration*' of Protestants, as the '*tabula rasa* of religion,' as the '*mere effect of political interest*, or rather of *indifference to all religion*.'—Gandolphy's Defence of Ancient Faith, vol. ii., p. 219 and 222.

"But, Sir, whether we contemplate the excluding principles, or read of the persecuting violence either of sectarian fanaticism, or of Romish bigotry; are we not naturally led to bless a gracious Providence for that mild and tolerant Christian Church, whose spirit pervades our free constitution, and secures alike to all the subjects of our revered monarch, their PROPERTY, LIBERTIES, and RIGHTS?

"And now, Sir, to conclude this letter, for the length of which I am bound to apologize, with the words used by a Prelate of the Church of England, shortly after the Revolution of 1688:—'I know

it was *formerly* a popular objection of divers misguided dissenters from the Church of England, that we carried the doctrine of obedience farther than might be consistent with the safety of a Protestant Church, or the privilege of a free born people. But it is *now* to be hoped; that the strongest argument of all others, which is experience, from undoubted matter of fact, has put this objection for ever out of countenance; since it is *undeniable*, that during the whole time, when our civil and spiritual liberties were in so much danger, the greatest and most considerable stop that was here put to the arts of Rome and intrigues of France, was by the steady resolution of the true sons of the Church of England. It will be sufficient to affirm, once for all, that the main body of those, who made so brave a stand, were **ALL OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND**, and the principles on which they stood, were all Church of England principles. It was by these persons, and these principles alone, that Popery was stopped in its full career; by these it was hindered from conquering.—Bishop Spratt's Letter to Lord Dorset. See Echard's England, vol. iii., book 3, chap. 3.

"I remain, Sir,

"Your obedient servant,

"FABRICIUS.

"P. S. The following is a statement taken from the *Dublin Correspondent*, of the heads of the title-page of the *Cork publication*: — 'A new, superb, and elegant edition of the Catholic Bible, now publishing in Numbers and Paris, by J. A. M'Namara, Cork, under the patronage of HIS GRACE the Most Rev. Dr. O'Reilly, Roman Catholic Lord Primate of all Ireland; HIS GRACE the Most Rev. Dr. Troy, Roman Catholic Archbishop of Dublin; HIS GRACE the Most Rev. Dr. Murry, Coadjutor Archbishop of Dublin, and President of the Royal College of Maynooth; the Roman Catholic Bishops of Cork, Waterford, Ferns, &c. &c., containing the whole of the books in the Sacred Scriptures, explained or illustrated, with *Notes or Annotations*, according to the interpretation of the Roman Catholic Church, which is **OUR INFALLIBLE AND UNERRING** guide in reading the Holy Scriptures, and bringing men to salvation.'

"I have seen the three specimens of the persecuting Notes taken from the Cork publication, and they are precisely and verbatim the same as those on the same parts of Scripture in Dr. Troy's Dublin Bible. I have no doubt that the two publications are in all respects the same; and therefore, that Dr. Troy's Bible is now sanctioned either *actually* by the *whole* body of his brother popish bishops in Ireland, or by such a body as may be considered equivalent to the whole, by *all the leading* Popish Bishops.

"The *Dublin Correspondent* newspaper to which I refer, is dated Thursday, July 3, 1817."

NOTICES, RECEIPTS, ACCOUNTS, ANSWERS TO LETTERS, &c.

JUNE 25 TO JULY 24. Magazine of Dr. Waddell, (deceased,) stopt by order of P. M. at Wellington, S. C.—Rev'd A. W. Black, Pittsburgh, added in the place of J. A., of Philadelphia.—The direction of the Mississippi Intelligencer also changed to Pittsburgh.—Rev. Dr. L. W. Green, name added from January, 1841, and back numbers will be sent.—\$5 from P. M. at Boonville, Mo., for T. F. Swimm, for 1840 and 1841, and direction changed to Boonville.—\$10 from Rev. M. B. Patterson, placed to his credit, and direction changed to New Bloomfield, Perry Co., Pa.—\$10 from Mr. P. Morrow, for 1837, '38, '39, and '40, and P. O. changed to Coatsville, Chester Co., Pa.—Thomas H. Wallace, Lawtonville, S. C., name added from January, 1841, and back numbers sent, by order of B. T. Milton, Versailles. The list will be forwarded according to request in letter.—\$10 per letter of Mr. J. Kemp, New Orleans, to pay for the following new subscribers, to commence with the July number:—

Rev. J. J. Henderson, Galveston, Texas, care of Watson & Kemp, N. O.

Rev. J. Twichell, N. O.

Mr. J. Dronillard, N. O.

H. Thomas, Jr., commencing January, 1842.

Rev. Phineas D. Gurley, Indiannapolis, Indiana, name added from May, 1841.

—Name of Mr. Jas. A. Wallace, Eutaw, Ala., added from January, at direction of Capt. J. H. Dearing, Tuscaloosa, Ala.

A GOOD DEAL IS SAID about the necessity for more labourers in the Lord's vineyard; and about the duty of bringing forward candidates for the holy ministry. In looking over the records of the Second P. church of Baltimore, we find the following facts, which we state to encourage others, and to give praise to the Lord of the harvest. From 1836 to 1841, this church has furnished *fourteen candidates* for the holy ministry, of whom *two* were persons of colour. Of these 14 candidates, 7 have been licensed to preach, of whom 4 are now laboring as ordained ministers in our connexion—2 are still preaching as licentiates, and 1 is dead. Of the 7 others, 4 are now pursuing their studies, 2 removed out of the bounds of the congregation while still in the early part of their course, and their subsequent life is unknown to us, and the remaining 1, by the (as we think erroneous) advice of Presbytery, gave up the hope of getting into the ministry, on account of his age and difficulties. One of those now preaching as a licentiate, (one of the men of color,) was also dissuaded from the ministry by the Presbytery; but was afterwards taken up and licensed by the 1st Presbytery of the city of New York.—We think it right to say in this connexion, that not the slightest personal influence was ever used in any of these cases by the pastor of this church, to induce any of these persons to seek the holy office; and that in every case, the candidate offering himself has been his own spontaneous act, dictated, as we trust, by the operations of the Holy Ghost. We speak from personal knowledge as to 9 of the cases, and from information equal to personal knowledge as to the other 5. The whole of these 14 candidates have not received as much aid from the churches as would bring 3 persons through a complete course of study; and most of them received none at all—blessed be God for his great goodness to us.

THE
BALTIMORE LITERARY
AND
RELIGIOUS MAGAZINE.

VOL. VII.]

SEPTEMBER, 1841.

[No. 9.

SERMON TWO.—BY REV. JONATHAN DICKINSON.

THE TRUE CHURCHMAN.

Being a Vindication of the Sovereign free Grace of God.

ROMANS ix. 16.—So then not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth; but of God that showeth mercy.

THE great Doctor of the Gentiles is in this chapter, by irrefragable arguments, defending the sovereignty of God; and the absolute freeness of his grace; against all cavils, objections and opposition. In our text he is exploding all confidence in the flesh, all hope in, or trust unto our own sufficiency or excellence, either of will or deed. Not of him that willeth, &c. A text that wounds Arminianism under the fifth rib. If we consider the words, we shall find notable,

1st. The impotency of our wills. Not of him that willeth. The natural bent of our wills is to evil, and only to evil continually; and without the saving influence of the insuperable grace of God, enlightening the mind, renewing the will, and changing the heart and affections, our wills are and can but be, obstinately and resolutely going after the gratification of our lusts and sensual appetites. Our wills, as all other the faculties and affections of our souls, are, (by our apostacy,) depraved, and put out of square; the renovation of which is the execution of Christ's kingly power; Ps. cx. 3; Thy people shall be willing in the day of thy power. Note,

2d. The deficiency of our best doings, and our utter inability to purchase our own salvation. (Nor of him that runneth.) The words seem to allude to the running in the Olympian, Isthmean, or Nemean games; (in use among the Grecians,) where, by the swiftness of running, they won the crown or garland, set up in the end of the race. But though it be our duty to run, if we would obtain the crown; though a diligent course of duty is the only way wherein we may hope for salvation; yet the crown of glory shall not be conferred upon any, for their running, nor upon the account of any thing they do or can do. *Nec volenti, nec volanti.* Note,

3d. The only cause, origine, and foundation of our eternal salvation: viz., The mere grace and mercy of God. (But of God that

sheweth mercy.) The whole transaction of our salvation, from the first corner-stone, unto the perfection thereof in glory, is a continued series of free and sovereign grace.

Hence observe this,

Doctrine. That the whole transaction of our salvation proceeds from the sovereign, free grace of God, and not from our depraved wills, or imperfect performances.

A truth than the which nothing is more insisted upon, or inculcated in the oracles of God; nothing more impugned, or spoken against, by the enemies of the gospel. A truth that contains the very vitals of our holy religion, and therefore worthy our peculiar notice and regard. This observation may be something illustrated by speaking to these three propositions.

Proposition I. The whole transaction of our salvation, proceeds from the sovereign free grace of God. The apostle very sententially sums up the scope of the gospel in Eph. ii. 8. By grace are ye saved, through faith, and that not of yourselves, it is the gift of God. And the Church of England, in one of their Homilies, clearly lays down this doctrine—"But that although we have faith, hope, charity, repentance—dread and fear of God, within us; and do never so many good works thereunto, yet we must renounce the merit of all our said virtues, and good deeds, as things that be far too weak, to deserve remission of our sins, and our justification, and therefore we must trust only in God's mercy, and that sacrifice, that our High Priest and Saviour Jesus Christ, the Son of God, once offered for us upon the cross." This proposition may be more distinctly considered in these particulars.

1. Nothing but the displaying and magnifying the riches of free grace, was the foundation of the eternal covenant of redemption. What other motive could there be in the breast of the eternal God, to make a covenant with his Chosen—to give unto our glorious Lord Messiah, a chosen number, to be vessels of mercy, and heirs of eternal blessedness? Or what other motive could our Lord Redeemer have, to undertake the station of a surety, (as stiled, Heb. vii. 22,) to stand in our place and stead, to undergo for us and bear off from us, the shock of revenging justice; but the making illustrious his sovereign free grace? It is true, that the choosing some and rejecting others of the same lump of clay, was an act of sovereignty, and not of mercy, or justice. But the contriving such a way, (in the glorious covenant of redemption) for the bringing a number of ungrateful rebels from an estate of foreseen misery and perdition to an estate of glory and happiness, was for the eternal display of free, (because undeserved,) distinguishing and sovereign mercy.

All the truths in God's blessed book, find opposers. The covenant of redemption also, (as well as other essential articles of Christianity,) is controverted and ridiculed; strange indeed! When it is so abundantly confirmed from clear and full evidence, in the word of God. We read in John vi. 37, of those whom the Father has given to Christ. It is written in Tit. i. 2; in hope of eternal life, which God, that cannot lie, promised before the world began. It is plainly expressed in Ps. lxxxix. 3; I have made a covenant

with my chosen. To the same purpose is that, *Is. xlix. 8*, I will preserve thee and give thee for a covenant to the people. It is written, *Eph. i. 4*, that we are chosen in Christ. The like evidence we may find from many other Scriptures, and the church of England in their Homily of salvation, do bear their testimony that this first corner stone was laid upon the sovereignty of free grace.

“The great wisdom of God, (say they) in this mystery of our redemption, hath tempered his justice and mercy together; his great mercy hath, *1 Peter i.*, he showed unto his, in delivering us from captivity, without requiring any ransom to be paid, or amends to be made on our parts—which whereas it lay not in us that to do, he provided a ransom for us, which was the most precious body and blood of his own most dear, and best beloved Son, Jesus Christ.” But,

2. Our effectual vocation flows likewise from the mere grace of God. An eternity is short enough, to adore and praise the riches of that grace, that has called us out of darkness into marvellous light, that has translated us from the kingdom of darkness, into the kingdom of his own Son—that has quickened us who were dead in trespasses and sins; and made us partakers of the heavenly calling.

We are naturally under the power of spiritual death; and what but omnipotent grace, can make us alive from the dead? We are by nature fallen into a gulph of misery, where inevitable and eternal perdition awaits us, if infinite grace reaches not forth his hand, and helps us out. O, the riches of that adorable grace that knocks off the fetters of our miserable thralldom to our spiritual enemies; and brings us into the glorious privileges of the sons of God. O, the wonders of that astonishing love, that breaks down the middle wall of partition, that slays the enmity between offended justice, and provoking sinners, that brings us nigh to God, and makes us one with him through his own blood. *Eph. ii. 13, 14, 15*. What but mercy, exceeding as well our conception as desert, makes us meet to partake of an inheritance amongst those that are sanctified! Justly does the apostle ascribe this renewing and life-making work of the Spirit of God, to the riches of his mercy. *Eph. ii. 4, 5*. But God, who is rich in mercy, for his great love, wherewith he loved us, even when we were dead in sins, hath quickened us together with Christ. By grace are ye saved. And the Church of England, in their 17th Article, most truly say, “That the predestinated are called, according to God’s purpose, by his spirit working in due season, and through grace obey the calling.

3. The saints and children of God shall by his mere grace, persevere and hold out unto the end. Those for whom Christ has died, and shed his most precious blood, shall surely partake of all the benefits of his redemption; and be brought to the fruition of that inheritance that (at so dear a price) he has purchased for them. *John vi. 37*. All that the Father giveth me shall come unto me, and those that come unto me shall in no wise be cast out. Justification and glorification are inseparably linked together. *Rom. viii. 30*; and whom he justified, them he also glorified. Neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor heighth, nor depth, nor any other

creature, shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord. Rom. viii. 38, 39. None shall pluck Christ's sheep out of his hand. John. x. 28. They shall be kept, by the mighty power of God, through faith unto salvation. 1 Peter i. 5. Wonderful grace! that the justified children of God—though conflicting with, and often foiled by an indwelling body of death; all the malice of the powers of darkness, and the ensnaring vanities of a sinful world, shall nevertheless win the field at last, and become more than conquerors. Rom. viii. 37.

I know there are such that oppose, and cavil against this doctrine of perseverance; they allege, that the daily falls and sinful errors of the best of men, evidently contradict their perseverance in grace. They plead in opposition to this doctrine, that, Ezek. xxxiii. 13, when I shall say to the righteous he shall surely live; if he trust to his righteousness and commit iniquity, all his righteousness shall not be remembered, but for his iniquity that he hath committed, he shall die for it. Thence they argue that a man may fall from saving grace. This reasoning is very corrupt—for—1. Though the children of God may fall into repeated transgressions, and thereby bring heavy strokes of Fatherly chastisement upon their heads; yet they cannot fall from a justified state, nor become the objects of God's hatred and vindictive displeasure. This is clearly and fully evidenced in Ps. lxxxix. 29, 30, 32, 33. His seed also, will I make to endure forever. If his children forsake my law, and walk not in my judgments, then will I visit their transgressions with the rod, and their iniquity with stripes; nevertheless my loving kindness will I not utterly take from him, &c. And, 2, for the clear understanding the text, (improved by some, to countenance their opposition to this preserving grace of God, and the comfort of the saints,) we must consider that righteousness is used in a various sense in the sacred Scriptures. There is the imputed righteousness of Christ, whereby a sinner is made righteous in the sight of God, and this is of an eternal and unfading permanence; as appears from the before mentioned scriptures. And there is a righteousness which is a man's own, "Which does arise from a man's own reason, or will, improved by common grace, or education or awed by fears, or swayed by interest, or maintained by some failing spring, that may easily be drawn dry,"—(Vide *Pool's Annot. in loco*,)—and of such the prophet speaks. Very plain and true is the 5th Article of Lambeth upon this point. "A true, lively, justifying faith, and the sanctifying Spirit of God, is never totally or finally extinguished, does not fall away, or come to nothing in those that are once made partakers thereof."

4. The children of God shall be crowned with eternal glory, to the everlasting praise of infinite, free grace. Such that might justly have been fire-brands; in the unquenchable flames of an eternal hell, shall forever be crowned with an exceeding and eternal weight of glory. Such that were born under the condemning guilt of original sin; such as have perpetrated multiplied actual transgressions; such as have been emphatically sinners, monsters of iniquity, sinners of the blackest dye; there shall be even such as these freed from deserved vengeance, and made partakers of an inherit-

ance with the saints in light. Herein is the Lord manifesting himself to be the Lord, the Lord God, gracious and merciful. Ex. xxxiv. 6. Herein is the riches of God's free and marvelous grace magnified. Herein is the display of mercy never to be enough adored, admired and praised. The breadth, and length, and depth, and height hereof, passeth knowledge. Eph. iii. 18, 19. Thus the 17th Article of the Church of England, "At length, by God's mercy, they attain to everlasting felicity.

Proposition II. Our salvation proceeds not from the improvement of our depraved wills. It is not the right improvement of our free wills, that will procure our salvation. It is not the best of our doings that will bring us to heaven. Our wills are naturally so depraved, all our faculties so corrupted and put out of square; that unless Christ, of unwilling, make us willing; and through the imputation of his righteousness, make both our persons and duties acceptable unto God, we can't will, much less perform, what is savingly good. This is plainly evident from Phil. ii. 13; For it is God that worketh in you, both to will and to do of his good pleasure. Thus, also, the 10th Article of the Church of England: "Wherefore we have no power to do good works, pleasant and acceptable unto God, without the grace of God by Christ preventing us—that we may have a good will, and working with us, when we have that good will."

Objection. I am not ignorant that some cavil after this manner: For what end are the calls of the gospel, if we can't, by the improvement of our free wills, procure salvation? If all men han't power to work out their own salvation, why are they exhorted to it? Phil. ii. 12. Does not Christ make a mock of us, when he tells us, that every one that will, may come to the waters of life freely? Rev. xxii. 17, if we han't a natural power to comply with this invitation?

Answer 1. It is most certain, we han't a natural power, to obey all the exhortations, or to comply with all the invitations of the gospel; for instance, we are exhorted to faith in Christ, and yet we are plainly told, John vi. 44, that no man can come unto him unless the Father which hath sent him draw him. Thus the 9th Article of Lambeth, "it is not put in the will or power of every man to be saved."

2. Though we have no strength, ability, or sufficiency of our own, there is abundant fulness in Christ, to supply all our wants. Are we without strength? His strength is made perfect in weakness. 2 Cor. xii. 9. Have we no righteousness? That will commend us to God, or justify us in his sight? His name is Jehovah. Teidkenu. The Lord our Righteousness. Jer. xxiii. 9. Are we in an estate of unbelief? He is the author and finisher of our faith? Heb. xii. 2. Are our hearts obdurate, our wills incorrigible? It is he that must take away the heart of stone and give a heart of flesh. Ezek. xxxvi. 26. And make us willing in the day of his power. Ps. cx. 3. So that Christ does not mock us when he exhorts us to work out our salvation; or when he invites us to accept of eternal blessedness though we are never so impotent; since he has undertaken to work all in us and to do all for us. He can of

unwilling make us willing, he can bring dead men to life; can open our deaf ears, enlighten our blind minds, encline our stubborn and incorrigible wills, can sanctify our depraved and corrupted affections; that we may attentively hear, truly understand, and heartily embrace the calls of the gospel. And therefore from the sense of our miserable impotency, we should be more fervent with our glorious Christ, to give us strength; the consideration that all grace and salvation is treasured up in his own hands, and that he bestows it on whom he pleases, should augment our endeavours, prayers, cries and tears unto him, that he would interest us in his free and distinguishing grace and favour. Thus the Church of England in their Homily of salvation, (part 2, "So that Christ is now the righteousness of all them that do truly believe in him. He, for them, "paid a ransom by his death. He, for them, fulfilled the law in "his life. So that in him and by him every true Christian man "may be called a fulfiller of the law."

But I go on to clear this point.

3. Nothing can be more clearly, plainly and expressly laid down in the Scriptures, than the contrary to this tenet; that salvation is procured by the improvement and right use of our free wills. Very plain and express is the words of our text. Another clear evidence from the Spirit of God, is that, Phil. ii. 13, It is God that worketh in us, both to will and to do of his good pleasure. To the same purpose in Jer. x. 23, O Lord, I know that the way of man is not in himself; it is not in man that walketh, to direct his steps. And equal evidence from many other passages of the book of God, that this essential article of Christianity should be thus invaded and subverted. Alas! there is much of the agency of Satan in it. The forecited 10th Article of the Church of England is very clear in this point.

4th. Can a dead man perform vital functions? Can he shake off his grave clothes and appear with former beauty and activity? Is it in the will and power of a stinking dead carcass to re-assume his life, reason and sensation? Neither is it in the power of a natural man to perform any spiritual actions. 1 Cor. ii. 14. The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God, neither can he know them because they are spiritually discerned. We are naturally under the power of spiritual death. Eph. ii. 1. Our body is but a grave and tomb for a spiritually dead soul, and there must be a marvelous change wrought in us, from darkness to light, and from death to life, ere we can be in an estate of salvation. John iii. 3. Thus the first clause of the 10th Article of the Church of England — "The condition of man after the fall of Adam, is such, that he "cannot turn and prepare himself, by his own natural strength and "good works, for faith and calling upon God."

5. This doctrine is most opposite unto, it destroys the covenant of grace, and revives the covenant of works. If it be in our power to enrich ourselves with, or to reject the grace of God at pleasure; if we can by our own doings, by the right improvement of our natural faculties, bring ourselves into an estate of salvation, what does this differ from the covenant of works? save in a plausible show only. But it widely differs from the whole tenor of the

gospel. Rom. xi. 6. If it be of grace, then no more of works. Our blessed Lord disciplines his disciples, in that essential article of Christianity, that our salvation is the fruits of free, sovereign grace. Matt. xi. 25, and xiii. 11, and thus the Church of England very plainly hold forth in their 13th Article :—" Works done before " the grace of Christ, and the inspiration of the Spirit—are not " pleasant unto God; for as much as they spring not of faith in " Jesus Christ—neither do they make men meet to receive grace, " or (as the school authors say,) deserve grace of congruity.

6. If this doctrine be true, that the right improvement of our free will, will procure our salvation, then the glorified saints have no more cause to acknowledge nor praise, the free grace and love of Christ—than damned sinners. The glorious inhabitants of heaven are under no more abligation to the redeeming love of the Son of God, than the damned in hell.

The stock of grace, (according to this tenet,) was equally distributed, to Paul and Judas, to Abel and Cain, to Jacob and Esau. That the one is in glory, while the other is in endless horror and misery, is owing to their own care and diligence. They did better, and therefore fare better. They have, therefore, cause to praise their own industry, and not the distinguishing special grace of God. Ah! soul destroying doctrine! Every sensible Christian will bring in a ready testimony against it. The great apostle was such an one, and hear his language; 1 Tim. i. 14, 16; And the grace of our Lord was exceeding abundant. Howbeit for this cause I obtained mercy, that in me first, Jesus Christ might shew forth all long suffering. The perpetual language of the glorified shall be, as Ps. cxv. 1, Not unto us, O Lord! not unto us, but to thy name be glory. From all these considerations, the 7th Article of Lambeth appears most true.—" That sufficient grace to salvation is not given, " is not communicated nor granted, to all men, whereby they can " be saved if they will." Thus I come to

Proposition III. Our salvation proceeds not from our imperfect performances. This doctrine the Spirit of God plainly lays down. Tit. iii. 5. Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us. And thus also, the 11th Article of the Church of England—" We are accounted righteous " before God, only for the merits of our Lord and Saviour Jesus " Christ; by faith, and not for our works and deservings." But to be more particular.

Know 1st, that we are infinite debtors to divine justice. Our debt is two-fold; a debt of observation and of satisfaction: the former due as from rational creatures; the latter as from offending sinners. As we are the workmanship of the Most High, created for, and capable of the manifestation of his glory—it is in the highest degree reasonable, it is our natural duty, to live to the perpetual honour of our glorious Creator, by an exact obedience to his perceptive will. Therefore justly might he thunder forth that curse against the non-observers of his sacred law. Gal. iii. 10. Moreover as we are criminals, and delinquents; as we have broken his law, provoked his justice, and stirred up his jealousy, there is satisfaction demanded and due from us. A debt payable by noth-

ing less, than the rigorous execution of justice, upon ourselves or surety. The glory of unspotted justice requires, that the sentence, Gen. iii. 17, thou shalt surely die, must be executed. Thus 9th Article of the Church of England—"Original sin standeth not, &c. —therefore in every person born into this world, as it hath of itself "the nature of sin, so it deserveth God's wrath and damnation.

2. Our apostacy has so depraved, and debilitated all the faculties of our souls, that we are incapable to fulfil the demands of justice, in the least instance. Our most elevated performances will fall so far short of perfection, that they will (if rewarded) but lay us further obnoxious to the strokes of displeased justice. The sin that cleaves to our best duties, (if imputed,) might justly render us, the eternal monuments of unrelenting wrath. Our prayers and tears themselves want washing in the blood of Christ. The pure eyes of justice find numberless spots, blemishes and defects, in our most holy duties. Most reasonably, therefore, does the Psalmist expostulate, Ps. cxliii. 2, And enter not into judgment with thy servant: for in thy sight shall no man living be justified. Thus the forecited 13th Article of the Church of England—"Works done before the "grace of Christ, and the inspiration of his spirit, are not pleasant "to God, &c. Yea rather for that they are not done as "God hath willed, and commanded them to be done, we doubt not "but they have the nature of sin."

3. Were our righteousness never so excellent, it would not stand us instead for our justification. Could we yield such exact obedience, to the whole preceptive will of God, that the pure eyes of justice could find no fault.—Could we attain to angelical holiness, omit no duty, commit no actual sin, nor be chargeable with the non-observance of the least tittle of God's preceptive law, our debt would not yet be paid, nor justice satisfied. For (saith Bishop Usher,) God will not have justice swallowed up of mercy, nor sinners pardoned, and offenders acquitted, without satisfaction. But we must remain God's prisoners, until we have paid the uttermost farthing—a debt not payable by Christless sinners, by any thing less than eternal sufferings.

Our own righteousness, were it never so excellent, would be but a broken reed, a sandy foundation to build upon. Could our excellency mount up to the heavens, and our head to the clouds, we might perish forever, as our own dung. Job xx. 6, 7. Thus the Church of England in their Homily.—"That we must renounce "the merit of all our virtues and good deeds, as things that be far too "weak to deserve remission of our sins and our justification." —(*Sermons of Salvation, part 2.*)

A P P L I C A T I O N .

My only use shall be by way of exhortation in two branches.

1. Be exhorted to hold fast the form of sound words, that you have heard at this time delivered unto you. It is (Syr) an awful consideration, to see the prevalence of error amongst us, and especially to see the essence of Christianity invaded and corrupted. Let me, therefore, with gospel earnestness, address you with the

language of the apostle, in 2 Peter iii. 17; Beware lest ye also being led away, with the error of the wicked, fall from your own steadfastness.

1. Consider your everlasting state depends upon your heeding or rejecting what you have heard. You see that each particular is agreeable with the standard of the sanctuary, the word of God, as well as the established doctrine of the Church of England, therefore a mistake here is of no better consequence than the loss of a soul.

2. Consider that an error here is forever remediless. It won't do at last, (when in the scorching flames of God's fiery vengeance) to say you was mistaken. That won't ease or deliver you. We read of such that expected salvation from their duties and privileges, concerning whom Christ pronounces, a "Verily I know you not;" Matt. vii. 23.

Exhortation 2. Have all your dependence upon special grace.

Direction 1. Labour to see, and pray that you may see, more and more your own nothingness and misery. Until you see yourselves sick, you won't want a physician; until you see your poverty you won't buy of Christ, gold, tried in the fire. Therefore labour to be of those lost ones whom Christ came to seek and to save. Matt. xviii. 11. Oh, labour to see yourselves undone, helpless, hopeless, unless special, astonishing grace be magnified in your salvation.

Dir. 2. Rest not satisfied in a Christless state. What, at ease when the billows of amazing wrath are ready to overwhelm you. Awake, thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead, that Christ may give thee life. Eph. v. 14.

Finally. Cast yourselves at the foot of Mercy. Resolve to rest there. Be found constant, fervent, incessant, with your eyes to our blessed Jesus for grace and salvation. Resolve in a course of constant duty, to cast yourselves upon Christ, seeking unto, and depending upon him, to do all in you, and all for you. Blessed are they that thus watch at his gates, and wait at the posts of his door.

[Continued from page 366.]

MOLINISM.

No. IX.

XVII. *The five propositions taken before the Court of Rome—Different views of the French Bishops—The conduct of the Court of Rome in the matter.—The Bull of Innocent X., dated 1 June, 1653, condemning these propositions.*

IN France, those who required the condemnation of these propositions, solicited the bishops to write a letter to Innocent X., to procure it. Habert, who had become bishop of Vabres, was appointed to draw it up. By it, the pope was informed, that France was agitated with disputes, to determine which, his judgment on the five propositions was desired. By intrigues they succeeded in obtaining the signature of eighty-five bishops—but the letter itself was not laid before the Assembly of the Clergy of France which

was then in session. The fact of this letter was known to them, and several of the chief dynasties informed the pope's nuncio, that the letter was not written in the name of the clergy of France, and that they did not approve of having recourse immediately to the pope, in such matters. They thought it prejudicial to the rights of the bishops. They represented to the nuncio the importance of the subject—that both parties should be heard, and that no condemnation should be made without distinguishing the sense in which the propositions were heretical. They requested the nuncio to write to the pope, which he promised to do.—The Archbishop of Sens, and ten bishops actually addressed a letter to the pope, complaining of the irregularity of the course of their brethren.

At length, however, Hallier, who succeeded to Cornet as Syndic of the Faculty of the Sorbonne, went to Rome. Mulard, a relative of his, had preceded him, and had presented himself to the pope, as a deputy of the Faculty of Theology of Paris, although he was not so—that Faculty having thus far stood neutral. Several doctors also appeared there, on the other side of the question. A Congregation was appointed to be held in July, 1652, and the Jansenists wished to be heard in formal or juridical opposition to their adversaries, but their request was refused. They, therefore, did not attend at the time appointed, and Hallier had the opportunity of giving such a complexion to the dispute as he chose, and he declared that these propositions were taught in France in the sense of Calvin—that the dispute was not about the efficacy of grace, and that there was no intention on his part of attacking that doctrine. Had the Jansenists been heard, the designs of the Jesuits would have been revealed, and they knew this, and therefore used their efforts to prevent a discussion. They represented, that if a discussion should be allowed, the pope would make as much trouble for himself, as Clement VIII. did, in appointing the Congregations *de auxiliis*. The Dominicans also took an interest in this matter, and, it is said, they requested no less than seventeen times to be heard, but without success. They said, that they held to the doctrines of Jansenius on the subject of grace.—Hallier tried to persuade them that they had no interest in the question. They, however, insisted that the sense in which these propositions were heretical, should be specified in the bull, but Hallier would not consent to that, as it would be giving up the chief advantage he was in pursuit of. But the pope would not hear the matter juridically, though he consented to hear the Jansenists or Augustinians in the presence of the Congregation, without parties, or dispute, which proposition they accepted although it was rumoured that the bull was already drawn up, and so it was, in fact. Accordingly, on the 19th of May, they appeared, and one of their numbers made a long discourse on the authority of Augustine upon the subjects of grace. He then read a paper arrayed in three columns, by which he distinguished the different senses of the five propositions. The first was what he called the Calvinistic and Lutheran sense, which he condemned.—The second contained the doctrine of gratuitous justification and efficacious grace in the sense of the Augustinians. The third contained the sense in which they were maintained by

the Molinists, which he said they were ready to prove, was nothing else but Pelagianism and Semi-Pelagianism. The speaker was very particular to show the pope, that he was not contending for (what he called) the heresies of Luther and Calvin. Nor were their opponents contending against that sense, but that the dispute was, rather between the doctrines of grace as held by the Augustinians on the one hand and the Molinists on the other; and that the real drift of the Jesuits was to substitute for the Catholic faith the heresy of Pelagius.

The pope heard him very attentively, and said the Augustinians were not heretics; adding some compliments to the speaker. But he published his bull condemning these propositions on the 1st of June, 1653. The pope is reported to have said, that the Holy Spirit on this occasion had made him see the truth clearly, by revealing to him in a moment the most difficult matters in theology. Du Bosquet, to whom the pope made the remark, declared it in the Assembly of the Clergy of France, and Duval, (who was a staunch supporter of the notion of the pope's infallibility,) said that this sort of infallibility of enthusiasm, was an open door to all sorts of errors. The notion of Duval was, that the pope is infallible, only when he proceeds to judgment *canonically*, and this proceeding of Innocent X., was any thing but canonical.

The bull condemned the five propositions as heretical without explaining the sense in which they were condemned, except in respect to the last, the pope states briefly the two senses which might be put upon it. The reader may be interested with a specimen of the pontifical style in matters of this sort, and as the condemnatory clauses are short, we copy it—omitting the propositions, which have already been copied—*Arimam prædictarum propositionum temerariam, impiam, blasphemam, anathemate damnatam et hæreticam declaramus, et uti talem damnamus. Secundam hæreticam declaramus et uti talem damnamus. Tertiam hæreticam declaramus et uti talem damnamus. Quartam . . . falsam et hæreticam declaramus et uti talem damnamus. Quintam . . . falsam, temerariam, scandalosam et intellectam eo sensu, ut Christus pro salute duntaxat prædestinatorum mortuus sit: impiam, blasphemam, contumeliosam, divinæ pietati derogantem, et hæreticam declaramus et uti talem damnamus.*

The bull proceeds: We command, therefore, all the faithful of Christ of either sex that they presume not, to think, teach, preach otherwise than is contained in this our present declaration, under the censures and punishments expressed in law against heretics and those who favour them.

Likewise we command all patriarchs, archbishops, bishops and other ordinaries of places, also the inquisitors of heretical pravity, that they entirely coerce and restrain, contradictors and rebels, whosoever they may be, by the censures and punishments aforesaid, and other opportune remedies of law and fact, *the aid of the secular arm being invoked for this purpose, if necessary.* Not intending, nevertheless, by this declaration and definition made upon the aforesaid five propositions, to approve in any respect the other opinions which are contained in the aforesaid book of Cornelius Jansenius. Given at Rome, &c., 1653.

It would neither be interesting nor useful to enter minutely into the details of this affair, nor does the object of these notices require it. We shall, therefore, select but a few incidents from the mass, and leave it to those who may be interested to pursue the subject, to consult the historians of the time.

At the time of the publication of this bull, Cardinal Mazarin, was but a simple clerk, and his attention was given to any thing rather than theology. In fact, he knew nothing about the subjects involved in the dispute. But he wished to mortify the Jansenists, because he had been made to believe that they were favourable to Cardinal De Retz, who was his personal enemy. He was anxious to prevent the court of Rome from protecting Cardinal De Retz, then in disgrace, and his hope was to conciliate that Court by persecuting the Jansenists. De Marca was at that time archbishop of Toulouse. When he was a layman, he wrote a book, *De Concordia Sacerdotii et imperii*, which was quite displeasing to the Court of Rome, and he had been obliged to retract it in order to obtain his ecclesiastical bulls, and as he was ambitious of rising still higher, he did what he could to acquire favour. A sure method, as he supposed, was to harrass these persons, against whom the Jesuits had excited a prejudice at Rome, and this made him also an enemy of the Jansenists. The confessor of the King of France, was Annat, a Jesuit, and as the Jansenists attacked the errors of his Society, he was interested also, to do what he could, to excite a suspicion of heresy against them.

These three persons, having different motives, but the same end, were the prime movers of those proceedings in France against the Jansenists which followed this bull. Their efforts were not so much directed against the five propositions, as they were against the Jansenists—that is to say, the Society of Port Royal, and those persons who had become odious to the Jesuits. They wanted only a pretext to crush these men, and they were willing to obtain it at any price. Ultimately this object was attained.

Cardinal Mazarin called the clergy of France together on the 11th of July, 1653, in pursuance of the king's letters patent of the 4th of July, 1653. The Assembly thanked the pope for his bull—all the bishops received it, but some expressed the wish that the pope had conducted the matter in such a way as to clear up difficulties, and at the same time avoid the danger of evil consequences.

In march, 1654, Cardinal Mazarin, called another Assembly; and eight commissioners were then nominated to consider the means requisite to carry into complete effect this bull. After six days, these commissioners made a report. They pretended they had thoroughly examined the book of Jansenius and the numerous publications to which it had given occasion—a labour which would require six months of close application.—They said that they had not found in Jansenius the five propositions in proper terms,—but judging of an author by the context of his doctrine, it could not be doubted that the propositions were contained in the book—that they had found some even more dangerous. But they had two decisive proofs that the propositions were contained in the book—one of which was the words of the bull itself, which referred these

propositions to Jansenius—the other was the letters of the bishops of France, in which they take it for granted these propositions are from that author.

The Assembly on this report, declared by a plurality of voices, that the bull had condemned these propositions in Jansenius, and in the sense of Jansenius, and directed that the pope should be informed that such was their judgment.—Some of the prelates were opposed to this declaration. They attempted to qualify their signature to the constitution by oral declarations made in the Assembly, an expedient which in the end they found to be ineffectual.

If these propositions were contained in the book of Jansenius, the fact could have been shown by simple inspection. Annat said at first, that they were *in totidem verbis*, but he was obliged to qualify this, by saying that they were in sense contained. Finally the Jesuits resorted to the extraordinary expedient of making the fact that they were in the book a matter of *doctrine—pertinet ad partem dogmatis*. And this position they advanced under the name or phrase or proposition, *the inseparability of the fact of the law*. The reader is referred to the 17th and 18th of the Provincial Letters for a development of this very singular and very absurd proposition.

It should be observed too, that the two senses of which these propositions were said to be susceptible, were the Calvinistic and the Augustinian, as they were denominated. The Jansenists repudiated the Calvinistic sense, as they called it, and the Jesuits dared not to call in question the Augustinian sense, which Pope Innocent X. had approved. Hence the drift of the Jesuits to avoid explanation. Yet an explanation would have terminated the dispute between the parties, provided, both parties had in reality been aiming at the object pretended. But the truth of the matter was, the Jesuits wanted to establish their new theology on the ruins of the system of doctrine, which, until their time, was chiefly in vogue, in the Roman church.

Finally, De Marca drew up a formulary condemning the propositions of Jansenius in the sense of the author. This he did in concert with others, and they formed the resolution to compel the clergy to sign it. This formulary was first proposed to fifteen bishops assembled by Cardinal Mazarin, at Paris, in May, 1655, upon some other business. In 1656, at a general Assembly, De Marca determined, by the aid of the first minister, with whom he had great influence, to compel its general adoption, by the regular and secular ecclesiastics of France, and even by the nuns.—This Assembly wrote a letter to Alexander VII., the successor of Innocent X., to ask his judgment on this question of fact relative to Jansenius, and this pope, without making any new examination, published a bull on the 16th of Oct., 1656, in which he confirms the bull of Innocent X. He declaims against the *children of iniquity*, who say that the five propositions are not contained in Jansenius, and he declares (relying on the ground that the matter had been thoroughly examined by his predecessor, which was not true) that they are in effect contained in Jansenius and that they are condemned in the sense of this author. This bull was received in

France, 17th March, 1657. The Parliament made a difficulty about registering it; and the king, on the 16th of November, 1657, went in person to cause it to be done.

This bull of Alexander VII., begins with the words, *Ad Sacram*. On the 15th of Feb., 1656, Alexander VII., published another bull, beginning, *Regiminis*, by which he prescribes a formulary to be subscribed, (which differs but little from that already referred to)—the sense of which is as follows:

"I submit myself sincerely to the Constitution of Pope Innocent X., of the 31st of May, 1653, according to its true sense, which was determined by the Constitution of Alexander VII., of the 16th of Oct., 1656. I acknowledge that I am bound in conscience to obey these Constitutions; and I condemn with the heart and the mouth, the doctrine of the five propositions of Cornelius Jansenius contained in the book entitled *Augustinus*, which these two popes and the bishops have condemned, which doctrine is not that of St. Augustine, which Jansenius has badly explained against the sense of that holy doctor."

There was great difficulty encountered in compelling signatures to these formularies, and an Assembly of the Clergy was called in 1660. This Assembly did not of its own motion act on the formulary, but the King of France declared to them that it was his pleasure, that they should labour to destroy the heresy of Jansenism, and that he would sustain them with all his authority in the execution of that design. De Marca, too, was very active, and harangued them, it is said, two hours.—Finally, the Assembly declared that all those who should be delinquent in this respect, should be deprived of a voice (active and passive) in all assemblies of the clergy, and they requested the king not to permit the granting of any benefice to any person who had not signed the formulary—that he would forbid his courts of Parliament to receive any appeal in this matter, and that he would forbid the printing of books which favoured Jansenism.

The king granted this petition by a decree of April 23, 1661, and directed a letter to all the bishops, requiring their immediate signature to the formulary of the Assembly, and that they should render to his majesty an account of the matter in two months.

In this way the Jesuits surmounted the difficulty arising from the *question of fact*, whether the five propositions were contained in the book of Jansenius,—and obtained their revenge on the Society of Port Royal, who had attacked their doctrine. They also thus laid the ground for turning upon the Jansenists the charge of heresy, and of acquiring for their own views the denomination of the orthodox Catholic faith.

These incidents serve to show the real character of the unity which prevailed in the Roman Catholic Church, and the expedients resorted to in order to preserve it. It is proper to inform the reader, also, that not only must the formulary be subscribed, but the subscriber must swear that the anathema pronounced against the book and the doctrine, was just, and also that he or she was persuaded of it. De Marca, as it has been said already, advanced the principle that the *fact* was a part of the dogma, although he had

maintained in his published works, that the church is fallible in matters of fact. The Jesuits finding a difficulty in supporting De Marca's notion, invented another, which was maintained in a thesis at their College in Paris, on the 12th of December, 1661. It was this: that the Pope had the same infallibility as the Lord Jesus Christ himself, as well on questions of fact as on questions of doctrine. Whence it followed, that inasmuch as Alexander VII. had said that the five propositions were in Jansenius, it was necessary to believe it with a divine faith, in like manner as it was necessary to believe the revealed mysteries. The absurdity of this proposition could only be exceeded by its blasphemous impiety. And in regard to Alexander VII., his reputation for veracity was so bad that Renaldi, an ambassador residing at Rome, wrote of him, *Abbiamo un papa che non dice mai una parola di verita*—we have a pope who never speaks a word of truth—(See Memoirs of Cardinal De Retz,) and writings of this pope have transpired which give the lie to his own public declarations. But passing this matter, the Parliament and the Sorbonne opposed this thesis of the Jesuits, and many of the Romanists maintained that it was false to say that the church is infallible in the facts which she decides; and it was in this way, that Bellarmine and others excused Pope Honorius of heresy, who was, nevertheless, condemned of heresy by the 6th general Council—alleging that this Council erred in a matter of fact, by ascribing to Honorius errors which he did not teach.

Another mode of getting over the difficulty of *the fact*, was that of distinguishing between a *divine* faith, and that sort of faith which was *merely human and ecclesiastical*, and which obliged one to submit his sentiments with sincerity to those of his superiors. The honour of this distinction belonged to Mr. Perefrix, who was made Archbishop of Paris, after the death of De Marca—for De Marca had been nominated to that place, but died immediately after he had caused possession of it to be taken in his name.—Still, however, this distinction between *divine* faith and *human* faith, did not remove the difficulty; because the signing of the formulary implied *a belief* of the fact, that Jansenius's book did contain these propositions, which many did not believe.—Another way suggested, was this:—It was said that the signature and the oath had no reference to the fact, and so the formulary could be signed and sworn to purely and simply without believing the fact.

As to the Jesuits, all they cared for, was to compel the ecclesiastics to sign and swear to the formulary. The signature would remain, while the reasons by which the signers reconciled their consciences to the act, could easily be disposed of afterwards. They wanted to use the bull and the formulary and the signatures and oaths of the clergy as a means of destroying the doctrine of efficacious grace (as held by the Thomists and Jansenius,) and their policy in this matter is very clearly stated in the 17th of Pascal's Provincial Letters, addressed to the Jesuit father, Annat, to which the reader is referred. It is not, perhaps, generally known that Fenelon, Archbishop of Cambrai, was a zealous partisan of the Jesuits, nor that he maintained, previously to the bull *Unigenitus*, that the error condemned by the popes in the five propositions

was nothing else than what all the theologians know under the name of *grace efficacious by itself*, and he undertook to prove it by the very argument which Pascal, in the letter just referred to, predicted the Jesuits would some day use for that purpose—and the Constitution *Unigenitus* is a decisive proof that this doctrine of grace was that precisely which was sought to be condemned under the name of the errors of Jansenius.

{To be continued.}

[For the Baltimore Literary and Religious Magazine.]

THE UNITY OF THE CHURCH.

No. II.

AN organization, such as that of the church, so benificent, proposing ends so high, embracing so much moral worth, and addressing to the intellect and the heart motives so numerous, powerful, and sacred, to engage her children to seek her preservation and advancement, would in an abstract view of the matter, induce the belief that her claims would be felt, and in the sustaining of those claims, no counteracting agency among men could be found. Experience has shown another result. In the moral as well as in the physical system, allowance must be made for the influence of opposing forces, the power of which, in theory, cannot well be ascertained. "Old Adam often proves too strong for young Melancthon." Imperfection attaches to the saints themselves, hypocrites find a place within the walls of Zion, the spirit of an evil world presses injuriously upon her interests, and an enemy of unceasing activity and endless devices gives direction to all that is evil.

To sustain the new against the old mah, and to counteract the combined forces of the great enemy against the Church of God, requires an influence not found in mere forms, and an energy which belongs not to the simple annunciation of a mere scheme, however grand in its object, however wise in its details, or ample in its provisions. These, and more than these, in all the departments of moral life, have been turned to evil purposes. The truth of this the church, in her divided state, has been made to feel. And yet by not a few, whose range of social vision is limited by the horizon of their own community, as though it were the entire church, the evil now complained of is, to a great extent, unfelt. If such have a calm at their own little home, the agitations abroad, their own sectional inefficiency, and the unpropitious braving of a schismatical state upon the general interests of true religion, affect them not. Not so the saint of more extended views and expansive heart. Whatever retards the progress of enlightened piety, he deeply feels, and sincerely deplures. The bringing over the whole condition of mankind an evangelical influence, that they may be brought nearer to God, that they may be advanced in spirituality of mind, that saint may be more closely bound to saint, by the sacred ties of the economy of mercy; and that, thus united as one, in the prosecution of a great and hallowed cause, their actings may

be more efficient, being guided by sounder counsels and carried forward with a mightier power, are the immediate objects contemplated by the church of God. Instead of which the enlightened expectant of a better day is too often called upon to see the operation of opposing evils, upon the whole frame of Zion's organization, arresting her in her progress, and enfeebling her in her efforts to lengthen her cords, strengthen her stakes, and spread abroad the curtains of her habitation. How deeply is this calculated to impress with sorrow the heart of the friend of Presbyterian organization, doctrine, and order! Let us notice,

I. The aspect under which, at the present time, this divided church appears. The professed causes of these separations, whether found in views of doctrine, forms of order, or in administrations of discipline, we shall not discuss. Nor shall we intimate that, under these heads, there are not real causes of important difference; and that integrity may be ranged on different sides, few will have the hardihood to deny. In the state of parties, however, in our age, there is something peculiar. Mere party spirit is, in general, very strong; yet the several parties have causes and actings of bitterness, among themselves, more intense than against opposing sects, without their bounds. Decided attachment to distinctive sectional dogmas is much more feeble than in former days. To a great extent, by reflecting men, a pretty accurate judgment is formed of the relative value of what is peculiar in their respective communities, and there is less backwardness than once existed, to acknowledge what is commendable in an opposing sect; yet, in every section, the party spirit retains an almost unimpaired vigour. It is probably true, that compared with former times—"Bigotry is less, party spirit more." This is peculiar to our age, and, at first sight, would seem to say little for the integrity of the men who give it character. The mistaken zealot has usually accorded to him a sincerity in his own wrought violence, which in some measure shields his integrity. But what shall be said for him who justly estimates the value of his party dogma, admits that it is little worth, and yet, in its maintenance, is decided for the continuance of the sectional distinction; though that distinction breaks in upon the unity of the household of faith, mars the beauty of the new Jerusalem, divides in affection her citizens, and, in the cause of God, renders feeble their divided efforts. This would seem to argue little in favour of the influence of *principle* over the minds and hearts of such men; and in this age they are not few. Nevertheless, this evil may, possibly, be more apparent than real. We should on this point endeavour to ascertain the truth.

The fact is not to be disputed, that many of the disciples of the Redeemer, in the respective denominations of Christians, in all that is truly Christian, have a deeper sympathy with not a few of those beyond their own denominational boundaries, who occupy the common fundamental ground possessed by the entire *true* church, than they have with most of the more ardent advocates of the sectional peculiarities, within their own ecclesiastical limits. With the former their communion is more full, more spiritual, and more joyful, than with the latter, though bearing the same party

name. Mere party distinctions are seldom animated by much of sound and important principle. When party is formed and sustained by mere party considerations, a falling off from these may be the effect of the greater influence of permanent and important principle; and in proportion as this is the case, so will attachment be extended and strengthened, toward the friends of what is general, permanent, and important, rather than to the votaries of what is doubtful, partial, and passing in its form and character. Thus, in these apparent anomalies, good, rather than evil is indicated. From unprincipled peculiarities there is a declension; to sound principle and its friends, there is a tendency toward a firmer adherence.

But how can mere party spirit, in this state of mind, be strong? For inconsistency in human conduct and character, it is often difficult to account. In the case before us, however, the mystery is not deeply veiled: habit is insensibly formed, and to sustain it when formed, its own native stubbornness, for a time, may defy the assaults of principle. The temporary connexion of what is merely distinctive, in party profession, with what is more permanent and of greater value, has its imposing power upon the mind; associations whose bonds are not easily broken have, too, been formed under the party flag; and commitments have been made, a disregard of which, both consistency and duty may appear to forbid. In the movements of faction there is, generally, a concurrence of circumstances which operate in the rearing of party walls, which no common exertion is adequate very soon to overcome. But those walls of separation cannot be perpetual. Their foundations rest upon the sand, and their materials are held together by untempered mortar. The feeble hold of the mere sectional dogma upon the mind of the party man, more than indicates the approaching dissolution of the bonds that hold him in the relationships of faction. In the increasing coldness of heart toward mere sectional notions, in the internal conflicts of party, in the extended and extending recognitions of brotherhood among the saints of various names, while we witness in their company many causes of sorrow, we likewise see some rays of the morning of a fairer day. Sound principle, unperceived by both the lukewarm and the violent agitator, is at work, and is in progress toward the attainment of its appropriate end. There is an agency on high which presides over the whole moral system; a wisdom that cannot err, directs it; a power that cannot be resisted urges it on, and a bounty which never fails, attends with goodness its every step.

2. While treating this subject, the causes which have operated in the production of existing divisions in the church, should not be passed without regard; nor should those causes be sought for in the innocent occasions of unreasonable dissatisfaction. Regard to principle is the plea of all, and different views, either of principle or its legitimate application, if we admit their plea, have given rise to denominational divisions. That principle has had no place in the unnatural formations before us, it would be unjust and cruel to deny. But we sin against no dictate of enlightened charity, when we affirm that, in the formation of parties, principle had much less to

do than party professions would induce us to believe. In this remark, we wish to be understood as having in view those in whose creed and authorised administrations, no causes of difference are to be found, except what are referable to mere circumstances of locality, or to matters of doubtful disputation. It can have little bearing upon that state of things where fundamental articles of the Christian faith are not only impugned, but the renunciation of the truth and the adoption of the opposite heresy are imposed, as terms of fellowship; or where the associated circumstances are such, that a continuance of communion would imply either a departure from the faith, or a sanction of the error. In such cases there is no way left for those who would preserve a pure conscience, but to hold by the rule of their former attainments; in the mean-time, using in the best manner they can, the means adapted to the maintenance of harmony, while acting in defence of the cause of truth. The introducers of corruption and the persevering imposers of error upon the church, are the schismatics, and not those who abide by the old landmarks of righteousness. They have forfeited their title to the communion of saints, and their excision from organical fellowship is demanded by fidelity to the purity of that fellowship; or should innovators upon the faith and order of the gospel be so powerful as to defy the ordinary exercise of discipline, the voice must be obeyed which says—*Come out from among them, my people, and be ye separate, saith the Lord.* And such having pursued the course indicated by a due regard to the requisitions and provisions of evangelical order, have reason to confide in the promise—*I will receive you.* The great ecclesiastical schism, at the period of the Protestant reformation, will stand while the records of time endure, as an example of dutiful separation from a prevailing and incurable apostacy. But what of the schisms among Protestants! What of the divisions in the ranks of orthodox Presbyterians! The factions among the Gentile “tenants of the outer court,” can furnish no good example for those within the court of Israel.

It may be well for all to advert to the fact, that schismatical separations in the church, are the work of comparatively few. Hence, when mere names are set aside, the great body of the good people, in the divided communities, are found to be wonderfully one. It may then be asked, without any impeachment of general integrity, if love of sound principle and consistent administration has led to existing divisions, in the ranks of evangelical Protestantism, why in each section of it, do we find so many of different views and of doubtful morals? Why does not the zeal which for deviations, speculative and practical, at least as harmless as these, urged the schisms, follow up its measures and expel from the altar those who, in principle and morals, are so little in accordance with the established standard? After making all due allowance for the unavoidable imperfections of human administration, we are induced to think that, in the production and continuance of existing schisms, other causes than love of sound principle have had some hand. History, imperfect as its records and traditions are, is not without evidence of this fact. But this is not the place to inquire

of the church that are, though visibly divided, truly evangelical in doctrine and order, there is a predominance of spiritual virtue that only needs to be called into united action, to effect every desirable result. Rouse those virtues into enlightened and associated activity, and schisms will be healed, and factions, however rampant, will give way.

Before we proceed to a more detailed consideration of the remedies of existing schisms, let us briefly advert to a mistake or two upon the subject. We have now in view the creed of the church, and the inter-communion of parties, while in a state of actual original separation. We mean not a full discussion of these points, but merely a few passing remarks, that we may not be misunderstood, on the general question before us.

Among the causes of schism, whatever indiscretions may have occurred in its management, we must not reckon the fact that the church has felt it necessary to express her faith, in a creed. Confession, or distinctly expressed Articles of belief. To object against such a symbol, it is too late in the day. The professed reception of the Scriptures, as of divine authority,—the proposed substitute for all such symbols,—was never *the* expressed term of the church's fellowship. This reception of the sacred Scriptures was implied in her conditions of communion, but at no time was *the* condition. To propose the casting of the church's symbols of her faith and order, with the idols of the nations, with the moles and the bats, would, indeed, be the extreme of folly and faithlessness. The professed opposers of a creed, have themselves some other term of communion, than the simple acknowledgement of the divine authority of the word of God. Either expressly, or by well understood implication, they have their leading interpretations of the Scriptures, as their bond of union and term of fellowship. Without such bond there can be no social action, the most general intercourse of man with man has its well understood terms. Wherever an end is to be obtained by the connected exertion of men, rules, implying principles of action, must be observed; and a pledge, expressed or implied, is required and given in the case of accession to the association, whatever may be the object of its formation. Is the church of God to be so entirely without aim, as to need no such laws of association? Or is she to be supposed so far removed, from the principles that ordinarily regulate society, that the laws of social action may be safely disregarded? This is not the case. It indicates no very extensive acquaintance with the word of God, the social constitution of man, or the ends of Zion's organization, to affirm, as some have thoughtlessly done, that the time is coming when the church's constitution will be an acknowledgment of the word of God as divine in its origin, the only term of her communion.

The Bible, indeed, furnishes the principles of the church's constitution—understanding by constitution, the declaration of her fundamental laws—but that declaration is in form distinct from the supreme standard given us by the Great Lawgiver. That standard we are obliged to receive from Him. Its reception is a matter between him and his church. The constitution or creed, is the expression of their understanding of the supreme standard, and is,

among themselves a declaration of what they apprehend to be their rule, in their social state. The Bible is immediately a matter between God and the individuals of the community; the creed or constitution, is a matter that immediately relates to those individuals, as united for concurrent action in pursuit of a great object; referring, of course to the word of inspiration, as the ultimate and only standard of infallible authority. Such a document is indispensable to the social, official, and efficient, acting in the church's related state. It is similar to the arrangements of the political commonwealth. The volume of nature furnishes the first principles of the order of civil states; but if made available for the attainment of the ends of the social state, those principles, with some degree of formality, must be distinctly arranged in a constitution of government. The progress of states, in the settlement of their fundamental laws, indicates their advances in civilization. When it shall be found that nations, highly civilized, shall formally adopt, as their constitution, the book of nature, or the Bible, without any distinct expression of its principles, other than is found in its unwritten or written pages, then may it be expected that the church, committing her creed to the flames, will proclaim the Bible and the Bible only, to be her constitution, or confession of faith. But while she prizes her Bible as the only infallible rule of faith, and has her imperfect saints to edify, she will cherish her subordinate, scriptural, symbols.

The ends of the church's existence, the concurrent efficiency of her members, in pursuit of those ends, fidelity to her head, in managing the trust committed to her, her duty to the world, and her obligations to her own children, all unite, in demanding of her the solemn declaration of her faith. The church is the pillar and seat, resting place of the truth. As of the individual, so of the social body,—the moral person,—it is required to confess with the mouth, unto salvation. This confession should be distinct and intelligible, but suppose the Papist, the Pelagian, the motley crowd of the Socinian infidelity, and the orthodox believer, should, in the same congregation, speak out their respective views of Bible doctrine, and attempt to carry it forward in application, where would its distinctness be found? What intelligence could be given, by such an assembly to the world, either as to its principles, ends, or means? The profession of such an assemblage would indeed be "confusion confounded." The communion of its members would be the jarring of contradictions. Of such a state of things, a well formed creed is one mean of prevention.

But whose is the creed, when formed and solemnly adopted? Past all doubt, the church's. *The church of the living God, is the pillar and ground of the truth.* But again, what do we understand by this church? Is it the men in official robes, and in their courts of judicature. Or is it the great body of the Christian people, in the possession of the truth, the sacraments, and the ministry,—the gift to them of their exalted Redeemer? To propose the question is, perhaps, to answer it, when attention is given to its import. Yet in practice, sometimes, it seems, good men have been found at the two extremes of the subject. On the one hand, the demand

of "an intelligent profession" of every article of the church's creed as the condition of fellowship in her sealing institutions; and on the other, the confining of such profession to the candidates for office, in a great measure regardless of what reception the creed shall have by the general communicants. The former of these extremes bears its refutation upon its front. That requisition would go to exclude the great majority of the heirs of life from a participation in the seals of God's covenant, as few could be found coming up to the condition. The latter goes to the sealing of ignorance and error at the baptismal font, and at the table of the Lord. Let the communicant once understand, that his sacramental fellowship has little or no connexion with a confession of faith, and the church will soon cease to be the pillar and ground of the truth. Between these extremes there is a middle and a safe course. The church is the school of Christ, and an admission to the seals of membership there supposes an acquaintance with the fundamental truths and aims of the establishment, on the part of those admitted, or their sponsors, as the case may be; and the assumption of an obligation to attend upon the lessons of instruction there given, and an orderly submission to the laws of the institution. Thus a place is taken upon the appropriate form by each class, where a progressive development of the system is had, and its lessons learned. More than this cannot be justly required, and less cannot be safely demanded. To limit the obligations of the church's faith to her officers, is to act a very inconsistent part. What? Do the officers of the church embrace all those whose unity in the faith and the knowledge of the Son of God are to be sought? Is the measure of the stature of the perfect man confined to those who occupy official station? A ministry without a people to whom to minister, would, indeed, be a very imperfect church. The church is to be considered as substantially existing, antecedently to the giving or necessity of having a ministry. In her organical form, she possesses the ministry as the gift of her Redeemer; to her belong the oracles of God, which that ministry is to help her to understand; her's are the sacraments, as seals of her covenant; and her's is the form of order which, under her ministry and by it, she is obliged to observe and maintain. The ministry is the gift, to her, of her exalted Head, and from Him it has all its authority; yet that authority cannot be formally exercised, by any individual, over any people, except with their own consent. Offered, the ministry may and must be, in order to be chosen, but till submitted to, it has no formal power over any community. The rights of the people are thus secured against obtrusive usurpation. Yet the ministry is in no sense derived from the people. Of the popular voice, the officers of the church, *one and all*, for their official power, are entirely independent. That power is from Jesus Christ, upon whose shoulders the government supremely rests; and to individual office-holders, it is, from him, conveyed, through his own instituted medium of ordination.

The Presbytery of the church, both teaching and ruling, in their several places, represent the interests and the character of the faithful body, and are appointed to do so by the Head, Christ; they

are ministers of Jesus, and not the servants of men, except, as sent by the Saviour, to do all that he commands for their salvation. In the faith, sacraments, and principles of gospel order, the church has an original, a radical interest. Those, *in union*, she legitimately claims as her own. None of them is peculiar to the ministry, except as the official administration of each is assigned to it. The creed is the church's faith which her ministry is bound to proclaim, *not as the articles believed by the ministry alone, but as the creed of the body*—the belief of the whole. The text book of her public instruction, which the church puts into the hands of her children. Thus fellow-Christians speak and know their own language as that of Canaan, and the world may understand its import. The members of the church "profess the true religion." To do so, they are taught.*

The idea of either a "secret or double doctrine," in every form and modification of it, is at once excluded. The faith of the church is one for both her ministry and her people. With both of these classes, there is great diversity of attainment, but in a well ordered state of the church, whilst the right of liberal inquiry is defended, a decided opposition to, or denial of, the recognized creed will not be allowed, in either the public teacher or the scholar. The solemnly adopted "confession" is that of the private member as well as of the recognized functionary. The constitution and constitutional laws of the civil state belong equally to the magistrate and the humblest citizen. The principle of this fact is the fundamental law of social man, in the social state, whether ecclesiastical or political. Privilege and responsibility go hand in hand.

Out of this view of the matter arises the following interesting, and not the less interesting that it is a "vexed," question: shall none, except those who place themselves, according to the provisions of her constitutional creed, under the review and authoritative control of the church, be admitted to the enjoyment of her distinguishing privileges—a participation in her seals? The discussion of this point introduces at once the subject of the occasional intercommunion of church members, in a state of organical separation from each other. Upon this view of the subject, neither the practice of the apostolic nor reformation churches sheds much light. For a settlement of the question, we must throw ourselves back upon the nature of the subject, and seek the application of the principle that regulates it, in the light of the principle itself. Consistency will stamp its signature upon the sound application of a sound principle. The results of this may sometimes, be painful to the sensibilities of the heart. And who among the saints that have had opportunities of observation, has not been made to feel, deeply

* How far the declaration of Dr. Hill, Principal of St. Mary's College, Aberdeen, is admitted in the churches of America, we cannot say; but to us it appears very exceptionable. Speaking of the atonement, and the system of the church of Scotland, upon that subject, he remarks: "It is decent and fit that those who desire to be her ministers should be well acquainted with the grounds of that system. But it is not necessary that these grounds, or that the system itself, should be explained to the people."—Lectures, vol. ii. p. 588. Would American Christians—Presbyterians—bear to be spoken to in this manner? But it was to his students, Dr. Hill thus spoke.

feel, upon this subject. As to this, it matters not upon what side of the question he has taken his stand: he is a Christian, and he feels,—feels, that all is not right in the present condition of Zion. How painful to the heart, under any circumstances, the refusal of a place at the communion table, to one whom we hope is a child of God, and not be repeated upon this page; one whom we are persuaded is not less worthy in the sight of God—perhaps more worthy—than many we unhesitatingly admit; one whom the Holy Ghost appears to have sealed unto the day of redemption. Eloquent men* have placed this aspect of the subject in a very impressive light. We are not disposed to make the impression less deep. It ought to be deep. We think, at the same time, that mind as well as heart has its claims, and that the appeals to the powers of intellect as well as those to feeling, should be heard. The subject, past doubt, pertains to the one as well as to the other; and to the former first, in order to reach the latter with permanent effect. Mere feeling, if not sustained by admitted principle, should be little valued, and the misapplication of sound principle, in the undue extension of terms of communion, ought to be reformed. Errors arising from excited and unregulated feeling, and those that spring from misapprehensions of judgment, call for deep sorrow and speedy reformation. It is trusted, that both aspects of the subject, by some one competent to the task, will be presented in candour and with power, while light shall be shed upon the path of safety and of truth. At present, there is reason to fear, mistakes are cherished on each side of the unsettled question.

That there are upon the subject of ecclesiastical fellowship, several important positions, in which enlightened Christians are generally agreed, is matter of great satisfaction. Among these are the following:

The Sacramental table is not ours, but the Lord's; and so of the baptismal font.

This table is not a common one, to which all are invited. It is provided for the children of the family—and those children are the visible church—her members.

The law of admission, or exclusion, enacted by Him of whom the family is named, must be scrupulously observed by the servants to whom he has committed its administration.

The visible church and the invisible, being distinct, are under distinct forms of administration, and must not, by us, be confounded. What pertains exclusively to the one, must not be forced into the other. The visible church, with its administration, is, indeed, intended to subserve the interests of the invisible, and does so; but the terms, laws, discipline and agency of the one and the other are very distinct. Inattention to this is always followed by disorder. Of avowals and known acts the functionaries of the visible church are competent to judge; but into the recesses of the heart they cannot go. There they must not erect their tribunal. Hence it may be, that an entire stranger to the communion of the invisible

* Among others, Mason, of New York, and Hall, of England, occupy a chief place.

church, a
believer,
ship of his
privileges
believer e
the order
1; 2 The
With
existing f
in cond
kept in m
not be for
church, in
of truth
be to the
To the
commun
solely, be
than tha
To the
regardle
of Chris
can do n
On th
of God'
over wi
referenc
be very
ministry
to whom
this is th
affirm th
Again,
as disting
will oper
the exhib
the ordi
holiness,
the dispe
believe th
nor regard
ends? T
in the s
church Ca
which dis
ends of l
and giving
ends. Br
in the sai
other end
than the
what he b

church, may gain admittance into that of the visible, while the believer, who, overtaken in a fault, remains in the invisible fellowship of his Redeemer, is justly excluded from the distinguishing privileges of the visible society. The impostor is received and the believer excluded; and yet both acts may be in accordance with the order of the house of God. See Acts viii. 13, 21, 23; Gal. vi. 1; 2 Thess. iii. 14, 15.

With abstract reasoning, upon this subject, we must connect existing facts; otherwise our conclusions may lead to extravagance in conduct. The value of abstract principles of truth must be kept in mind, and the Saviour's love to his imperfect people must not be forgotten. To the objects of divine regard it becomes the church, in her administrations, to condescend as far as the claims of truth will allow; and to infringe upon those claims would not be to the advantage of the child of God.

To the violence done to the sensibilities of the heart, in refusing communion to the professed follower of the Lamb, chiefly, if not solely, because he stands under a denominational banner other than that we have chosen for ourselves, we have already adverted. To the remedy proposed,—the extension of sacramental fellowship, regardless of sectional distinction, to all who appear to be owned of Christ—we may now, for a moment, turn. To it, however, we can do no more than very briefly refer.

On this side of the discussion it is inquired, may the sacred seals of God's covenant, by a particular church, be dispensed to those over whom the laws of that church cannot be extended, either in reference to faith or morals? And if they may, why in that church be very careful in establishing an order, to guard the faith of the ministry, if the ministry may be regardless of the belief of those to whom are dispensed the peculiar privileges of the church? In this is there no danger? No inconsistency? Few, perhaps, will affirm that there is none.

Again, it is alleged, that if the ends of church fellowship be such as distinguished men have supposed, this unregulated communion will operate in opposition to their attainment. Those ends are—the exhibition of a system of sound doctrine, the observance of the ordinances of worship in their purity, the promotion of true holiness, and, finally, the preparation of the saints for heaven. Is the dispensation of the seal of the covenant to those who neither believe the creed of the church, observe the institutes of worship, nor regard her forms of order, calculated to promote those holy ends? The whole system of doctrine, worship, and order, found in the sacred Scripture, God has given to his church, to the church Catholic,—and upon Catholic principles that church acts, which dispenses the sacraments for the attainment of the original ends of her constitution. Her sacraments are bonds, engaging and giving strength to her members in the prosecution of those ends. But will they answer this purpose to those who see them, in the same place, given to those who are openly in pursuit of other ends? Whosoever introduces other ends and other terms than the Redeemer has settled, acts a sectarian part; but from what he has fixed there should be no departure. Is not the present

divided church of God loudly called upon to ascertain the causes of the discrepancy of her administrations? Somewhere there is something wrong. Where, and what is it? Let all be persuaded to inquire.

Again, the church is a covenant society, engaged in solemn bonds with God and one another; may she admit to her communion, in her sacraments, those who are banded together under covenants opposite to one another, and hostile to the avowed principles of those who dispense to them the solemn seal of unity, the seal which declares them to be, one head and one body? Is it consistent and safe, at the table of the Lord, and there only, to make no distinction between the intelligent and *bona fide* believer in Christ's authorized creed, and the publicly pledged impugnors of that creed, her worship, and principles, and forms of order; and who, were their views carried effectually out, would put an end to her existence as a distinct organization? Against the organization, hostile establishments exist, and hostile banners are displayed, and for the few moments they sit at the communion table only, are those ensigns of opposition furled; and without any expressed or understood pledge that they will not be again displayed, upon retiring from the sacred feast. Is this practice consistent? Is it sustained by sound principle? Does it not imply the assumption of a law peculiar to the invisible church, and the transfer of it, to be a rule of administrations in the visible administrations of the visible society? The assumption is, that grace in the heart, of which we are incompetent to judge, will supply the defect of visible Christianity, as expressed in the adoption of, and living according to, the church's faith; and of which we may judge; but which is a wanting. A *supposed* invisible characteristic is allowed to supply the place of an absent visible qualification of membership in the household of the church.

We are apprized, indeed, of a reply that is and may be given to this: the communion contemplates that in which the parties communing are agreed, and is not considered as regarding their points of disagreement. "It is an affectionate remembrance of an admitted fact,—the death of Christ,—and a respectful recognition of each other, as disciples of the same great Master." And is this, indeed, the communion of saints, for which this most solemn ordinance of Jesus was instituted? It is believed not. That which gives value to the supper of the Lord is its relation to great, hallowed, and commanding principles. It is a memorial of the Son of God in the glories of his person, his relation to the eternal covenant, to his redeemed church, to his redemption of the church, to the blessings secured by his death, to the principles of God's moral government, to the grace of the believer here, and to his glory hereafter. It is that institute of Zion in which concentrate, so far as visible administration is concerned, the glories of redemption. It carries the mind back to the united actings of justice, love, and wisdom, before the dawn of time; and forward to the advancing glories of the celestial state, when these heavens and this earth shall have passed away. Separate the sacramental communion from these principles, and it becomes a very little thing; an ill defined emotion of affection, and a graceful act of courtesy! This

is not to ea
well to asc
and the en
another.
tinguishing
Such com
this sacred
sion. To
ing of the
sickly affe
sentiments
Again; c
give a sole
The most
to those ar
tion!—W
our own o
pledged th
haps an h
But we
understoo
of it. Th
criminate
supporter
error, or
With t
stances o
well know
heart, are
separated
communio
contemplat
cross, and
results in th
of love is
and eterna
emotion;
ema upon
which parti
Though th
avowed fel
aloof.
Can the
them from be
In order to
wished," ca
attempt an a

is not to eat the Lord's Supper. At the communion table, it may be well to ascertain, in what the Pelagian—or full grown Arminian—and the enlightened evangelical believer have fellowship one with another. Assuredly it will be found, that very little of what is distinguishing in Christianity, is the common property of the parties. Such communing, in the light of the true and extended import of this sacred institution, is in danger of being branded as idle pretension. To avoid this belittling of a glorious ordinance, this narrowing of the mind from its expansive bearings, to accommodate a sickly affectation of courtesy, we must give place to more worthy sentiments and higher views.

Again; does not this intercommunion of parties so discordant, give a solemn sanction to the continuance of organized schism?—The most sacred and higher privileges of the church are dispensed to those arrayed in hostility against the principles of her constitution!—What, then, in point of peculiar privilege, distinguishes our own orderly members, from the disorderly factionists who have pledged their name and influence, to sustain a schismatical—perhaps an heretical, organization?

But we go not into details. Note, too, that we are not to be understood as hostile to “occasional communion” in every form of it. That upon which we animadvert, is the doctrine, that discriminates not between the orderly and consistent observer and supporter of the church's constitution, and the avowed votary of error, or schismatical faction.

With these suggestions, as to some of the perplexing circumstances of the visible church, we close this number. The reader well knows that many, very many, who in principle, in faith, and in heart, are one, and who, by dividing walls, should never have been separated from each other, are divided and entangled. At the communion table the mind is directed to the scenes of Calvary, contemplates the principles that conducted the Son of God to the cross, and, in the light of the divine promise, traces the glorious results in the redemption of sinful, ruined men. The whole scheme of love is grand, for it is holy, ordered, infallibly sure, extended, and eternal. The heart is full. It swells with deep and hallowed emotion; and while it blesses God, pronounces an emphatic anathema upon those dark walls, reared by the folly and crimes of men, which partition into factions so many of the children of adoption. Though thus believing and thus feeling, in open profession, in avowed fellowship, in social action, from each other they stand aloof.

Can the walls that thus divide these sons of Zion, and keep them from being fully, visibly, and efficiently one, be safely removed? In order to the effecting of “a consummation so devoutly to be wished,” can any step be taken? In another number, we shall attempt an answer.

G.

SERMON ON THE DEATH OF WILLIAM HENRY HARRISON, LATE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA—PREACHED ON THE 14TH OF MAY, 1841, IN PISGAH CHURCH, WOODFORD CITY, KY., IT BEING THE DAY OF THE NATIONAL FAST, APPOINTED AND OBSERVED BY REASON OF OUR LATE NATIONAL BEREAVEMENT.—BY REV. JACOB F. PRICE, A. M., PASTOR OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH OF PISGAH.

(Published by request.)

PSALM XC. 12.—“So teach us to number our days that we may apply our hearts unto wisdom.”

WE have met to day to mingle our sorrows with weeping thousands. The painful providence, which is the occasion of our present assemblage, is a *whole nation's calamity*. We have not met, *now*, as we often have, to mingle our sympathies and tears, with a small circle of affectionate friends, and relations, to perform the last office of kindness and respect, to the lifeless remains of one of their number; but we have met to mingle our sorrows, with a nation's grief, at the death of our *recently honored*, and *now deeply lamented* HARRISON. Since we have been a nation no such calamity has ever before, befallen us. No President has ever before died in office. The honored man whose death, the nation now mourns, had just been raised to the highest pinnacle of earthly elevation. The willing suffrages of a free and enlightened people, had just called him from his retirement to the Presidency of the nation. For no man on whom the nation has conferred this highest office in its gift, have there ever been greater indications of high personal and political regard and confidence on the part of the people, than for WILLIAM HENRY HARRISON. The acclamations and joyous congratulations of a mighty nation, were still echoing upon his ear, like the music of many waters to gladden his aged and manly heart; when lo! a summons from the “*King of kings*,” calls him from the applause and honors of earth, to his *fast—dread account*. Those elastic limbs that once bore him with a firm and dignified pace—that arm that once and again wielded the unsheathed sword to defend his country's rights and to avenge her wrongs—that keen and expressive eye that once kindled with intelligence, and lighted up with mingled tenderness and firmness, his benign countenance,—and, that manly heart that once, beat warm and big with his country's love, are now stiff, and cold in death's chilly embrace. But yesterday he was the nation's pride—the nation's idol; to day he is no more. But yesterday he reposed in dignified simplicity upon his well earned honors, to day he slumbers in unconsciousness in the gloomy vault. He whose undaunted heart and nerved arm, were ever victorious in many a hard fought battle, is an easy prey to the king of terrors. The fourth of March, and the fourth of April were both days of intense interest and deep feeling to the nation. The countenances of the processions of these two days, tell the sad tale of the nation's sudden reverses. How fleeting are all earthly joys, how fading are all earthly honors. They are—

“Like the snow—falls in the river,”

“A moment white—then melts forever.”

A sad comment upon all earthly ambition. The sainted bard of Israel, when he struck the sad notes, of despondency and grief upon his heaven strung lyre, in view of similar griefs, says "So teach us to number our days that we may apply our hearts unto wisdom."

The great practical lesson to be learned from all such calamities as the present, is to be so impressed with the shortness, and uncertainty of human life, as to "apply our hearts unto wisdom." So deeply impressed, with the solemnity of the providence by which the nation has been deprived of its first officer, so soon after his elevation, was his successor, that he has proclaimed this, the 14th of May, as a day of fasting, humiliation, and prayer. In the observance of this day and its religious services, he requests all Christian denominations to unite. This recommendation, has no doubt met the cordial approval of every Christian, and will be observed by appropriate religious services throughout the nation.

It has been the custom of all Christian nations from time immemorial, upon all such occasions of public calamity to recognise in some appropriate and public manner the providence of God, and humble themselves under its severe and painful inflictions. Great and threatened calamities have been averted from the nations and cities of antiquity by humiliation, fasting and prayer. The Bible is full of injunctions and examples on this subject. "Happy is that nation whose God is the Lord."

The points to which I wish to direct your attention and meditations on this occasion, are,

1st. The afflictive providence which has been inflicted upon us, in the lamented death of WILLIAM HENRY HARRISON, late President of the United states of America—its individual and natural bearings.

2d. The lesson of wisdom—both individual and national, we should learn from this melancholy providence.

The death of the humblest individual is an event of deep and incalculable moment, when viewed in reference to his relations to eternity. If death were the entire extinction of our being—physical and mental, it would still be an event of solemn interest. But as it is only one of the changes in a life that is endless, I ask, is it not a matter of the deepest importance to us all, to be fully assured of our moral qualifications for the coming state of our endless existence? If this life is but the nursery of our being, how important that the present state be improved and cultivated. In contemplating the death of PRESIDENT HARRISON, as a man, we view that event in its most solemn, and momentous bearing. It is in this aspect we connect him with eternity. In his official relations, he was only connected with time. But in his relations as man, he was connected with his God, and linked with immortality. When death is viewed in its relations to another and more enduring state of being, it rises into a subject of the highest importance and the deepest solemnity. Man is ushered into being—matures into manhood—runs his rapid career of life—and dies in the midst of all his plans of usefulness and honor; I ask is this the termination of his existence? Reason, instinct and Scripture answer NO. This

life is but the commencement of an existence that will career on, in far stretching prospective, through the uncounted ages of eternity. This life is but the infancy of our being; its manhood is beyond the grave. Here men are not rewarded according to their deeds. This was intended as the theatre for the formation of character, and not as the world of rewards and punishments. Hence it is, we often see virtue dishonored, and down-trodden, and vice riding in earth's high places. A man's success or failure—his elevation or depression here, is no evidence of the estimation in which he is held by the wise Sovereign of the universe. Lazarus, in rags, and a beggar, was piety and virtue in dishonor and want, while Dives, earth's proud lordling, was vice in honor and opulence. Lazarus, who was earth's disgust and abhorrence, was heaven's favourite, and at his death, was escorted by angels to the companionship of the Father of the faithful. While the rich man, who was in honor here, was frowned away to seek a dwelling amid the heat. The Psalmist was once tempted almost to forsake his God, by seeing the wicked spreading themselves in honor, influence, and wealth, like the green bay tree, and the servants of God in poverty and depression. But when he learned their end, in God's sanctuary, his heart ceased to pant for their wealth or their honors. While it is true that elevation among men is no evidence of a man's estate in the estimation with his God, it is also true that God often raises up men of virtue, and piety to rule over a people he intends to bless.

While it is perfectly clear that this world is not the world of rewards and punishments, and that there must be another and future state of existence, where all the wrongs of this, shall be rectified,—it is also true that there is enough evidence from the pleasures of morality and virtue, and the pains of vice, both physical and mental, even on earth, to satisfy us that virtue is pleasing and vice displeasing to God. It cannot fail to be evident to every reflecting mind, that as God is holy and wise, and Almighty, and as he does not distribute his rewards equally here, that he intends men to live and to balance their account in their coming state of being. If God sends sufferings, mental and bodily, on the race for their violation of his laws here, he being immutable, will continue to punish man for sin in the future world. Some men reason very ingeniously to ease their consciences upon this subject. They argue that because God is benevolent and merciful, he will not inflict punishment eternally, upon his creatures for the sins they commit in this life. But I ask, is it not far more logical and conclusive to believe, that as God, a wise and benevolent being punishes sin (at least in a degree) in this life, that he, prompted by the same wisdom and benevolence, will punish sin hereafter. He, as an *immutable* being, is bound by the pledge he makes by punishing sin in this life to punish it, whenever and wherever in the endless series of man's coming history, it shall be found. If, then, man enters eternity with his sins of earth unaltered and his disposition to sin unsubdued, he will continue an eternal sinner, and by necessity an eternal sufferer; therefore, these deductions of reason are perfectly in accordance with the teachings of inspiration. Reason and Scripture perfectly harmonize upon this subject. Death, is then only the

1841.]
 terminati
 retributio
 existence
 ter for ete
 earnestly
 such a ch
 eternity
 can fit us
 ments he
 dethronin
 by bringin
 ianity, an
 and benefe
 in the le
 this first
 of our be

We ar
 HARRISO
 ian relig
 day excl
 of his k
 orthodox
 the soler
 he has e
 repose a
 had won
 valor, in
 of the na
 part of h
 served his
 of his gra
 gift—if he
 man of C
 where she
 in the sar
 But we
 in its nati
 a chasteni
 God of na
 portray bef
 offences in
 hideous an
 in the eyes
 charges the
 alone, is a s
 to desert us.
 way along t
 there, but it
 counsels, an
 poisoned wi
 53

termination of man's probation and the commencement of his retributions. If, then, death is only that change in our *form* of existence, which instead of changing, only stereotypes our character for eternity, how solemnly should it affect our feelings, and how earnestly should we seek by all the means in our power, to form such a character as we would desire to be perpetuated through eternity. The character of holiness and virtue is that alone, that can fit us for the highest usefulness here, and the highest enjoyments hereafter. And such a character can only be formed by dethroning sin from the mind, and repairing the ruins of the mind, by bringing it into contact with the elevating principles of Christianity, and reconstructing the entire man, upon the noble and pure and benevolent mould of the gospel. This life is but the first link in the lengthened chain of endless existence. The character of this first link connects us with the ascending or descending chain of our being of ever progressive joys or misery.

“ That future life in worlds unknown,”

“ Must take its hue from this alone.”

We are happy to announce our sincere hope from **PRESIDENT HARRISON'S** known, and publicly declared “*reverence for the Christian religion*,” from his known habit of observing the Sabbath as a day exclusively devoted to the duties of religion and from the fact of his known purpose to have united himself very soon with an orthodox branch of the church of Christ, that he was prepared for the solemn, and trying change through which he has passed—that he has exchanged the toils, and cares and honors of earth, for the repose and bliss and ever brightening honors of heaven. If he, who had won glory and honor in the profession of arms, by his skill and valor, in the tented field—by his wisdom and virtue in the counsels of the nation—and by his humanity, honesty and fidelity in every part of honor and trust he was ever called to fill—if he who had served his country with the heart of a patriot, and had at the hands of his grateful countrymen now received the highest honors in their gift—if he looked not to these, but to the cross of the bleeding man of Calvary, for his qualifications for heaven and happiness, where should you, my dying fellow sinners, repose your trust, but in the same hallowed cross.

But we were to contemplate the death of President Harrison, in its national aspects. No Christian can look at this event but as a chastening stroke upon the American people, inflicted by the God of nations, for their national and individual sins. Could I portray before you to-day our numerous and aggravated national offences in detail, and in their true colors they would form a picture hideous and disgusting even to us. How, then, must they appear in the eyes of Him in whose sight the heavens are impure, and who charges the angels with folly. The *intemperance* of the nation alone, is a sin sufficiently disgusting and prevalent to provoke God to desert us. This hideous serpent has not been content to slide its way along the lowest walks of life, and leave its slime and poison there, but it has wound its way up into our state and national counsels, and into the highest ranks of life, and it has polluted and poisoned wherever it has gone. But I shall not undertake to detail,

much less to portray the sins in which we, as a nation and people indulge, greatly to our discredit and injury, as well as our guilt in the sight of God. Ambition, speculation, wealth, fashion and irreligion—all are growing evils—and corrupting the morals of the nation, and thereby sapping its foundations. The manners and mode of conducting social intercourse at Washington city, the seat of the nation, are a servile and sickening imitation of one of the most heartless and dissolute and Godless cities of the old world. Paris, the metropolis of France—the proud mistress of fashion, first in all that corrupts and degrades and last in all that purifies and elevates the moral principles and character of man, has usurped the claim to dictate to all the world beside, on the subject of manners, social intercourse and fashion; and the national seat of republican America obeys her haughty and vile dictation!!! It is sufficient, just to say on this subject, that the dignified simplicity of our former republican manners and fashions, are fast giving place to those of royalty and vice, that so much disgrace and corrupt the governments of the old world. I shall not now attempt to even enumerate the many corrupting changes, and vicious customs which are fast undermining the republican virtue and morality that characterised the balmy and virgin days of the nation. Its utter neglect of religion—its desecration of the Sabbath—that day of sacred rest—blessed and hallowed of God—its profanity—all have been calculated to provoke God to forsake and scourge us. It may be, that God, in tender regard for the good man he has called away, and in awful rebuke to the nation for its many and crying sins has thus visited us. President Harrison refused to receive and entertain company on the Sabbath. He is almost the only President since Washington, the illustrious father of his country, who has publicly and officially recognised the Christian religion. Although we have ever professed to be a Christian nation, our chief magistrates rarely recognise the Christian's God. President Harrison, in the most public manner, and on the most solemn and important occasion—his inauguration—when the expectation of the nation was at its highest point, announced his "*profound reverence for the Christian religion*"—which must have won for him the confidence of all Christian hearts, and added another gem to his already illustrious name. The appointment of this day for the nation, with the Christian and appropriate address that announced it, is a sufficient guarantee that so far as morality and religion are concerned, that President Tyler, will follow in the footsteps of his illustrious predecessor. A very remarkable providence has attended the names and fortunes of Harrison and Tyler. The father of President Tyler succeeded the father of President Harrison (who was a patriot of the old school, and a signer of the Declaration of Independence), to the speaker's chair in the Virginia Legislature. President Tyler now succeeds President Harrison to the chief magistracy of the nation.

It is a common occurrence in sacred history for God to punish his people by removing their pious rulers. So doubtless God intended this truly melancholy providence. He has rebuked us for our sins, in the very stroke by which we trust he has removed the

lamented
and peace
the wear
rulers pe
II. We
national,
Wisdo
means to
tive, for i
in the sel
wicked e
accomplis
governs h
amount o
and enjoy
worldly s
same defi
time or et
nal exist
being—
regulate:
around h
ings, and
eternity.
ception
the solen
to apply
this, to r
ference to
gion is wi
satisfying
world, the
of its high
He dishon
ency of his
faculties—
The ada
of man, is
for religion
ligion of so
people, how
lution, and i
The religion
It only can
morality, for
thought and
plation. Th
brought into
subjects and
contact with
and animal n
higher intelle

lamented Harrison from the toils and ills of earth, to the repose and peace of heaven—"where the wicked cease from troubling and the weary are forever at rest." May this providence teach our rulers peace, and our exactors righteousness.

II. We were to notice the lesson of wisdom both individual and national, that we should learn from this providence.

Wisdom is sometimes defined to be the selection of the best means to accomplish an end. This definition is somewhat defective, for if it were correct, a man might indicate very great wisdom in the selection of the best means to accomplish a very foolish and wicked end. True wisdom is the selection of the best means to accomplish the best ends. We say that he is a wise man who so governs himself and so guides his affairs as to escape the greatest amount of the evil, and to secure the largest share of the usefulness and enjoyments of existence. That man is a wise man in the worldly sense of that term, who so lives and acts for time. The same definition is correct whether we regard man's relations to time or eternity, or to both. When we add our temporal and eternal existence together, and make our calculations for our entire being—on earth and beyond it—we say that is a wise man who so regulates and educates and guides himself by all the lights and aids around him, within his reach, as to avoid the most evils and sufferings, and to secure the most usefulness and enjoyment in time and eternity. He is too, a pious man—the wise man in the Bible acceptance of the term. This is the wisdom of the text, to which the solemn providence that has clad a nation in mourning, calls us to apply our hearts. And what louder call could we expect than this, to rouse us as a nation from the apathy in sin, and cold indifference to religion which so extensively prevail among us. If religion is wisdom—irreligion is folly. The man who makes the unsatisfying and fleeting honors and pleasures and wealth of this world, the objects of his highest hopes and efforts, robs existence of its highest pleasures, and paralyzes his most exalted faculties. He dishonours his God by debasing himself. He gives the ascendancy of his animal and lower nature over his intellectual and moral faculties—he exalts the perishable over the imperishable existence.

The adaptation of the Christian religion to the moral constitution of man, is a subject of the easiest demonstration. Man was made for religion—he is emphatically a religious animal. Without a religion of some sort, he can never be content. Every tribe and people, however low in the scale of human degradation, and pollution, and ignorance, has its religious sentiments and ceremonies. The religion of the Bible only can elevate and purify our nature. It only can lead to the highest developments of intellect and morality, for it only opens up to the mind the highest subjects of thought and the purest and the most elevating objects of contemplation. The mind is thus educated in all its faculties by being brought into contact with the purest, highest and most ennobling subjects and objects of intellectual and moral contemplation. Our contact with earthly interests and pleasures only educates our lower and animal natures, while the religion of the Bible develops our higher intellectual and moral faculties by bringing us up to associ-

ate and mingle with the most elevated and pure beings in the universe. We hold converse in the Bible with God and angels. We are thus attracted back to God, the bright sun, from whom the rays of being have been emitted and are gilded afresh with his unfading lustre.

The Christian religion develops "the manifold wisdom of God" to his entire creation. The grand end of the creation and government of God, is the display of his true character, and the diffusion of happiness to his creatures. The highest happiness of his creatures is "to see God as he is" and "to be like him." How far the unfallen creatures of God in other worlds learn his character, from its developement, in the plan of man's redemption, in this, we have no certain knowledge from the scriptures. But certain we are, that the highest display of his character to man, is connected with the cross of Christ. We are informed in the scriptures of truth that God made the worlds by Christ Jesus, "to the intent, that now unto principalities and powers might be made known the manifold wisdom of God through the church." The church is founded upon Christ the rock of eternal ages. The plan of redemption through the cross then, develops not only to man but to the universe, the "manifold wisdom of God." And it is not only the grand and noble exhibition of God's character, but is also the healing remedy for diseased and fallen man. The story of Calvary and the cross, will ever continue a theme of interest and song, to the redeemed from earth and to wondering angels through the circling ages of eternity. It will remain a subject of ever growing interest and mystery, while the unwasted ages of eternity shall last. If then the plan of redemption exhibits the manifold perfections of God, and is a subject of such interest to angels, who have no direct personal interest in it; how should it affect man whose salvation is suspended upon it. If that is only the wise man, who so lives, and believes, and acts, as to avoid the greatest ills, and to secure the greatest good of existence, how can he be a wise man, who lives without God and hope in the world? Timely preparation for death and eternity, is evidence of the highest personal wisdom. And this preparation upon our part, is simply our cordial approval of and reliance upon the atonement of Christ, which develops the manifold wisdom of God. Our only preparation for heaven, is a compliance with the provisions of the gospel. And such a compliance is not a performance of some protracted and difficult work to fit ourselves for heaven, but it is only to accept cordially a work planned and executed by an infinite God, ready to our hand. Fruitless and vain would have been all our toils to perform a work so vast. With what eager haste and joyful hearts should we embrace provisions so ample and so needed. We are warned, and instructed by the example and death of the illustrious man around whose honoured grave, to day, a weeping nation has gathered, and lingers with melancholy interest "to apply our hearts unto wisdom." One of the first articles of furniture which this venerated man procured for the executive mansion, was the lamp of life to guide its inmates to the skies, for, to the shame of the nation be it said, *he found that mansion without a Bible.* It was his custom, morning and

evening, to read a portion of that sacred word, and conduct religious worship, both before he committed his body to, and rose from sleep, the fit emblem of death, that now holds this lamented man in its cold embrace. He, too, spent his Sabbaths not in receiving company, and feasting the body, but in communing with his God, and in feasting his immortal part upon the manna of the skies. We say to all, follow in these respects, the worthy example of him whom the nation has delighted to honor. His noble example in this respect, has spread a lustre around his setting sun, that we trust will be reflected back, and exert a salutary influence upon his successors in office, through all our coming history. If it were wise and noble and safe, for the distinguished hero and patriot, whose courage and power drove back the infuriated savage, and made England's proud lion to tremble and crouch at his feet, and who filled every office of honor or of trust *with clean hands* and a sincere heart, to repose his trust in Christ for acceptance with God and happiness for eternity, can it be less so for us, who have never rendered such distinguished service to our country and our race, to make similar preparation for futurity? It is folly for us, as it would have been for him to defer, much more to neglect a work so fraught with the soul's best interests. Folly, did I say? it is worse—it is madness. It would be folly for a patient under the influence of rapidly wasting disease to defer, much more to reject, the prescribed remedies. How far worse, to reject the remedies "infinite wisdom has devised to heal diseases of the mind." This occasion is a stirring and affecting appeal to us all. It says in the most moving accents, to every individual of the nation, "be ye also ready, for in a day and an hour when ye think not, the son of man cometh." When the sad and distressing intelligence was borne upon the swift wings of a thousand heralds from the periodical press, to every point of this wide-spread nation, that HARRISON IS NO MORE—THE HOPE—THE IDOL OF THE NATION IS DEAD—tears of sorrow stole their burning way down many a manly cheek. But conceive, if you can, (for I cannot describe it,) the swelling emotion that broke the heart of the patriot soldier who fought and suffered and bled at the side of their gallant general. You once followed with fond heart and willing step, this gallant man in the field of earthly glory and danger—this Providence calls upon you to follow him in a field as far more glorious as it is less bloodless and its rewards more enduring. This providence calls you, by his living example and his dying testimony to seek, with the lamented good man, "glory, honor, immortality," and "a crown of righteousness," as an humble soldier of "the Captain of salvation." Will you follow his example, and share with him and all the redeemed, the glories and honours of the skies?

But we were to notice the lesson of wisdom that we, AS A NATION, should learn from this providence. This part of our subject opens so wide a field that it is almost as difficult to determine what I ought not, as what I ought to say. This calamity should impress every mind with the folly of all plans, and interests which terminate in this life. If there be any distinction among men, worthy the toils and cares and ambition of a noble mind, it is the chief magistracy

of a free and enlightened people. And if ever human elevation was calculated to gratify, and delight a noble and magnanimous mind, it was the election of the chief magistracy of the nation of W. H. Harrison, by a majority so overwhelming, and by suffrages so willingly and enthusiastically given in every section of the union. If ever earthly honors could satiate, he ought to have been satisfied, for the highest of them earth could bestow, had been cheerfully conferred upon him, by the most virtuous and enlightened of the race. But there was nothing in all this, to feed a mind that was made for immortality. Earthly pleasures and earthly honors are but the toys and play-things of the childhood of our immortality. When we become men, we put away these childish things. The distinguished man, whose death has broken up the deep fountains of a nation's grief, has set his cotemporaries and all future generations an example of wisdom on this subject, which is well worthy of imitation. He nobly served his country, not for its rewards, but because he loved it. His ambition was not that sordid and corrupt passion that terminates on the honors and emoluments of office, but it was that sublimated and noble principle that prompted him to serve and please his God, and to seek an honored dwelling at his feet. It does not become me, and much less this sacred place, consecrated to the worship of the most high God, to speak of the party measures that characterised the political contest that resulted in the election of the lamented Harrison to the Presidency of the nation. There was doubtless much on both sides to condemn. This occasion calls upon all, of every party, to lay aside the bitterness, and asperity that may have been permitted to arise, during a contest perfectly unparalleled for its interest and excitement in this country. All should unite in one common confession of guilt, and supplication to the God of nations for forgiveness, for the sins connected with the contest which has terminated in the election of the man whose death we now mourn. There is connected with the press, and the mode of conducting the canvass for office in this country, much that is demoralising and corrupting, and dangerously threatening to our free institutions. The custom of treating, in elections, is a blighting curse—a growing plague spot, upon the morals of the nation. It is a custom based upon the lowest conceptions of the independence and intelligence of those, with whom it is attempted. A sad compliment indeed the candidate pays to his fellow-citizens, whose suffrages he seeks to gain for himself, by degrading and making beasts of them! The man, too, is an object of the deepest pity, who can be induced to aid in the elevation of him, who attempts thus to degrade him. The candidate whose custom it is to treat in elections, pays his own patriotism about as severe a compliment, as he does the intelligence and virtue of those whose favor and votes, he thereby attempts to bribe. He gives to his countrymen this *singular* evidence of his regard for them, that he would be willing to compass their disgrace in order to gain their aid to elevate himself. That community pays dearly indeed for their folly which promotes any man to a situation where he can inflict other wrongs and injuries upon them, as the price of their own drunkenness and disgrace. This custom is the most

1841.]
 singular
 land. I
 That ma
 his cour
 privilege
 him. T
 nanced
 among
 cially in
 ernmen
 enlighte
 morals
 treating
 full wei
 intellig
 Nothing
 institut
 vicious
 supers
 popul
 of the
 alone,
 morali
 is a da
 lectua
 tion, s
 the m
 fails to
 eral leg
 is purs
 of anti
 treasur
 their g
 and co
 physic
 highes
 dependen
 our in
 Tha
 fluence
 advanc
 would
 age, an
 is but t
 and blo
 hours, t
 war of
 Christia
 This
 intercou
 proveme
 ple. Si

singular folly, as well as one of the most degrading vices in the land. It is as irrational as it is disgracing, and as ruinous as both. That man is not a consistent and enlightened friend of his race, or his country, who asks of his fellow men, the privilege (singular privilege indeed) to debase them that they in return may elevate him. This custom of treating at elections ought to be discountenanced by every Christian and patriot. Intelligence and virtue among the people are the great safe-guards of the nation. Especially in a government like ours, where the foundation of the government is the popular will, should the great mass of the people be enlightened and moral. Nothing is more calculated to corrupt the morals of the people, than this degraded and degrading custom of treating in elections. Every friend of his country should lend the full weight of his influence and hearty co-operation, to disseminate intelligence, and to cultivate sound morality among the people. Nothing can so well secure the stability and perpetuity of our free institutions as this, for if the mass of the people be ignorant and vicious, the foundation of the government will be rotten, and its superstructure must soon fall. No government based upon the popular will, can be long preserved and perpetuated where the mass of the people are not kept intelligent and moral. Intelligence alone, is not sufficient. Intellectual influence, without virtue and morality to temper and guide it into pure and healthful channels, is a dangerous power, and becomes often a destructive one. Intellectual power, misdirected by vicious passions and a reckless ambition, sometimes falls upon society like a mighty avalanche, from the mountain's brow. That government, state or national, which fails to afford all proper assistance, by a wise and prudent and liberal legislation, for the intellectual and moral training of its youth, is pursuing a course that is suicidal and destructive. The nations of antiquity made large legislative appropriations from the public treasury for the physical training of their youth. They trained in their gymnasiums and olympic games, a race of men of iron nerve and constitution. Their object was conquest and war, and hence physical strength and valor, and the profession of arms held out the highest honors to their youth. Our strength and glory as a nation, depend more upon our union and moral influence, and that upon our intelligence and virtue, than our valor and skill in arms.

That nation that would depend alone for its perpetuity and influence, upon its military powers and physical strength, in this advanced state of society in civilization, intelligence and religion, would soon learn the folly of such a reliance, in a premature old age, and a decline in the society of nations. The history of war is but the bloody history of human wrongs. It was only the cruel and bloody butchery of their weaker and more defenceless neighbours, that the barbarous nations of antiquity won their fame. A war of ambition *now*, would be esteemed by all enlightened and Christian nations, as disgraceful as it would be foolish and wicked.

This improvement in the sentiments and social relations and intercourse of nations, has been the result of a corresponding improvement in the intelligence and morality of the mass of the people. Similar causes continuing to operate, will, at no distant day,

by the universal enlightenment and improvement of the public mind in morality and religion, cause swords to be beaten into plough-shares and spears into pruning hooks, and man will forget as he ought never to have learned the art of war.

These results are all to be produced by the slowly yet steadily advancing influence and triumphs of the Christian religion, over the passions and ignorance and prejudice of man. The throne of reason and conscience, in the human mind, so long occupied by passion and prejudice, (vile and cruel usurpers,) is, by the gradual, yet all transforming influence of the Christian religion, to be repressed by its legitimate and rightful sovereigns.

The government under which it is our happy lot to live, was the result or offspring of prayer and piety. The colonial settlements of this country were chiefly made up of the most intelligent, and firmly moral and decidedly pious men, that the old world ever produced. Most nations settle their colonies by letting off the excess of their dregs, and their vilest population, but in the settlement of the colonies out of which we have grown, as a nation, the order of nature or of events by a particular providence was changed. Our ancestry, instead of being the dregs, were the cream of England's population. The seeds of Christian intelligence and piety were deeply planted in the hearts, and their fruits were clearly evinced in the lives of the first emigrants and settlers of this country. Their intelligence and piety grew and strengthened with the growth and strength of the colonies, until England which had persecuted our ancestry out from their native land, had undertaken still farther to oppress them in the distant land of their adoption, and then these noble men, weak as to numbers, but strong in intelligence, union and moral principle, rose like a giant, and made their oppressors feel, that "one could chase a thousand and two put ten thousand to flight." To illustrate and prove how deep was the pious sentiments of the time of our revolution, we will relate an incident. On the ever memorable 4th of July, '76, when that band of enlightened patriots and sages, called the Continental Congress, with sad hearts, and dejected countenances were deliberating upon the *Declaration of American Independence*, they reached a point pending these deliberations when all hearts were faint, and all countenances deeply sad, and it was feared by many that the decision would be against that instrument. The destiny of the nation hung for a moment in even balances. The slightest influence would have thrown our fate either way. We had reached the point that was to decide our destiny for weal or for wo. At that solemn—awful, and yet gloriously eventful crisis, that *patriot, sage, statesman, philosopher*, and, we trust, *Christian*, BENJAMIN FRANKLIN, rose in his place and moved "that we have prayer." The motion was carried without a dissenting voice. Dr. John Witherspoon, a *Scotch Presbyterian clergyman*, who was a member of that Congress, yes! a *Scotch Presbyterian*, was called on to offer up the prayer. While that prayer was being offered up, American Independence was born. These noble men rose from their bended knees of prayer, and signed in solemn silence the declaration, that sealed our independence and made us a free people. This nation

was born and cradled in prayer. The illustrious father of his country, who led our few and feeble and often disheartened bands to battle, and to victory, was a man of prayer. Nothing but the same enlightened virtue and piety can ever perpetuate our free institutions to coming generations.

It is with emotions that I cannot command language to vent, that I congratulate you and the entire nation at the indications that this day affords, that if not the *Christian days*, at least the *Christian habits and practices* of our republican fathers are about to return to the nation. Washington and Harrison both patriots of the school of '76, with civil and military wreaths to adorn their venerated brows, added the highest and richest lustre to their names by their virtues and their "*profound reverence for the Christian religion.*" These men filled all the posts of honor and of trust confided to them, not only with honesty but without suspicion. They sustained all the private relations of life with honor to themselves, and with pleasure and profit to those around them. They both as the chiefs of a great and mighty nation, recognised the truth and importance of the Christian religion, and we trust died in the triumphs of that religion, and are now together reaping its blessed fruits. They had both served their country, by the most distinguished service, and had shared its highest honors, and neither was ashamed to acknowledge and serve his God. Israel, under the administration of pious rulers, rejoiced and would exclaim, "Happy is that people whose God is the Lord." Their rulers were peace, and their exactors righteousness. "Righteousness exalteth a nation, but sin is a reproach to any people."

The path to political elevation and honors is indeed a thorny and dangerous one. It is one of temptation, of trial, and of the most imminent peril. And as to its effects upon the hopes and destiny beyond the grave, in regard to those who enter it, it is as destructive to those who succeed, as to those who fail of success. Like the ship in the whirlpool upon the coast of Norway, its first circle is graceful and delighting, each contracting circle accelerates the velocity, and imparts an enchanting and bewildering delight to the enterprize,—at length all dread of danger is forgotten amid the enchantment of the scene. The ship glides with a smooth but hurrying pace, as if around some centre of attraction. The crew dream not of danger until the thunder of the fatal vortex is heard. The yielding ship complains. The crew scream for help. The angry waves, deaf to their cries, rage on. The ship is dashed to atoms. The crew are lost. So the giddy and bewildering whirl of political life. The man who commits himself entirely to political life, freights his soul in a flimsy ship, upon a boisterous and dangerous sea. And yet it is a necessary and important department of human affairs. Those who aspire to distinction in this department of life, should study the character, imbibe the spirit, and imitate the example of such illustrious models at Washington, and Harrison, who like elevated mounds serve to connect the distant generations of men together. Their example should be used as beacon lights to guide the steps of the youthful politician in the sure path to real honor; both here and hereafter. Their Christian

virtues were the last finishing touch of the chisel, or the pencil, that lent the highest charm and enchantment to all the rest. Those who seek distinction from motives of patriotism ought to lend the weight of their influence, both by precept and example, to reform and correct the demoralising influences that are fast undermining the foundations of the fairest political fabric earth ever saw.

The influence of our republican institutions, if perpetuated, is to be felt in its transforming power to earth's most distant bounds, and to the latest generations of men. Our example is an evidence, "seen and read of all men," that enlightened, Christian men are capable of self government—that an intelligent and moral people can better understand and protect their interests and rights, than can any one man or woman, whose sense and virtue is not above the average of the people, he or she may claim to govern. Our example will teach all nations, that "God has made of one flesh" all people that dwell upon the earth. Not as royalty claims, kings of one and common people of another.

The rapid improvements in the various departments of human knowledge are binding in closer union, the interests of the world, as they are facilitating its intercourse. The facilities and rapidity of travel are fast drying up ocean and cleaving down mountain barriers that have too long held the nations of the earth asunder. And as the nations of the earth are gradually brought into closer contact by these improvements, they will necessarily exert a more extensive influence upon each other, until the entire population of the world shall be brought to some desirable elevation in intelligence, civilization and religion. It is my belief, for reasons which I cannot now detain you to enumerate, that the language and institutions—civil and religious, of republican America, are to prevail in modifying the principles, and fixing the language and the civil and religious character of the world. How important, then, is this aspect of the case, if we are to be the model by which all nations are to be fixed in their language and institutions—civil and religious, that we hand them down to posterity not only unimpaired but improved. This can only be done by improving them while we live. To do this, we should cultivate the youth of the land with assiduity and care, and impress upon their tender minds the most enlarged intelligence, and the most firm, self-denying, and inflexible virtue and morality. When I speak of educating the *youth* of the country, I include both sexes, for that economy which attempts to improve one sex to the neglect of the other, is extravagance, and folly. They were both designed by the All-wise Author of our being, to fill and adorn spheres, somewhat different, it is true, but both equally important to society and the world. If either exerts a greater influence than the other, upon the character of the youth, and thereby upon the character of the nation, it is the mother. And when I speak of *education*, I mean not merely *intellectual training*, but I include *moral culture*, for that system of training which attempts to cultivate the intellect, and leaves the extended and more important field of moral emotions waste, is a dangerous one. It was to the early instruction and example and prayers of his pious mother, that President Harrison attributed his religious

impressions. If
ascertained, it wo
early maternal influ
children are the
large share in th
whether maternal
to the neglect of
them by his exam
into their bosom
evil," which is
to confer wealth
religion, only sh
and how little he
his country. T
will.—If the w
tion is solid ar
tion's surest
to curb the p
defence and
fortifications
endow milit
the professio
of war, like
to every bro
minion, the
educated a
men who a
and true, t
intelligenc
ian religio
only sure
the nation
patriotism
uals, and
safe defe
has conv
to be Ch
ant ends
as as a n
ple, evin
"righte
May
and reli
but grea
posterit
and wis
is my h

impressions. If the history of the piety of the world could be ascertained, it would be in a large degree made up of the details of early maternal influence and instruction. To mothers, we say, your children are the hope of the nation, and you, under God, have a large share in the formation of their character. That parent, whether maternal or paternal, who hoards up wealth for his children, to the neglect of their intellectual and moral culture, and teaches them by his example and precepts to love it, pours burning lava into their bosoms. He plants and cultivates there, "*the root of all evil*," which is "*the love of money*." And that parent who prefers to confer wealth upon his children, to intelligence, morality, and religion, only shows how sordid are his own views and feelings, and how little he regards the interests and honor of his kindred and his country. The foundation of our government is the popular will.—If the whole people are enlightened and moral, that foundation is solid and firm. The religion of the Bible is, then, the nation's surest safe-guard. Without moral and religious influence to curb the passions of men, in vain are all other means of national defence and safety. You may line our frontier and sea-board with fortifications and block houses—you may at the public expense endow military academies, and educate men in the art of war and the profession of arms—you may increase our navy until our ships of war, like so many fierce eagles may spread their canvass wings to every breeze, and whiten on every sea, and roam in proud dominion, the haughty mistress of the ocean, and unless you have educated a Christian intelligence and virtue into the hearts of the men who are to manage all these varied interests to make them loyal and true, they are no sure safeguards to our free institutions. The intelligence, and stern virtue, and inflexible morality of the Christian religion, inwrought into the very elements of society, are the only sure and impregnable defence of the liberties and safety of the nation. What are ocean ramparts and physical strength, if patriotism and public virtue be wanting? Let us then as individuals, and as a nation, learn in what consists our true glory and safe defence. Let us learn from the melancholy providence which has convened us to-day, to be wise. Let us, as individuals, endeavor to be Christians in heart and life, and thereby secure all the important ends of existence—usefulness here and a crown hereafter. Let us as a nation, by our morality and enlightened and elevated example, evince to the world the truth of the inspired sentiment, that "*righteousness exalteth a nation*."

May God grant, that our national privileges, and our free, civil and religious institutions, may be transmitted not only unimpaired, but greatly improved, from generation to generation, to the latest posterity; and that we as individuals, may learn the lesson of piety and wisdom here, that we may reap its ever glorious fruits hereafter, is my humble prayer for Christ's sake.—Amen.

BRIEF NOTICE OF THE LATE REV. DR. JOHN BRECKINRIDGE.

"And I heard a voice from heaven, saying unto me, 'Write, blessed are the dead which die in the Lord from henceforth: Yea, saith the Spirit, that they may rest from their labours; and their works do follow them.—REV. xiv. 13.

It is the voice of God that has spoken to us the glorious truth that the dead in Christ are blessed. They rest from labor and their works follow them. When a servant of Christ dies, it is to him a blessing. It is pleasant to labour in that which has our hearts, but to the weary and worn-down labourer it is pleasant to rest from the labor, when he sees that the work is still to progress and be finished. This makes death an unspeakable blessing to those who have lived, laboured and died in the Lord.

With a deep impression of the applicability of this Scripture to the person of the late REV. JOHN BRECKINRIDGE, we here write, *Blessed are the dead that die in the Lord from henceforth: yea saith the Spirit, that they may rest from their labours; and their works do follow them.* While we so write, it is with a sense of the great loss to his family and the church occasioned by it; and we sit down more in grief and sadness at that loss, though so long feared, to record the fact, than to publish an extended notice either of his life or death.

The particulars of his death have not reached us further than that he died on the 4th of August, calmly and peacefully in the place of his childhood, and we cannot give at present any particular account of his last moments. It is not, however, so much the question, how did he die, or where, but *how did he live?*—Was his life, the life of a servant of the Lord Jesus Christ?

We will briefly say of him that he was the second of four sons of the late Hon. John Breckinridge, formerly attorney general of the U. S., under the administration of Thomas Jefferson—and of Mary H. Breckinridge, who is now living at an advanced age at the residence of her late husband, near Lexington, Ky., and at whose house he died.

He was educated with the intention and expectation of following the profession of the law, but before he had entered upon it, the Lord called him to prepare for serving him in the office of the gospel ministry. His college and theological studies were prosecuted and completed in the college and the theological seminary at Princeton, New Jersey.

In the year 1823, and a short time after he had finished his studies at the theological seminary, he was married to Miss Margaret Miller, eldest daughter of Dr. Miller.

1841.] B
 He left
 with the
 he was ca
 and after
 town to
 great fa
 In the
 to the F
 be assis
 city of
 Dr. Gle
 hood,
 ed and
 yet wit
 ized by
 advan
 grega
 and
 in his
 with
 to we
 ence
 deno
 cam
 him
 ed h
 cong
 wer
 inst
 lectu
 mee
 to s
 sid
 pro
 to
 he v
 S
 priv
 wh
 pro
 heal
 from
 thei
 phy
 ind
 age
 mir
 Bo

He left the theological seminary with a heart deeply impressed with the solemnity and importance of the great work to which he was called, and an ardent love for the souls of his fellow men, and after a time was settled at Lexington, Kentucky, the nearest town to his parental home. In this place he laboured with great faithfulness, zeal and success.

In the year 1826, and after he had ministered for several years to the Presbyterian church at Lexington, Ky., he was called to be assistant pastor of the Second Presbyterian Church in the city of Baltimore—until then under the pastoral care of the late Dr. Glendy. To this church he came with the vigor of his manhood, with a zeal and indefatigableness which could not be resisted and refused to be wearied; with a meekness and gentleness, yet with a firmness, decision and ardour, that could only be realized by those who were observers of his labours. Through the advanced age and protracted infirmity of Dr. Glendy—the congregation had dwindled to a mere handful. So great, so constant and unceasing, so faithful, and so blessed was he, of the Lord, in his labours, that in a very short time the large house was filled with constant worshippers; very many of whom had been brought to worship God, through the success of his labours. The influence of his efforts, were soon felt through all the evangelical denominations of this city, and scarce a man could be found that came in contact with him, however much he might differ from him in opinion, or hate the pungency of his appeals, but respected him as a truly devoted Christian and a gentleman. In this congregation, more than any other place, we may say his labours were abundant in the Lord. He did not spare himself, but was instant in season and out of season—in the pulpit—the weekly lecture—in preaching from house to house—in the private prayer meeting—in the inquiry meeting—in the direct personal appeal to sinners—in faithful, affectionate family visitation—by the bed side of the sick and dying—in a word, wherever there was any prospect of doing good—to his fellow men, of bringing sinners to Christ and giving honor and glory to his divine Master—there he was continually to be found.

Such labours, so unwearied, protracted and selfdenying, depriving him of relaxation and of regular rest, were beyond that which any man could bear without failing more or less, and proved in his case to be beyond his strength. Under them his health failed, he became enfeebled. At this time the application from the Assembly's Board of Education for him to become their agent, uniting with the frequently expressed opinion of his physicians, that his constitution could not endure these labours, induced him to resign his pastoral charge and accept of its agency. An additional reason which weighed heavily upon his mind, was the languid and feeble, yea almost dead state of the Board itself.

He entered upon this new field of operation with the same ardour and selfdenying spirit that had been manifested as pastor, and in a short period that Board which had but sixty young men on its list, numbered a thousand, who were receiving assistance from it. In this office he continued several years, with great success.

The General Assembly, in the year 1836, elected him professor of pastoral theology in the theological seminary at Princeton.

When the Assembly entered upon the work of foreign missions, after a complete organization of her board, he was called to act as agent for it. To this agency he brought his whole heart. There was no work of his life in which he felt a deeper interest. The claims of a dying world and the wail of the perishing millions of Pagans, presented by him through many of our churches induced many to give of their abundance and of their penury to send the gospel to the heathen. Long will those appeals through the vast extent of that church be remembered by such as had the pleasure of hearing them. So that being dead he shall yet speak.

During the varied scenes of his labour, and amid a constant press of duties belonging to his station, he found time to enter into and conduct a written and an oral controversy with a Jesuit priest, besides contributing occasionally, articles on this controversy, and other matters, to the periodical press of his day.

In the year 1839, he lost by death, his amiable and affectionate wife. This afflicting stroke of the Almighty, served to cut him from his family connection and give himself up to the church. So he seemed to think himself, and went forward. In the prosecution of his agency, he was led to spend much of the winter in the south and at New Orleans, where he was called to be pastor of the Presbyterian church, but he declined accepting it, yet ministered to that congregation for a great part of two years, during which time his enfeebled constitution was prostrated and almost entirely destroyed by fever. Here he became acquainted with Miss Babock, to whom he was afterwards married, and whom he has left, with an aged mother—two brothers—three children—a large family connection—and a most extensive circle of warm friends to mourn his death. The messenger of death regards not the person, the place, the ties, the usefulness of his victims; yet how consoling, that while we mourn this loss, a voice from heaven says, "*Blessed are the dead that die in the Lord.*"

☞ We publish this brief notice in this number, but shall hereafter furnish a more extended and minute record of his life and character.

RESOL

At a
by tera

J. Bre

Re

Rev.

2d.

yet we

we can

most i

3d.

unpar

during

4th.

dress

5th.

inridg

6th.

the d

Rev.

7th.

we di

8th.

and at

in Pru

Sig

B

EXT

T

deep

D. D.

ciety.

est w

his ab

mittee

exert

Re

Amer

Res

surviv

Res

thirty d

RESOLUTIONS OF THE SECOND PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH OF BALTIMORE,
IN RELATION TO THE LATE DR. JOHN BRECKINRIDGE.

At a joint meeting of the Elders, Trustees, and Deacons of the Second Presbyterian Church of Baltimore, now under the Pastoral care of the Rev. Dr. R. J. Breckinridge, the following resolutions were unanimously adopted, viz.

Resolved 1st. That we have heard with unfeigned regret, of the death of the Rev. Dr. *John Breckinridge*, one of the former pastors of this Church.

2d. That whilst we recognize in this event an overruling and wise Providence, yet we cannot but mourn the loss which the Church at large has sustained; and we cannot but feel that the Presbyterian Church has lost one of her ablest and most fearless supporters, and her ministry one of its brightest ornaments.

3d. That we remember with gratitude to the great Head of the Church, the unparalleled success with which he crowned the labours of this faithful servant, during the space of five years, the time that we enjoyed his pastoral care.

4th. That we would thus publicly recognize this Providence, as peculiarly addressed to us, in view of the relation which we sustained to the deceased.

5th. That we record our deep sympathy for our Pastor, the Rev. R. J. Breckinridge, and fervently implore for him the rich consolations of the gospel.

6th. That we tender our affectionate sympathies to the aged surviving parent of the deceased; to his afflicted widow, and orphan children; and to the family of the Rev. Dr. Miller, his honoured father-in-law.

7th. That as a suitable expression of our feelings in view of this dispensation, we direct that the church be put in mourning.

8th. That a copy of these resolutions be forwarded to the venerable mother and afflicted widow of the deceased, in Lexington, Ky., and to the Rev. Dr. Miller, in Princeton, N. J.

Signed by order of the Meeting, on behalf of *Elders*, WM. McDONALD.
Trustees, JOHN WILSON.
Deacons, R. S. HOLLINS.

Baltimore, August 20th, 1841.

EXTRACT FROM THE MINUTES OF THE AMERICAN WHIG SOCIETY,
AUGUST 18TH, 1841.

THE American Whig Society of the College of New Jersey has received with deep sensibility the intelligence of the death of the Rev. JOHN BRECKINRIDGE, D. D., a graduate member of this Society. Dr. B. became a member of the Society, in early life, and the attachment which he then formed for it, and the interest which he took in its welfare, was by no means diminished by the distance of his abode, or the labours and trials of an arduous profession. As one of a committee appointed to procure the erection of a new Hall, Dr. B., by his unwearied exertions laid the Society under deep and lasting obligations, Therefore—

Resolved, That in the death of the Rev. JOHN BRECKINRIDGE, D. D., the American Whig Society has sustained a serious and important loss.

Resolved, That the sympathies of the Society be respectfully tendered to the surviving relations of the deceased.

Resolved, That the members of the Society wear crape on the left arm for thirty days.

NOTICES, RECEIPTS, ACCOUNTS, ANSWERS TO LETTERS, &c.

Wm. L. Hasbrook, Burlington, I. T., discontinued by order of the P. M.—Rev. P. A. Stobell, direction changed to Columbia, S. C., by notice of P. M. at Concord, N. C.—J. W. Talley, from Sparta to Macon Ga., and credited with \$5, paid to Dr. J. Morell, Savannah.—Mark Walton, N. Y., discontinued by order of P. M., York.—Rev. D. X. Pinkin, Still Valley P. O., Warren Co., name added from January, and will send all numbers including August, as directed. Rev. J. Mason, changed from Bridesburg and directed to No. 9, York Buildings, Phil.—The 1st letter of Mr. J. Kemp, N. O., was received, and the numbers directed accordingly, the acknowledgment of which see in the number for August.—H. G. Gutorie, changed to Barterbrook, Augusta Co., Va.—T. Dolan, Lexington, Ky., discontinued by order of P. M., Lexington.—Rev. Mr. Currie, Mason Hall, N. C., discontinued by order of P. M.—Rev. J. L. Yentis, changed to Lexington, Mo.—\$10 from Mr. Victor King, Madison, Indiana, for himself; Rev. E. D. McMasters; Robert Marshall; and James McMullan, each, for the year 1841.—The request of Dr. Ritchie, of Frederick, will be complied with, and it continued to the end of the year 1841.—Rev. R. B. McMullen, Knoxville, Tennessee, \$3, for the year 1841, and balance of '39; all the numbers desired, that we could procure, we have forwarded according to order.—The names of the following persons are added to our list: Rev. John Lyle, Lexington, Ky., from Jan'y, 1841.—Mr. James Lowry, ditto, beginning with September No., 1841.—Major John W. Preston, ditto, with Sept., '41.—Union Society, Hampden, Sidney College, Prince Edward Co., Va., Sept., '41.—Rev. Wm. G. Craig, Great Crossings P. O., Scott Co., Ky., Sept., '41.

NOTICE TO DELINQUENT SUBSCRIBERS.—The cry of the printer and paper maker, with us, as we suppose it is with all publishers, is regular. They are ever in need, and their supply comes from those for whom they work. Believing, as we do, that it is our duty *not to owe them*, and endeavouring to practice upon this rule, we feel constrained to jog the memory of our subscribers. This Magazine has never paid the editors and publishers *one cent*, for all the toil, weariness, and expense, at which they have been since its commencement; it has left them both considerably out of pocket—because we have regularly paid our printer and paper maker. That we may continue to do it, it will be necessary for our subscribers to forward what they owe us, and for which we have all assiduously laboured.

Will those subscribers who are owing us, be so good as to enclose to us, under the *frank* of their Post-Master, the amount which they owe us? A little from each of you will help our printers.

THE
BALTIMORE LITERARY
AND
RELIGIOUS MAGAZINE.

VOL. VII.]

OCTOBER, 1841.

[No. 10.]

[For the Baltimore Literary and Religious Magazine.]

CRITICAL REMARKS ON JOHN xii. 23, 31, 32; AND xvi. 8—11.

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

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

COMMENTATORS do not agree as to the meaning of these clauses. One of the difficulties is to determine the sense of the word *judgment*—(Greek, *κρισις*, Latin versions, *judicium*).—Another difficulty is to determine the application of the word *all* (Gr. common text *παντας*, Codex Beza, *παντα*, Vulgate, Jerome, Augustine, Ruffin, Ambrose, and most of the Latin fathers, *omnia*—see Mill in loco.) Some difference of opinion exists also as to the meaning of the phrase, *prince of this world*. (*ὁ ἀρχων του κοσμου τουτου*). Gilbert Wakefield understands it to refer to our Lord himself, and according to this view he translates (*John* xii. 30,) thus: Now this world will pass sentence: Now will the ruler of this world be scornfully rejected. He cites *Rev.* i. 5; *Luke* vi. 22; *John* xvi, 11, to justify this version. Our country-man, Thompson, (the author of a translation of the Septuagint) follows Wakefield. Hardoin, the Jesuit, understands the word *prince*, in a collective sense. By it, he says, are intended all the princes of the priests of the Jewish synagogue. He cites *Luke* xxiv. 20; *Acts* iii. 17 xiii. 27; *1 Cor.* ii. 8; *Matt.* viii. 12. He adds, “Christ would not, I think, say that the devil is the prince of this world, or of the Jews.” (*Magnus mundi princeps ipse Deus omnipotens est*, 2 *Mach.* xii. 12—*τον μεγαν του κοσμου δυναστην* lxx.) But most of the commentators suppose that Satan is intended (*Superbo titulo ornatur spiritus adversarius Dei aeterni Camerarius*, *Eph.* ii. 2; vi. 12; 2 *Cor.* iv. 4; *1 John* v. 19; *Rev.* xii. 9,) and this is doubtless the correct opinion.

But to return to the word *judgment*: Is the last judgment intended? But the appointed day or period of the last judgment had not

arrived, nor has it yet arrived. Acts xvii. 31. Is it the *beginning* of the last judgment that is meant? The discourse proceeding upon the idea, adopted by Dr. Scott, that the death of Christ would make way for the condemnation of the Jewish nation and the whole Gentile world; those excepted who embraced the gospel. In this sense, the whole gospel dispensation may be called the judgment. Besides this, Paul teaches us to refer the condemnation of men to a much earlier date; for by the offence of one, (Adam) judgment came upon all men to condemnation (*κρίμα εις κατακριμα*, Rom. v. 16, 18). Mankind, ever since the fall, have been condemned prisoners, yet not without hope of deliverance: but that hope has no other foundation than the sacrifice which our Lord was now about to make of himself; it is with reference to the condition of men in this respect, that we are to understand the expressions (John iii. 16, 36,) he that believeth not (on the Son) is condemned already, (*ἡδη κριται*) and the wrath of God *abideth* (or continueth to abide *μεινι*) on him. Others still, understand the word *judgment* not as signifying in this place *the condemnation* of the guilty, but *the absolving* of the innocent or rather the delivering of the oppressed from the oppressor—(*Nunc est id est nunc instat tempus quo mundus pertyranidem oppressus a diabolo ab eo liberetur. Cornelius a Lapide, who cites Rupert.*) Michaelis, says the word (*κρισις*) judgment refers to the judgment pronounced against Satan in Gen. iii. 15. (*Serpenti infernali in terminatum.*) He cites Is. i. 27, and Matt. xii. 20.

Again, what are we to understand is affirmed of the judgment? Simply, that it *was then present* in point of time? The difficulty of finding any other predicate probably influenced Wakefield to refer the word to that judgment which was pronounced by Pilate against our Lord himself: or are we to understand the word *now* as denoting the commencement of an extended period during which the dominion of Satan should be weakened and ultimately destroyed by that succession of judgments which are symbolized by the trumpets and vials of the Apocalypse? This idea would be more probable if the word translated *now*, were *ωγα* which more easily admits this extended sense than the word *ων*—(Rom. xiii. 11; 2 Cor. vii. 8; 1 John ii. 18; Rev. xiv. 7.)

Again, as to the application of the word *all*: what must we supply? If the true text be *παντας*, the translators have rightly supplied the word *men*. If the reading should be *παντα*, it may be translated (as Junius and Tremillius have done) *every* (supplying) *man*, (omnem hominem) or as an accusative plural neuter (omnia) *all* (supplying) *things*. This last corresponds with the sense of the vulgate and the Latin fathers. But we are elsewhere taught that *all men* will not be saved. Yet the Universalists rely upon this passage to control the sense of many others which are contrary to it, when so understood. To avoid this objection, some say that the word "all" has a national allusion merely; it means, they say, "I will draw all other nations as well as the Jews unto me."—(Græci, *παντας*, retinuerunt, perhibentes significari tam Judæos quam alias gentes *Camerar.*) Others say, *all*, means "great multitudes," the word being often taken in this restricted sense, Piscator's annota-

tion is, "all, viz. all given to me by my Father; that is, all the elect; for concerning the impious and the reprobate, he had before said their condemnation was at hand." The sense given to the reading *παντα*, by Junius and Tremellius, does not so easily admit of this mode of explanation, which, to say the best of it, is not entirely satisfactory: for they apply the word distributively to the whole race. To avoid, therefore, the argument of the Universalist, the words *I will draw*, (*ελκυσω*) must not be understood in the sense of an effectual calling, or the reading *παντα* must be understood in the sense of the Latin fathers.—(See John vi. 44.)

Augustine comments thus: "What means (omnia) *all*, if not those things from which the prince of this world is cast out: for, observe, he did not say *all men*, but *all things*. (Non autem dixit omnes sed omnia). He did not refer this, then, to the universality of men, but to the creation as an entirety (ad creaturæ integritatem).

Such are some of the opinions entertained upon the first of the passages at the head of this article. The doubts connected with the other, are withheld for the present in order to make a few observations which it is hoped will serve the double purpose of explaining the one and preparing the way for the more easy explanation of the other. The writer, however, would not be thought unduly to estimate the value of what he is about to submit to the consideration of the reader; but should his observations suggest a train of thought which shall lead others to the true sense of the passages under consideration, the end desired will be attained. To begin, then:

The discourse in which the words to be explained occur, was delivered by our Lord, in the temple, a short time (probably not more than five days) before he suffered on the cross. The festival, which immediately followed the crucifixion, was so near that the Greeks from a distance and the people from the surrounding country had begun to assemble in order to participate in its solemnities.—(See John xi. 55; xii. 12, 20.) The near approach of the Saviour to his last conflict—the awful crime which the Jews would soon commit against him—the wrath which would soon break upon them, and the awful desolations which would follow and abide upon them (*εις τελος*—*αιωνος*, 1 Thess. ii. 16,) to the end, and upon all the incorrigible as well as his own severe sufferings, filled his mind with the most painful emotions. Previously to this, when he was drawing near to the city, on the occasion of this last visit, as he looked at it, he wept over it, saying, "if thou hadst known, at least in this thy day, the things that belong to thy peace; but now they are hid from thy-eyes: for the days will come upon thee, that thine enemies . . . shall lay thee even with the ground, and thy children within thee . . . because thou knowest not the time of thy visitation." Luke xix. 41, 44. But not to cite proofs, which the reader will readily supply:—the whole discourse (and this is the point of our first remark,) was uttered under the promptings of deep and strong emotions.

The time, which had now so nearly arrived that it might with propriety be said to have come, (vs. 23,) was the time appointed by God for the fulfilment of the first great prophecy and gospel promise

recorded in the Holy Scriptures—"I will put enmity between thee and the woman, between thy seed and her seed: it shall bruise thy head (or he shall bruise, smite or crush thee as to thy head,) and thou shalt bruise his heel. Gen. iii. 15. The reader needs not be reminded that this language refers to the apostacy of man, or rather to the accursed dominion which Satan thereby acquired in this world. The just and irreversible decree of God against him is recorded in this verse—Christ as the seed promised, was at the time in question, about to accomplish and suffer that which was foretold at that time. The phrase, "Son of Man," used in this place, appears to have been taken from Ps. viii. 4, 5: in fact the glorification of which the Saviour here speaks appears to have been there predicted. It is important for the present, only to observe that the hour was come when in the figurative language above cited, Satan should bruise the heel of the Redeemer, yet in the conflict his head or dominion would be crushed and forever destroyed. But this first judicial proceeding of God (for such it was in truth,) was not confined, as the reader knows, to Satan. Man, and the earth itself, had a melancholy share in it. Gen. iii. 14, 19. Without entering into particulars, it is sufficient to say that this transaction in Eden, between God and man and Satan, the seducer, was the first of the three most memorable events which, so far as we know, this world can ever witness. Indeed the apostacy of man, and this first judgment of God pronounced upon it—the work of redemption which our Lord was now to accomplish by his sufferings, and the final judgment which will follow immediately upon the ingathering of all the redeemed from among men, may be said to comprize the whole of revelation and of religion.

It is important to our present purpose only to observe that the work upon which the Redeemer was then to enter, was the consummating act of the second of these great transactions, which was the expedient of Divine mercy to repair the ruins of the apostacy, and to remove (as far as infinite wisdom sees it best,) this first judgment, or as we commonly call it, the curse.

These observations have been made as so many suggestions to the reader to trace for himself and more minutely, the the intimate connexion, or if we may so say, the relations between these three great transactions. By the first of them, judgment came upon all men unto condemnation;—the earth, which till then was free from physical as well as moral evil, (Gen. i. 31,) felt, for the first time, the withdrawal of God's favour, and the blighting influence of the dominion of Satan; it was accursed for man's sake, because man had become an apostate from God and a servant of Satan. The purpose of God, to redeem and restore the world to his allegiance, by the vicarious sufferings of Christ, led to the introduction of a series of economies or dispensations, and as a necessary consequence, measurably suspended, so to speak, the punitive effects of the curse. But the judgment of the last day will terminate that suspension. And when the purposes of redemption shall be completed, and the elect or mystical body of Christ shall awake from the dust and ascend to meet him at his second coming, the last of these great events will have arrived, and the history of the

world's apostacy be completed, and its results sealed in an eternal doom.

In one sense, therefore, the first judgment is the same as the last. The wicked will fall under the doom pronounced against the devil from the beginning. Matt. xxv. 41. The atonement of Christ stands between these two judgments. Hence it is said that God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world, (for the world had been condemned already, Rom. v. 16; John iii. 18,) but that the world through him might be saved, (John iii. 17)—that is, saved from the punitive effects of the curse upon the apostacy, as well as saved from the second death which those will incur for their personal sins, who reject this atonement.

Such, then, being the connexion between the apostacy and the curse, and the atonement, it was impossible that they should be disconnected in the mind of the Redeemer. It was impossible that he who came expressly to redeem men from the curse of the law, and who was now about to offer his body on the cross for that purpose, should not refer to that law, the breach of which incurred the curse which he came to remove. Is it unreasonable, then, to believe that he referred, by the expression, "Now is the judgment of this world," to the judgment of Eden or the curse? Not, indeed, as it respected Satan—(he is referred to in the succeeding clause)—but as it respected the creature which was subjected to it in hope of deliverance through a Redeemer? Rom. viii. 20, 21. This suggestion will appear the more probable if we attend to the leading thoughts of the whole passage. These are (1,) the sufferings he was soon to undergo; (2,) the glory which would result from them to himself as God-man-Mediator; (3,) the good that would result to man from the expulsion of Satan and the removal of the curse from the world, and the restoration of the harmony which subsisted between God and this portion of his creation, before it was marred by the apostacy—(See verses 23, 31, 32.)

It may not be improper to add, that each of these particulars was connected with the same *point of time*, and therefore connected with each other. "*The hour has come* that the Son of man should be glorified;" (verse, 23,) that is, the period of his humiliation (which was brief) is now drawing to a close, and the period of his glorification (which will continue to the end, when he shall deliver up the kingdom to the Father, 1 Cor. xv. 24,) is upon the point of commencing. "*Now is my soul troubled*" (v. 27,) in view of the conflicts I am soon to enter upon; predicted in Gen. iii. 15. "*Now is the judgment of this world; now shall the prince of this world be cast out*" (v. 31). But these results were connected with that time only through the transactions of that time; and as these transactions may be said to have originated in the temptation and apostacy of Adam, and the curse of God which followed—as an expedient may be said to spring from the exigency which it was devised to meet—we must regard these results in their remedial aspect, or as they stand in opposition to the apostacy with its cause and incidents and wide spreading effects.

The reader is also desired to consider the style of this discourse of our Lord. Evidently it is the language of deep feeling. The

repetition of the word (*νῦν* now, in verse 31, indicates rapid and impassioned enunciation. The verse appears to be an example of abrupt or rapid transition from one thought to another—an example of that form or figure of speech which consists in recalling, for the purpose of correcting or expanding a thought not fully expressed, or for the purpose of repeating it in connexion with some kindred or associated subject. Nothing is more common than this style, when the feelings are intensely excited or greatly disturbed. We must remember, too, that our Lord, although truly divine, was yet also perfectly a man, and as such, subject to pain and mental disquietude; John xii. 27; xiii. 21; Heb. iv. 15; ii. 10. Assuming this idea, it may be added that the second or amended clause of verse 31, is exegetical, or as we would rather say, suggests in a general way, the sense of the first clause. Augustine appears to have considered it somewhat in this light. His words are (Nunc iudicium est mundi; et exponens quid dixerit nunc inquit princeps huius mundi ejicietur foras. Hoc intelligendum est quod nunc fit, non quod tandum post futurum est in novissimo die.) “Now is the judgment of this world, and expounding what he had said, now, he says, the prince of this world shall be cast out.” &c.) This author is cited merely to show his view of the connexion between these clauses. The writer of this article inclines to believe, as may appear from a remark already made, that by the word *judgment*, the Redeemer refers to the curse as it affected “the creature” which was subjected to it in hope of deliverance, Rom. viii. 20, and that the second clause was added in respect to Satan or the serpent and his seed, who were subjected to the curse without hope, and with the certainty of an irreversible decree of God (φοβίῳ ἰδοχῆ κρισίως, Heb. x. 27.)

According to this suggestion, then, we must look for the predicate of (*κρίσις*) *judgment*, in the second clause of this verse; in other words, we must affirm that of the (*κρίσις*) *judgment* (understood in the sense of curse, for such it was) which is affirmed of the prince of this world. The sense, then, may be expressed thus: (Νῦν κρίσις τοῦ κόσμου τούτου ἐβλήθησεται ἐξω—ὃς Νῦν κρίσις τοῦ κόσμου τοῦ ἐβλήτου ἐστίν, 1 Tim. iv. 4,) “Now the judgment (i. e. the primal curse) of this world (is to be, or) shall be cast out. Now shall (Satan, the seducer, and) the prince of this world (who through malice and falsehood procured the apostacy of the first man, and thus called down the curse of God upon the world and himself, also) be cast out.” If it should be objected that this form of expression is not allowable, the reader is referred to Matt. xii. 20, where he will find (*ἐκβαλλῶ*) *expulsion*, predicated of the word (*κρίσις*) *judgment*. The passage is the following: “A bruised reed shall he not break, and smoking flax shall he not quench (ὡς ἂν ἐκβαλλῆς εἰς νίκης τὴν κρίσιν) until he cast out the judgment (i. e. the curse) in victory, or unto victory. (Donec ejiciat ad victoriam iudicium vulg. *Erasm.*—Donec ejiciat in victoriam *Montanus.*) This passage in Matthew, refers to our Lord. It is a quotation from Is. xlii. 3 (where the lxx. have ἐξοίσει κρίσιν). The translators of our version not perceiving how judgment (a mere abstraction or ideal thing) can be cast out, changed the meaning of ἐκβαλλῆ, into “send forth,”

which besides being an unusual sense, (see Matt. vii. 4, 5, 22; viii. 12, 16, 31; ix. 25, 33, 34, 38; x. 1, 8,) does not render the clause more perspicuous. But we are not now to inquire into the meaning of this place in Matthew. It is cited merely to show that the phrase (*κρισις εκβληθησται*), *judgment shall be cast out*, is allowable.

Still, the reader may inquire what sense we are to give to the affirmation in this place. In reply to such an inquiry, several suggestions may be made. In the first place it may be suggested that the expression in both clauses should be understood metaphorically, meaning simply that the curse of God pronounced at the fall, upon the world, and the dominion which satan then acquired, shall be utterly and forever abolished—that is as we shall have occasion to say hereafter—abolished so far as God's purposes of redemption extend. John saw this result in fulfilment (may we not suppose?) when he saw in vision the new heaven, and the new earth, and the New Jerusalem. Certain it is, that the condition of things which he then saw, shall be free from the curse. Rev. xxii. 3. "And there shall no longer be any curse," (or, "and every curse shall be no more," *και παν κατ' αναθημα ουκ εσται επι*).

Or, secondly, if we should believe in respect to Satan, that he shall be actually and locally expelled from this world into the abyss of darkness, may we not still metaphorically apply the same idea to the judgment? Indeed, without a metaphor we may say that the first judgment was a curse. It was so in fact—(Gen. iii. 14, 19). Now we must not allow ourselves to suppose that the judgments of God, whether for good or for evil, are like those of men. When man pronounces a judgment, the purpose involved in it, is altogether inert in itself. Not so the judgments of God. (*πασαι αι οδοι αυτου κρισις*, Deut. xxxii. 4; lxx.) His ways or methods of giving effect to his will, are judgments. In other words, his purposes are self-executing, inasmuch as they originate and carry on the means of their execution. With Him, to determine, is to execute. The words, "I will: be thou clean," as an expression of the divine mind, are equally able to cleanse a world as a leper from pollution. It cannot be otherwise in regard to Him upon whom all created existence (and of course all means) depend. Now we see daily, the effects of the curse of God upon this world; yet we do not know the extent of them, because we can form but poor conceptions of the exalted excellence of this world when God pronounced it very good. The world, though it may seem full of light to those whom the god of this world has deluded, is in truth full of darkness, when compared with its original—(John xii. 46, 35; Eph. vi. 12; Col. i. 13; John i. 5; iii. 19). The physical causes (as we denominate them) which concur in producing disease, decay and death, the penalty of the transgression, depend entirely upon the purpose of God. They are but instruments of conveying the punitive effects of the curse. Yet it may be inquired whether there are not also subordinate spiritual agencies, largely concerned in producing these evils, which are in truth the effects of the curse. Is it incredible that God should leave man to experience in some measure, the malignant influences of that foul spirit of whom all men (until reclaimed by the Holy Spirit of God) are the willing

subjects? It was Baxter's opinion that evil angels are God's instruments of inflicting His judgments upon men, both spiritual and corporeal,—even their ordinary diseases. He refers to Ps. lxxviii. 49; 2 Sam. xxiv.; John i. ii.; Paul's expression, "delivering to Satan," 1 Cor v. 5; see also, Dan. x. 13; Zech. vi. 5; iii. 1; Jude ix.; Matt. iv. 8, 9; Luke iv. 5, 6; 2 Thess. ii.; Eph. iv. 12; Luke xxii. 53; 1 Cor. xvi. 24.)

But whatever be the means by which the altered condition of man, and the earth itself was introduced, and has been continued since the primeval judgment, whether physical, truly so called, or spiritual, inasmuch as they originate in and depend upon the will or permission of God, they may be called by a natural and not unusual figure, the curse itself. If these agencies are wholly spiritual, they may be resolved into the dominion of Satan, who though an usurper, has been for wise purposes, allowed a temporary sway over this world, and we may with equal propriety affirm of them, that "they shall be cast out," as we may affirm it of Satan himself, to whom they are subordinate. If material or physical causes, independently of any subordinate spiritual agency, serve these purposes, the sense of the phrase may be merely that these causes shall be annihilated, or their nature changed, or their power destroyed.

As we shall have occasion to recur to this subject in connexion with another part of the passage, we shall, in our next number, proceed to call the attention of the reader to the phrase, "If I be lifted up from the earth"—(*εαν υψωθω εκ της γης*).

[To be continued.]

[Continued from page 400.]

MOLINISM.

No. X.

XVIII. *The Port Royalists offer to sign the Formulary—distinguishing, however, the fact from the doctrine; and binding themselves to observe a respectful silence as to the fact.—This course not satisfactory to their opponents—Violence offered to the Monastery.*

The members of Port Royal offered to condemn these five propositions wherever they should be found; and in respect to the question of fact whether they were contained in the book of Jansenius, they promised submission and respectful silence. This offer was made to Cardinal Mazarin, and De Marca. Arnauld had proposed the same to the Sorbonne: nor did they refuse to sign the formulary, provided they were allowed to add to their signature a declaration distinguishing the condemnation of the propositions from the attributing of them to Jansenius, and they agreed, also, to maintain a respectful silence afterwards, as to the matter of fact. And it was in this way that the nuns of Port Royal, who were required to sign the formulary, did in fact afterwards sign it. But the Jesuits, whose influence predominated at Court, were unwilling to admit of any such distinction or qualification;—for it would in

fact have been giving up the main point, at which they were aiming. Besides this; many of the bishops, might have regarded such a precaution as a reproach upon them—as if they had not taken sufficient care to defend the faith of their church. The offer was of course rejected, and the Society of Port Royal began to suffer more direct and open persecution, than they had previously suffered, under pretence that they were the enemies of the faith. In this, also, the nuns of Port Royal experienced a share. Both of these bodies were accused of being the enemies of religion. Arnauld and Le Maitre were styled heresiarchs. The Society was represented at the Court as consisting of hypocrites and impious persons, who, under pretence of retirement and penance, were resolved upon overturning the discipline of the church and of abolishing the use of the sacraments—they were charged with being greater and more dangerous heretics than Luther and Calvin.

On the 30th of March, 1656, the king sent a civil lieutenant—a Mr. Aubrai—to Port Royal *des Champs*, to disperse its inmates, but it is said, that he was prevented from carrying into effect the object of his mission, by a miracle wrought upon Mademoiselle Perier; a niece of the famous Blaise Pascal, who was a boarder at Port Royal de Paris. The miracle was said to consist in the cure of a *fistula lachrymalis*, of such a malignant character that it had produced a *caries* of the bones of the nose and palate. The miracle, it is said, was wrought by a nun, who caused Miss Perier to kiss a thorn of the crown of the Saviour, which was preserved at Port Royal. We are told, that at the time of the miraculous cure, a surgical operation was in contemplation, and the father of the diseased lady had been sent for, to be present at the operation. When the surgeons came, they were astonished to find that the diseased eye no longer existed. The report of this miracle made a great commotion at Paris; and other miracles, it is said, were performed by the touch of this thorn.—The Jesuits did not undertake to deny the truth of the miracle; but they maintained that it was a proof that these nuns were heretics, inasmuch as God works miracles (they said) only for the conversion of heretics.—Pascal thought it necessary to take notice of this explanation in some observations which he made upon miracles; and it is said, that he refers to this subject in his 16th Provincial. Miss Perier died on the 14th of April, 1733, at the age of 87 years.

However the fact may have been,—and it is not necessary to our object to enter into the inquiry of its authenticity*—the proceedings against the monastery were checked by it for a time, but on the 13th of April, 1661, the king's Council resolved upon the suppression of the monastery, and the inmates of both houses, (Port Royal *de Paris* and Port Royal *des Champs*,) were compelled by the civil authority to disperse.—Besides this, they were required to sign the formulary, which they did not refuse to do, with the distinction or qualification before referred to. The nuns especially had a very cogent reason, it would seem, to urge why they should

* The reader may be referred to some very judicious "Remarks on the Revival of Miraculous Powers in the Church," by the Rev'd Baptist W. Noel, for a discussion of the general question.

not be obliged to aver the fact, that Jansenius's book contained the propositions condemned, *namely*, that their sex and occupation forbade the idea that they could be informed upon *the question of fact*; and it seemed severe to require them to declare and swear to their belief of that which they neither did nor could know, and which in truth they did not believe.—But their explanation of their signature was considered rebellion by the Court, and the proceedings commenced were pursued to extremities.

Arnauld had been excluded from the Sorbonne on the 31st of January, 1656, and the motive which led to it, was fear of the Court and of the Molinists. The point of doctrine which led to his exclusion, concerned the doctrine of grace discussed in the first two of Pascal's Provincial Letters. But the matter of the formulary led to open persecution. Arnauld; De Sacy, and the principal members of the Society of Port Royal, were obliged to conceal themselves, to avoid violence. De Sacy, a nephew of Arnauld, and who had the direction of the nuns and *solitaries* of Port Royal, occasionally left his place of concealment to visit them. He was taken during one of these visits, and conveyed to the Bastille, where he was confined two years and a half. It was during this imprisonment he translated the scriptures into the French language, and what is remarkable, he finished the translation, it is said, the day that he was discharged. The cause of his discharge from the Bastille, was what is called the peace of Clement IX., of which something will be said presently. This version of the Scriptures was well received and many editions of it have been printed, and is at the present time more favourably received in France than perhaps any other. It is said to be more elegant than exact. This is the version, however, with which the Commentary of Calmet is connected. During these troubles, also, another version of the New Testament was made into French, by Le Maistre, Arnauld and De Sacy, which is known as the New Testament printed at Mons. This version was highly esteemed by the Jansenists.—But to return to the subject.

Perefix, the Archbishop of Paris, and who was a mere tool of the Jesuits, required on the 7th of June, 1664, the nuns of Port Royal to sign the formulary, without distinction or qualification; declaring that the signature was a mark that the signers believed the fact, not with a *divine* faith, but with a *human* faith. The nuns refused to do so; and on their refusal, he prohibited them the use of the sacraments, and six days after, *viz.*, the 26th of August, he sent Lieutenant Aubray, with 200 men, to take off twelve of the nuns and convey them to different monasteries. At length, however, a small number of the nuns yielded, but most of them persevered in their refusal.

It is no part of our object to trace minutely the history of these proceedings. It would be unedifying to do so, although it is not unimportant to know, generally the fact, that disputes have existed in the Roman Catholic church upon the most important doctrines of religion, and that the strong hand of power has been unhesitatingly put forth, to coerue the consciences of men and women into the adoption of the grossest errors. Such knowledge enables us

to appreciate more justly, the value of that external unity which is the boast of Romanists.

To come then to a conclusion of this topic. This persecution of the Jansenists was interrupted by what is called the peace of Clement IX., which consisted in allowing those who were required to sign the formulary, to annex a qualification or explanation of the sense in which they adopted it. The circumstances which resulted in this peace were briefly as follows:—Four of the bishops of France, (after the bull of Alexander VII., was formally received by Parliament) in the requisitions by which they ordered the signature of the bull, explained the distinction between the fact, and right, declaring, that the submission of faith touching *the right*, was required, and that with respect to the *matter of fact*, they required only the *submission of respect and silence*. Thereupon complaint was made against these bishops, to Alexander VII.; and he was prevailed upon to appoint nine bishops as commissioners to issue process against the four bishops. This commission was a violation of canonical rules, and the irregularity of the measure displeased many of the bishops, who were in truth opposed to the four bishops. Some of the bishops who were nominated, refused to accept the office of commissioner, and others who accepted it, were ashamed of it. The unpopularity of this commission, as well as the excellent character of the four bishops, led to considerable embarrassment at court. Under these circumstances nineteen bishops wrote to the pope (Clement IX., Alexander VII., having died,) and to the king, in defence of the four bishops. They declared that if the crime of the four bishops consisted in maintaining that the same submission could not be required in relation to the *matter of fact*, as to the *matter of right*, it was not a crime peculiar to the four bishops; but that they all shared in it, or rather it was the crime of *the whole church*. They also approved of the manner which the four bishops had taken to express this distinction, and alleged that many others of the bishops of France had done substantially the same thing. This letter of the nineteen bishops was afterwards inserted in the book *De Causis Majoribus*, of Mr. Gerbais, which book was approved by the Assemblies of the French clergy, held in 1670 and 1671. The letter of the nineteen bishops produced very great embarrassment at Rome. It was apparent, that the proceeding against the four bishops could not be followed up without including the nineteen bishops, who declared themselves of the same opinions. The pope's nuncio (Bargellini) perceived that the four bishops could never be compelled to an unqualified signature of the formulary, and therefore, that all which could be obtained, was an *alteration in form*, which would remove the *appearance of collision* with the Court of Rome. The nineteen bishops, or most of them, had adopted the method of *process verbal*, as it is styled in the French law, by which method the distinction, taken by them, between the matter of fact and right, was not published to the world, though it was open to inspection. The four bishops had incorporated the distinction in the writs or formal requisitions which they issued. The Court of Rome, therefore, forebore to express dissatisfaction with the nineteen bishops, who had adopted *the more*

delicate method of doing that which it was the serious intention of the Jesuits and, until this difficulty, of that Court also, not to permit under any circumstances, and the four bishops were required to conform to that method—to which they consented. Accordingly, they wrote to the pope a letter, the terms of which had been settled between them and the nuncio: and the pope, as it had been agreed, wrote to them in reply, that he was content.

This arrangement took place without the knowledge of the Jesuits. In fact the king was informed that no arrangement could be effected, if the Jesuits were to know that it was in contemplation. After it was concluded, the Jesuit Annat, reproachfully said to the nuncio, that *by the weakness of a quarter of an hour he had ruined the work of twenty years*. This work of twenty years, was that of the Jesuits. Their projects were in effect marred by the peace; for the pope by permitting the distinction to be taken between *the matter of fact, and the matter of right*, and by forbearing to require the belief of the fact, took from the Jesuits the power of making the condemnation of the five propositions fall upon the doctrine of efficacious grace; which Jansenius had defended. The Jesuits no longer had any pretext for accusing those as rebels against the see of Rome, who defended the doctrines of grace, since by the peace of Clement IX., the submission of faith was required only in respect to the condemnation of the five propositions in themselves. The Jesuits finding the peace concluded, undertook to destroy its effects, by alleging that the pope was deceived, but without any appearance of truth. Into this question, however, it is unimportant to enter.

After the conclusion of this peace, Perefex, who had proceeded with such severity against the nuns of Port Royal, reduced his demands to the terms exacted by the pope of the four bishops. Decency required thus much of him, because otherwise, he would appear to aim at greater orthodoxy than the pope himself. Accordingly, upon the presentation to him, by the nuns, of a request to be admitted to the sacraments, and the other rights of which they had been deprived, he made a decree to the effect already mentioned. Other prelates extended the same principle to ecclesiastics who had fallen under censure for refusing to sign the formulary without qualification.

The nuns of Port Royal, however, did not get back their house in Paris. That was left in possession of the nuns to whom it had been given. It has already been mentioned, that De Sacy left the bastille on the conclusion of this peace. Arnauld also left the place of his retirement and was publicly presented to the king and the pope's nuncio. Arnauld, on this occasion, announced his purpose of writing against the heretics, (meaning the reformers,) which gave the nuncio great satisfaction. Accordingly, he wrote, in connexion with Mr. Nicole, a book on the perpetuity of the faith, which, it is said, was the occasion of the conversion of M. De Turenne to the Roman Catholic faith, to whom it was shown in manuscript. Arnauld also wrote a book, which he called *Renversement de la Morale par les Calvinistes*. Nicole, also, wrote, *Les préjugés légitimes—Les prétendus réformés convaincus de schisme—*

L'unité, de l'Eglise. In short, the labours of these men show, that they were as much the determined opponents of the reformation, as they were of Molinism. A principle cause of their errors consisted in the great, (not to say paramount) importance which they attached to episcopal succession, and the external unity of the church. They hoped, doubtless, that their efforts would result in the purification of their own communion from certain pestilent heresies with which it had been recently infected by the Jesuits, but the event did not justify the expectation. Could they have foreseen the issue, it is not improbable that they would have come out from the mystical Babylon as the reformers had done.

But notwithstanding the peace of Clement IX., and the apparent reconciliation of the Court of Rome and the Court of France with the Port Royalists, Arnauld was never restored to his place in the Sorbonne. So far from it, he was shortly afterwards forced, by the persecutions of the Jesuits, to go into retirement, where he remained until his death. Out of *fifty-one* years, which he lived after the persecutions against him were commenced, he passed *forty* in obscurity; being often obliged to change his asylum; and being almost always confined to limits so narrow, that they in fact amounted to a sort of imprisonment. He died at Brussels, August 8th, 1694. He spent the last part of his life in the Netherlands, where he was obliged several times to change his place of retirement to escape his enemies. Near the close of his life, he could have obtained permission to return to France, but as he knew that permission would be granted only on condition that he would write no more, he chose to remain where he was.

Such, then, is a very brief outline of the disputes between the Jesuits and the Port Royalists. That the former were actuated by a spirit of worldly policy, as well as by a spirit of persecution, cannot be questioned by those who know the facts of the case. Nor can it be doubted that the best men at that time in the Roman communion were Jansenists, or those who concurred with them in their views of the doctrines of grace. That the Jansenists were free from error, no intelligent Protestant will admit—their efforts were directed chiefly against what they called Molinism, or Pelagianism in a new form, and against the lax morality, or rather immoralities, of Jesuit theology.

The more ancient errors of the Roman system, such as transubstantiation, the worship of images—the supremacy of the bishop of Rome, the binding effect of the canon law, &c., they received as well as their opponents. They occupied, in fact, a position which the event has shown could not be maintained. One of their authors has said, in reference to this period, "that there were *two spirits*, as it were, in the church,—*viz.*, the spirit of the church itself, and a spirit foreign to the church, and a stranger to it, which came in with Molinism." But this foreign spirit, by a rapid process, prevailed, so as to animate the whole church, and in fact, to expel what this author called the *proper spirit* of the church itself. The fact, however, was, that the falling away or apostacy predicted by the apostle Paul, had commenced long before the time of the Jesuits. A foreign spirit had been in the church, for centuries, as is

proved, not only by the idolatry of that church, but by its bitter persecutions and worldly ambition. The number of the truly pious was, comparatively, very small, and *their spirit* was not the spirit which animated that church as a body. The errors of the Jesuits or Molinists were only a new manifestation of the mystery of iniquity which had long been at work in the church, and the persecutions which the Jansenists suffered at their hands, should occasion no surprise. Intolerance and persecution had for a long time marked the career of that church, and the only thing which rendered the case of the Jansenists peculiar, was, that it should be inflicted with so much severity upon those who adhered so steadfastly to the see of Rome, and who opposed with such earnestness, the progress of the reformation. The event, however, proved how unavailing both learning and piety were, to arrest the downward course of that church. It also proved that the measure of separation which the reformers adopted, was the only one which it was the purpose of God to bless. Had the reformers held the same views on the subject of the unity of the visible church—of the supremacy of the Roman pontiff—the authority of canon law, it is not improbable (humanly speaking,) that their efforts would not have been more effectual to the reformation of the church, than were those of the Jansenists. But when we consider that these Jansenists received and practised many of the idolatries of the church, and were in fact contending not so much for the reformation of the church from *inveterate* abuses and corruptions, as against the *further* corruption of it by the peculiar heresies of the Jesuits, we think we can see a reason why God should permit their enemies to prevail, and thus hasten the full manifestation of that Man of Sin, whom the Lord himself will consume by the spirit of his mouth, and utterly destroy by the brightness of his second coming.

The scriptures teach that there is no possible healing for that great Babylon which is stained with the blood of so many martyrs. Individuals or families, now dwelling within it, may be preserved; but for the corrupt church itself, there is no hope—(1 John v. 16; Matt. xii. 31, 32; 1 Sam. ii. 25; John xvii. 9.) The predicted end of the fourth beast, is, to be burned, Dan. vii. 11—of the son of perdition to be consumed and destroyed, 2 Thess. ii. 1—12;—and of the mystical Babylon to be thrown down with great violence and to be found no more at all, Rev. xviii. 21. If, then, the Romish church be represented by these symbols, and if such be her end, separation was the indispensable duty of the reformers, as well as the necessary means of reformation, to any portion of its members.

[To be continued.]

BRECKINRIDGE'S DEFENCE.

SPEECH OF REV. W. L. BRECKINRIDGE, DELIVERED IN THE FIRST PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH, ON TUESDAY EVENING, JUNE 1, IN VINDICATION OF HIS PRINCIPLES AND CONDUCT AGAINST THE ASPERSIONS OF THE REV. MR. TAYLOR, UTTERED IN THE UNITARIAN CHURCH, ON SABBATH MORNING, MAY 29, 1841.

To all intelligent and candid persons of every religious persuasion, into whose hands this speech may fall, it is respectfully dedicated, by the author, with the confident expectation that they will do him justice—which is all he asks. He is assured that TRUTH IS OMNIPOTENT, AND PUBLIC JUSTICE CERTAIN.

The following notice appeared in the morning papers of June 1, 1841.

[**TO THE PUBLIC.**—The undersigned having been informed that representations were made in the Unitarian church, on the last Sabbath morning, by Rev. Mr. Taylor, of such a nature as to demand notice from him, takes this method of requesting his fellow citizens to suspend their judgment till they hear him; and to this end very respectfully invites them to meet in the First Presbyterian Church, this evening, at 8 o'clock.

W. L. BRECKINRIDGE.

HOWEVER unpleasant the occurrences of the last few days, which have occasioned this assembly, I deem myself compensated for all by the deep conviction that I have done right. The testimony of a good conscience is far better than the applause of men. Nor can their frowns, nor even their bitterest curses, be set by an honest mind, against the smile of God.

I should be uncandid, if I failed to say that I find an additional mitigation of all that is painful in these circumstances, and therefore, an abundant compensation, in this, that however you may view it, I am conscious that I stand before you in defence of liberty. It is an honor which God puts upon a man, when he forces him to defend just principles and great interests; and I hail it as such to-night—the due expression of which I am not afraid that the people will always withhold—that I appear before this vast, intelligent, and most respectable assembly, to plead for liberty.

I deem myself to have been arraigned at the public bar, by an attack, not only unprovoked, needlessly wounding my feelings, and unjustly assailing my character—not only violating the sanctity of my personal rights, as a citizen, a Christian, and a minister of the gospel—but in fact, assailing the rights of all, invading public liberty, insidiously violating the best liberty, without which there can be none, liberty of conscience!

Every one has a right, as to his fellow-men, to be in religion, what he pleases; and he from whom this right is withheld, whether by ignorance, delusion, prejudice, or oppression, is the most abject and degraded of slaves.

God forbid that I, a Kentuckian, nay I bear a prouder name, an American and a freeman, whose veins are swelling with mingled currents of English, Scotch and Irish blood—boasting yet a higher distinction, in claiming to be an Evangelical Protestant Christian—God forbid that I should attempt to rob any human creature of this right. I must first abandon my principles and bury all my hopes. It is every one's ample and inalienable right, as to other men, to be just what he pleases in religion—Pagan, Turk, Atheist, Universalist, Unitarian, any thing he pleases. But none may compel me to countenance his errors—give my sanction to the usages of his false religion, and thus connive at, nay encourage and foster his sins. Such an attempt is going rather too far. My conscience objects—my liberty resists—for God's word says, and my reason assents to it, "Whosoever transgresseth, and abideth not in the doctrine of Christ, hath not God. He that abideth in the doctrine of Christ, he hath both the Father and the Son. If there come any unto you and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your house, neither bid him God speed: for he that biddeth him God speed is partaker of his evil deeds."—2 John 9—11.

The attack upon my feelings, principles, conduct, and good name, which constitute about all I have—except, thank God, an incomparable wife, promising children, steady friends, and immortal hopes—this assault I shall not characterize in words, in the absence of my assailant. If you say, when all is told, that it was dastardly, malignant, and false, my adversary must blame himself and the truth, not me.

This attack was made principally on the last Sabbath morning, by the Rev. Mr. Taylor, in the Unitarian Church of this city—of course in my absence—and without any notice having been given me of his intention to make it. And when last evening in the other church, by the kind permission of the pastor previously obtained, I gave in his presence public notice of my purpose to-night, he informed the assembly that he was no warrior, he could not reply to any thing I might say, he had no time for such contests, having better things to do. Truly he may well say that he is no warrior. I do not wonder that he deprecates that distinction. Such demeanor is not honorable warfare. He may be a sailor, but he is not a *gallant* tar—he is no soldier—and brave stomachs must spew him out. He attacked me without cause—for no more than a respectful expression to him of my conscientious views of Christian doctrine and duties. He attacked me without notice, in a place where men's minds were hostile to my religious opinions, if not to my person—at least, where every prejudice was alive against me and my principles. He attacked me behind my back, and when I confronted him, he turned his own. I am ashamed to strike a coward, and shall, therefore, speak as mildly upon this whole subject as the nature of the case will permit.

I will shew you presently, too, that the charge, which he repeated last evening, of inhospitable and insulting treatment of him, as a stranger, on my part, is utterly unfounded, having not the most distant shadow of truth, in the sense intended by him, and so far as I can learn, understood by the community—but of that in its proper place.

The history of my knowledge of Mr. Taylor, and of my intercourse with him, is briefly this. According to my present recollection, I had never heard of him until lately. This may reflect some discredit on the extent of my knowledge, but so it is. I had heard of him only in general terms—that he was a converted sailor—now a preacher to seamen—a man of rare abilities—of great devotion to this particular enterprise—a Methodist minister. All this won my heart in advance.* Beyond this I had not heard any thing very particularly of his views and relations. I had the impression, however, (I know not how gotten, for my acquaintance with Boston, and with Bethel operations at large has not been as intimate as I would be happy to have it) that he was sustained by the Seaman's Friend Society—an Institution supported by sound Christians. With such information of Mr. T., I was truly gratified when I heard that he had been invited to this city by the Board of Managers of the Bethel Union here—which by the way, it now appears, that he never was. No doubt, as he told me, he supposed that he was when he came, and I supposed so too—but it seems that he was not.

When I was informed of his arrival a few days ago, I was as truly gratified, and took the very earliest steps in my power to have him invited to occupy our pulpit on last Sabbath night, and take up a collection for the Bethel.

On Thursday morning I called to see him, and then to my astonishment and mortification learned from himself what he was in religion. I say from himself—from his own lips. I went to no one else to enquire about him. I was entertaining no suspicion of him—my prepossessions were very strong

* I believe my first expression after being introduced to him and having welcomed him among us, was an affectionate—familiar enquiry, "Is this *Father* Taylor?"—surprised at his youthful appearance, having heard of him under that patriarchal appellation.

in his favor. I took him by the hand with the utmost cordiality. In our conversation he informed me that his connection with the Methodist Church was rather nominal than otherwise—that he went to the Conference annually—reported himself—was subject to its authority during its sessions—was assigned to his labors for a year—and then had no more to do with the Conference, and no farther responsibility to it till the next year.

A Methodist, that is to say, in his connections, and responsibilities, according to his own account of the matter, for some five, six, or ten days annually!

He informed me farther—in reply to my enquiries, become of course more numerous and interesting to myself, as a new state of facts was opening before me—that he was not sustained in his labors in Boston, by Methodists, nor by the Orthodox, (I understood him to mean Evangelical Congregationalists) nor in short, as I understood him, by any body but Unitarians: that his pulpit had no doors, and was open to all, who called themselves Christians and had fair standing among their own sort, except those whom he called, Ultra-Universalists, understood by me, and upon enquiry explained by him to mean, those who hold to no future punishment of any kind or duration, distinguished therefore by him, from such as he termed Restorationist Universalists: that his views of Christian doctrines, duties, and fellowship, were such that he could refuse Christian intercourse to none who professed to hold the Bible, if they were orderly in their behaviour—and ministerial intercourse to none of like description who preached the gospel of Christ. I asked if he would consider one to preach the gospel of Christ, who *kept back* in his preaching what were commonly called *Trinitarian* doctrines. He said *he would!* I asked if he would consider one to preach the gospel of Christ, who positively preached what are commonly called *Unitarian* doctrines. He said *HE WOULD!*

I told him that I was inexpressibly pained and astonished to hear that such were his views and habits: that, it seemed to me, to have Christian fellowship with one holding such views and practising on them habitually at home, would be to sanction them here: that having now come to the knowledge of his religious character and views, I did not see how I could have any ministerial intercourse with him without being understood by the public to give my sanction to them: that I could, of course, commit no one else, but my impression was, that if his position at home had been understood here, the Board of Managers of the Bethel Union would never have invited him to visit this city*—and that the friends of the Bethel Union would not now desire his labors, if his position, views, religious character and principles were understood by them. I aver before this great assembly, and what is far more, before God, that this was said with all kindness, and with as much respect as my mind could entertain for one who held his principles. Having made known to him very candidly my first and very strong impression, as to my duty with reference to his occupancy of my pulpit under these circumstances, I added that before I finally decided on my course, I would confer with such of the Ruling Elders of the church, and such Managers of the Bethel belonging to our congregation, as I might be able to find—and parted from him with apparent kindness on his part, and certainly no feeling of another sort on mine, making to him as I left him a sincere and cordial tender of such hospitalities, as my poor house could afford. Having met, and fully conferred with four persons, being two of each of the classes referred to above—and being fully, I believe—certainly substantially—sustained by them in all my views of the matter, and these gentlemen concurring with me in the opinion that courtesy required me to see Mr. Taylor in person, and communicate to him, as respectfully as possible, our sense of the necessity of withdrawing the

* My impression was, it must be remembered, at the time of this interview, but corrected that afternoon, that Mr. Taylor had been officially invited by the board.

invitation, which had been given him, I called on him for that purpose. Instead, however, of being received by him, in a respectful manner, I deemed myself insulted by him. I felt of course, that it must be very unpleasant for him to receive, as it certainly was for me to make, such a communication—and I pocketed the insult—a thing that I am not in the habit of doing. I assured him that I meant it for politeness; and that if it were not really so, the error was in my sense of good manners, and not in my purpose. He appeared to be mollified by this special effort to convince him that no offence, but the reverse was designed, and that I was acting under a conscientious view of my public duty. I then left him, saying that I would address a note to the Board of Managers of the Bethel Union on the subject—his own suggestion of the propriety of that course concurring with my previous determination. After his address that night in the 4th street church, and the withdrawal of the assembly, the Board of Managers had a meeting, when that note was read, as follows:

TO THE CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD OF MANAGERS OF THE LOUISVILLE BETHEL UNION.

SIR.—It is with unaffected pain and regret that I deem myself obliged to make the following communication. You are aware that I had desired the ministerial labors of the Rev Mr. Taylor, for the congregation which I serve, during some portion of his visit to this city, and that I had designed availing myself of such an occasion to take up a collection for the support of the Bethel enterprize here. Your Board, in whose hands Mr. Taylor had, with great propriety, placed himself while here, was kind enough, at my request, to assign him to us for next Sabbath evening. I am now constrained, very respectfully, to decline the arrangement which I had sought; and candor, no less than respect for your Board, and my concern for the interests involved, require me to state the reason. In a conversation somewhat full, with Mr. Taylor this morning, the first time that circumstances permitted me the pleasure of seeing him, I heard, with equal pain and surprise, fully expressed to him at the moment, that his views of Christian doctrines—his relations at Boston, and his habits of ministerial intercourse, are such that as I suppose, to avail ourselves of his labors, however valuable in many respects they may be, would require, hereafter, if consistency were observed, such concessions on the part of the evangelical friends of the Bethel in this city, as in my judgment, would be fatal to that enterprize. Mr. Taylor informed me that he was sustained at home (I understood him wholly) by the Unitarian churches—that his personal connection with the Methodist Episcopal Church, was rather nominal than otherwise—that his views of Christian doctrines and duties, required him to fraternize and exchange ministerial labors with Unitarian and Universalist clergymen. It seemed to me, that under the circumstances of the present case, for me to open my pulpit to Mr. Taylor, would be to sanction his views and habits upon these subjects—and that I could not hereafter, without inconsistency, object to the introduction into the Bethel pulpit in this city, of clergymen of the Unitarian, Universalist, and other kindred bodies. As a Trinitarian, from deep and clear conviction, I cannot willingly place myself in such an attitude. While, therefore, I have no right, as I have no desire to dictate to others, I feel it necessary to request, that the application lately made to your board, and so kindly granted, may be considered as withdrawn. The congregation to which I minister, will on another occasion, and in our own way, take up subscriptions for the Bethel, in which we feel a profound and undiminished interest—an interest, which I am sure, will not easily abate; although it is but candid to say, that if at any time, the competent authority should open its pulpit for the instructions of clergymen who deny what the body of my Christian brethren, correctly, as I think, interpreting the word of God, hold to be fundamental doctrines of the gospel of our Divine Lord, and this should become the settled policy of the Association, I should feel myself bound to exert what influence I possess to induce my congregation to withhold its support. I beg you to be assured of my respect for your Board, and of my sincere disavowal of any desire to wound the feelings of Mr. Taylor, or of those gentlemen at whose request he visited the West. I trust that no offence will be taken by any one, as I am only discharging what seems to me a duty as imperious as it is painful. I am, &c.

Louisville, May 27, 1841.

It should have been stated that Mr. Taylor, in an early part of his address to the citizens on Thursday evening, had said that it had been intimated to him from a very respectable source, that if his position, views, &c., had been understood, he would probably not have been invited to come here, and that if they were now understood, his continued labors might not be deemed desirable: that he was here at personal inconvenience, and while he wished to do us all the good he could, he wished to do us no harm: if, therefore, his labors were undesirable on any account, he would gladly "make his bow" in the morning, and return to his important labors at home. He closed his address with the same strain of remark. When my note was read to the board of Managers, assembled immediately after his address closed, and the congregation had retired, he made great exceptions in some remarks before the Board. In the observations, which I made in reply, intended to be perfectly respectful, but firmly to take the ground which I believed to be proper, and therefore tenable, I alluded with much caution, as I supposed, and with all due modesty to what Mr. Taylor had insisted upon and reiterated in his discourse just delivered, to wit, his willingness and desire to return home at once, provided evil instead of good were likely to result from his labors here. Was I, or was I not, bound to believe him sincere? I said that I had seen enough to assure me that a continuance of his labors would divide and distract the friends of the Bethel in this city—and that I much feared the issue would be the ruin of that enterprize, which was too interesting and important to be lightly sacrificed: that he would, therefore, in my humble opinion, best consult his own honor, and the permanency and true interests of the Bethel cause here, by doing what he had said would be very convenient and highly pleasing for him to do. It soon appeared that I was utterly wrong in ascribing candor to Mr. Taylor: he replied with much asperity that this was equivalent to ordering him out of the town, &c. I rejoined that nothing was farther from my intention: I claimed no right to order any body away: I knew and respected his rights as a freeman as fully as my own; and that I meant only respectfully to say that in my opinion, the course which he had twice publicly declared would be highly agreeable to him would be the most honorable and useful.

And now was I right? I protested, at the time, that I meant no indignity; and I protest so now; and no just, unprejudiced mind will do me the wrong of doubting my candor. Then, in fact, was I right? Mr. Taylor's heart, he tells us, is in the Bethel cause. He lives for it—he has long laboured in it—he is willing to die for it. Now would he be more truly glorious, leaving it in peace, as he found it, or by what he has brought on—endangering its very existence? Is it the glory of a man to stir up strife? Is it the real glory of a man to consult his own gratification—to indulge his own pride, vanity, ambition, even any of his better sentiments, at the expense of a noble cause with which he has linked his name? I confess I know not what is true honor if this be so. And had I no cause to say that the course which he had himself suggested would be the most useful to the Bethel? Time alone can disclose the issues of events. But who thinks this commotion good for the Bethel? And yet I do not say that Mr. Taylor was bound to go away. But I do say that I was justifiable in expressing as I did, the convictions of my own mind on the subject, especially under its peculiar circumstances.* Now I have been informed that Mr.

* It is proper for me here to say, what escaped me in the delivery of the speech, that at the close of the meeting of the Board on that evening, and as the persons present were retiring from the house, Mr. Taylor approached me with a manner of kindness, and taking and holding my hand with apparent cordiality, said to me in substance, if not in words, "Here our war closes." Supposing him to allude to the general question which had been spoken of in the Board at the meeting just held of the admission into the Bethel pulpit of Unitarian ministers, for the settlement of which the Board had adjourned to the next afternoon—and understanding him to mean that it would be promptly settled when the Board

Taylor stated in the Unitarian Church that some one in this city, understood by his audience to be myself, had written him a note requesting him to leave the city. It has come to me without any search on my part, through some four or five different channels, all respectable and independent of each other, that he was understood to make such an allusion to me, and such a statement about me. Now I declare that I never addressed a line to him on the subject—and you have seen that the note which I did address to the Board contains nothing whatever on that subject. The whole affair occurred precisely as I have related it.* And yet Mr. Taylor, with an ingenuity and promptitude worthy of a better use, attempted, and with unique consistency has all along attempted, to discredit me by the charge of arrogant rudeness to a stranger. It has been made a serious accusation against me. Now, when you express an opinion that great harm will result from certain things, are you ordering the people who practice them out of the city? I understand that there are many gentlemen from distant places now in this city pursuing the sports of the turf daily in the vicinity. Many of you think that these sports are dangerous and hurtful to those who practice them, and beyond all doubt and to a great extent injurious to this city in their influence upon it—and these opinions you do not hesitate to express upon proper occasions. But are you to be understood by such expression to order all these persons out of the city? There are many coffee-houses as we call them, kept here, which many of you believe to be exceedingly injurious in their tendency and influence—and you do not hesitate to say so. Now do you mean by this to order the people who keep them out of the city? There are many, no doubt, in this house to-night, who think that my course towards Mr. Taylor is improper and hurtful, and some of you have had no hesitation in saying so, and that in very different terms and spirit, from those employed by me when I said this thing. Now are all such to be understood by me, and the public as ordering me out of the city? And suppose you are—who cares? Do I? Do I care? Why, yes—there is a sense in which I would care. Because, for many reasons, I desire the esteem and confidence of you all. But there is another sense in which I care not—in which I would trample such orders under my feet as

should meet, by admitting such ministers, I replied, "No, Sir, it just begins here—the question must be met and fully discussed." He then made some remark which showed that I mistook his meaning, which had reference to war between him and myself personally. I instantly said—"There has been no war between us, except what you have seemed disposed to wage against me. I have felt no anger against you in the matter." After some other brief expressions on both sides, not now recollected, but meant on my part to be friendly and received from him as meant in the same spirit—we parted. I thought to myself, why, he must be a generous old sailor after all—excitable—violent—but kindly too, and ready to forget and forgive—and so I supposed that I should not be pained with having given him serious offence—but that appreciating my motives and approving my adherence to my principles, he had dropped all unkindness in a frank and manly spirit. I heard no more particularly of Mr. Taylor until the ensuing Monday morning, when I was informed of his violent attack upon me in the Unitarian Church the day before. What wrought the change, is not for me to say.

* There is something rather queer about this. Since the delivery of this speech two very respectable gentlemen, friendly to Mr. Taylor, who heard him, have declared to me that he said no such thing as is here ascribed to him about a note or letter—while the number of the channels, equally respectable, and perfectly independent of each other, through which assurances of the most positive kind have come to me that he did make this statement, has now swelled to a much larger amount than stated in the speech. It is a small matter as to the letter, however, comparatively, and susceptible of innocent mistake, and it is certain that both there and in other places, he has stated that I had desired him to depart the town. So I have done him no injustice.—(Since this speech was printed in pamphlet form, I have taken some pains to ascertain the precise language employed by Mr. Taylor—and, as the result of my enquiries, I am satisfied that he used the term, *communication*—not saying whether verbal or written—but making the impression generally that he meant a written communication.—It would be easy to prove that some of his very particular friends so understood him—and between the time of his making the statement, and my reply to him, expressed themselves very bitterly in relation to me for having written to him in that way. It is impossible for Mr. Taylor to escape from the charge of misrepresentation on this point.)

baser than the dirt. It is as much MY CITY as any other man's. I possess but little of its goods, but there is a clear sense in which it is as much my city, as it is the richest man's in it. And so Mr. Taylor knows, or else his bosom does not hold a freeman's heart, that it is as much his city as mine. (And here I might have said in the speech and I will say in this parenthesis—suppose that I had gone to Boston and that Mr. Taylor had really done far more and worse things to me than he has ever charged that I have done to him, would I have gone around to such churches as I might be permitted to occupy, and under the guise of preaching the gospel or promoting some benevolent institution, abused and slandered Mr. Taylor, and complained and whimpered of his ill treatment, until under such false and mean spirited pretences, I had gotten the good people of Boston by the ears—what would you have said to me when I came back? I believe you would almost have ordered me out of the city. You would have said that I was a base and false representative of you and your manly spirit, in the old cradle of liberty. You would require me to respect myself, and to remember that I went from you, tho' every man in Boston were to insult me. And you would have shewn me no countenance, if my conduct had been like his.) Then why all this ado? Why this studied, persevering, undignified, self-degrading effort to excite a popular clamor against me! Why does he attempt to discredit me by these unworthy appeals to your generous sympathies for a stranger, and rouse your displeasure against me, for that, which was as far from my design and which is as foreign from my nature, as it can be from yours? No! No! If he were a MAN, worthy the name of a Christian Minister, or an American Citizen, he had never stooped to such dishonor!

Tar, he claims to be—one of the "blue-jacket boys!" I think he's a double Tar,—Tartar, dastardly at that!*

But it is said that Mr. Taylor is a Methodist minister, in good standing with that church—so received by his brethren here, and so ought to be received by all Christians.

Certainly, his standing with them, who are cordially embraced by me as Christian Brethren, is *prima facie* evidence in his favor. But it is not *conclusive*. And when an objection comes against him, we must look behind all that. Am I bound to recognize as a Christian brother, as a sober and honest man, every professed Methodist in this city? Am I bound to invite to my pulpit every Methodist, or every Presbyterian minister who may come along? There was a time when to be a Roman citizen was to be a freeman everywhere. I know not but to be an American citizen now is to carry a passport round the globe. But can a man do nothing to forfeit his personal claims to respect before he loses his citizenship!

It is rather too summary a method of whitewashing character to demand that standing in one church, and that but nominal standing in the present case, should bar all enquiry. Mr. Taylor's own account of himself, apart

* I freely confess myself to be heartily ashamed of these words—not that they do not contain the very truth, and truth, the proper utterance of which was justified, nay, demanded by the circumstances—but because they are in miserably bad taste, and fall very far "below the dignity of the discussion." I would gladly expunge them—but they were uttered by me as they stand here—and I deem it proper to print the speech, as nearly as possible as it was delivered. I can offer no apology for their use, except the extremity of the provocation, and that, although I endeavored to use all possible caution, even in the selection of my words, the time was too short to weigh them with sufficient deliberation. I think any one would find it hard to measure his terms in such a case. I say, too, that however much I regret this instance of impetuosity, and however gladly I would recall the words, neither my assailant nor his defenders can justly object to the language used in reply to him, who had charged me with bigotry, intolerance, narrow-mindedness, and insulting arrogance towards a stranger. He is reported to have said, speaking of the bigot—and understood to have levelled it at me—"he is moved by no kindly sympathies, he sees not, he feels not, his skin is thicker than that of the Leviathan, and the tenderest fibre of his heart is cast iron." Whoso cannot forgive my language, let him put himself in my place, and I am willing to abide his judgment, without one word of murmur.

from his use of the term, convinced me that he is but a *nominal* Methodist. Now if those brethren choose to have nominal members not bound by their avowed principles, and settled and published standards of doctrines: very well. But Christian liberty and faithfulness require me to form my estimate of the man as he *is*—not as their connivance at his irregularity or dishonesty may intimate that he is. Nor does it meet the case for Mr. Taylor to asseverate and protest that he is a sound and consistent Methodist, when so much of his conduct contradicts him. Actions, I have heard ever since I was born, speak louder than words. The way to estimate a man is not merely by what he says—but also by what he does. Now, to whom is the influence of Mr. Taylor given at this time in this city? To Methodists, or to Unitarians? His name which has grown very great—his talents, which are certainly considerable—his power to move the public mind, his aspersions of me, his perversions of truth—to whose aggrandizement do they all tend, and whom do they encourage and gratify most highly? To whom, if not to Unitarians, will his victory inure if he should gain one? Was it to advance Methodism, or “liberal Christianity,” that he went into the Unitarian Church and defamed me? I charge upon this gentleman then, that he is no Methodist—and I say it is not right to impose himself on men as one. I charge that he is a piratical vessel sailing under false colors. And I think that when such an one ventures out upon the high seas, and still more, when he runs into an unsuspecting and peaceful port, any one who can detect his character, has a right to capture him. The consent, the policy, the necessity of nations require every vessel to sail under its true flag—and whoso sails under a false one becomes a public enemy. If Mr. Taylor choose to adopt a flag of his own, and to become, as a good and brave, but rather injudicious gentleman, who wished to be a looker-on merely at the battle of Guilford, declared that he was, to wit, a Neutral and Independent Power—be it so. As far as we are concerned he has a right to be so—but then don't let him say he's a Methodist—Oh no!

But this gentleman insists that he is a Methodist minister of good and ancient standing. If so, you, every body, I, have a right to expect that he will carry out the Methodist principles in his conduct, as they are announced in their Book of Discipline. Let us bring him to this test. He cannot object—for these are his principles—if he be a Methodist minister—declared to the world, as solemnly adopted by him. The book in my hand is “The Doctrines and Discipline of the Methodist Episcopal Church.” The edition, I believe, in common use here, authorized by the Bishops, and published by the regularly appointed Agents of the Church. On page 8, I read, “ARTICLES OF RELIGION. *Of Faith in the Holy Trinity.* There is but one living and true God, everlasting, without body or parts, of infinite power, wisdom, and goodness; the maker and preserver of all things, visible and invisible. And in unity of this Godhead, there are three persons of one substance, power, and eternity;—the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost.

IX. OF THE JUSTIFICATION OF MAN. We are accounted righteous before God, only for the merit of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ by faith, and not for our own works or deservings:—Wherefore, that we are justified by faith only, is a most wholesome doctrine, and very full of comfort.”

I read again on page 134, which is in chapter 4—“THE FORM AND MANNER OF MAKING AND ORDAINING BISHOPS, ELDERS AND DEACONS.”

Sec. 2d, “The form and manner of Ordaining Elders.” Among other questions, the Bishop asks of the candidate the following: “Will you be ready with all faithful diligence to banish and drive away all erroneous and strange doctrines contrary to God's word? *Answer.* I WILL, THE LORD BEING MY HELPER.”

Such are some of the doctrines held by the Methodist Church. They are rules for none but Methodists—but for them and especially for Method-

ist ministers, they are obligatory and indispensable. For the Church to connive at their violation by her ministry, while they remain her doctrines would be not only wrong—but if general, destructive and suicidal—and whoso says that he is a Methodist minister, and holds them not, is not an honest man.

Such too are the especial, grave and solemn vows which this gentleman has taken, if he be a Methodist clergyman ordained to administer the ordinances.

Behold how he fulfils them! You have seen what the doctrines are—which at his ordination he said he held—these are doctrines indispensable to the system—their opposites, to a Methodist are false—nay, ruinous; they must not be taught, lest they destroy, instead of saving men. Such, all such, all false doctrines, contrary to God's word, he has in the most solemn manner promised that he will with all faithful diligence banish and drive away—not by force, certainly, except the force of reason and truth—not by violence—but by example and precept—by combatting them in all proper ways, and utterly refusing to countenance and sanction them—and religiously speaking, those who propagate them. Is not this the plain, reasonable, necessary sense of the vows which he has assumed? Behold, then, how he acquits himself of this great responsibility! His intimate connections at home, his religious associations, his constant intercourse, are with UNITARIANS, who deny truths which the system, claimed by him to be his, lays down as fundamental and necessary to salvation! Nor does he hesitate in like manner to countenance errorists of all grades—one single class excepted, Ultra-Universalists, as he calls them. But how is honesty maintained, while, being a Methodist, he countenances others in preaching doctrines which he has declared, and being a Methodist, is every day by his profession declaring, to be at war with such as are vital to the system not only of Methodism, but of Christianity!

The Methodist standards of Christian doctrine, announce as the true explanation of the Bible, a method of salvation—the way of being saved. Unitarians and Universalists teach other and different methods, while they deny positively points of the Methodist system which are fundamental. I say he is sailing under false colors! He reminds one too forcibly to pass it over, of the scripture which says, "And in that day seven women shall take hold of one man, saying, we will eat our own bread, and wear our own apparel only let us be called by thy name, to take away our reproach."—Isa. iv. 1.

Now was I bound to receive, nay could I with a good conscience, with honor, with fidelity to men, at large, and especially to my own congregation, receive this gentleman into my confidence and open to him my pulpit? I had cordially invited him, while ignorant of his character; but when I learned it, was I not bound in candor, in honor as a gentleman, in all fidelity as a Christian minister, to tell him that I had been wholly mistaken in him—and that I must decline a fellowship which I had ignorantly sought? Would any other course have been candid—honest—manly? If I had opened my pulpit to him, and thus as to all essentials, endorsed his character, when all the while I had my doubts about him, nay could not confide in him, and yet not told him so, had this been honest, polite, manly or Christian?

I thank God I have not so read my Bible. I have no such ways about me. I never sucked such principles from my mother's breast. She would disown me this day if she knew I held them. I can't bring her gray hairs down with sorrow to the grave. I don't mean, God helping me, to dishonor my name, or my religion!

Christian doctrines are something, nay with Christians, *great things*. If every one, who says he believes the Bible, is to be held to understand it aright, and to teach it truly—and charity will not allow, and religious liberty will not tolerate, the questioning of any one's soundness in the faith—

but if all are bound to say that all doctrines are equally good and equally efficacious to save sinners, why religion is at an end. You may as well tear down your churches, and burn your Bibles. No, you must leave every man to the untrammelled liberty of his own conscience, not only as to what doctrines he will hold himself—but as to the confidence and fellowship which he will extend to others in their doctrines. Every faith must be tolerated by law—but every doctrine must not be sanctioned by Christians. I hold that Unitarians undermine the very foundation of the gospel. They have a right, as far as man is concerned, to risk their own salvation on their doctrines; but they have no right to require me to risk mine, or by connivance to encourage other persons to risk theirs—and they invade my liberty and my conscience when they try to do it. I understand Jesus Christ to be Divine in the highest sense of Deity—and to deny that is with me to deny the gospel. I will not therefore be compelled to have fellowship—(why how can you *compel* fellowship?) with any who deny it. And I hold to be one with such those who will countenance them religiously—nay if they profess to know and do really know better, they are more to be blamed on that account—for to him that knoweth to do good and doeth it not, to him it is sin. I cannot be forced to sanction this universal connivance at men's errors.

Nor indeed can my accuser. He informed me—he informed the Board on Thursday night, that *ultra Universalists* were not permitted to preach in his pulpit. Then it is not correct as he has said, that his pulpit has no doors—it *has* doors to exclude the *ultra Universalists*. But who are they? Savages?—Turks?—Devils?—nay verily—men entitled to all our sympathies—mine, yours—Mr. Taylor's, no less than any other man's. Men like ourselves.

Why exclude them? Mr. Taylor's charity is wide as the sea and as the land. Why does it exclude these *ultras*? Who authorized him to call them *ULTRAS*? Is this the name they give themselves? I think not. The reason simply is, that in Mr. Taylor's judgment they have extracted from the Bible a system that denies the gospel. Now, if he may in his all expanded and pure charity, without bigotry or offence to religious liberty, bar up his doorless pulpit against these people, with what face can he revile me for acting upon the same principle according to my best discretion? Exercising that discretion on that principle, (and can this man justly blame me for it?) I exclude from my pulpit *Universalists* that are not called by him *ultras*, and then *Unitarians*, and then as part and parcel, hand and glove with them, himself!

Mr. Taylor could, I hope in his sailor days, navigate a ship better than he does an argument—he has given up the principle—he has allowed the right and duty—and hence he has raised a clamor against me for nothing. He has excited all this tumult, because I have treated him as he treats *ultra Universalists*! If they are *MEN*, they are entitled to the same sympathy with himself—and if I am wrong, no less is he.

And now, fellow citizens, you have heard my defence. There is a sense in which I am not responsible to you—and I tell you plainly, that unless I get far other light, I shall do again just what I have done now, for I am sure I have done right—and no man may hinder me in what is my clear duty to God and his truth. Nor will I regard the frown of all mankind, or, compared with the principle, care for their displeasure.

There is another sense in which I am responsible to you. I have said that I deem myself to be arraigned at your bar. Nor do I come there unwillingly. I have called you together to answer for myself before you. You have my defence—you are an intelligent and just people and I am willing you should decide this case. I ask no favor. I desire neither God nor man to protect me in the wrong. If I have done wrong, I pray you say so—and I bow to your judgment with deep respect, if not conviction. If I have done right—I pray you say so. You are competent to decide—

and justice demands that you do so. And justice is all I ask. For, however much I know that I have offended God and man in countless things, and however unfit to stand before God, and account for myself in other things, I do not fear *as to this* to meet my accuser at the judgment. And as I can lay my hand upon my heart, and, as I appeal to God to decide between us, feel that I am safe; so I can freely say to you, judge this case fairly, in the light of truth,—of reason, liberty, and the fear of God—and I'm content. I ask no more.

[For the Baltimore Literary and Religious Magazine.]

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

PART FIRST.

*Ecclesiastical Boards necessary, and the proposed scheme offered by the objectors altogether untenable and insufficient.**

THE tendency of the human mind is to extremes. Man, by his fall, lost that perfection of wisdom, which would ever have preserved him in the middle path, safe from the dangers of latitudinarianism, on the one hand, and of ultraism on the other. As it is, we find the human mind like the pendulum perpetually verging from one extreme to the other.

This tendency is manifested in a very striking manner when the attention has been directed with absorbing interest to some great perversion of truth. When such errors, on whichever side of the line they are found, are sustained by all the force of apparent reason, and of persuasive eloquence; and thus call forth in their refutation the utmost powers of intellectual vigour; it is not in human nature to resist that impulse by which the mind is insensibly driven to the opposite extreme.

So has it been in the recent controversies in which our church has been so warmly engaged. The truth of God as it is contained in the doctrines of his word, and the purity of those ordinances which have been established in his church, have been both assailed, and both triumphantly defended. And as the power, with which such opposing views were advocated, has been great, and is still threatening us with a renewed assault. So has it called forth a fiercer and more determined resistance. Every position occupied by the enemy has been reconnoitred, and every possible force brought to bear against them. It is unavoidably necessary that in such an attitude and spirit of hostility, we should be disposed to

* The very able and temperate article published in our April number, and the reply by a distinguished hand now published, are written, we take leave to say, by gentlemen living remote from the centre of our ecclesiastical operations, and near each other; and who, therefore, view these matters wholly from the same position, and without the least personal bias. That they should arrive at conclusions so opposite, is surely a clear proof of the intrinsic difficulty of the subject; and may well excuse such of us, as for our scruples have fallen under the ban of those illustrious men, whose bread and glory alike depend on their ability to convince the church that she can, in no possible way, get along without them.—[Eds.]

entrench ourselves on the most opposite grounds. That there should, therefore, be manifested in some quarters both as it regards doctrine and practice, a tendency towards extremes, every reasonable mind must have confidently anticipated. Such a tendency we must regard as the result of that internal pressure by which the spiritual machinery of our church was impelled when the heavy sea burst upon her, and threatened to impede her onward progress; and which after the storm has subsided, carries her forward with accelerated speed. Viewing it, therefore, as in itself good, and as meaning only good to the church, there is no occasion for trembling or alarm. Our present duty evidently is to look out calmly upon the present and the future, to make an accurate calculation of our present bearings, to adjust and trim our sails, and in a confident reliance upon the propitious gales of heaven, to press forward in the glorious course before us.

The tendency of which we speak, has been especially manifested as it regards our ecclesiastical organizations. These have become the objects of the severest scrutiny, and are now regarded by some with feelings of jealousy and distrust. Rejecting, with conscientious reprobation, the arbitrary assumptions of those who would enslave the church to the despotism of merely voluntary associations, originated and controlled by men beyond the church, and irresponsible to it, and subject to no immediate and direct control of the church; these individuals are now found denying to the church the power of framing such organizations for herself, and denouncing those she has instituted as anti-scriptural, anti-Presbyterianism, and dangerous. Thus have these worthy individuals been led by their microscopic examinations into all the evils, actual and possible, connected with Boards and Agencies as found in the system of voluntary associations to impute the same deformities to Boards even when subjected to the entire control and review of our own ecclesiastical judicatories. Hitherto the controversy was between the claims of boards and agencies as existing under one or other of these conditions. The question propounded to every conscience was—not whether such means were scriptural and proper in themselves considered, but whether they were more scriptural and proper in themselves considered—but whether they were more scriptural and expedient when employed by the church or when controlled by voluntary associations. This and this alone was the dividing line by which the views so strenuously maintained by the opposing parties in our church were separated.

Both agreed in regarding such missionary operations as imperatively required by the spirit and precept of the gospel, and as of all commanding interest and importance. Both agreed in acknowledging the absolute necessity of some instrumentality by which these operations might be carried on. Both agreed that boards and agencies were necessary as this instrumentality, so as that without these, in some form, the duty, however plain, could not be discharged. But they differed, not as to the form or organization of these boards, but only as to their relations,—the one contending for their entire severance from, and the other for their perfect subjection to, the church. This position which I regard as important, on enter-

ing upon this discussion, is fully admitted. "It was not," says the author of the *Calm Discussion*, "a subject of discussion *how* the church could most efficiently conduct these matters in her ecclesiastical capacity—by common consent it was admitted that societies or specific organizations for the purpose were indispensably necessary—and the church felt that she could gain her point and secure the desired oversight and controul, by placing these societies or organizations under her own supervision."—*Balt. Mag.* 1841, page 146.

It is, then, apparent, that the perfect propriety as well as the absolute necessity of boards and agencies was unquestioned during the recent agitations of our church. These things were laid down as first principles, and assumed data from which both parties started in their introductory demonstrations. The wide differences in the results to which these parties were led, arose not from any variance in the premises, but from the method by which they arrived at their respective conclusions.

This being so it is evident that the objections now raised against our system of ecclesiastical organizations are new. They "never occurred to the church" during all the period of her late faithful contendings. They are, therefore, novel. They have originated with their present authors, and date no farther back than the present time. The doctrine of the church on this subject was established. That doctrine was never once questioned during the severe and scrutinising investigations to which this whole subject has been submitted. That doctrine she still upholds and upholds too as the golden treasure, which, at immense price and hazard, she has rescued from her foes. It was one of the prizes of victory for which she struggled. It was one around which her soldiers fought with most resolute bravery, and which after it had been seized by the enemy, she regained after many a hard encounter. It is therefore endeared, when by the recollections of the past, it is associated with the memory of striving times and noble exploits, while with its recovery, the recollection of the eminent firmness of some who would now restore it to the enemy, is sacredly entwined.

Still it is true that this doctrine and this system may be false. Our church, and these individuals among the rest, may have been short-sighted and mistaken. Grant that this may be so, still the presumption that it is not, is irresistibly strong. *Possibly* our church may have originated this system of means, and preserved in its approval through evil and through good report, and contended earnestly for the liberty of its full and unrestricted enjoyment—and all this time have been contending for that which is un-scriptural, un-Presbyterian and dangerous. All this is possible, but who will say that it is *probable*?

The presumption, then, is against these objections, and it is strongly in favour of that system against which such objections are made. The *onus probandi* is therefore clearly on these objectors. On them lies the burden of proof for the substantiation of each of these positions. They must *prove* that this system is what they thus declare it to be. It is not enough to object or to throw out difficulties. These attach themselves to every doctrine and to every system. They must establish against this system a charge

of un-scripturality and dangerous opposition to our standards and to our creed. Nor is this all. These objectors admit with us the absolute necessity of accomplishing that work which these boards and agencies are designed to perform. They acknowledge as fully as we do the necessity of the end. Our only difference is as to the *means* by which that end may be best secured. The means we proposed are those already in operation. These means have been sanctioned by adoption—by long trial—and as is believed, by eminent success. Now it is incumbent on these brethren to show not merely that this means is liable to objection and abuse; or that it has been actually abused in time past. They must make it evident that it necessarily leads to such evils—and that these evils are inseparable from it. They must further provide a system of means by which the end, which, as they allow, **MUST BE ATTAINED**—can be accomplished. This system of theirs, they must show, is free from all similar difficulties and objections—is not liable to similar abuses—and is in itself Scriptural, Presbyterian, and expedient. All this our objectors are under obligations to do before they can fairly call upon us to abandon the existing system, and to endanger our end of such necessary and transcendent importance.

If, then, such objectors either propose no substitute whatever for our present system, or one which is of doubtful expediency, it most clearly follows that all their objections, however plausible, fall to the ground—that our present system is to be necessarily retained—and that our church, in abandoning it, would be recreant to duty, and justly chargeable with folly. She would leave her ships and disarm her forces because chargeable with some deficiencies, and that, too, while the enemy was in sight, and she was under positive command to put forth to sea and war a good warfare against the powers of darkness.

I will therefore proceed to take up the difficulties in the objector's plan—and by showing its untenableness—construct a negative argument against his position. It is incumbent upon him to give us some system which will meet all the difficulties of the case, and failing to do this, we are left to conclude that all his objections are vain. The very fact—if it is a fact—that while the necessity of this duty is admitted on the one hand—he utterly fails to provide a system adequate to the wants of the case—is conclusive evidence against him. Allowing, then, the existence of many incidental evils in our existing system, which nevertheless commends itself substantially to a large portion of the church, we will proceed to show there are difficulties as great, if not actually insurmountable, connected with the proposed substitute.

What, then, I ask, is the case where difficulties are to be met? It is simply this: The world is given to our church, in common with others, as a field to be cultivated for the Lord of the harvest. The heathen world is, according to our ability, to be provided with the preaching of the gospel, and all other things necessary to its full success. The present wants of our own country also, are to be met, by a continually increasing supply of good and faithful ministers. These claims require for their fulfilment, the education of candidates for the sacred office—and the sending forth and sus-

taining them when ready to enter upon their various fields of labour. For the accomplishment of this work which is of such evident greatness, the co-operation and assistance of every church is required to supply the men and the means—and in addition to this, some agency by which these men and this means may be disposed of to the best advantage, and by which all the operations involved in carrying out such a plan may be conducted under the most watchful responsibility, and with the greatest possible economy. Let any one for a moment consider the details implied in the prosecution of this entire work—the extent of the field to be overlooked and accurately surveyed—the number of the ministers to be sent forth—the number of candidates to be brought forward—the incalculable difficulties connected with their preparation, the sending forth, the locating, and the supervision of these labourers in the vineyard—the indisposition of our churches to exercise liberality, and yet the absolute necessity of an unfailing supply of means—the wisdom, prudence, and toil, involved in the management and out-lay of the funds—and the daily and hourly demands which are made upon the church by these innumerable calls from all quarters for immediate direction, assistance and co-operation.—Let any one fairly consider these things in connexion with the department of education, or of domestic missions, or of foreign missions—or of publication—or of our seminaries of instruction, and he will at once perceive how vast is the end to be attained, and how wisely adapted must be the means for its attainment. Let it also be remembered that all these claims come upon the church in every period of the year—at all times—and in urgent demand for their immediate consideration and provision. Let it also be borne in mind, that the change of circumstances continually requires a change in the arrangements of the benevolent operations of the church. It will be thus most certain and evident that for the wise management of these operations, a permanent body of some kind, entrusted with discretionary powers, is absolutely necessary. If, therefore, as is admitted, the church is imperatively required to carry forward these enterprizes, then are some ecclesiastical bodies separate and distinct from the ordinary courts of the church not only occasionally and for a short term indispensably required.

Now what is the system proposed as a substitute for our existing one.—“It has been frequently admitted,” says our objector, “that while every thing connected with the spiritual aspects of domestic and foreign missions falls appropriately within the province of the Presbytery, there is no adequate arrangement in our book for conducting the pecuniary matters of the various stations with efficiency and success. This we apprehend, is a great mistake. In the first place, the Constitution expressly provides that the judicatory sending out any missionary, must support him—(Form of Government, chap. 18.) In the second place, the book provides that our churches should be furnished with a class of officers for the express purpose of attending to the temporal matters of the church, and these deacons might be made the collecting agents of the Presbytery in every congregation, and through them the necessary funds could be easily obtained and without expense. For transmission to foreign

parts, nothing more would be necessary than simply to employ some extensive merchant in any of our large cities, who for the usual per-centage would attend to the whole matter, or a committee of deacons appointed by the Assembly for the purpose. So far, then, as the collection and disbursement of funds are concerned, our Constitution has made most abundant provisions."

"We know of nothing which more strikingly illustrates the practical wisdom of the Divine provision of deacons as collecting agents in each congregation, than the fact, that after long and mature experience, the American Board has recommended the appointment of similar agents in each congregation contributing to its funds as the most successful method of increasing its resources. Our book, however, does not confine deacons to particular congregations. There should be a competent number of them in each particular church, but we insist upon it, that Presbyteries, Synods and the General Assembly should also have deacons to attend to their pecuniary matters. Those ordained at Jerusalem were not confined to a specific congregation, but acted for the whole college of apostles. By entrusting all pecuniary matters into the hands of men ordained under solemn sanctions for the purpose, our spiritual courts would soon cease to be, what they are to an alarming extent, at present, mere corporations for secular business. If all our boards were converted into mere benches of deacons, commissioned only to disburse funds under the direction of the spiritual courts, there would be no serious ground of objection to them; but in their present form they are lords and masters of the whole church. They are virtually the head of the church—their will is law—their authority irresistible; and they combine what God has separated, the *power* and the *keys*."—p. 151.

Such, then, is the system which after a year's agitation of this subject—after the fullest discussion—and the maturest reflection of one of the most capable minds—is to be substituted for our present ecclesiastical organizations. I have given it in his own words and in its full development, and would invite for it the most careful and impartial consideration. Let it be supposed unobjectionable and free from all censure on the ground of its innovating character. Let it be estimated simply in reference to its adaptation to the difficulties of the case. Bring, then, before your mind the outline already given. Contemplate all the interests involved in our missionary enterprizes foreign and domestic; in our education of the youth of our church who are destined to the sacred ministry; in the preparation and publication of works suited to the wants of our ministers, churches, and the community at large. And when you have spread out before you, these various portions of the one great field of labour which it is the duty of the church to exercise, then contrast with the work to be done the means here provided for its accomplishment.

In the first place, none are to be sent out into any department of this field but such as are deputed by some particular judicatory, to which and to which alone they are to look for their support. In the second place, as the instruments for procuring these necessary funds, no other collecting agents are to be allowed than deacons.

In the third place, for the transmission of these funds to foreign parts, nothing more is to be permitted than some expensive merchant in some large city. In the fourth place, as standing bodies, "commissioned only to disburse funds under the direction of the spiritual courts," we are to have "benches of deacons" instead of our several boards. In this form, says the objector, "there would be no serious objection to any of our boards."

I fearlessly stake the issue of this controversy upon the single question—Is this system of means adequate to the wants—or does it in any measure meet the difficulties of the case? Would any merchant in this mercantile country, entrust to such an agency the accomplishment of such ends, involving such interests, and requiring for their management such continual oversight, such deliberative wisdom. Would any sensible and prudent minded Christian man commit the affairs of our missionary boards, with their hundreds of employed missionaries—their numerous churches—and their continually increasing openings for enlarged usefulness,—or our board of education with hundreds of young men in its watch and care,—or our board of publication, with all the responsibilities it involves—during the twelve months that intervene between one meeting of the Assembly and another—to "a bench of deacons commissioned only to disburse funds," which funds are to be raised only by deacons within the bounds of each several congregation? I will venture to say there is not a man to be found who believes in the necessity and importance of the ends to be attained by these several boards, and who is anxious for its accomplishment, that would adopt the system here proposed as in any measure adequate to such ends.

It is maintained by the objector, "that our Saviour constituted his church with a special reference to missionary operations," (page 157.) therefore the church is under obligation to carry on such operations by the best and most effective agency. But is this system such an agency? Are all the responsibilities which are inseparable from the conduct of these several departments of benevolent effort to be thrown upon a bench of deacons who are by the very supposition limited to the single object of disbursing funds? Most plain it is that these operations cannot sustain themselves. Money—the funds requisite for their support—these, however important, are not the moving principle—the life or soul of such enterprizes. They require supervision, direction, and controul. These moral influences are even more necessary than the physical resources. The latter may exist and yet may the enterprize fail, just as there may be machinery and water and yet no motion where there is no superintending mind to bring these elements into such a combination as to produce and preserve that motion. Let, then, our several operations be committed to such a bench of deacons, restricted in their powers to the mere supply of funds, and they must run down in a single year. Confusion must ensue. They will be inevitably paralysed.

There is to our minds, no adaptation in the system here proposed of the means to the end. It is perfectly chimerical. It bases a system of practical operation upon a mere theoretical hypothesis. It assumes a self-controlling, self-perpetuating principle, to exist

somewhere or somehow within these operations. It attributes to our several judicatories a foresight and wisdom which can provide for the thousand contingencies which may arise during the course of every year, and that they could make all those provisional arrangements in the course of a brief session which now occupy busily during the entire year, our several officers and committees. It assumes that the funds will be voluntarily forthcoming from all our churches in every portion of the church. It seems to imply that such benches of deacons, and such general treasurers can be found to devote themselves to such agencies and duties, and to do so gratuitously. The whole scheme is built upon hypothesis and the most utopian and gratuitous assumptions. It sets at defiance all consequences—all the calculations of prudence—and all the lessons of experience. It would pull down, subvert and destroy existing institutions, before it has erected others to supply their place, and while there are no materials and no workmen by which such buildings can be possibly erected. The question then being whether our present system of agencies shall be suspended or this scheme be adopted—the alternative most assuredly is—the rejection of this hypothesis, or the suspension of all the benevolent operations of our church.

As early as the year 1802, the General Assembly found it impossible during the term of its sessions to devote to these operations the time and attention demanded for their successful prosecution. The Assembly therefore appointed a standing committee, to whom was entrusted the proper management of all their missionary affairs. For similar reasons in the year 1816, this committee was succeeded in their own recommendation by a board, to whom this whole business was handed over. That board has continued in succession until the present time, while the particular fields of education, of foreign missions, and of publication, have been respectively entrusted to the special oversight of special boards. Against this whole system, our objectors protest. They are, therefore evidently bound to provide a substitute of more certain efficiency and power. And having, as we have just seen, utterly failed in this attempt, their objections fall to the ground, and our church is under obligation to continue her present system for the accomplishment of her necessary work.

Such is our conclusion on the supposition that the system here proposed is scriptural and proper. We now proceed to show, however, that this is not the case, and that this scheme is not only a novelty—an innovation—inexpedient—and destructive of all our benevolent operations—but that it is also unscriptural and unconstitutional. It is unscriptural. It cannot be traced to the scriptures directly. It cannot be deduced from them by necessary inference. It is therefore to be "denounced as a human invention." But still, if it could be made to appear the wisest means to secure an end which the scriptures do make necessary, and for securing which no exact system of means is there provided in detail, it might be expedient and proper. But it is not only unsupported by positive scripture enactment, it is, we think, clearly contrary to scripture. The scripture teaches us that deacons were instituted as

officers of particular churches and for the single purpose of taking care of the poor, and of distributing among them the collections which were raised for their use. That deacons are recognized in scripture only as the officers of a particular church, we never before heard questioned. Nor is it at all necessary to establish this fact until some plausible evidence can be produced against it. Our objector does, indeed, affirm that "those ordained at Jerusalem were not confined to a specific congregation, but acted for the whole college of the apostles"—p. 151. We can hardly think this writer was serious when he made such a declaration. Does he mean to say that these deacons were appointed as ministers to the apostles, so as that when they left Jerusalem and were dispersed throughout the world, these deacons acted for the whole college of apostles? Did they accompany the apostles in their missionary tours as their attendant deacons? Manifestly not. They remained with the church at Jerusalem, to whose interests they were devoted. And doubtless as the churches increased in that city, other deacons were appointed to take charge of the poor connected with them. There is not a particle of evidence in the New Testament to support the idea that deacons were officers in the church Catholic and not officers of some particular church. There is positive testimony to the contrary, since they are enumerated among the officers in particular churches—(Phil. i. 1; 1 Tim. iii.)—and since the specific duty devolved upon them is only consistent with such a special change.

To make deacons, then, the officers of Presbyteries and Synods, is to create new officers unknown to scripture, and to constitute benches of deacons for the purpose of disbursing funds for missionary and other operations, however proper such employment may be in itself considered, is nevertheless to assign to them duties not given in the word of God; and for which nothing like a precept can be any where discovered. The Bible knows nothing of deacons but as officers appointed in each particular church, for the single purpose of taking care of the poor, and distributing among them the collections raised for their use—(Acts vi. 1, 2.) This scheme, therefore, is wholly unsupported by scripture.

It is also unconstitutional. It contravenes the letter and the spirit of our standards. It assigns to deacons a character and duties which are unknown to those standards. What are deacons, according to our "Form of Government?" In chapter sixth it is taught—"The Scriptures clearly point out deacons as distinct officers in the church, whose business it is to take care of the poor, and to distribute among them the collections which may be raised for their use. To them also may be properly committed the management of the temporal affairs of the church."

In chapter thirteen it is said, "Every congregation shall elect persons . . . to the office of deacon . . . in the mode most approved in that congregation. But in all cases the persons elected must be made members in full communion in the church in which they are to exercise their office."—(§. ii.; see also §. vi.)

Dacons are thus expressly and repeatedly denominated the officers of a particular congregation, and they are never recognized

in any other character throughout our entire standards. They are limited to a particular church, and they are not known beyond it. They are to act only under the direction and controul of the session. They are not even empowered to raise funds, certainly not by their own independent authority. They are to "distribute the collections which MAY BE RAISED FOR THEIR USE." Our standards very judiciously add, as an inferential conclusion from the preceding, that "to them MAY BE PROPERLY (tho' not as enjoined by any explicit scripturo or as in itself necessary*) committed the management of the temporal affairs of the church." That deacons are not empowered of themselves to raise collections is farther evinced by the declaration in chapter vii., (Form of Gov.,) where "making collections for the poor and other pious purposes," is ranked among the ordinances of a particular church, and of course under the direction of the session or the ministers and elders of that church.

To appoint deacons, therefore, "as collecting agents of the Presbytery, in every congregation," is to interfere with the established authority and duties of church sessions, through whom alone any such appointment can be constitutionally made. And to institute "a committee of deacons appointed by the Assembly" for "the transmission of funds to foreign parts," would be an interference with the provisions of the constitution, and as it regards the nature of the office thus assigned—the officers to whom it is given—and the body by which the appointment is made. No such duties can be constitutionally assigned to deacons, as deacons, nor by the Assembly as such, since it cannot remove from particular churches their particular officers without their full consent.

"If all our boards," therefore, "were," as this writer desires, "converted into mere benches of deacons . . . there would be" the most "serious ground of objection to them" on the score of constitutional propriety. Such boards or benches would be as certainly an innovation—a new court, or office in the church—as they would be utterly insufficient with the limited powers entrusted to them, for carrying on her operations. Our present boards are objected to because unknown to scripture and to our standards, and therefore as implying a defective constitution. But in framing a substitutionary system of agencies for the accomplishment of the necessary work, we have the creation of not less than three new officers unknown to scripture and to our standards. We have first in every Presbytery an order of permanent agents for the purpose of collecting funds in every congregation. To call these deacons, is a perfect misnomer and founded on the most gratuitous assumptions. Secondly, we are to have several merchant officers in our large cities, "who for the usual per-centage would attend to the whole matter" of transmitting funds, and with whose accounts, salary, expenditures, defaults, &c. &c., our ecclesiastical judicatories are to be regularly occupied. And thirdly, we are to have boards consisting of men here called deacons, but which might be as well called aldermen, "commissioned only to disburse funds

* Therefore does our church allow each congregation to manage its temporal affairs according to its own wisdom.

under the direction of the spiritual courts." As described on page 158, it does not appear to be even necessary that such a board of finance should consist of ordained officers at all. "The funds thus raised could either be transmitted by mercantile agents of the Presbytery, or by a central committee of the Assembly, consisting of *business men* charged only with executive duties," &c. Here, then, are three new officers alike unknown to scripture and to our standards. Here we have provision made for the monetary department of our benevolent operations, a department which requires indeed, as much authority as any other, while it communicates to its managers more influence; but for the superintendence and direction of the spiritual and moral interests involved we are to have no provision whatever. These are to take care of themselves. It is not possible for our judicatories to arrange the monetary concerns of their several operations for a year, without several new offices and officers, while it is possible for them to provide every contingency affecting the moral bearings of their missionaries, their missions, their young men and their publications.

I confess the whole scheme appears to my mind preposterous in the extreme. It is, as I view it, altogether visionary, and in no degree adapted to the necessities of the case. And since our objectors have been again and again required to produce some substituted agency more conformable to scripture and more likely to secure the ends in view than those already established, and this is the only result of long and frequent meditation—our conclusion is that no such system can be devised, and that while our existing system may be open to objection and may be susceptible of many improvements, it is notwithstanding necessary, proper, and to be faithfully preserved.

PAPAL PRINCIPLES EXEMPLIFIED,

In Persecuting Bible-Annotations, and an exposure of the Jesuitism of Mr. Troy, Primate of Ireland.

No. III.

WE confess that we were a little surprised to see in the Dublin newspapers of the 24th of October, a declaration from ARCHBISHOP TROY, most solemnly rejecting and condemning the said Bible, and denying that he ever had given his approbation to this Dublin edition! The booksellers in Dublin and London, whose names were prefixed to the work, found it needful to vindicate themselves; one from the charge of having used Dr. Troy's authority surreptitiously, and the other from the allegation of selling the work in the British metropolis.

It is certainly our bounden duty, as well as our inclination, to let the Archbishop and the booksellers speak for themselves; but when we have put the public in full possession of their own story, it will be proper to weigh the whole affair in the balance of justice and truth, in order to discover what conclusions should be drawn by Protestants in general. It will be necessary to consider whether

OR NOT OTHER PRELATES, PRIESTS AND BOOKSELLERS, OF THE ROMISH COMMUNION, in this empire, disapprove the "opinions and doctrines" alluded to? for with all due respect to the Archbishop immediately concerned, it is not enough to discountenance such sentiments himself, unless the great mass of His Grace's Irish colleagues, and the four Vicars Apostolic of Great Britain, will also declare explicitly their entire acquiescence in his views; and it is further requisite that they should recall, if possible, every unsold copy of so infamous a publication, however painful this might be to their feelings.

We transcribe the following documents from Dublin newspapers, though they have since appeared in those of London. Two of the Popish journals (called "Orthodox" and "Catholicon") have reprinted Dr. Troy's Declaration with great pomp and circumstance, but not COYNE'S *letter in reply*;* and the editor of one of these Magazines "respectfully solicits the particular attention of his friends to the *Declaration*,"—which (as it came too late for insertion) was thought "important" enough to claim "two additional pages" of letter-press beyond "the common limits."

Extracts from the Dublin Freeman's Journal.

"ON CATHOLIC AFFAIRS."

"WE consider the following a very interesting document, and, therefore, readily give it a prominent place in our columns. The publication to which it alludes, has drawn on the Catholic hierarchy, through the pages of the *Times*, and other English papers, much severe and injurious censure. These journals, we hope, will have no hesitation in acquainting their readers, by copying the Declaration of the Titular Archbishop of Dublin, that all the reprehension grounded upon this work, of which their columns have been the vehicles, is wholly unmerited; and that it has fallen under the eye of no censor who more cordially denounces it, than the venerable individual said to have given it all the benefits of his revision and declared approbation:—

"DECLARATION.

"Having seen a new edition of the Rhemish Testament, with Annotations, published by *Coyne, Dublin, and Keating, &c., London, 1816*, said to be revised, corrected, and approved by me: I think it necessary to declare, that I never approved, nor meant to approve, any edition of the Old or new Testament which was not entirely conformable, as well in the notes as in the text, to that which was edited by *R. Cross, Dublin, 1791*, containing the usual and prescribed formula of my approbation, and which has served as an exemplar to the several editions that have since been published with my sanction.

"As in the said new edition the notes vary essentially from those of the last-mentioned editions, which exclusively I have sanctioned for publication, I should think that circumstance alone fully sufficient to induce me to withhold every kind of approbation from it;

*MR. CHARLES BUTLER, in his Historical memoirs of the Roman Catholics, of which two editions have been printed and published in 1819 (apparently in two months,) has been guilty of the same partiality as the popish journalists, omitting Mr. Coyne's Reply to the Archbishop's Declaration.

but having read, and now, for the first time, considered these notes, I not only do not sanction them, but solemnly declare, that I utterly reject them, generally, as harsh and irritating in expression, some of them as false and absurd in reasoning, and many of them as uncharitable in sentiment. They further appear to countenance opinions and doctrines, which, in common with the other Roman Catholics of the Empire, I have solemnly disclaimed upon oath.

"Under these circumstances, and with these impressions on my mind, I feel it an imperious duty to admonish that portion of the Catholic body which is intrusted to my charge, of the danger of reading, or paying any attention to the notes and comments of said new edition of the Testament; and I enjoin the Roman Catholic Clergy of this Diocese to discourage and prevent, by every means in their power, the circulation, amongst Catholics, of a work tending to lead the faithful astray, and much better fitted to engender and promote, among Christians, hostility, bitterness, and strife, than (what should be the object of every such production) to cultivate the genuine spirit of the Gospel—that is, the spirit of meekness, charity, and peace.

" J. T. TROY.

" *Dublin, Oct. 24, 1817.*"

TO HIS GRACE THE MOST REV. DR. TROY.

" *Parliament Street, Oct. 26, 1817.*

" MOST HONOURED LORD,

" It is with pain and difficulty that I am obliged to controvert, for a moment, any statement coming from your grace; but the character which I have earned and maintained these fifteen years, unsullied in the opinions of the Catholic Clergy and Hierarchy of Ireland, as the *only* publisher and bookseller in the kingdom, of works *exclusively* Catholic, puts me under the indispensable necessity of addressing your grace in public. The Declaration, which your grace has published in the *Freeman* of Saturday, leaves no alternative but that of either submitting to the imputations which it fastens upon me, or of giving, as I now do, a simple statement of facts; for the truth of which I appeal to your grace's candour, and which shall, I trust, substantially remove the impression that your grace's Declaration is calculated to produce on the public mind with regard to me.

" On Monday the 13th inst., your grace sent me a message by your servant, requesting to see me at Cavendish Row, at the hour of two o'clock. I had scarcely entered your grace's apartments, when the Very Rev. Dr. Hamill, your grace's Vicar-General, and the Rev. Mr. Kenny, of Clongowes College, appeared. Your grace then produced and read a paper, purporting to be an extract from the *British Critic*, and containing animadversions on the Notes of a late edition of the Catholic Bible, bearing in the title-page the approbation of your grace. You then observed, 'that you were sure I had no bad intention in putting your grace's name to the work, but that very bad consequences had followed; that, finding its way into England, it had armed our enemies against us; and this at a time we were seeking emancipation.' Upon these remarks I asked, 'Did your grace approve and sanction the publication of a Bible by a M'Namara of Cork?' Your grace replied, 'I did.' I

then asked, 'Did not your grace depute the Rev. P. A. Walsh, of Denmark street chapel, to revise, correct, and approve for publication, in your grace's name, the said Bible of M'Namara?' Your grace answered, 'I did.'—'Then, my Lord,' said I, 'that is the Bible now in your hand.'—'I never authorized,' replied your grace, 'the Rev. Mr. Walsh to approve a Bible with the *Rhemish Notes*.'—'Of any private understanding,' said I, 'between your grace and Mr. Walsh, I know nothing; but this I know, that Mr. Walsh is accountable for your grace's approbation, which is now in the title-page.'—'But,' said your grace, 'are not you the person that published *this* Bible?—It bears your name.'—'No, my lord,' said I; 'I am neither the printer nor publisher; and I shall now relate to your grace how it comes to bear my name:—M'Namara, the publisher of the Bible, to which your grace gave your sanction, became a bankrupt before the work was completed. Mr. John Cumming, of Ormond Quay, assignee to the bankrupt, purchased the unfinished part, and, to cover his own losses, resolved upon perfecting the publication. Having called upon, and requested me to allow him to put my name to the work, I refused, except on the condition that the Clergyman, deputed by your grace, continued to correct the unfinished part. This I did without any interest whatever in the transaction. Mr. Cumming accordingly applied to the Rev. Mr. Walsh, to whom he paid 20*l.* on completing the revision of the work, and took his receipt for the amount.'" When I had finished this narrative, your grace, in presence of Dr. Hamill and Rev. Mr. Kenny, acquitted me, in the most unequivocal terms, of having had any thing to do with the publication. I then remarked, that your grace having in different conversations disclaimed your approbation, and certain individuals having in consequence denounced me as the forger of it, I should in my own defence publish the whole transaction; upon which, your grace promised me to take every opportunity of disabusing those, to whom you had spoken on the subject. For the truth of what I have now related, touching this interview of Monday 13th inst., I appeal to your grace, to Dr. Hamill, and to the Rev. Mr. Kenny.

"Did I not afterwards send your grace the numbers of this said *Rhemish Testament*, on the covers of which are printed these words: '*Now publishing by M'Namara, the Catholic Bible. To render it the more complete, the elegant, copious, and instructive NOTES or ANNOTATIONS OF THE RHEMISH TESTAMENT will be inserted. By permission of His Grace, Dr. T. Troy, Catholic Lord Primate of Ireland, this work is carefully revising, by the Rev. P. A. Walsh, Denmark street, Dublin. Printed by Cumming?*'—Moreover, did I not accompany these numbers with a letter, calling on your grace to make good your promise of clearing my character from the imputations it had lain under, through your grace's misconception of the facts? This letter, my lord, I suppress, from the same motives of delicacy which have kept me silent, until your grace's Declarations forced me thus to state the facts: nor shall I add one single comment, but leave the public to draw their own conclusions.

"I am, most honoured Lord, your grace's very humble and most obedient servant,
"RICHARD COYNE."

REMARKS BY FABRICIUS, ON THE ABOVE CENSURE OF THE NOTES IN
THE RHEMISH TESTAMENT.

"SIR,—If the late republication of that shocking engine of mischief, the *Rhemish Testament*, with its *persecuting annotations*, were a subject merely for theological criticism, I could not expect that you would admit any observations upon it, into your columns. But, Sir, it is a subject nearly connected with the tranquillity of a great member of the empire: permit me to add (and I speak it not lightly), bearing in its consequences on the dearest interests of Great Britain.

"On a subject, then, of such deep importance, I hope to be allowed, through the medium of the *Courier*, again to address the British public.

"Your paper of the 30th ult., contained an article, described as a Declaration on the part of the Popish Archbishop of Dublin, in which he 'not only disclaims the publication in question,' but censures it, in a tone every way worthy of a Christian prelate.

"Revering, as I do, the high and sacred office held by Dr. Troy, in the Roman Catholic branch of the Christian church; impressed as I am by those honourable public testimonies which have been borne to his private character; I must regard any document issued by him, as justly possessing extraordinary weight; and his *late Declaration* respecting the *Rhemish Annotations*, as eminently entitled to the consideration of the public.

"It has been stated in the *Courier*, first, that he has disavowed his having sanctioned those Annotations; secondly, that he has expressed his censure of them.

"On the subject of his *sanction*, I shall trouble you little at present, farther than to observe, that after a full consideration of Dr. Troy's protest, and of the Dublin Roman Catholic's bookseller's reply, published in the *Courier* of the 1st inst., I find myself obliged, reluctantly, *still to consider the Rhemish Annotations, as published with the official sanction of the Titular Archbishop of Dublin.* I enter not now into the grounds of my conviction on this head, lest the limits I have prescribed to this letter should be exceeded, and because the *censure*, as it is expressed in Dr. Troy's protest, appears to me to call for immediate inquiry and PUBLIC EXPLANATION.

"I object to this *censure*; that it is expressed in a form so *evasive*, as to be wholly unsatisfactory. All that Dr. Troy has said may be true, according to the Romish interpretation of his words; and yet, he may religiously adhere to every one of the persecuting *principles* contained in the *Rhemish Annotations*. He has not expressly denied any of the *principles* which were taken from that book of high popish authority, the *Rhemish Testament*, and brought before the view of the public, in the *Couriers* of the 11th and 23d ult. He censures the Annotations *generally*, as being harsh and irritating in *expression*: *some* of them as containing false and absurd *reasoning*; and many of them as uncharitable in *sentiment*; and he adds, that they *appear to countenance* opinions and doctrines, which he and the other Roman Catholics have disclaimed upon oath.

"Now, Sir, the great question at issue relates to the *PRINCIPLES* plainly avowed in the Annotations, not to the form of *expression*; not to the nature of the *reasoning*, or of the *sentiment*, observable

in those comments : nor to what opinions and doctrines Dr. Troy may conceive them to *appear to countenance*. If it be the wish of the Titular Archbishop of Dublin to give just satisfaction to his Protestant fellow-subjects, I would propose for his adoption a very different form of declaration.

“ Let even the few specimens of the *principles* inculcated in the Rhemish Testament, and lately inserted in the *British Critic*—or, let the more numerous and important specimens, which appeared in the *Couriers* of the 11th and 23d ult., be stated distinctly by Dr. Troy ; and let him declare his judgment upon *each of those principles separately* : or, if this be too troublesome, let him select from the Rhemish Testament the one great comprehensive principle that contains them all—the *infallibility, the perpetual and divine authority, of the decrees of the Romish General Councils*. (Note on Acts xv. 28.) The Rhemish Annotations are little more than a development of this fundamental principle. If Dr. Troy shall retract his sanction from the Rhemish Annotations, on account of the *falsity of the principles* they contain ; let him act consistently, and retract his solemn avowal, in his Pastoral Letter of 1793, of the principle in which they are all included.

“ In this case, it might also be advisable, that his Coadjutor, the President of the Royal College at Maynooth, should examine the class-book for the divinity students, in order to its condemnation.

In this class-book, he may not only find the same comprehensive principle maintained, but some of the most shocking of the *minor tenets* inculcated in the Rhemish Annotations, distinctly asserted. If Queen Mary’s Rhemish Priests have informed us, that Protestants are heretics, and that all heretics have ‘ devils’ lying spirits in their mouths ;’ Professor Delahogue has instructed the young popish priests of Ireland, that ‘ *the deadly tongues of heretics*’ (and therefore of all sincere Protestants, according to his explanation) are ‘ **THE GATES OF HELL**’ (de Ecclesia Christi, p. 221). If Queen Mary’s priests have declared that heretics (Protestants) cannot be saved, though they should die martyrs in the cause of truth ; Professor Delahogue has given the same information to his Maynooth divinity students : softening it, however, by intimating, that in *such a case*, the Protestant may, *possibly* suffer a *more tolerable* punishment in the regions of the damned. (De Ec. Christi, p. 24 and 25.)

“ If Queen Mary’s priests have maintained the monstrous and perilous pretension of the church of Rome, to a jurisdiction over Protestants, as over deserters and rebels ; the Professor at Maynooth acquaints the students, *ex Cathedra*, that ‘ the Church’ (of Rome) ‘ *retains* her jurisdiction over all apostates, heretics, and schismatics’ (Protestants), ‘ &c., as a MILITARY GENERAL has a right to decree MORE SEVERE PUNISHMENTS against a DESERTER, who may have been erased from the army list.’ (De Ec. Christi, p. 394.) If, then, Dr. Troy shall, *bonâ fide*, censure the persecuting *principles* inculcated in the Rhemish Annotations ; let him also recall and censure his own Pastoral Letter of 1793, and condemn the divinity class-book of Maynooth. Let him command the popish priests, who have, of late years, been sent from that seminary, throughout Ireland, to deny the maxims they have been instructed to maintain and disseminate ; perhaps, to contradict many of the sermons they have

preached. And, lastly; if the *principles* contained in the Rhemish Annotations shall be condemned as *false*; let the progress of consistency be completed, by an injunction to the Romanists of Ireland to unlearn the Catechisms they have been taught in their childhood, and disavow the tenet of popish infallibility.

“But, Sir, the Rhemish Annotations having been published at Dublin, in 1816; it appears, that they have been circulated amongst the Roman Catholics of Ireland for the space of *at least* a year, possibly almost two years. The Rev. Mr. Walsh had ‘*carefully revised*’ them; and, in the discharge of the solemn duty intrusted to him, ordered them to be published. Dr. Troy says, in his Declaration, ‘Having read, and *now for the first time considered* these notes.’ He does not say, that he never read them nor heard of their character before. To suppose that this were the case, would be to charge that very learned and zealous Prelate with being shamefully unread in the history of his Church, and grossly ignorant of subjects with which his sacred office required him to be acquainted: but he never ‘*considered*’ those notes before. Were *all* the other popish prelates in Ireland like Dr. Troy, and did they never before the last month ‘*consider*’ them? And were *all* the other popish priests like Mr. Walsh, and did *they approve* of them? However this may be, it appears certain, that notwithstanding the length of time during which that *notorious* instrument of rebellion and persecution, devised originally by a band of conspirators* against the PROTESTANT GOVERNMENT OF ENGLAND, under the name of an infallible exposition of the word of God, was in operation amongst the Romanists; no one popish prelate or priest in Ireland gave warning of the danger, until it was published in ENGLAND, in the BRITISH CRITIC, and proclaimed in the COURIER, from the Land’s End to the Orkneys!!!

“As to Dr. Troy’s having now, for the first time, ‘*considered*’ them; I will only observe—they were most *obviously* designed, not so much for the *consideration* of the closet, as for the EXCITEMENT of the MULTITUDE: that ‘he who runs, may read’ and see their terrible intent.

“Dr. Troy’s authority was printed on the covers of the numbers of the work (for it was published in *numbers*, for more easy and extensive circulation amongst the Romanists); and on the same covers was the following statement:—‘The *elegant, copious, and instructive* Notes, or Annotations of the Rhemish Testament will be inserted.’ And for what purpose?—‘to render the CATHOLIC BIBLE more *complete!!!*’ Were Dr. Troy, and every one of his brother titular bishops in Ireland, ignorant of all this for the last year or two?

“But, how was Dr. Troy’s sanction given to this volume of persecution? By the Rev. P. Walsh, an eminent Roman Catholic priest, and confidential friend of Dr. Troy, expressly deputed by him, for the purpose of examining, revising, correcting, and *sanctioning with his name*, the Roman Catholic Bible, then in prepara-

* Some historic memorials of these men were inserted in the *British Critic* for September 1817:—other records of a similar description might be adduced.

tion. Dr. Troy must have been *well assured* of the principles, and of the integrity of the Rev. Mr. Walsh, or he would not have committed to him an office of such stupendous importance; no less than that of declaring in his name, to the Roman Catholics of Ireland, what was, or was not, to be received as the DIVINE WORD. Of the Rev. Mr. Walsh's principles, the Rhemish Notes speak with sufficient evidence: and, surely, a very moderate portion of integrity would have induced him to mention to his Archbishop the Bible he had sanctioned in his name; with the nature of which, however, his Archbishop (it would now appear) was wholly unacquainted, *until after it was published in the last month, to the BRITISH NATION!*

"Sir, the subject is painful. I will make but one observation or two more on it:—'Very bad consequences' (said Dr. Troy, in his *private* conversation with the Roman Catholic bookseller) 'have followed,' from publishing his sanction to the Rhemish Notes. He then stated what those *very bad consequences* were.

"Were they, that disaffection to the Protestant Government, rebellion against the Protestant Government, persecution of their Protestant countrymen, may have been instilled into the minds of numbers of the Roman Catholics of Ireland?—No—nothing of all this. The *bad consequences*, and it would appear, the *only* bad consequences stated by him, in *private*, were, that 'finding its way into ENGLAND' * * * * Yes—it has found its way into ENGLAND * * * * 'finding its way,' he said, 'into ENGLAND, it has armed our enemies against us, and this at a time when we were seeking emancipation.'* Surely this requires no comment. Afterwards, comes forth the *public* Declaration, Dr. Troy's apprehension, lest '*the faithful*' should be led astray, by a work of such dangerous tendency. Even in this Declaration, designed for the purpose of giving satisfaction to Protestants, he *distinguishes* the Romanists from their Protestant fellow subjects, by the epithet of 'the faithful.' Roman Catholics alone are to be accounted 'the faithful,' and therefore the *accepted* servants of the Saviour of the world.

"But, Sir, as long as they shall be instructed to imagine themselves the exclusive favourites of Heaven; to view their Protestant King, (eternal blessings rest upon his head!) and their Protestant fellow-subjects, as the just objects of divine vengeance; and to consign them to everlasting damnation a spirit must be excited and fostered among them, which, if it should be aided by the *powers of the State*, would, ere long, produce the fatal fruits of persecution and tyranny. Reason, the history of Popery, the past and present circumstances of Ireland, unite in demonstrating this. A similar principle, operating on the sanguine minds of the motley sectarians of the days of CROMWELL, involved the English nation, first in the horrors of civil war, and then in slavery.

"With most unfeigned respect for the enlightened, sober, and loyal body of our dissenting brethren, I would entreat them to pon-

* When Dr. Troy used these words, he held (it appears) in his hand a paper "purporting to be an extract from the *British Critic*, and containing animadversions on the Notes" of the Rhemish Testament, republished with his sanction. Was he *then* ignorant of the tendency of those Notes?

der on the consequences, political and religious, of the example of their separation from the Established Church. To that pure Church do they owe the liberty they enjoy. Its free, tolerant, Christian spirit, circulates through every part of the Constitution, as the life-blood through the frame. The Church of England, unlike the Church of Rome, unfurls not the auriflam of persecution; displays no motto of military conquest.* In characterizing the Church of England, we are unaccustomed to talk of *standards*. But, Sir, if we were required to describe that Church, with a banner and a motto, expressive of her attributes, we might justly represent her, bearing on her ensign the DOVE and the OLIVE—and her motto—the Song of Angels: 'GLORY TO GOD IN THE HIGHEST; on earth Peace; Good Will towards men.' "FABRICIUS.

"P. S.—Dr. Troy, at the conclusion of his Declaration, speaks of 'meekness, charity, peace,' and 'cultivating the spirit of the Gospel.' I have thought it unnecessary to observe upon this part of the document. Queen Mary's priests, in their Rhemish Annotations, have said *much more* in favour of those duties; and with the professed view of promoting them, endeavoured to excite 'the faithful' to the extirpation of Protestants. Therefore those expressions of Dr. Troy, though highly becoming him to use, appear to me *quite insufficient* to effect that which seems to be the object of his Declaration: viz. to give satisfaction to *Protestants*, respecting the republication of the Rhemish Annotations.

"N. B.—That the Rhemish Notes do not appear to have produced disturbance in Ireland, during the last year, is no argument against their perilous efficacy. While these Notes inculcate a deadly animosity against Protestants, they at the same time enjoin the politic caution to *defer* the work of *extirpation* until the *strength of Romanists* shall be sufficient to effect it, without hazard to the *Popish Church*."—*Courier*, Nov. 6, 1817.

NECROLOGY.—JOHN BRECKINRIDGE.

DIED at Cabell's Dale, near Lexington, Ky., on the afternoon of Wednesday, the 4th of August, 1841, of a protracted illness, the REV'D DR. JOHN BRECKINRIDGE, A. M.—D. D., a minister of Jesus Christ, in connexion with the Presbyterian Church, in the United States of America.

He was born (at the spot where he died) on the 4th day of July, 1797; and was therefore aged 44 years and one month. He was the sixth child (of nine) of the late *John Breckinridge*, whose name is identified with the civil and political history of his country—and of *Mary Hopkins Cabell*, of the Virginia family of that name; and was connected in blood, and by alliance, with many of the best and most distinguished persons of his time.

He lost his father soon after he had completed his ninth year; but his education was conducted in the best manner possible at that period, under the superintendence of his mother—who still survives; and he graduated, with great distinction, at Nassau Hall, Princeton, N. J., in the autumn of 1819. He was intended for the bar, of which his father had been one of the proudest ornaments; and

*"The columns of *Catholicity* . . . unfurl the auriflam, and display its glorious motto."—(*Speech of the Roman Catholic Doctor DROMGOOLE.*)

of which his elder brother, the late *Joseph Cabell Breckinridge*, was at that period one of the most distinguished members in the West. But during his connexion with the college of New Jersey—about the year 1818—under the presidency of the venerable *Doctor Ashbel Green*, he became a subject of divine grace, and connected himself with the Presbyterian church, to which his paternal ancestors had been attached from the period of the Scottish Reformation in the sixteenth century.

He was led by the spirit of God much against the wishes of most of his family, to devote himself to the gospel ministry, of which he became so great an ornament; and after spending two or three years in the Theological Seminary at Princeton, he was licensed and ordained by the Presbytery of New Brunswick. In the year 1822, he was chaplain to the Congress of the United States; in 1823, he became pastor of the Second Presbyterian Church in Lexington, Ky., (commonly called the McChord church); in 1826, he was removed to the pastoral care of the Second Presbyterian Church in Baltimore—first as adjunct pastor with the late Rev'd *Dr. Glendy*, and then as sole pastor; in 1831, he took charge of the Board of Education of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian church, as its corresponding secretary and general agent; in 1836, he became connected with the Theological Seminary at Princeton, as professor of pastoral theology, &c.; on the organization of the Assembly's Board of Foreign Missions, in 1838, all eyes were turned to him, as its chief executive officer—and he was more or less connected with it, as its general agent, till the spring of 1840, when he dissolved his relations with it—*partly* on account of the state of his health, but mainly, perhaps, for reasons which cannot, at this moment be stated; and at the period of his last sickness, he was pastor elect of the Presbyterian church in the city of New Orleans—a station which that sickness, in chief part, prevented him from accepting; and still held under consideration, and would have accepted, if his life had been spared—the Presidency of Oglethorpe University, in Georgia—which had been pressed upon him, in the most urgent and affectionate manner.

Coincidentally with these employments, he performed an amount of *incidental* labour which was equal to the whole power of a man of common gifts; thus while pastor of the McChord church, he established and edited the *Western Luminary*, one of the earliest and most efficient weekly religious journals in the West, and conducted in it the Arian controversy, and that in regard to slavery, both of which exerted so great and so happy an influence in that region; while pastor of the church in Baltimore, he was incessantly co-operating with one or other of the great benevolent operations of the day; while connected with the Board of Education, he not only acted as a pastor to the *Central Presbyterian Church* of Philadelphia, then in its infancy—but conducted the controversy in regard to popery with the present Bishop Hughes—which excited so much interest at the time, and was one of the earliest decisive movements in that great controversy in this country; while professor in the Seminary at Princeton, he was successfully engaged in agencies to complete the founding of that institution, and in plans for extending and perfecting the accommodations of the Col-

lege of New Jersey, of which he was a trustee; and at all times, and under all circumstances, he was, perhaps, the very most laborious preacher of the church to which he belonged—his public exercises having averaged at least twenty a month—during nearly twenty years, that he served God in the ministry; and these were not *written* sermons, read over and over, from place to place—according to the growing and detestable habit of the times—but they were true, real, varied, *preachings* of Christ.

In all these labours and employments, God was constantly with him; and no man of his day, was blessed with a more evident and decided success in all his undertakings for the good of man and the glory of God. As a pastor—as a preacher—as a public speaker—as an editor—as an agent—as a professor—as a controversialist—he was blessed with distinguished success. For few men ever combined, in a higher degree, those personal qualities which command success, or those spiritual graces and gifts upon which God ordinarily bestows it. He was a man of the humblest and yet the most ardent piety; he was endowed with extraordinary power over the judgment, the feelings, and the conduct of other men; and he possessed in the highest degree, those executive faculties, which as second causes, compass the ends we propose. He was a man fitted to succeed in great and good undertakings; and thus fitted, he gave himself from the moment of his being engrafted into Christ—till the hour of his death—with sacred, untiring, unwearying devotedness to the cause of him who purchased him with his own blood. He was literally spent in the service of his Master; and fell in the prime of his life, worn out in the King's work—and was translated, before his time, to be crowned in the King's presence.

He was a man of middle stature—and of an extremely elastic, though not of a firm constitution. His immense labours in Baltimore, caused him to rupture a blood vessel in the chest, about 1829, from which, however, it was supposed, he had entirely recovered. His visits to Texas and to the southern portion of our own country had no reference to his health, which was then firmer than usual; but were designed only to extend and strengthen the Lord's cause in those parts. The effect of the southern climate, and of his great labours, was to derange his liver, prostrate his nervous energy, and develop bronchitis—that insidious scourge of the ministry in our day. When he left New Orleans, in the summer of 1840, it was in a state of utter prostration. His constitution reacted—and it was hoped, he might still be restored to perfect health. This was so decidedly the opinion of his southern friends and physicians—that in the autumn of that year, guided by their counsels, and yielding to the tender and urgent appeals of the church of New Orleans, he returned to labour with them again. But his health again gave way, and about the first of May of this year, he reached the mansion of his fathers in Ky., with the hand of death visibly upon him—and after lingering till the 4th of August, slept in Jesus.

The writer of these lines, knew him longer, and better, than any man living; and for a period of more than forty years, had been bound to him by the tenderest and firmest ties that can unite men on earth; and by a confidence and affection that had changed no otherwise than to become more steadfast. If we ever knew a man

of whom we could truly say, his faults were few and his virtues transcendent, this was one.

The close of such a life is necessarily a matter of extreme interest and importance. We will therefore give some facts concerning it. He was endowed by nature with a degree of intrepidity of character—perhaps, more properly speaking, hardihood of spirit—which made him, all his days, insensible to fear; and we suppose, that at any moment during his life, this quality alone would have enabled him to die with perfect composure. He had besides, in the highest possible degree that sense of propriety and that perception of what is becoming—which constitutes the highest charm of the behaviour of a gentleman—in all circumstances; and this ruling characteristic was so strong to the very last—that some hours before his departure, he put his thin hand in ours, as he feebly revived from a season of great bodily suffering, and with a voice nearly inaudible, but perfectly steady, said—“Do not permit me, in moments like these, to do any thing unbecoming.” To say that such a man, meets the king of terrors, with all the dignity that could illustrate the names of heroes or philosophers, is to say nothing.

And yet there was no insensibility to the solemnity of the occasion, or to the overwhelming importance of the event. For the same morning when asked about his spiritual consolations, he replied, “I have no fear, but I have not that rapture of which many have spoken. I never had much rapture in religion. My views of the depths of sin and of the awfulness of eternity have been such!”

He seemed, till the last days of his life, to expect that he might, perhaps that he would recover; and while, in repeated conversations he expressed a confident hope that all was well with him, for eternity; his desire, if it had been God’s will, was perhaps to have been restored to health. He spoke often of a certain dulness, and darkness of mind; but never seemed, for a moment, to distrust the fulness, the infinite sufficiency of Christ, nor the reality of his own interest in him. His utmost doubts were uttered in words like these, “To distrust him, would be as much as to say I have served a hard master.”

Several weeks before his death, he was told that his circumstances were such, as to render it proper for him to make his final arrangements as to the things of this world; arrangements, the more important, as the children of his first marriage would be left by his death, absolutely orphans; and his temporal possessions, reduced by his too generous and confiding nature, required his special directions as to their disposition. He received the information with perfect composure; took a day or two for reflection; required a friend to draft a will for him;—gave clear and precise information and directions about every thing—embracing his family, his estate, his manuscripts, his business; executed the whole, with the most perfect exactness; and then made these two remarks, viz., that as to this world, his last duties were done; and as to death, he desired only that we would not allow him to encounter it unawares, but inform him, in due time, of the approach of the last struggle.

The principal seat of his disease, was in the throat; and for several months before his death, that eloquent voice, which had filled so many hearts and thrilled so many spirits with all high and ten-

der emotions, was already hushed to the lowest whisper. At the same time his frame was reduced to the last degree of emaciation—(though he daily rose and dressed himself, almost to the last)—and his nervous and vital energy so much prostrated, that he could not endure the least excitement, whether physical or mental.—While these circumstances render his great and enduring self possession and composure, the more remarkable; they explain also, how it was, that the last months of his life, were essentially months of solitude and of silence. It was a continued season for divine meditation, for inward prayer, for sweet communion with God; and his chief sorrow seemed to be—not that he was shut out so much from human intercourse, as that repeated spells of coughing—the constant application of palliatives—and the thousand little necessities of his condition, interrupted so often and so much, the profitable employment of this period, mercifully granted him, as he said for the turning over and examination of his hope; for, he added, it had been one error of his Christian life, to cultivate the piety of others, at the expense, as he feared, of some neglect of his own.

On one occasion, the day, perhaps, before his death, he called his only son, a youth of thirteen years, to his bed side, and with the tenderest admonitions, and the most fervent blessings, besought him to remember that he had consecrated him, from the womb to the service of God—as a minister of his Son, Jesus Christ, and that, unless his whole heart and soul were in this great work, it would be an abomination in the sight of God, if he should intrude into it.

For several days before his death, it was evident that he was sinking rapidly; and his bodily distress, which was great during many months, became excessive, and sometimes overpowering, as his end drew nigh. It seemed to be his earnest desire that his departure should be peaceful and without bodily suffering. But the conflict seemed protracted, and sometimes the last enemy struggled fearfully; and at such times his desire to depart was very strong. The night of the 3d of August was a scene of constant distress, restlessness and suffering. The next morning he seemed convinced that his hour was nearly come; and calling his two brothers to his bed side, he extended a hand to each of them, and said, "I am dying: remain with me."—He also desired that his old and very dear friends and relations, *Dr. and Mrs. Marshall*, should be near him; and that all besides might leave the room. Death came slowly on; the extremities became cold, which he observed with evident satisfaction; his pulse ceased at the wrist—then gradually higher up—and as, in reply to his feeble inquiries, these facts were communicated—his countenance would light up, and an ejaculation of praise or hope—break from his parched lips; and as the promises and consolations of the gospel were, from time to time, suggested to him—he constantly assented,—oh yes—true—true.

An hour before his death, extending a hand to each of his brothers—he roused himself—and said to them, in broken sentences, and as he could command utterance,—“Take more care of yourselves, or you will soon follow me.—Live very near to God.—Beware of a secular spirit.—I thank God, I leave such men behind me.—If any thing is to be said of me, you (addressing one of them,) are the man to do it.—Do not praise me;—exaggerate nothing.—I am

a poor sinner—who have worked hard—and had constantly before my mind one great object—the conversion of the world.”

After this, he soon became, apparently, entirely free from pain—and his poor, frail body, sunk into a posture of rest and quiet. He was, as he had constantly been, in the perfect exercise of all his senses and faculties. After a few moments, he said, “Nothing is impossible with God.” And a little after—“God is with me.” These were his last words. He seemed to sink away into a sweet and gentle slumber; his breathing became easy and more natural; and some of us thought he would revive, and continue perhaps some days longer. This was suggested, by one, who said, it is sweet sleep. Another said it is the sleep of death. And so in whispers, and with eager and intense interest we watched—it may be half an hour—uncertain. But the practiced eye of his old friend and beloved physician—whom in our anxiety we beckoned to his bed side—saw it all. “You are both right,” said he—“he is dying in a sweet sleep. I never knew it otherwise. God always visits his children at the last.”—Thus passed away as true a man—gentleman—and Christian—as God ever lent to earth.

He was twice married;—first to *Miss Margaret Miller*, daughter of the *Rev'd Dr. Miller* of New Jersey, by whom he had several children, of whom two daughters and a son survive him;—afterwards to *Miss Mary Ann Babcock*, of Stonington, Connecticut, by whom he left an infant daughter.

The desire has been already several times publicly expressed, in quarters entitled to great consideration, that an extended notice of this gifted man, and eminent servant of God, should be prepared; and such an event seems to have occurred to his own mind—as sufficiently probable to justify him, in designating the hand, if any, that should draw it. And we incline to think, that whether reference be had to the peculiar character and gifts of the man himself—to the magnitude, diversity and results of his labours—or to the extraordinary character of the times and transactions, both in the church and on the general theatre of life, in which he acted so conspicuous a part; something of this sort, is due—as at once a testimony to him, and a memorial of his times. In the contemplation of such a thing as possible—we take leave to say, that any materials for such a work, and especially his own letters, will be gratefully received—(and if it is required, copied and returned)—by the *Rev'd Robert J. Breckinridge*, of Baltimore, or the *Rev'd William L. Breckinridge*, of Louisville, Ky.; to either of whom, they can be sent, by the earliest private opportunity.

We have, at present, merely aimed to give a few prominent facts of the life—and some details touching the death—of this good and great man. It is not our part, at a moment like this, to draw his character. Tenderly as we loved him—deeply as we lamented him—assuredly as we know, that, to us, his loss can never be replaced; yet, in the spirit inspired by the contemplation of such a life and such a death—we can truly say—our highest desires for him, are fulfilled, in what he was, what he did, and what he has become.

THE
BALTIMORE LITERARY
AND
RELIGIOUS MAGAZINE.

VOL. VII.]

NOV. & DEC., 1841.

[Nos. 11 & 12.

THE SECOND DEFENCE OF ROBERT J. BRECKINRIDGE, AGAINST
THE CALUMNIES OF ROBERT WICKLIFFE, BEING A REPLY TO
HIS PRINTED SPEECH OF NOVEMBER 9, 1840.

The best temper of minds desireth good name, and true honor.—LORD BACON.—Sylva Sylvarum. Cent. X. Exp. 1000.

TO ROBERT WICKLIFFE :

SIR—I now proceed to redeem my pledge to you and to the public, and invite your attention to what I am about to submit, as my *second* defence. Your printed speech of November 9, 1840, (I refer to it, by the date given to it by yourself—though that date is entirely incorrect, as I have heretofore publicly shown) is the principal count in the long and bitter indictment you have preferred against me; but other publications of yours may enter into the case, and your unpublished letters, in your somewhat famous correspondence of 1832—especially your letter of August 29, 1832, in 38 manuscript pages, must form a large item in it. While it is very far from my intention to go over all you have written against me, and especially not over what I have already refuted and exposed, in my printed speech of October 12, 1840; yet, your memory is so elastic and your imagination so creative, that it is often necessary to compare your charges made at various times carefully with each other, in order to get precisely at your meaning; and, happily, when you mean any thing distinctly, besides unmeasured abuse of all that stand in your way—this process of comparing you with yourself, not unfrequently administers the fullest justice to yourself, as well as the amplest deliverance to those you accuse. Surely no man can expect to be better answered than by himself; nor can any one desire to be better defended than by his accuser.

Before proceeding with the details of the case, however, I crave your attention to several general observations, which seem to me worthy of a moment's notice. And in the first place, it is to be noted that you have been obliged by the overwhelming facts of the whole case, to give up entirely, the grand cause and ground of your recent attacks upon me. Who, sir, is the guilty and disloyal author

of the detestable act of 1833? Sir, I would not, for all the land you ever wrested from its rightful owner—occupy your position, in regard to that one thing. You attempted to make me infamous, by proving me the author of a particular law, which law I did not know existed, while you had yourself, as a Senator, voted for it; and when these facts are set in a light so palpable, that even the blind cannot help seeing them—you silently drop the subject, and attempt to escape public execration by raising an outcry upon other matters having no sort of relation to the case, or to the merits of the original charge. Upon the case between us, as made by your attack and my defence, your present speech, by its studied silence, concedes your guilt and my innocence. Here we take a new start.

Be pleased to observe, again, that the bitter and violent introduction into this debate, of transactions purely personal and private, has been wholly your work. I had been a non-resident of Kentucky for more than eight years, when my name was introduced into the county canvass of Fayette, and when you delivered and printed a violent speech against me, in the summer of 1840. Your charges, though utterly unfounded, were at first of a public character; but now they have degenerated into private accusations of a nature so scurrilous, that no gentleman should print them even if they were true; and being, to his own knowledge, false, no man could utter them who was not lost to all sense of self-respect. But what I insist on is this—that you had no sort of inducement in the subject matter of our dispute in 1840, nor any provocation or example from me in my speech to which yours of November, 1840, professes to be an answer—to fly off into bitter and abusive personal accusations about private matters, even if your charges had been all true instead of all false. My speech was a public discussion of public acts and principles, and it mixed up personal matters no farther than they absolutely formed a portion of the case. Your reply, is an indecent tirade of personal abuse, for transactions which are in general, altogether private; and public affairs are introduced by you, only so far as to enable you to revile those who took part in them.

There is one peculiarity of your present publication which is so entirely characteristic, that I confess to you, I have never thought of it without smiling. Here is a pamphlet of 55 pages, expressly got up to prove certain charges against me, and so far as may be necessary to injure me, against the Presbyterian Church in America; and at the end of the pamphlet you publish as testimony, a letter, which not only disproves some of the charges deemed by you amongst the worst of all, but which actually proves that you yourself did not believe them! For example, you labor hard to prove abolitionism on me and on my church, and then publish a letter of Mr. *Emilius K. Sayre*, in which he says in terms, and by your own procurement, that you never meant to charge me or it with any such crime, and that you were willing to have said so much in print if called on! You vilify me in a manner unrivalled except in your own pages, and then conclude the book with a certificate, that you had in your other speech, no idea of being “disrespectful or injurious” to me—but on the contrary, “that you had

complimented me highly, for openness, fairness, and great ability." Yea, a speech intended to ruin me, closes with proof, that a public explanation and disclaimer was tendered, the week before the speech was delivered, and all other accusations are capped by this, that I would not ask for a disavowal of all I complained of, with a certainty of getting it!

Ah! sir, I had known you too long and too well to be taken in such a trap. You had made charges which you knew were unfounded—and when you saw, most unexpectedly, that you were to be held responsible for them, you protested that they did not mean what every body saw they did mean—and what you now avow, you always knew to be true, and really intended to utter. It was not to disavow any thing—but it was to turn the dispute with me, from the vile calumnies you had uttered, into a wrangle about the sufficiency of the explanation which you wished me to ask, that you agreed to answer *if called on*. I was willing, nay anxious, that you should disavow what all men understood you to mean; and would have continued to bear, as I had done for ten years, all your private injustice and abuse. But, if you had been in earnest, the only possible course consistent with honor and propriety, was a spontaneous disavowal of accusations, which all men understood you to make—and which you pretended, for the occasion, were erroneously imputed to you. Subsequent events have fully established the accuracy of my estimate of your principles and intentions; and this under plot, in our affairs, affords a new proof of the openness and forbearance with which I have treated you, and of the rancorous duplicity with which you have been accustomed to act towards me.

Let me note as another general fact, that nothing can be more evident, than that your *printed* speech was not intended for the latitude of Kentucky. The *spoken* speech was for the community in which you dwell. The result of our personal discussion, fortified by your subsequent public conduct, left you completely prostrate, not only in the commonwealth but in your own county. Having resigned your unexpired term in the Senate—avowedly because the defeat of your son at the previous election showed that the sentiments of the people of Fayette were opposite to yours on the subject of the importation of slaves; you were *allowed* by the people of the county, to return and finish your unexpired term. But with all the reluctance which many felt to give up a man, who as they thought, had done some service in former years; with all the efforts of those who still adhered to you; with no body out against you as a candidate—and yet with the polls kept open three days, in order to test the real sentiments of the people; still you could command in a constituency polling but the other day some 2400 votes—only about 766 supporters: and under this contemptuous silence, a more eloquent instruction than even the vote that caused you to resign—you went to Frankfort to make your last public acts responsive to the tenor of your private conduct—and finished your political career by the betrayal of your principles, your party, your constituents and your country. In the midst of these transactions you wrote and published the speech to which I am now

replying—not at all to operate on those, who, before its publication, had publicly condemned you ; but to be read and believed elsewhere, by such as were ignorant of the facts, unacquainted with your constitutional infirmities, and not informed of the overwhelming result of your conflicts of 1840 and '41, in Fayette and in Frankfort. For example, sir, who that reads on the 34th and 35th pages of your speech—that I made a public apology for my former conduct and opinions, and was hardly allowed to be heard by “a part of the crowd”—after the mass had departed, refusing to hear me ; can imagine it was intended to be read by those who knew that my apology consisted of a public rebuke of you for charging me with the writings of Judge Green and Mr. Clark—a public defiance to you to prove what you had pledged yourself to prove I had penned and printed, viz., a draft of the law of 1833, which you stood for twenty minutes thumbing old newspapers to find,—and a public protest to the people—which the greater part heard with loud applause that your general character and present conduct required every honest man to consider all you said against others, false, until it was proved to be true.

Let me also, in a general way, call your attention to the correspondence of 1832, already hinted at—and to the origin of our first difficulties. On your return from the Legislature in the spring of 1830, you published a circular to the county, which you then represented in the Senate of Kentucky—making, amongst other things, a great outcry on the subject of slavery. In reply to this part of your circular, I published seven Nos., between the 21st of April and the 9th of June. Here began our troubles—you the friend, as I then thought and as you now admit, of perpetual slavery—I controverting your theories as founded in error and injustice, and your plans as fraught with the ruin of the commonwealth. It so happened that about the same time, I had advocated the repeal of all laws of Congress, requiring the mails to be transported and the post offices to be kept open on the sabbath day ; and that you had caused to be passed, the winter before, a local law about the public high ways, which like all your legislation had a special eye to your own case—and which the people received with general derision. When I became a candidate for the county, therefore, in the summer of 1830, these three points were up for discussion ; and you, though a Senator, “took the stump” against me. A county committee, appointed in relation to national politics—and unless I am entirely deceived, appointed by yourself as chairman of the public meeting—saw fit to arrange a ticket for the county, excluding me ; and the opposite party seeing ours embroiled, brought out a ticket of their own. In this contingency, I did not throw myself into the hands of men whose principles I had always opposed—as you have lately done : but I firmly held by my convictions, refused alike to surrender my principles, or sacrifice my party—and calmly withdrew from a conflict in which success appeared to me no longer compatible with personal honor. I believe, sir, no one except yourself, ever considered my conduct on that trying occasion, unbecoming a patriotic citizen, and an independent and upright man. You, however, had injured me ; and therefore never ceased to hate and

fear me.—You had besides, deeper reasons for distrusting the future than I knew at that time ; and this leads to the *second* point of our troubles. For a very long period you had managed a case for the heirs of my father, against the executors of John Lee, and others, in which we were endeavoring to subject the Slate-Creek Iron Works, to the payment of a large sum of money : of which, more presently. At the March term of the Fayette Circuit Court, for 1830, we obtained a decree *Nisi*, as it is called, for the payment of the money ; and at the June term, 1830, a decree for the sale of the property mortgaged. When you saw us about to collect our money—you, who had been our lawyer in this case from its commencement twenty years before—employed your nephew, Mr. D. McC. PAYNE, to get our decree set aside—and when he failed, you appeared against us yourself—as counsel for other parties whose interest was subsequent to ours—parties who had employed you years after you had brought our suit—and your connection with whom, as a party interest, we never suspected till that moment.—These facts and dates, are from official statements ; you will reconcile them at your leisure, with what you say on the subject in your printed speech. It is needless to say, that I considered your conduct in this matter, altogether outrageous ; that I immediately felt convinced you were personally interested against our recovery ; and that as trustee for my father's heirs, I was obliged to resist a proceeding, which as a lawyer and a gentleman I felt bound to condemn. Of all this more presently ; it leads to the *third* part of our original difficulties. About the first of May 1832, I left Kentucky, with my family, and after spending some months at Princeton, N. J., I settled in the beginning of November, in Baltimore, where I have continued to reside ever since. About thirty days after my departure from the state, you opened a correspondence with my younger brother, the Rev. Wm. L. Breckinridge, then Professor of Ancient Languages in the College of Danville ; the purport of which was, that in this suit with the Lees and others, I had taken a course, as agent of the family, which was greatly detrimental to its interest, and might entirely lose the claim ; that in this I had been led astray by *Richard H. Chinn, Esq.*, who was, as you insinuated, unduly influenced by the Hon. *Henry Clay*, the executor, remotely of *George Nicholas*, whose heirs, you said, were in fact, the parties most directly responsible to us, for our debt. Your first letter to my brother William, is dated July 6, 1832, and consists of about 3 pages ; your second letter, also directed to him, is dated June 22, 1832, and consists of 18 pages. Both of these letters are entirely in your own hand writing. The third letter in this series—I speak only of such as are now lying before me—is a copy of my letter to you, dated “ *Pfinceton, New Jersey, July 2, 1832,*” written in consequence of my brother having communicated to me, the nature of your movement on him. This copy consists of 8 large pages, and the original was sent open, to my brother and to Mr. Chinn. The fourth letter is one from you to me, dated “ *Lexington, August 29, 1832 ;*” it consists of 38 closely written pages. It is not written in your hand—you doubtless have the original—but every page is sprinkled over with your corrections, and the

whole is signed by you. This letter was inclosed to my brother, in one from you to him, dated September 3, 1832, containing 3 large pages—entirely in your own hand. My brother returned it to you, under an envelope, which envelope you returned to him in a blank cover, apparently in childish spite—both of which wrappers are before me. The letter was then sent to me by another channel, and reached me about the end of February, 1833. I have what appears to be a draft of the beginning of a reply to you, dated March 4, 1833—consisting of 5 pages only. It is incomplete, and my recollection is that no answer was ever sent. So ended our *third* period of difficulty. Presuming on my long forbearance in repeatedly permitting such conduct to pass without any further notice than the absolute duties of my position required; you became finally so much emboldened, that in the autumn of 1840, you delivered and printed the speech, which I met fresh from the press on my unexpected visit to Kentucky, in October of that year. It seemed to me, that the time of endurance was ended; that duty to myself, my friends and the truth, required of me a change of conduct; that God had demanded at my hands more than I had done; and that nothing short of a faithful and thorough dealing with you could set matters right. In this view of the subject I delivered my speech in Lexington, in October, 1840; and in the firm conviction that your published reply to it, requires the following notice at my hands, I proceed to administer it in all good conscience.

Looking back on these troubles—it seems to me most proper to proceed at once to the developement of that portion of them, on which you have manifested the most interest—and around which you have made all the personal accusations of your second speech, cluster. We shall thus escape, as far as possible, from the chaos created by your designed want of method, and easily slide along into the midst of those charges, which have induced me to trouble you with this paper.

Some time after the death of my father, John Lee's Executors commenced a suit against his Administrators to recover on a contract entered into by said Lee with my father and George Nicholas, for the sale of one half of Blackwell's Entry for 19,000 acres of land, near the Slate Creek Iron Works. This suit was prosecuted with *various* success, till the month of June, 1825, when a judgment was rendered against us in Woodford, and subsequently affirmed—by which we had to pay about \$7,400. You were our lawyer throughout. In the month of September, 1811, you filed a Bill in Fayette, in the name of my father's administrators and heirs against Lee's executors and others—one principal object of which was to subject to the payment of whatever sum we might lose by the foregoing suit—certain property mortgaged to our father for that very end. The case stood thus: John Breckinridge and George Nicholas, proprietors of the Iron Works, the former owning 18-48 parts thereof, jointly contracted with John Lee, for the purchase of Blackwell's Entry; John Breckinridge subsequently sold his interest in the Iron Works to Nicholas and Walter Beall, taking from Beall a mortgage upon the estate sold, to indemnify him, amongst other

things, against his liability on this claim of Lee; Beall subsequently sold his interest in the iron works, to Thos. D. Owings, taking from him a mortgage upon it, amongst other things, to secure him against his own liability to Breckinridge, on account of his mortgage to him; then Beall, Nicholas, and Breckinridge all died, Owings being still in possession: and in this state of case, Lee's executors sued and recovered against us; we, by you, having filed our bill, as above stated, to recover so much as we might be forced to pay. The nature of Nicholas's liability as partner—and the extent of Beall's and Owings's as mortgagors, are nothing to the present matter. In 1830, as heretofore stated, we got first a decree *Nisi*, and then a decree to sell; and were just on the eve, as we supposed, of getting the money we had actually paid and expended. But all of a sudden, our own lawyer—the honest and faithful Robt. Wickliffe—who had filed our bill—managed our case—made contradictory allegations in our pleadings—and been, as he insinuates, our patron, and our father's bosom friend, came into court in the name of Luke Tiernan and Ellicott and Meredith, and by Mr. Payne, filed a petition for a postponement of the sale ordered, and a review of the decree itself. The reasons alledged in the petition of this faithful counsel in favour of his *new* clients and against his *old* ones, are 1, That George Nicholas's heirs were not before the court. 2. That the decree was for too much; to which others are added, of which learned counsel whose abstract I follow, says, "*they are not worth notice.*" Now the first reason is false, as the pleadings show; and the second is false, if your allegations in our bill are true; for in it you say, all Blackwell's claim is within a circle of three miles around the forge and furnace, and in your reason 2d, you assume that it is not—and therefore our decree is for too much. But if both were true—the question still remains, and your character requires it to be answered—what right had you—our original counsel, and constant attorney in this case—our general legal adviser in the business of the estate, and that for twenty years running; what right had you, thus to interfere against your own clients, friends, yea, if we may believe you—dependants—and defeat a recovery which was in some form absolutely beyond question—upon doubtful points of legal learning? I demand, sir, does the honor of the legal profession, tolerate such a procedure? Will the sacred relations of client and counsel endure it? Does the just interpretation of contract between man and man, allow it? No sir, no sir. It is a procedure, altogether without precedent, at the Kentucky bar; and which, I am glad to say, admits of the clearest possible explanation. I proceed to give it.

On the 11th September, 1817, (six years after filing our bill against Lee and others) you filed a declaration in debt, in the Circuit Court of the U. S. for the Kentucky District, in the name of Luke Tiernan vs. Thos. D. Owings for \$5525,75; and got judgment the following November. On the 10th day of July, 1818, you filed in the same court, against the same defendant Owings, a declaration in debt, in the name of Samuel Smith, for \$17,952; and got judgment the November following. On the 25th of July, 1819, you filed in the same court, against the same defendant

Owings, a declaration in debt, in the name of Comyges and Pershouse, for \$1785,45, and got judgment the November following. These debts jointly amounted, originally, to \$25,263,20, as appears of record; though you say, (*p. 5, speech of Nov. 9, 1840.*) "I had recovered for Samuel Smith, Luke Tiernan, and Comyges and Pershouse, judgments against Thomas Dye Owings, to the amount of seventy or eighty thousand dollars." Now, sir, we begin to get into the light. This Thomas Dye Owings, was a sub-purchaser under Beall, to whom my father sold his interest in the Iron Works; he was a sub-mortgagor under Beall, who mortgaged to my father; he was in possession of the identical property—and was made by you, a defendant to our bill. In your speech (*p. 5.*) you say—as part of the sentence quoted above—"Owings gave up to the Mar—shal large bodies of lands, including parts of the lands mortgaged by Beall to Breckinridge"—to satisfy the debts of your new clients. And then you immediately add—that the trustees of Owings, put your said clients into possession of all these lands, "and they, by their Agents," proceeded to rent them out. At the head of that agency—stood Mr. Robert Wickliffe—faithful friend and counselor of the heirs of his old friend, John Breckinridge.

We find you now in possession of the property—against which, it caused you so much anguish in 1830, that we should get a decree, prayed for, by you, for us twenty years before. Nominally, your possession was that of your new clients; *really, it was on your own account! You are the owner of the estate!* How much you may have paid Smith, Tiernan, Comyges or Pershouse—for their claim of "seventy or eighty thousand dollars,"—I cannot say; but this is notorious, that you are the possessor of the princely fortune of Thos. D. Owings—including the portion mortgaged to us; and that he is hopelessly ruined. When I called at the clerk's office to examine the papers in these cases—I was shown a thick bundle—which the clerk informed me, contained the executions. I counted them—and then asked him to do it. There were just *eighty one* of them. *Eighty one executions, issued by you, in three cases!* How you managed to do it—I leave the profession to guess. But by them you managed to divest Owings of all his estate, legal and equitable, in these same Slate Creek Iron Works. Mark that—*legal and equitable.* So that you having entirely divested Owings, in the names of your new clients; and then having become, in a way best known to yourself, proprietor of the interests thus divested; the recovery of your old friends the Breckinridges, upon their case instituted by you in 1811—against a portion of this property—becomes, in fact, a recovery—not against Thomas Dye Owings—but against Robert Wickliffe! No wonder, then, you should be so desperately uneasy, lest we should get our money, before Nicholas's heirs were properly before the court—or before we had proved all your allegations about Blackwell's Entry—twenty years ago, or before some abstract law question had been settled to the entire satisfaction of a passionate lover of mere justice—like yourself. To defeat our recovery makes the Slate Creek Iron Works just worth so much more to their owners—say ten, or twelve thousand dollars; and our old friend and lawyer, Mr. R.

Wickliffe, had become one of the proprietors, if not sole owner—when? Pray, sir, when? Shall I answer for you? Then turn to the 21st page of your great letter of August 29, 1832—and there you will find yourself saying—that at and before our decree *Nisi*—that is, before March, 1830, this Iron Works property belonged to *your clients and yourself—and that you and they, were partners in it!*

Here then is the plain case on which we quarrelled. My judgment is, that I would have been a faithless trustee, if I had connived at your conduct; and that I acted as every honest man placed as I was, would be obliged to act. What the issue of the law suit may be—is not for me to say, as it is still *sub judice*. What men may think of your conduct, is your affair, not mine.

In the confused and false narrative you give of the foregoing case, is contained one of your most unfounded and dishonoring charges against me. On page 6th of your speech of November 9, 1840, you say: "This said Robert J. Breckinridge, found among his father's or his brother Cabell's papers, George Nicholas's and Walter Beall's bond for indemnity, which he says he has lost, but which, I have always believed he, for motives which he knows I know, has hitherto suppressed." You then proceed to alledge the solvency of Nicholas's estate, and the case with which the money due us, might be made out of it, and add, in the following words, the reason, which induced me to suppress the aforesaid bond, viz.: "but this would close every part of the gentleman's duty as agent or administrator for his father's estate, and take from him every excuse for not settling with his heirs, by accounting for not only monies received, but lands of great value sold and sacrificed by him." Again on page 7, you say, that in regard to this whole business, I have "played off from that day to this, an intended deception, on the heirs" of my father, pretending that I cannot settle with them because my business is unfinished. Let us here examine first the *fact*, viz.: the suppression of the paper, and then secondly the *motive*, viz.: that I might fraudulently avoid a settlement with my co-heirs, whose estate I have wasted.

As to the *fact*, you shall be my witness. In your letter of June 6, 1832, page 2, speaking to my brother William of "the condition of a claim your (our) father's administrators have against Nicholas"—you say, "Nicholas's estate lay immediately open to pay *two-thirds* of the debt, and other property of Owings and Beall, in abundance, was liable." This letter shows that you had familiar knowledge of the relations and liabilities of the estates of Nicholas, Beall, and Owings to ours; that you considered Nicholas liable to us, for *two-thirds* of the amount paid by us, to Lee's executors for Blackwell's claim; and that you knew that the liabilities of Nicholas and Beall to us, were of an entirely different sort, and *not the result of a joint bond*, as alleged in the preceding quotation from your speech. That is, your written statement of June 6, '32, is entirely inconsistent with your printed one of November 9, '40.

Let us hear you again. In your letter of June 22, 1832, to the same individual, and written in reply to his answer to your letter of June 6, you say on page 1, "Indeed without some further aid

"from the family, there is one fact charged in the original bill or an amendment that I find no voucher for, although I think it was made on some voucher in the possession of your brother Robert or Cabell, or on information from one of them, viz.: that George Nicholas was bound for two-thirds of Lee's debt. By a joint contract, your father and George Nicholas bought the one half of Joseph Blackwell's Entry," &c. Now here observe the utter contrariety of this statement from both the foregoing. In the first, you assert your positive knowledge that I had the suppressed paper—that said paper was a joint bond of Nicholas and Beall; and that it made them clearly and readily liable to us for the debt recovered by Lee. In the second, you omit all mention of a bond, and state the liability of Nicholas and Beall to be different from each other, both as to amount and foundation, and introduce a third party, viz., Thomas D. Owings. In the third, you profess utter ignorance of the whole matter; confess that you don't know who told you that Nicholas was liable for two-thirds; nor when they told you so; nor how it was to be proved; nor at what time it had been first asserted.

But we will try you again, from a fourth statement, made by you under still new circumstances. In your letter to me, of August 29, 1832, p. 19, you say, that not long after the filing of the amended Bill of 1826, in this famous chancery suit, I gave you the information which follows—I quote your words: "Not long after you made this amendment, you informed me that I was mistaken in only charging in the original bill, that Nicholas's heirs were bound for half, that by a contract between Nicholas and your father, Nicholas was bound for two-thirds of the purchase money, and I think you stated, you had, or showed me at the time of the conversation, such contract," &c. Now, here we have a new form of the case. What you say in 1840, that you "have always believed," you tell us in 1832, you did not know till 1826, although, you had at this latter period been managing the whole case for fifteen years. What you tell my brother William in June, 1832, had been obtained, you hardly knew where; you tell me in August of the same year, had come from me, at a precise time. What you assert in 1840, to be a joint bond of Nicholas and Beall, known by you to be suppressed by me; you tell me in 1832, was a contract between my father and Nicholas, and tell my brother in the same year, was "some voucher." These absurdities and contradictions, are, however, the less important, as they are all false; as I will prove, by yourself.

Let us hear you for the fifth time. In your letter of June 22, 1832, p. 1, you say, writing to my brother: "Shortly after your father's death, suit was brought on the bond for the £10 per hundred. At that time your brother Cabell was young and out of the state, and neither of the administrators seemed to be competent or inclined to act," &c. On p. 2, you proceed to explain clearly how you understood, from actual surveys, and the examination of papers and records, the case to stand, between Beall, Lee, and my father, and declare Beall's liability to us, to be, not from any supposed bond, trumped up in 1840—but because you found a

mortgage, from Beall to my father, precise to the very point, on which mortgage you say you filed a bill of foreclosure and for indemnity. Here then, the liability of Beall, which you charge me in 1840, with trying to smother up, in order to defraud my co-heirs, is confessed by you in 1832, to have been fully understood by you, "shortly" after my father's death, (he died December 14, 1806;) and was actually proceeded on, by you, in chancery, in 1811, and remains unsettled, depending, and open to all mankind, till this hour, in the case of Breckinridge's administrators vs. Beall's administrators and others, on the chancery side of the Fayette Circuit Court. That is, some thirty odd years after you are fully possessed of certain facts, and actually proceed to put them on record, and to hold parties to heavy liabilities upon them; you find it convenient, for purposes of personal malignity, to represent these facts, in four or five different ways—all, as you well knew, utterly false; yea proven so by your own testimony.

But you shall have a full hearing; answer, therefore, for the sixth time, and having told us, at last, the real state of the facts about Beall's liability; tell them also truly as to the rest. I have said my father died in the autumn of 1806. His administrators, whom you attack, as neither "competent" nor "inclined" to do their duty, were, the first, my uncle *Robert Carter Harrison*, a man who could have spared as much repute for unsullied honesty, as would enrich a generation, having such a repute as yours; the second, my brother-in-law, *Alfred W. S. Grayson*, who, though I shall not defend his errors—would, as to all noble, manly, and gentleman-like qualities, have justly considered himself defamed by a comparison with you; the third, my venerated mother. As to the two first, it is not my part to defend them; and for the third, I will only say, I feel a kind of degradation, in mentioning her name on the same page with yours. Now as you expressly assert (in the letter of 22d June, 1832, already quoted) the youth and absence, of our eldest brother (Cabell); the incompetency and negligence of the administrators; and your own knowledge on personal and careful examination of all the facts of the case as to Beall's liability: so also you are shut up by your own statements, as to that of Owings and Nicholas, for on page 3 of that letter, you say, "*On further search I laid my hands on Owings's contract or mortgage to Beall, and ascertained that he, Owings, was bound to Beall, to execute his contract with your father, as to indemnity. In this suit, I made Nicholas's executors and heirs parties, and also Owings a party, praying first, Nicholas's executors might be decreed to pay Nicholas's part, supposed to be two-thirds, and that Owings might be decreed to pay at the rate of £10 per hundred for all of the 10,000 acres of Nicholas and Breckinridge sold by your father to Beall.*" Here then is a clear and precise statement, by yourself, in 1832, flatly contradicting every allegation you have made before or since, against me, or my brother Cabell, on this subject; clearly pointing out the sources of your knowledge, as independent of both of us; and precisely convicting you of intentional falsehood, in all your allegations against me in this behalf.

But there is, if possible, clearer proof still behind; so let us hear you, for the *seventh* time, on this matter. I was born on the 8th day of March, in the year 1800. In the year 1811, you commenced both the suit in chancery in the name of my father's administrators against Lee's executors and others, and that against Beall's administrators and others. In your various statements, spoken, written, and printed, *when you desire not to be understood*, you confound these two cases; though they have little in common, were both commenced by you for many years. You have several times, within a few years, had the papers in these cases under examination, as I learn; and, those who have examined them after you, find them in a state, which all who know you will easily understand, under such circumstances. Being five hundred miles off, when I began to collect materials for this defence, I had to rely on the kind aid of friends. I have before me two abstracts of the case first named above; one made especially for me—the other to aid, in the perfect understanding of the case; both by professional counsel, men above all suspicion. Both these abstracts assert, that in the first case named above, an amended bill was filed in 1811, which contains amongst other allegations, this, *viz.:* *that George Nicholas the joint obligor with John Breckinridge, to John Lee, was bound to pay for two-thirds of the purchase*, and the amended bill prays that the trustees and executors of Nicholas, may be subjected to contribution. Now, sir, this amended bill is in your hand writing, and was filed by you—when I was eleven years old! So here is matter of record, contrived by yourself, and existing for thirty years before your charges of 1840—proving that what you assert is not only false, but impossible—and that you had for thirty years, known it to be both the one and the other. So far as I know, the first denial that the liability of Nicholas was for two-thirds, and that of my father for one-third, it contained in the answer of Henry Clay, as executor of Morrison, and so executor of Nicholas, filed in this case in answer to an amended bill *written by you*, in 1827—in which after the lapse of sixteen years from the first assertion of the fact, of record, by you—you reiterate the statement that Nicholas was liable for two-thirds.

But, sir, I demand of you as of a man long skilled in all the tricks that bring disrepute on the noble science of the law, to assign one tolerable reason, in this whole transaction, why there ever could have been such a bond, as you say you knew existed? Breckinridge and Nicholas were partners in the Iron Works. They entered into a contract for the purchase of Blackwell's land, wholly for the partnership, or in part for it, and in part on private account. Breckinridge then sold out his his partnership interest to Beall and Nicholas; but swears really for his (Beall's) single use; and Beall gave him a mortgage to indemnify him from loss by reason of any covenants in the contract with Blackwell. If Breckinridge really sold nothing to Nicholas, as Beall's mortgage and oath seem to prove, why should Nicholas and Beall in such a case, execute to Breckinridge a *joint bond*, to secure him against Blackwell? Pray sir, what would be the consideration of any bond under such circumstances, executed by Nicholas to Breckinridge? Especially

how could it be a *joint bond* of Nicholas and Beall to Breckinridge, when the interest of Beall and Nicholas, was in every respect unequal? If Nicholas owned 30 shares on his own account and 4½ shares purchased from Beall, making 34½ in all; while Beall owned only 13½ shares, having, as he swears, immediately sold to Nicholas 4½ shares of the eighteen purchased from Breckinridge, and received for them, in cash, the consideration money from Nicholas; how is it conceivable that they should execute a *joint bond* to Breckinridge? Moreover, why should Beall execute any bond, joint or single, when he had paid, in lands, the price contracted to be paid to Breckinridge, and secured him by mortgage, against collateral liabilities? That he committed a fraud as to some of the lands given to my father in payment for his 18-48ths of the Iron Works, or was himself in error in regard to them, and thereby rendered a subsequent transaction necessary between those two; rather strengthens than weakens this whole view of the matter. In other words, is it not perfectly clear, from the mere statement of the case—that neither Beall nor Nicholas could have executed such a bond; in other words, that no such bond ever existed? The liability of Nicholas to Breckinridge for money paid by the latter, was that of a partner—that of Beall, was that of a mortgagor.—And the quantum of their several liabilities, was matter of contract, of record, or of law; and all you say about a joint bond, is pure fiction.

I rest this part of this matter here—although I have ample means to push it farther—because I cannot see how any man who is open to conviction, can fail to perceive that I have demonstrated my innocence and your guilt. I now proceed to clear myself of those motives charged by you, as the spring of actions, which I have proved by yourself, it was impossible for me to have committed. It is indeed, true, that not having suppressed any bond, I could not be fairly held to feel the motives, which you say caused its suppression. But this does not satisfy me.

Why should I suppress such a bond, supposing it to exist? Look, sir, at the facts. The whole question, as made by yourself, is, whether we are to recover from Nicholas's estate one-half or two-thirds of a certain sum of money—amounting now to some ten or twelve thousand dollars. That is, the utmost interest we have at stake, is, the one-sixth part of that sum of money; and my utmost personal interest in that would be one-fifth or sixth part. So that, my particular interest, whether Nicholas's liability were settled at one-half or two-thirds, could not possibly exceed a few hundred dollars, even if we had no other remedy. But, you have repeatedly asserted, and I suppose there can be no doubt, that the mortgaged estate of Beall and Owings, is additional to this liability of Nicholas, as a partner of my father, and perfectly ample; so that the only question is, *how much* we should recover from Nicholas, and *how much* from the rest; and thus, whether there was ever any such bond as you alledge, is utterly indifferent, to every interest of my father's estate and to me.

But the entire facts in the case, show conclusively, that Nicholas is responsible to us, as the partner of my father, for money paid by

us, on the partnership account, for precisely so much as his interest in the concern was, say 30 parts out of 48, of what we have so paid; for 18 parts out of 48, was the exact interest of my father, as you assert; and that of Nicholas, if he owned the rest, must needs be 30 parts out of 48.

Again, the interest of Nicholas's estate in the premises, must be precisely measured by ours; the only question with them, on your own presentation of the case, is, whether they shall pay one-sixth more or less; for this is just the difference between one-half and two-thirds.—Whether Henry Clay, who has acted as the lawyer and the executor of Nicholas, would attempt to exert a corrupt influence over any one, and in particular over me, as you constantly insinuate, for an interest so remote and contingent as to him, and so clearly null as to me, I leave the public to judge. As to the heirs of George Nicholas being capable of such an attempt, luckily for me it happens to be true, that fair and open proposals of compromise, have more than once been made to me on their behalf, since the recovery of Lee's executors against us, in order to liquidate the liability of Nicholas; to all which I have steadily replied, that nothing less than the total settlement of the whole case would satisfy me; for since I had discovered your dishonorable and faithless conduct in it, I felt obliged to stand fast by our legal rights and remedies, and would do it, even if I did it singly. So that any collision between me and the heirs or representatives, whether legal or personal, of Mr. Nicholas, is utterly out of the question, upon the very face of the transaction; and for further proof, I appeal to all those parties, and especially to Henry Clay, to Judge Nicholas, and to Richard Hawes, Esq's.

But again. Why should I endeavor to prevent a recovery *by* my father's heirs? If you had said there had been a bond suppressed to prevent a recovery *against* us, there might have been sense at least, though no truth in the charge. But to say this was done to prevent a recovery *by* us, is at the same time false and ridiculous. In one breath you charge me with wasting the estate of my father; in the next, with preventing the recovery of its means: while, in very deed, your cause of quarrel with me was, that as its trustee, I had so managed its interests as to detect your infidelity as its lawyer, and to endanger your enormous speculations in property and claims, incompatible with its interests, and with your professional engagements to it.

There is one proof against this accusation, which, I presume, you, at least, will consider difficult to answer. Ah! you are too good to your adversaries. Who could suppose, that in charging me in 1840, with preventing the collection of certain monies due my father's heirs, in order to have an excuse for putting off a settlement with them; you had been so considerate of my good name, as to furnish me, eight years in advance, with proof, under your own signature, that my conduct was actuated in the identical case, by an entirely different motive? Hear yourself, and believe; for if you tell truth, I can prove my innocence by you; and if you tell not truth, that, too, establishes my innocence, for no one else accuses me. In your *letter of August 29, 1835*, you thus discourse

in regard to the money, which you say, I will not allow to be collected, and of the motives, which you *then* said, actuated me. "I wrote to you, stating your DECREE was erroneous, that it was void, and if it could be carried into effect, it was iniquitous; that the bill should be amended to state Clay's compromise with Nicholas's heirs, and his agreement to pay five thousand dollars, the insolvency of most of the heirs of Nicholas, and the necessity of an injunction, to prevent the money going into their hands. To this writing, communicated with the sincere desire that others, if not yourself, of your father's family, might not, *through your malicious folly*, be defrauded of what was justly due them, you made no reply, but that I must proceed at my peril." You then go on to assert, that the money could have been easily collected—not on any bond, as you now talk, but by the proceedings indicated above, and then add: "But this was not what you wanted; *this would not have been your sweet revenge.*" I do protest, sir, that it seems marvellously odd, to a plain man like myself, that a professed spendthrift should refuse to take money, part of which is his own, when he has only to hold his hand out and receive it. But it is still harder to see, how it could be true that he did this upon motives precisely opposite to each other. Good gentleman, you cannot tell how you have aided me in my defence, by abusing me too often.

And why should I desire, much less attempt, to shun a settlement with my father's heirs, either partial or general? It is true, my business relations with those heirs, individually and collectively, have been large; but they are wholly misunderstood, or wilfully misrepresented by you. I was the youngest child of the family, but one, that attained mature age; and must, therefore, have been involved in the business of my co-heirs, as individual persons, purely and solely by their own acts. And now, omitting all mention of any service I may have had the happiness to render to any of them, I freely tell you, that if you will point out any act of mine, by which any of them have lost and I have gained one dollar, in any individual transaction between any of them and myself; I will pledge myself immediately to cancel the act, or to prove it to be not only perfectly equitable, but kind and fraternal. As it regards the estate of my father, you utter a pure fiction when you say, (p. 9, Speech, Nov. 9, '40,) "the reverend gentleman had got himself, by an act of the Legislature, appointed administrator, with power to sell lands, pay debts," &c. &c. I never got the Legislature to pass any act on the subject; I never was an administrator of my father's estate; and I never *got myself appointed* to any thing whatever, by any authority whatever connected with that estate. While I was yet a child, other persons administered on it; while I was yet a boy, the Legislature passed two acts, (in 1812 and in 1813,) on representations in which I was too young to take any interest, by which certain trusts were created, to a limited extent, as regarded portions of the undivided estate of my father; and for many years, my oldest brother executed these trusts with great skill and ability, and as trustee, performed most of those important services which you falsely claim as your own. After his death, which occurred in 1823, I was, I may truly say, obliged by the family to consent that

the courts should throw on me the un-finished business of this trustee-ship—two of my co-heirs, one of whom had been my guardian and of course knew me well, becoming my sureties; and this trustee-ship is the sole foundation for your unparalleled statements. In it my powers were limited and special; the business which I transacted, though large, brought comparatively little money into my hands to be spent or accounted for. I never sold an acre of its land, nor compromised one of its claims, without a previous order in writing from a majority of the heirs, under the acts of Assembly; and the estate has always been in debt to me, from the moment I became its trustee. I have given bond and security that I would account for all monies that should come into my hands as trustee; and the statutes gave a summary remedy against me.

No, sir, you are utterly deluded, or else, in your malice, talk at random. It has been the aim of my life, to be always ready to settle with every body, in all respects. No rule of conduct has been more rigidly adhered to by me; and I think by this time, you must yourself be convinced, that it had been well if you also had adopted for your government, a principle which would have required you to be just, truthful, moderate and honest; and, therefore, constantly prepared, without fear, and as to all good men without reproach, to answer for all your conduct.

But if you still doubt, I submit to you the following testimonials. They are from the only children of my father, besides myself, who survived at the time they were given; and since their date, one of them has passed to his enduring reward above, affixing the seal of death to his ample vindication of me, and just rebuke of you. If any one should know the truth on the general subject in regard to which they speak, *they* should. The public know these men; and when they know that they speak in regard to matters about which you have attempted, for ten years, publicly and privately, to poison their minds; the matter must be considered as put to rest. If I had nothing to offer in my defence, but these two statements, I should consider myself beyond the reach of your malice.

CABELL'S DALE, NEAR LEXINGTON, KY., }
 May 14, 1841. }

Having been requested by my brother, ROBERT J. BRECKINRIDGE, to give him my certificate in regard to certain charges brought against him by Robt. Wickliffe, Sen., in his late speech, touching his management of our father's estate, I do hereby declare, that to the best of my knowledge, my brother Robert's agency has, throughout been conducted with ability, faithfulness, and a disinterested regard to the good of those he represented, which often exposed his own interests. These statements derive additional force from the facts, that the estate was remarkably difficult to direct, and that the agent occasionally found *fraud* practiced by those who were engaged with him in its settlement.

If this had not been requested, I should have thought it useless to give it, for I do not think that any one believes the charges brought; no, not even Mr. Wickliffe himself.

JOHN BRECKINRIDGE.

Having been from his earliest boyhood up to the period of his last illness, intimately acquainted with the hand-writing of my late friend and kinsman the Rev. Dr. John Breckinridge, corresponding with him for years together in boyhood, youth and manhood—I have no hesitation in saying that this is entirely his hand-writing, piece and signature.

Aug. 20, 1841.

J. CABELL HARRISON.

I have looked over a pamphlet by Mr. Robert Wickliffe, Sen., in which very severe charges are made against my brother, the Rev. ROBERT J. BRECKINRIDGE, in relation to his management of our father's estate, as Trustee thereof. Being one of the heirs, I deem it proper for me to say, that I have had no occasion, at any time, as far as I can now recollect, to be dissatisfied in the slightest degree with any part of my brother's management of that business, and that as regards his entire control and disposition of it, and his assiduity, discretion, and fidelity, I consider Mr. Wickliffe's insinuations as perfectly gratuitous, and utterly destitute of all foundation in fact.

W. L. BRECKINRIDGE.

Louisville, March 22d, 1841.

One of the most painful and degrading accusations you have seen fit to make against me, relates to a portion of my Brædalbane estate, and to my alleged unkindness to my deceased aunt, Mrs. Meredith. I will state the accusation in your own words. In your speech of November 9, 1840, you say, "I also recovered for the heirs 300 acres of first rate land, from their aunt, the late Mrs. Meredith, which this reverend individual now holds, at a price merely nominal, from the other heirs, as I am informed and believe." Again, on page 20, thus: "You were born and raised here, and inherited your fortune (except what you wrung from your old aunt Meredith,) *through my labor*. No sooner had you dispossessed your old aunt," &c. Again, on page 22, thus:

"In a practice of more than forty years, amidst our conflicting land titles, it could hardly happen that I should not be the lawyer for the successful claimant, and often interested in the event of the suit; and sometimes my feelings have been greatly excited for the unfortunate occupant. And I declare before high heaven, that in all my practice I never had my heart wrung more, than from the nominal ejection of the reverend gentleman's uncle, Samuel Meredith, but the real ejection of his aunt, old Mrs. Meredith, his father's beloved and only sister—*by the gentleman himself*; and that I never had a more unfeeling wretch for a client, than he was. After having dispossessed his aged relative, he had the impudence to apply to me to bring an action against her *for mense profits*. This I indignantly refused, and rebuked the gentleman, by telling him he wanted me to do what I would not do, and that he ought to treat and speak of his aunt more kindly; that he had no right to *mense profits*. He then, to harass his aged, infirm and destitute aunt, who, if then not a widow, had a husband incapable of business—employed another lawyer, brought his suit and paid the costs. This I state from impression, and the records will correct me if I do the gentleman wrong as to his suit for the mense profits. Mrs. Meredith was unfortunately married, and always relied on her brother for protection and counsel; and has often with tears in her eyes declared to me that the mortgage for 300 acres of land of which the gentleman dispossessed her, was had and contrived by her and her brother, to prevent her husband from selling her lands in Fayette county and moving to Green River. That her brother's claim on Col. Meredith, the father of her husband, which her brother and her made the foundation of the mortgage, had been fully paid by Colonel Meredith; and that her brother had died suddenly without thinking of the condition she would be in by the enforcement of the mortgage. This mortgage of ancient standing, was found among the papers of Mr. Breckinridge, and enforced by the expulsion of his sister; and *is the farm, the very farm*, the gentleman says he has come by the providence of God, to visit! Poor old Mrs. Meredith now sleeps with her brother in the silent grave, while the gentleman struts the lord proprietor of her land and her labor; and if any want to learn the character of this pious preacher, let him inquire of the descendants of his aunt."

These are bitter things; and whether they have any relevancy to prove that I was the author of the act of 1833, or not; if they were true, I should confess myself that detestable wretch, which

every upright man must pronounce him to be, who could bring them, knowing them to be false. I frankly take issue with you, then, upon this case as put by you. If what you say, be true, I confess myself infamous; if it is false, I hold you to be everlastingly disgraced.

I produce then at once the highest of all proof—in the most undoubted of all forms. Hear it—and if you are not dead to all honor, hide yourself forever from the haunts of men.

I, Harry I. Bodley, Clerk of the Fayette Circuit Court, in the State of Kentucky, do hereby certify, that I have examined the records of my office, and find that an action of ejectment was commenced in said court on the 20th of June, 1814, in favor of John Breckinridge's heirs against Samuel Meredith, which was served on said Meredith, on the 23d of June, 1814; the declaration in said case, is in the hand-writing of Robert Wickliffe, Esq., and his name is marked thereto, as the attorney for the plaintiff.

Judgment in said case was rendered for the plaintiff at the March term, 1817, which was enjoined by a suit in chancery, instituted in said court by defendant Samuel Meredith, and in which a decree was rendered in August 1819. A writ of possession issued on the judgment in favor of Breckinridge's heirs against Meredith, on the 1st March, 1821, upon which the Sheriff made the following return, viz.:

“Executed March 1st, 1821, by taking into and delivering to David Castleman, a complete possession of all the within mentioned premises amounting to 10 tenements.

R. SHARP; D. S. for

J. C. Richardson, S. F. C.”

Said writ issued for 355 acres of land in Fayette Co. on the waters of Elkhorn, except the interest of Conway's alienees in 4 acres, on which a saw mill &c. is erected, being one-half, which was enjoined in suit of Dallam against Breckinridge's heirs.

On the 20th November, 1821, Breckinridge's heirs commenced a suit against Samuel Meredith (Richard H. Chinn being the attorney for the plaintiff) for back rents, &c., which abated by the death of Samuel Meredith, on the 1st April, 1825. April 8, 1841.

H. I. BODLEY.

If you can look your degradation in the face, compare your libelous assertions with this overwhelming proof. My “father's beloved and only sister”—was ejected “*by the gentleman himself*”—you hardly assert and *print* the assertion in Italicks to give it damning emphasis. The truth sternly replies—that *you brought* the ejectment, when I was just fourteen years of age; recovered the estate when I was seventeen, and pursuing my studies at Princeton in New Jersey; got a decree in chancery, when I was nineteen and still a non-resident of Kentucky; and finally a writ of possession, on which the estate was put into the possession of David Castleman, who you know to be one of the legal representatives of John Breckinridge, while I was still a minor; and Mrs. Meredith not even a party to the proceedings! So that in point of fact, neither my aunt nor myself had any thing to do with this matter—as in point of law, neither of us had any authority to act in regard to it; and all you say about it—is a clear, sheer, and baseless fabrication. You say, that “to harrass his (my) aged, infirm and destitute aunt,” I proceeded after the recovery of the estate, and after being indignantly rejected by you, to engage other counsel to oppress her in the matter of *mesne profits*; whereas, the record shows, that this proceeding was had at a time, when I was barely of full age, and when this estate was under the general control of my brother

Cabell, as trustee, and the particular management of Mr. Castleman, as agent, and when I could not if I had desired it, have controlled the business; and in point of fact, had nothing at all to do with it. I repeat, it was impossible for me to have interfered, directly, in this matter, even if I had been of full age, and had ever so much desired it; for by those special acts of the Legislature of Kentucky, which I have spoken of in another part of this defence—passed in 1812 and 1813—cases of this very kind were put under the control of a trustee—my oldest brother, being such trustee from the 28th day of March, 1814, (which is the date of his bond as trustee—not quite ninety days before the commencement of the action of ejectment by you, against Mr. Meredith,) till the 1st day of September, 1823, (just two years and a half after the final recovery—and nearly two years after the commencement of the action for *mesne profits*)—when he died, in the midst of his days, his usefulness, and his reputation.

But, sir, I have a never failing, and you must believe an unimpeachable witness, by whom to prove the absolute untruth and entire impossibility of all these grievous things. It is yourself. You have repeatedly written and published, that your recovery from Mr. Meredith, was *for my father's heirs*—not for me particularly. You say this in one of the passages already cited, (*speech of Nov. 9, 1840, p. 10,*) thus, "I also recovered *for the heirs*, 300 acres of first rate land, from their aunt, the late Mrs. Meredith," &c. Again, page 28 of your letter of August 29, 1832, thus, "After I obtained judgment *for your father's heirs* for 300 acres of land against Meredith," &c. And to the same purport in various other places and on divers occasions. Now observe; in the accusations I am answering, you charge *me* with being your especial client, in all this business from 1814 to 1821; with being the cruel and unfeeling persecutor of my 'aged, infirm, and destitute aunt;' and with endeavoring, after wresting her estate from her by your agency, to engage you in still farther wrongs against her, under a demand for *mesne profits*. Mr. Bodley's statement, shows by the record, that all this must necessarily have been before the end of 1821, if at all. Now hear my unflinching witness. On page 18, of your letter of August 29, 1832, addressing yourself to me personally, you say, "I will now, sir, pay my respects to yourself in proper person, for the last time, as I trust, on this side the verge of eternity. *The first business I ever transacted with you, as the representative of your father, was to make you a deed and to receive one in the Voss claim, after dividing the land with you. Finding that you had taken upon yourself the agency, I informed you of all the unfinished business, which hung upon my hands, or that had passed over to your brother,*" &c. Here, then, we have a fixed date assigned by yourself, for the commencement of our business relations, touching the property of my father's heirs; and the land recovered from Mrs. Meredith, was by your own showing, and in fact, property of that kind. This period was *after* my brother Cabell had ceased to act—that is after September 1, 1823; and it was after I had "*taken the agency,*" that is after February 9, 1824—which is the date of my bond as trustee. I have endeavored twice, without success, through a pro-

essional friend, to find the date of the execution of the deeds spoken of by you ; but it must necessarily be later than Feb. 9, 1824. To confirm all this, and put it out of the possibility of dispute, you say (*p. 14, speech, Nov. 9, 1840,*) "Of the reverend gentleman who now assails me, at the death of his brother, of my own knowledge, I knew nothing," &c. That is, until after Sept. 1, 1823, when my brother died, you "*knew nothing*" personally of a man who had been your client from 1814 to 1821, in a most painful case—whom you dismissed with indignation and full knowledge of his being a "*wretch*" in the latter year—and whose conduct, during seven years, you paint in the blackest colours, from personal knowledge—yea, appealing to God for the truth of what you say ; when by your own printed confession, you had no personal knowledge whatever of him till more than two years after these seven had expired. Now, sir, how do you like the looks of this proof? I ask you, can any thing be more certain, than that you have herein published that of me, which you could not but know, was as completely false, as it was utterly disgraceful?

"If any want to learn the character of this pious preacher, let him enquire of the descendents of his aunt." It is thus you sum up the case. Yes, I freely consent, let all inquire.—They will tell them, I cannot doubt, that from the day of my birth to the day of my aunt's death, I never extended to that venerable lady any thing, but kindness, respect, and veneration ; that in the unhappy difficulties, which, for a number of years, existed between Mr. Meredith and those legally responsible for the adjustment of my father's estate—difficulties which in some degree alienated the families from each other—I never took the slightest part : that the confidence and affection of my aunt, in many of the members of my family, and in myself, continued unabated to the close of her eventful life ; that it was her habit to consult me, to trust me, and to confide in me as a son—God having given her no son—amid some of the sharpest and keenest trials she was ever called to bear ; that, to the best of my capacity, and with a veneration which the dignity and excellence of her character, and the greatness of her trials—not less than her peculiarly interesting relations to me inspired—I eagerly availed myself of all such opportunities, not to minister to her wants, for none know better than you, sir, that she lived and died in affluence ; but to offer my protection, and to testify my love ; and that in my last interview with her, no great while ago, and but a little before her death, she put into my hands a token of her constant attachment, with tears and blessings, all unwonted in one so lofty, tranquil and composed, thanking me for my friendship, and commending me to God. This, sir, I dare not doubt, is what her descendants will tell you. And they may add that one of them, the one whose trials have perhaps been the greatest, sought my intervention as that of a tried kinsman, with a member of your own family, in a matter of most delicate and painful interest, but a brief space before your first libel of 1840, was published against me. And to testify the cordiality with which I assent to this reference—made by you with a spirit and motive unworthy of a savage—I now inform you, that as soon as I read your speech in Baltimore, I wrote to a friend

in this country, beseeching him to lay it before all the surviving children of my aunt, all of whom are females, and all in circumstances which would prevent any being but yourself from dragging them, without permission, before the public; and with one accord their response was—that your reference to them was wholly unauthorized. Sir, it is idle to say, no gentleman could act thus; you scarcely deserve to be called man.

You make it necessary, that I should speak of these family transactions. Beware, that you drive me not to break over my firm resolution and visit you with a horrible retaliation. I will merely say, at present, that my father, before emigrating to Kentucky, purchased from the original patentee, Col. Samuel Meredith, of Va., a portion of his lands in the present county of Fayette, held by grant for military services. Samuel Meredith the younger, then married to my father's only sister—received the balance of these lands by gift from his father and settled on them; and notwithstanding the sale from his father to mine, sold the larger part of that conveyed to my father, to other persons. On the subsequent removal of my father to Kentucky, in 1792, he found things in this posture, and at the solicitation, as it appears both of Mr. M. the younger and his vendees, he confirmed the sales, and in lieu took from the former, evidence of claim and title to adjacent property. All these things happened before I was born. In 1806 my father died, intestate—all his children being minors: and in 1814, you sir, instituted proceedings on the deed of Samuel Meredith the younger, under the instructions, I will suppose—at least by the wish of the elder members of my family—and especially of my brother, Joseph Cabell Breckinridge, then trustee of the estate of my father. I have already stated, when and how, you recovered the estate, I have no doubt on a just and perfect claim—to which there was and could be no defence either in law or equity, but about which I knew nothing—and up to 1824, did nothing. All these are matters standing, not in hearsay, conjecture and belief, but in deeds and oaths of all the parties. In this last named year, I became the purchaser of the interest of my father's heirs, in this and some other property; not out of choice—but because the convenience if not the necessities of some, and my liabilities for others of my co-heirs, rendered the sale of the estate indispensable, and my purchase of it, hardly less so. In book Y, folio 15, and book Z, folio 161, you will find the deeds of my co-heirs conveying their interest in this land to me, of record in the office of the clerk of Fayette county; and the property now constitutes, not as you emphatically assert with reiterated Italics "*the very farm*"—but somewhat over half of that on which I last resided in Kentucky; and which I still cultivate.—The consideration paid by me, for this property, you say, was "*merely nominal*;" a statement which, if true, could be made only to give offence—as all the heirs who sold and conveyed it were adult persons, fully acquainted with the value of the property; but which as I will show, being like nearly all you say, untrue, adds another shade to that infamy which the whole affair brands indelibly upon you.—The consideration "*merely nominal*," stated on the face of these deeds, is \$850 for each fifth part

of 355 acres, being \$4,250 for the whole. This was silver; and by the scale kept by D. A. Sayre, of Lexington, from 1820 to 1830, I ascertain through a friend, that the average value of specie, during the year 1824, was rather over 100 per cent., or 2 for 1 in currency. The consideration paid by me, therefore, was as near as may be \$24 per acre in currency—prompt payment. Now, I find by examining the records, that this is more than the common price of circumjacent estates, at and about the same time. For example: Nicholas Long, sold to Newbold Crockett, 60 acres of land adjoining my farm, for \$1,000, on the 3d of May, 1824, which is only \$16,66 $\frac{2}{3}$ per acre; and John Clarke sold to William Nutter, 96 acres, then adjoining my farm, and now forming part of it, for \$1,431,45, on the 25th October, 1825, which is \$14,91 per acre, payable, as Mr. Nutter himself informs me, in currency, at seven annual payments—currency being then, by Sayre's tables, worth about fifty cents in the dollar; and as late as June, 1830, the heirs of Preston Breckinridge deeded to Jacob Shannon, 77 acres of land, also adjoining my farm, for \$16 per acre, which, even if it were silver, made only about \$20 per acre in currency, as by Sayre's tables, currency was then worth about 88 cents in the dollar.

What makes this matter more glaring in its injustice, is the fact, notorious in the neighborhood, that this Meredith portion of the Brædalbane estate, was in a worse condition than any other land in that region when I bought it; and instead of being worth more, was worth less than the common average. The statement of Mr. Bodley shows, that the Sheriff delivered 10 tenements on the 355 acres, when he put my father's heirs into possession; and it was partly on account of this enormous use and waste for many years preceding its recovery, that the suit for back rents and mesne profits was instituted. On the 25th May, 1824, I purchased the estate, which my family had finally recovered and peaceably possessed since March 1, 1821; on the 9th February, 1824, I became trustee of my father's estate. Mr. Meredith, and not his wife, was the sole party on that side in all these suits; his property, and not her's, was in contest. On the other hand, I was never your client at all in any personal sense. I had, properly speaking, nothing to do with the difficulties, legal or personal; and long after the property was finally recovered, I reluctantly, and by necessity, purchased it of my co-heirs, at a full price. This, then, is the case between us; and if you can escape without dishonor, I confess my inability to decide on moral conduct.

The slanders which I have now refuted, are perhaps the most offensive and disreputable of any in your pamphlet; on which account, I put them first. As you observe no order in making your charges, it is difficult in disproving them, to classify and connect them. I will do this as far as possible; and therefore invite your attention next to a congeries of falsehoods, which you have collected into your narrative of what you call your last legal service to our family. The facts of the case, as furnished to me by one of the learned counsel who managed a large part of it, stand thus: In October, 1811, you filed a bill in chancery, in Fayette, in

the name of *John Breckinridge's administrators vs. Walter Beall's executors, trustees, and others*, to recover £1,000 secured by mortgage dated April 23, 1801. There was an interlocutory decree, 9th Sept., 1814, and a final decree in our favor, 16th day of September term, 1819. A bill of review and injunction filed by N. B. Beall, September term, 1820. Demurrer and order to commissioner to proceed and sell, February term, 1822. June term, 1824, motion to set aside sales, heard and overruled. Under these sales, among others, N. B. Beall gave bond, with P. B. Ormsby as his security, for \$1,212, and P. B. Ormsby gave bond, with N. B. Beall as his security, for \$4,031; upon which suits were instituted and judgments recovered in Jefferson; and on the 10th May, 1824, certain equitable estates of P. B. Ormsby sold, and \$1,862,29 credited on the execution against him. On the 24th of May, 1824, Ormsby filed his bill against Beall and Breckinridge—praying that the decree of the Fayette Circuit Court might be reviewed, and alledging that Walter Beall was *non compos* when he made the mortgage which was the basis of the decree. Answers filed 6th June, 1826; injunction granted; and on the 17th February, 1827, injunction made perpetual, and appeal by the defendants; January 15th, 16th, 17th and 19th, 1829, cause argued before the Court of Appeals. Court took time; and on the 16th of April, 1829, decree of inferior court reversed. This case was managed in its various stages for Breckinridge's administrators, by R. Wickliffe, J. C. Breckinridge, R. H. Chinn, R. J. Breckinridge, and A. K. Woolley, of Fayette; and by G. Duncan and S. S. Nicholas, of Jefferson. From the filing of the original bill to the final decree in the Court of Appeals in our favour on the particular branch of the case with Ormsby, was nearly eighteen years; and the original case is still depending in Fayette, waiting a final settlement in the case of other parties prosecuted to insolvency. The mere inspection of the dates and facts herein given, shows conclusively, that the case was gained by us, against the most desperate opposition—and upon the absolute merits of our claim; and of consequence that the attempt to stultify Beall and impeach my father's character, was as you admit, an utter failure—made by unscrupulous men, for selfish purposes; and, also, that your graceless allegations that you gained the case by trick—watchfulness and overreaching the Bealls, are unhappy manifestations of your propensity for romancing, exercised upon your own character; and finally that your statements implicating the character of your brother, Governor Wickliffe, in his agency at the Bardstown sales, (*see letter, June 22d, 1832, p. 5, 6 and 18.*) though meant by you to do him a favor, by impressing us with high ideas of the value of his services and of our obligations for them—are, in truth, slanderous on him.

Your account of all this matter, is scattered over a number of pages of your speech—and as your intention was to prevent people from understanding the case, and thereby to enable you to say about it, whatever you judged most suitable to the particular objects you successively had in view; you have mixed it up with all sorts of things, according to your common habit in such cases. Your largest printed statement of the case, is, I think, on p. 11-12, *speech of November 9, 1840*; I give it in your own words:

"I directed the mode of defence, which was in part pursued; but notwithstanding able counsel appeared for the administrators of Breckinridge, the decree of the circuit court sustained the charges in the bill, and granted a perpetual injunction. I advised the appeal, with the intention to argue the cause in the appellate court; but such was the decline of my health and strength, and the weight of public and professional duties that had pressed upon me for some time before the court approached the trial, that I felt wholly unable to appear in the cause, and so advised the reverend gentleman, who seemed to acquiesce, and consulted with me as to the counsel he should substitute. In this we agreed, and I promised to aid them with my views upon the case, which I faithfully did. *But when the day of trial came near, my present slanderer and persecutor had confidence in me alone.* He appealed to me not only on account of the large sum involved, and which was indispensable, he said, to relieve me, as his security, but because the decree involved the memory of his father, to lay aside my public duties and make an effort for him. The last consideration was decisive with me. I arranged with Senators, to suspend, for a day, the important business of the Senate, and obtained, from the Court of Appeals, the same day to make my defence. I made it. The decree of the inferior court that nailed the foul charge on the coffin of the deceased—that he had cheated and defrauded a poor senseless lunatic—was reversed and annulled. By this decree, not only was the exalted name and spotless character of John Breckinridge vindicated, but nearly ten thousand dollars was put into the pocket and under the control of his profligate son. This was the last professional service I performed for the family, and God knows when at night I retired, exhausted and prostrate from the court room, I felt as if it was doubtful whether I should ever enter the court house again. If I risked my life as I did in the effort, it was in defence of the memory of a departed friend, and well has his ungrateful son paid me for it. It was not two years afterwards that he occupied the newspapers and took the field against me; and now again, when sixty-six winters weigh upon me, in the presence of my children and grand children, and before my county and country, under the garb of religion and a pretext that he is a missionary of heaven, he has, with a virulence and a brutishness suited to the mouth of a baron of a brothel, and to no other, falsely and infamously assailed my name and peace. In assailing me thus, this individual assails not only the friend of his father while living, but the defender of his fame when dead.

It is scarcely worth while, sir, in a letter to one like you, to argue any question, touching the meritoriousness, or even the propriety of human conduct, as exhibited by your statements: *first*, because your moral sense seems to be so obscure, that you could not feel or understand what would be said; and, *secondly*, because what you say is nearly always untrue, and, therefore, it is not material to urge, that the conduct charged is good or bad. If the case were otherwise, I would here point out, how, that in representing me to be, in general, a bad and an abandoned man; and in this particular case, while aiming to represent me in a light altogether hateful, you have recorded a fact, which, if the whole case was not a fiction, would put me before the mind of every virtuous man, in the noblest of all lights. A witness like you, whose soul is consumed with the very lust of gold, boldly declares of one, whom, in the same breath he calls a profligate, that the ruling passions of his life, gave way before the fervor of his filial love! A witness like you, consumed with a selfishness so intense, as to be able to make himself an idol even when that self was you; denounces one as a pattern of iniquity, and in the same sentence, proves that the great end of his anxious zeal, was the vindication of a father's memory! A witness like you, destitute of all notion of real glory and true nobility, in the very attempt to fasten the lowest vices upon one, sets him forth as struggling to save, from the least impeachment, a fame already so pure, that the great effect of its relation to him, is

to make his own enormities the more hideous, by the fearful contrast! That is, in attempting to blacken me, you set forth a character shining under one of the noblest, loveliest, brightest manifestations. Sir, in return for this felicitous blunder, I offer you one profound hope. You have often and bitterly accused me of degeneracy. I forgive you these unfeeling taunts, because they imply or assert the excellence of one, whose image nothing has been able to efface from my heart, and whose fame is precious to me as life itself. And now, my sincere and unfeigned hope is, that in all future time, no man may ever have just occasion to draw a picture of human baseness, such as is on the lips of scores of your cotemporaries every day, and applying it with fearful emphasis and unanimous consent, to any miserable descendent of yours—say, “worthy son of a sire like yourself.”

There are many things in this tirade about which it is not necessary, at present, to say much, beyond a mere indication of them.

1. Thus, you imply that you expected the cause to be gained in Jefferson, and after it was lost contrary to your hopes, you were consulted by us, being doubtful what to do, when we found that “the decree of the Circuit Court sustained the charges in the bill;” and that you “advised the appeal.” But the record shows, that the decree of the Circuit Court in Jefferson—seventy-five miles from your residence—“sustained the charges,” on the 17th February, 1827, and on the same day, an appeal was taken by us! 2. You say, that when it became probable, you could not argue the cause in the Court of Appeals, I consulted you, and “we agreed,” “as to the counsel” I “should substitute” for you. But it is of record, that Mr. Chinn argued the case with you; and it is not only notorious, but I could prove, out of your letters, if it were necessary, that he had been engaged in the law business of my father’s estate in the courts in which he practised, from the period of my brother Cabell’s removal to Frankfort—that is, for about eight years.
3. You speak of a certain security-ship, on your part, for me, which, as I shall have to explain it more particularly again, I will only say, is a pure figment of your imagination.
4. You speak of my attacking you upon the stump and in the newspapers, in former years, and then again more bitterly in 1840; whereas, in every case, as I have shown in my speech of October 12th, 1840, and more fully in the present paper, my difficulties with you, public and private, have been always in defence; viz.: that my “*Hints on Slavery*” were written in 1830, in defence of myself, my opinions and my party, against a circular previously published by you; that our controversy on the stump, during the same year, was produced by your previously attacking me before the people, when not a candidate yourself; that our personal difficulty, about the same time, arose out of your coming into open court, and endeavoring to set aside a decree for money we had paid, you being the counsel for us in the very case, and against our interest, counsel also for an opposite party; and that my conflict with you in October, 1840, was produced by libels published by you against me, in your September speech, of the same year, resigning your seat in the Senate of Kentucky.
5. The scurrility of your language, in a portion of

what you say, renders it alike unworthy of my notice, and inapplicable to my person or character. For the rest, I now proceed to a more particular notice of what seems to require it at my hands.

And, in the first place, you know perfectly, that what you say in regard to the alledged insanity of Walter Beall, and the supposed effect of that insanity, if proved, on the character of my father, is absolute trash. This pretended insanity was no new thing. On the 2d of August, 1804, Walter Beall himself filed an answer in the Federal Court for the District of Kentucky, to a bill previously exhibited against him by my father, in which answer he swore that he was mad when he executed the mortgage for the £1,000, above spoken of. On page 9 of your speech of Nov. 9, 1810, you make two statements, to which I call your attention as bearing on this point. The first is in these words: "*I voluntarily took upon myself the whole business of the late Mr. Breckinridge's estate,*" &c. The second is, that you knew my father had sued Walter Beall "in the Federal Court," on "a mortgage to secure" "a thousand pounds;" and you add, "That court having no jurisdiction, *I dismissed the suit,*" &c. Here, then, we have you first confessing your knowledge of this charge of Beall's madness, very soon after it was originally made; and secondly, acting without authority, in such a way as to prevent its being then tried. On the 4th of March, 1814, Samuel T. Beall, son and heir of Walter Beall, filed his answer, on oath, in the Fayette Circuit Court, in the case of *Breckinridge's Adm'rs. vs. Walter Beall's Exec'rs. Trustees and others*, (brought by you in 1811, after dismissing the suit in the Federal Court,) and reiterated the allegation of the madness of his father; making his father's answer of 1804, a part of his own answer in 1814. In this case, then, the question of his feigned madness was fully made, for the second time, and as a part of the cause was tried and decided in our favor, before our final decree in September, 1819; and in all the subsequent steps of that violently litigated case, up to the sale of 1822, was an adjudicated point. On the 24th of May, 1824, *Peter B. Ormsby* filed his bill in Jefferson, against Beall and Breckinridge, as already stated, and here again, for the third time, the question of Beall's insanity was made; and in this case, it came up before the Court of Appeals, and was again settled in our favour. So that the fact, that Walter Beall was not mad at all, was a fact fully settled by proof, and by a court of chancery, before the period we are now about to arrive at; was a fact sworn to by you, in a deposition taken in the defence against Ormsby; and whether it was a fact or not, was not of the smallest possible importance; because, at a period confessed by all, even by Walter Beall himself, to have been a period of perfect sanity, he had, by deed of record, confirmed the previous mortgage. These are the unvarnished facts; and they were all notorious to you, when you wrote your speech.

Suppose, sir, I now show that this whole statement of yours, in regard to my appeal to you, is a mere fabrication, without even a foundation in fact? You say, "*When the day of trial came on, my present slanderer and persecutor,*" &c. Again: "*He appealed to me,*" &c. Again: "*I arranged with Senators to suspend, for a*

day, the important business of the *Senate*, and obtained from the Court of Appeals, *the same day*, to make my defence," &c. Here you identify the supposed appeal to you, by me, as being during the session of the Court and the Senate; immediately before the hearing of the cause; and under an emergency, that allowed a *single day only*, for you to prepare for the argument. It is matter of record, that the cause was argued in the Court of Appeals on the 15th, 16th, 17th, and 19th days of January, 1829—upon some one or all of those days, and upon no other day. This is fixed beyond cavil. (See Order Book of the Court of Appeals, No. 29, pp. 108—113.)

I was a member of the House of Representatives of the Kentucky Legislature in the year 1828-9. The Assembly met that year on Monday, the 1st day of December, 1828. Immediately after the August election, I had gone to Western Virginia, and did not reach Frankfort, Ky., until the last day of November—the day before the Assembly met. I sat and did business in the House of Representatives, for twelve days—the first twelve of the session; and I never sat again in that house; as the Journal proves. I passed a considerable portion of the 14th day of December, 1828, in company with Col. James Love, now of Texas, and Judge John P. Oldham, of Jefferson; both of whom were at that time, members of the House of Representatives; the object of the interview on the part of Col. Love, and myself being to get Judge Oldham to consent to become a candidate for the Senate of the United States—at an election then about to take place; the party with which we acted being unable to elect a man of our opinions—and Judge Oldham being the person of the opposite party, most acceptable to many of ours. He declined being a candidate, for reasons—which I do not feel free to repeat—but which struck me at the time, as being disinterested and honorable in the highest degree.

On the night after this interview—I was taken dangerously ill, with a bilious fever. From that bed of sickness no one ever expected me to rise. I was confined to it for more than two months, and was at last removed from Frankfort, in a state of emaciation and debility—nearly as much dead as alive. I have not been able to bring the subject before the mind of Col. Love; but I confidently appeal to him for the truth of what I say. The statement of Judge Oldham follows:

During, and I think shortly after the opening of the Kentucky Legislature, in 1828, I spent a considerable part of a sabbath day in company with Robert J. Breckinridge, of Fayette, and James Love of Knox county, all of us being members of the Legislature.

The object of the interview, on their part, was to induce me to offer for the Senate of the U. S., there being a vacancy then to fill—much conversation passed between us on the subject, and when I assured them I could not offer, they seemed unwilling to take the decision as final, and insisted I should give further consideration to the subject, and that the matter should be farther discussed at another time.

On the next day I learned that Mr. Breckinridge was very sick, and I believe remained so until the end of the session.

Fair Hope, March 4th, 1841.

JNO. P. OLDEHAM.

The Hon. Thomas A. Marshall, Judge of the Court of Appeals of Kentucky, was my room mate, from the commencement of the

session of 1828, till I took sick; he being then a member of the House of Representatives, from the county of Bourbon. In a conversation with him, he informs me his recollection is distinct that my sickness commenced within the two first weeks of the session; and he has permitted me to make this reference to him. I refer also to Garnett Duncan, Esq., of Louisville, who was with me in Frankfort, when the session began, and subsequently during my sickness slept many nights in my room; and who being an intimate friend both of Judge Oldham and myself, was personally and deeply interested in all the events of the period; and has full knowledge of them all. You will observe also, from the statement of Judge Oldham, that Col. Love and myself were to have had another interview with him before the Senatorial election, and were prevented from having it, by my sickness. But the Journals of both houses will show that this election took place on Tuesday the 23d of December, 1828. The proof, therefore, exclusive of my own assertion, is positive, is irresistible, that my sickness commenced early in the session. I have already asserted that its actual commencement was on Sunday night, the 14th of December.— From that day till January 15–19, 1829, when you argued your "*last suit*," is more than thirty days. I had been in bed all that time, at the point of death; and yet you gravely tell the world a long cock and a bull story, of my making visits, appeals and what not to you, a day or two preceding this 15th–19th of January, 1829. Who do you expect will believe you when these facts are known?

But, sir, this is not the whole, nor perhaps the worst of the proof. You arranged important business with Senators for a *single day*: so, so. You obtained from the Court of Appeals "*the same day*," good, again. Now, Order Book of the Court, No. 29, shows that the last day in December, 1828, on which the Court of Appeals sat, was the 4th day of the month, [p. 103–4] Judges Owsley and Mills being present. The next day on which the Court sat was Wednesday, January 14, 1829, leaving a period of *forty days* during which the court did not meet. On that day George Robertson and Joseph R. Underwood, Esq's, produced in Court their commissions as Judges of the Court of Appeals, and also evidence that they had taken the oaths of office (the former on the 24th of December, the latter on the 12th January) and thereupon constituted the court (*Order Book, No. 29, p. 105 and 6*). Your "*last suit*" was called that same day, and fully argued on the 19th. Now if you will examine the Senate Journal for the same period, you will find the following facts, viz: That Judges Owsley and Mills resigned on the 5th December, 1828, and were renominated by Governor Metcalf, (p. 63,) and were rejected by the Senate on the 10th (p. 69–70); that Messrs. Robertson and Underwood were nominated as their successors on the 20th, (p. 107–8) and confirmed on the 22d (pages 110, 111 and 112); that Chief Justice Bibb (the only remaining Judge) was elected to the Senate of the United States, on the 23d (p. 118 and 119); and that *Robert Wickliffe*, the Senator from Fayette, was present and voted on these various occasions, and therefore knows all these facts from his personal knowledge. I have already shown that Judge Underwood was not qualified till

January 12, 1829, and that no Court was held after December 4, 1828, till January 14, 1829. And now it is seen that no Court of Appeals existed—there were not Judges enough, *in natura rerum*, to hold a court, for a month after I took to bed, on the 14th of December; and therefore, that all your fine statements, about our very pathetic interview, are, by inevitable necessity, untrue; and were of your certain and personal knowledge, known to be not capable of being true, in the nature of the case—when you printed them to damage me and glorify yourself.

But this is not all. You yourself furnish evidence, of that violent and dangerous illness, which you attempt to use, as you do every other incident in my life commented on by you—to my injury and your advantage. To my injury, by a fiendlike insinuation, as false as it is base, that the whole disaster arose from an attempt on my part, to kill myself, by taking an over-dose of calomel after a long debauch: to your advantage, by setting forth your great solicitude for me, and kindness to me during that long and painful malady; thus piteously exhibiting my ingratitude to one who had loved me so much, as well as served me so faithfully. On p. 14–15 of your speech of Nov. 9, 1840, after an account of a paternal visit to me, as fabulous as it is dramatic, you proceed as follows:

“He promised fair, but that was all, for he still kept up his habits *until late in the session of 1828*. I think a mutual friend disclosed to me that he was ruining himself at Faro and other games of chance, and had on the night before lost enormously. About the time I expected him to repair again to his sinks of ruin and infamy, I went to his lodging room, and found him in the act of rising from his bed to accompany some of his companions then in attendance for his company to commence Faro again. His guests soon disappeared, and he threw himself into bed, pretending to be very sick. After speaking to him privately not to leave his room that night, and obtaining a promise that he would not, I left him for the night, as I hoped, to sleep off the desperation which his countenance portrayed, arising from his dissipation; but I learned afterwards, that the gentleman, instead of going to sleep to ease his mind, took a quantity of calomel, without weight or measure, (having no more effectual remedy at command,) and was found prostrate next morning. The local physicians proving deficient to give the gentleman relief, he prudently called in Dr. Marshall, who, with Dr. Munsell, by the aid of hot bath and steam battery, brought the calomel from him in *witches balls*, and saved his life. During the awful suspense in which his fate was in the hands of his physicians, I remained near him, and no man living could feel more relieved than I did when Dr. Marshall exhibited to me the balls of calomel which the steam battery had forced through his stomach, and announced to me his hopes of saving his life, and when I saw him able to return to his family, all I said was to advise him to quit politics, go home and repair his constitution and fortune; this he assured me was his own plan, and I parted with him in perfect friendship.

Now, from the 12th day of the session, that is from the 14th of December, 1828, (the 7th and 14th being Sundays,) till after the session closed—which was on the 29th of January, 1829—all my friends were looking daily, for me to die; and yet during this period you were watching over me to prevent me from ruining myself at Faro! The Journal of the House of Representatives shows that I was in my seat on the 8th, 9th, 11th, 12th, and 13th days of Dec. There is no recorded vote on the 10th; and therefore only presumptive proof of my presence that day. The statement of Judge Oldham shows that on the *last day I was able to be about* (which was the 14th of January, the Sabbath day,) I spent “a considerable

part" of it with him and Colonel Love, on a matter, I now admit with sorrow not suitable to the day, but clearly proving my position, both social and political, to have been all I could have desired. But your testimony is, that having slept all the day that Judge Oldham thinks I was with him, I only rose up at night to commit suicide with calomel, producing thereby a disease, which my physicians were foolish enough to consider bilious fever! It is perfectly manifest from the whole testimony, that no such interviews as those described by you, could have occurred.—As is usual with you, you not only prove yourself a slanderer, but give a *key* to unlock your method; for you say, and no doubt thought, my illness did not commence till "*late in the session of 1828*," and therefore supposed yourself safe so long as you laid the scene of your fictions in the fore part of the session.

But my proof goes a step or two further yet. You do not publish what you spoke, in this, more than in other cases. But take it as you say. I assert that I never saw your face, during my whole illness at Frankfort; and that although you boarded in the same house, represented the same county, belonged to the same party, were connected with me by marriage, and professed to have been a personal and hereditary friend; I have no knowledge of a single act of yours, indicating the very slightest interest in my living or dying; and no reason, but your word, which can scarcely be called one, to believe you felt or manifested any. You have introduced the name of Dr. Marshall—a name precious wherever genius, knowledge, and honor are revered—a name dear to me by a thousand obligations, and by all the ties of the firmest friendship, continued through every vicissitude of life, from childhood to the present hour. Hear what he says:

SIR:—You ask me to state what attentions were paid you in your illness in Frankfort, by Mr. Robt. Wickliffe, Sen.? I staid with you 62 days, never having left the room but twice, for very short intervals each time, (not exceeding one hour each,) except for my meals, and when Mr. Wickliffe was at the private table with me. During this time Mr. W. was never in your room, or ever sent any enquiry for you as far as came to my knowledge. When I left the room, as stated, I left your brother William to stay with you until my return. After the adjournment of the house, I staid in your room until you removed, when I brought you home.

R. J. BRECKINRIDGE.

LOUIS MARSHALL.
Lexington, May 3, 1841.

Allow me also, to call your attention to the following statement:

IN relation to Mr. Wickliffe's personal attentions to my brother during his illness at Frankfort, in the winter of 1828-9, I can only say that, I did not reach my brother for some days after his sickness commenced; that although I was not wish him the whole of its continuance, I was a great part, I think much the greater part—that when there, I was seldom out of the room many minutes at a time, and have no recollection whatever of having seen Mr. Wickliffe in it during the winter, or of having heard any thing of his attentions. It is proper, however, for me to add, which I do with a very distinct and grateful recollection of the circumstance, that our friends were so abundant and kind in their attentions, that those of no particular individual were absolutely required.

Louisville, March 22d, 1841.

W. L. BRECKINRIDGE.

In addition to this, I feel authorized to refer to David Castleman and James H. Allen, Esq's., who are the only gentlemen of the

number who laid me under lasting obligations by their kindness at that period, with whom I have had an opportunity to confer particularly on this matter.

I have gone over this part of our case thus minutely, not so much on account of its intrinsic importance, as because of my peculiar abhorrence of the particular offence herein charged upon me. If I know my own heart, it is a grateful heart; prompt—it may be, too prompt perhaps in taking fire at intentional indignities and insults, even more than at real injuries, of which I think I am patient; but utterly incapable of forgetting benefits—of slighting affection—of requiting kindness with ingratitude. In my estimation, ingratitude is not a vice; it is a crime. I have therefore thought it my duty to put in the clearest light the falsity of your assertions, in this behalf, as relating to me personally; as I will now proceed to do the groundlessness of those which impeach me on the basis of your intimacy with, and services to my father; concerning whom you boastfully say in the foregoing extract, that you were his “*friend while living,*” “*the defender of his fame when dead.*”

What may have been the precise relations between yourself and my honored father, I cannot, of course, personally know, since he died before I had reached my seventh year. It has, however, as far as I know, always been the opinion of the whole connexion into which you married, at your first nuptials, that that marriage was the earliest decisive step in your fortunes; and that the notice of my father, and of your brother-in-law, General Howard, were your earliest passports into society and at the bar. How you requited the kindness of the latter, I shall not take upon me, at present, to display; how that of the former, I leave others to decide, after your controversy and mine is finished. You have yourself said to me, (*letter of August 29, 1832, p. 34.*) “I had a debt of gratitude to discharge to your father’s family, for his kindness to my wife;” and to my brother William you have said, (*letter of June 22, 1832, p. 14.*) speaking still of your first wife and our father, “He was her best friend and kind benefactor.” It is also true, as I suppose you will hardly deny, that my father was the tender and faithful friend of your present wife, and the steadfast and valued counsellor of her excellent mother, in their orphanage and widowhood, up to the hour of his own death; and that from the earliest settlement of the country, till your marriage into that family, the widow, the child, and the grand child of John Todd, and the entire family of John Breckinridge, were united by ties of friendship, cemented through three generations. Sir, there are things that might be said here, and I am not sure I am faithful to the memory of one of the earliest and dearest friends of my childhood, in leaving them unsaid; the bare recital of which, in the public ear, would be deemed, by any honorable man, a dear purchase of all the undeserved wealth conferred upon you by that generous family. *Conferred, did I say? It was a hasty expression.* I will qualify it a little, and venture an opinion, which may be of some importance to you, and for which, though it is professional, I will charge you nothing. Those deeds of settlement; you have ridiculously enough accused me of prying

into and exposing your private affairs. My answer, if any were necessary to such a charge, under such circumstances, would be—*first*, that when a man puts a deed on record, he does it precisely, that it may be private no longer, and that all the world may note its contents; and, *secondly*, that I noticed the matter no farther than to prove that you were more an abolitionist than I, on your own showing, with this difference, however, that I set my own slaves free, without being paid for them; while you set your wife's free, and got a princely fortune for doing it. But did you get it? Will those deeds pass it? This, sir, is the point on which I venture to give you a legal opinion. I predict to you now—note it down by the side of your scornful declarations of my incompetency as a lawyer—I predict to you, that those deeds, whenever the question is fairly made, will turn out to be absolutely void, as being utterly at war with some of the most sacred principles of equity, and some of the clearest maxims of law. This will be remembered, when you and I are dead.

But to return. The obligations you were under to my father are confessed. The evidences of any special intimacy, and more particularly of any ground of obligation on our part to you, upon the basis of our father's intimacy with you, or his obligations to you, are not only utterly unknown to the whole family, but are precisely and explicitly denied. I speak now of your relations with my father during his life. Your alleged services to his family, collectively and individually, after his death, are distinct matters, to be treated of in their proper places. Your speech contains two allegations to sustain your general statements on this particular subject, which I will now examine.

The first relates to a suit of one Wood, of Va., or his representatives, against the administrators of my father, for certain monies, which you say my father was represented to have collected and kept; and about which you give a long story, embracing your services in it, and a visit to my mother founded on it. The story is told on pages 7 and 8 of your speech of November 9, 1840. The extract which follows is from the latter page:

The suit was shortly called, and the administrators being wholly unprepared, I with great difficulty got the case postponed until I could go, myself, and search Mr. Breckinridge's papers for evidence, pledging myself to make no further resistance to the claim, if I found no evidence against it among his papers. On the next Sunday, (for then the sun shone but few Sabbaths on me,) I repaired, for the first time, to the desolate mansion of my departed friend, which, in his palmy days, I had visited as the happy residence of the most accomplished gentleman and talented man I ever knew. It was my fate to find no human being at home but his bereaved and disconsolate wife. I told her my business. She handed me the key to her husband's papers, at which the tears streamed from her eyes. I found his papers in such order as to stamp the mind with a thorough conviction that he was a fair and honest man, for he seemed to have retained the evidence of his whole life and transactions with perfect security. Among these thousands of papers, I at last found Weed's papers, and, to my joy, discovered that the suit was a gross fraud, and the tale a vile slander. The papers and the vouchers showed that Weed had been paid every farthing, and was debtor to Mr. Breckinridge, nine shillings. I soon put an end to the suit and an end to the calumny.

I find, through professional counsel, that a suit was brought in Fayette, *Wood vs. Breckinridge's Adm'rs*; no date to the declara-

tion, nor is it stated on it when it was filed, but a *capias* amongst the papers directs the sheriff to summon the defendants to appear at the *September term*, 1809. The declaration is endorsed, "*Dismissed for want of prosecution.*" Barry, for plaintiff; Clay, for defendants. So far, then, as the record goes, it appears that the suit was never tried, and that you never had any thing to do with it. The danger and the calumny of which you speak, as well as the great zeal, success and friendship of which you boast, having existed only in your own imagination. But I thought it worth while to quote the passage from your speech, chiefly on account of the narrative it gives of your visit to Cabell's Dale, and your interview with my mother, and your inspection of my father's papers. All this, *I am authorized, by the highest authority to say, is pure fiction; absolute fabrication.* In a letter to me, dated March 6, 1841, my venerable parent, speaking of this particular matter, positively denies that you were ever on terms of intimacy in my father's house; and says in terms, "*I never gave him access to your precious father's papers in my life.*" This decisive testimony is confirmed by the best of all witnesses, as you must believe, viz: yourself. If you will examine your copy of your 38 page letter of August 29, 1832, you will find, on p. 3-5, a statement of this Wood's case, differing materially from your published account of it; and especially in two points, conclusive of the matter now in hand. For you say, in the *first* place, (p. 3,) that *prejudices* existed in our family against you; that they were strengthened by your bringing a suit against them in the name of William Breckinridge; and (p. 14,) that "no intercourse of a family character took place"—such are your words—till your alleged appearance in this Wood's case; that is, for *three years* immediately following my father's death. And, in the *second* place, you give (p. 5) quite another version to your famous visit to Cabell's Dale, after a confessed absence of three years. Here you say, "Before the next court, I visited your mother; examined and found myself, or received from Harrison, whom I directed also to search, a bundle, labelled, Major Wood's papers," &c. Sir, have I spoken too hardly of you, where I have said, you had two tongues and no memory?

Let us now try your *second* specification, to prove your intimacy with my father, and kindnesses conferred on him, and by consequence, my dreadful ingratitude in defending my character, my principles, and my conduct, against your vile calumnies. On p. 7, *speech Nov. 9, 1840*, you say:

I had known Mr. Breckinridge long, and in the latter part of his life our acquaintance ripened into an intimate and family friendship, and no man living or dead ever had more of my respect and esteem. I witnessed his last moments, and bore him to his grave, where I mingled my tears with those of his bereaved family and friends.

This is the *last version* of your conduct during my father's last illness. Your *second version*, given in your speech, as delivered, was, that you had tenderly and assiduously, watched by him, as a tried friend, according to the simple and affectionate manners of our country, during his last protracted and fatal sickness.

Your *first and earliest version* of the story, known to me, is con-

tained in your letter of August 29, 1832. You will find it on p. 3. I give it in your own words: "I visited him on his death bed, and "the few moments I was (alone) with him, convinced me, that in "the event of his death, he expected my friendship to his family. "I parted with him most friendly, scarcely hoping to see him living "again, promising to return, &c.; but, alas, I was doomed to see "him again but a lifeless corpse," &c. It is your part, not mine, to reconcile these statements with each other; and when you have done so, perhaps those which follow will enable you to perceive the difference between the truth and every allegation on your part, that any thing occurred at the death, any more than during the life of my father, to justify your unfounded, indelicate, and repeated boasts and accusations on this subject.

THE MEADOW, JUNE 30th, 1841.

Rev. Robt: J. Breckinridge.

My Dear Sir:—In conformity with your expressed wish, I now answer the questions proposed. With a view that my answers may be certainly correct, I have referred to my day book, on which I kept a record of each day's business: On the 30th of Oct., 1806, I was sent for to the residence of the Hon. John Breckinridge; where I met in consultation Doctors Tood, Marshall, and Walter Warfield—that I attended very constantly from that day until the 14th of December, on which day I believe Mr. Breckinridge died—Dr. Marshall or Dr. Watson, or both, were (the latter part of his illness) nearly all day and night in the house; and at any time when I was there, and that nearly daily, I have no recollection of seeing Mr. Robt. Wickliffe at the house; neither do I remember of seeing him at his burial. If there was a personal intimacy existing between Mr. Breckinridge and Mr. R. Wickliffe, I did not know it. I am respectfully,

Yours obt'y.

E. WARFIELD.

LEXINGTON, MAY 3d, 1841.

Dear Sir:—You desire to be informed what I know as to Mr. Robt. Wickliffe, Sen. having nursed your father at any time during his last illness. In answer to this inquiry, I state, I attended your father without intermission during his last illness, and sat up with him the forepart of every night until the evening but one preceding the day of his death, (as informed afterwards by his attendants.) During this time I never saw Mr. R. Wickliffe at the house, nor did I ever hear of his being there. I was with Mr. B. from the 18th of October to the 12th of December inclusive, he having died on the 14th, in the morning. I saw all the family of the Grove (except Mr. W. and lady,) at Mr. B.'s during my attendance, and left Mr. B. Howard with Mr. B. when an appointment previously made, rendered my going to Frankfort indispensable.

Robt. J. Breckinridge.

LOUIS MARSHALL.

To these proofs, furnished by the surviving physicians, I add a few words, from the letter of my mother, already referred to, of March 6, 1841. Speaking of you and your statements on the present subject, she writes: "He never nursed your deceased and "ever lamented father. I don't recollect ever to have seen him at "my house, during his long illness. If he was at his funeral, I did "not know it." In what light does the subject now appear to you?

Perhaps it is as well, while we are on this general subject of *ingratitude*, to go through with it; for you charge me with forgetting your services and friendship, not only to my father, but to his heirs in general, and to several of them in particular. You carefully set forth your claims on me, for having served my sister; and then again, for having served my brother Cabell; and still more elaborately, for having *intended* to serve me; a beneficent purpose, which my

alleged intractableness, haughtiness, and general worthlessness, unhappily defeated. As it regards my brother, it is perfectly notorious in the country, that his standing, whether personal, professional, or political, was as compared with yours, when you and he were on the theatre together; such, that if there was any patronage in the case, it was your part to receive, not to confer it. In what you say about my sister, you go into particulars, and therefore, put it in my power to show your constitutional bias. On the 12th and 13th pages of your speech, you tell a long story about a most important service rendered to her at very great personal sacrifice to yourself, and that your influence over *Mr. Charles Carr* was successfully exerted to prevent him from pushing for a certain debt; and conclude by saying, the service was gratuitous. As to this last point I am not able to speak, as I have not access to the books of Alfred Grayson's trustees, by whom you confess, on p. 17 of your letter of August 29, 1832, you were employed. But a friend, who conversed with Mr. Carr, at my instance, informs me, that he says you are entirely mistaken, in so far as relates to him; for he actually proceeded, and made his debt. You must permit me also to doubt your accuracy, both as to the general extent, and still more as to the gratuitousness of your services, both to the trustees of Alfred Grayson, and to the estate of my sister; both of which are paraded with much pretension by you. For, in the first place, you confess, on p. 17, of your letter of August 29, 1832, that you were paid \$25 by General Robert Breckinridge, one of Mr. Grayson's trustees, for certain professional services for the trust estate, thereby showing your relations to that estate; and, secondly, however true it may have been, that you were employed on some special business by those trustees, about which I know nothing, it is hardly probable, that you did their general business, as two out of the three (Cabell Breckinridge and Frederick Grayson,) were themselves eminent lawyers. As regards your relations to my sister, you shall yourself be my witness. In your letter of August 29, 1832, p. 3, you thus write: "Mr. Grayson, I understood, was appointed or assumed the duty of the lawyer, declaring, that when he wanted counsel, he would engage me, *your sister protesting that I should have nothing to do with the business,*" &c. You then go on to explain the origin of this prejudice, which you trace back to a period several years anterior to the death of my father; and afterwards show, that it increased to a total separation of the families, which you confess lasted till your famous and fictitious visit about "Major Woods's papers," in 1809. I confess to you, that this early contempt and aversion of my sister for you, which you were the first to inform me of, is a very remarkable evidence of that elevation of character and force of understanding, which distinguished her through life, and made her one of the most remarkable women of her age. And I venture to suggest, that with many hundreds, perhaps thousands of persons, in our wide spread country, your confession, that the late Mrs. Porter, from her early womanhood, throughout her greatest trials, equally as during her subsequent brilliant life, absolutely refused to trust, or even to employ you; will be the last proof you could adduce that you were

ever worthy of the friendship, or had earned the gratitude of her family.

In immediate connexion with the general subject, which we have just been considering, are others closely connected with it. Having elaborately set forth our ingratitude in contrast with the *greatness* of your services, you carefully explain that they have been, in reality, *gratuitous*. Let us now examine that. On the 12th page of your speech, the following paragraph occurs :

Fellow citizens, I have only adverted to the prominent cases and services rendered to the estate of the gentleman's father. While his children were in infancy and unable to help themselves, I performed other and numerous services for them; I performed the duties of agent, attorney, paymaster and friend; I caused witnesses to be summoned, surveys to be made, and, for the family, advanced the fees when called on—for all which, I never asked or presented a fee bill, until I argued the last suit, and then did not charge, for all I did, what would have been charged by many lawyers, for the single suit of Ross and Carneal against Preston and Breckinridge; and a part of that pittance was paid in a most iniquitous demand on my brother, which the reverend gentleman coerced, of the injustice of which he was fully notified.

What may have been the true extent or value of your services to the estate of my father, it is not possible for me, at this time, to ascertain. Whatever they were, you deserved proper compensation for them—(of which more presently)—and were also entitled to due consideration and respect on the part of those you served. It is notorious, however, that my father left a very large estate, which was so entirely free from embarrassment, that the proceeds of the sale of that part of it which was most perishable, not only discharged all its debts, but divided many thousands amongst his children. So that all pretence of there having been any necessity for gratuitous, and especially, pecuniary aid from you, is about as well founded as the insinuation that you were a man either able or disposed to extend charity to us, or that we were people likely to receive it. The difficulties of the estate were such as grew out of executory contracts; and these almost exclusively in regard to lands; and even taking all your statements as true, the evident fact is, that our claims very greatly exceeded our liabilities, and that we have gained very much more than we have lost on this score; and the estate, ample at my father's death, has had large additions made to it since. That your professional service were the only cause of our prosperity and success, may perhaps be modestly doubted, when it is considered, that from 1804, (two years before my father died,) till 1830, (one year after the arguments of *Breckinridge's Adm'rs. vs. Ormsby*, which you say was "*the last suit*" you argued,) there was an uninterrupted succession of lawyers in our own family, who devoted themselves, for twenty-five years, to all our business. It is also to be considered, that at various periods, other lawyers, and they the most distinguished in the Commonwealth, James Hughes, John Allen, Henry Clay, Martin D. Hardin, J. J. Crittenden, James Haggin, R. H. Chinn, James Denny, S. S. Nicholas, Garnett Duncan, and many others, were employed from time to time, in various, difficult, and important business of the estate; and that you, sir, were often, on your own showing, employ-

ed adversely to us, sometimes to our vexation, and sometimes to our loss. For example, I think you sued us *twice* in the name of Howard, after the death of General Benjamin Howard, who was the near kinsman and confidential friend of our father; a third time in the name of Wm. Breckinridge, who was his brother; a fourth time on the claim of Green, by which you gained a large estate, and my sister Porter lost one, that we had to replace; as a fifth case of favor to us, we surely ought to be thankful, that you, as the attorney of Morrison, who was the executor of Nicholas, defeated Lee, and so turned him over on us for about \$7,400; (*see p. 13, letter 29th August, 1832;*) and as a sixth special mercy, you are now, and have been for some years back, trying in the name of Tiernan and other parties, to prevent us from recovering those \$7,400, which we have paid *for some body*, but for whom it seems hard to find out, and you having been, by turns, lawyer for nearly all the parties in the case, have tried successively to show *was for no body in particular*. When all these matters are considered, I think I may venture to conjecture, that your habitual modesty has for once forsaken you, and that in the general statement of your services and relations to us, you have gone a little, a very little, over the mark.

What I cordially admit, however, is that you ought to have been paid, fees, advances, out door work and all. And I will contend, on your behalf, even against myself—that twenty-two or three years are too long to keep you waiting—and that you ought by all means to have presented your bills before 1829. You have doubtless been a greatly injured man. But let us compose ourselves, and examine together, the weighty allegations of this extract—which contains the essence of what is distributed over many of your pages.

You positively assert, that you never presented a bill against my father's heirs, for services rendered and money advanced for the estate, *until you had argued the last suit*. This *last suit* is clearly identified in your speech—the 11th page of which is devoted to it. It was the suit in chancery, *Breckinridge's administrators vs. Ormsby*, an appeal from Jefferson county, about which I have already said so much. It was argued in the Court of Appeals on the 15th, 16th, 17th, and 19th days of Jan., 1829, as already proven at large. Appended to the opinion of Chief Justice Robertson in this case, is the usual notice of counsel, from which it appears that '*Chinn*' was with '*Wickliffe*,' in the argument for the appellants (the same gentleman, whom you lose no opportunity of insinuating evil against, in all the manuscript letters before me;) and I remember that the case below was managed with great ability by Mr. Duncan, and prepared with much labor and learning above, by your son-in-law, the present Judge Woolley, upon whose brief, I think, you argued the case. But no matter; you have forgotten that any one else ever had any part in the cause—and as it was your "*last suit*" for us—we will pass over your left-handed compliments, to your colleagues and kinsman. Until after the 19th of January, 1829, you "*never asked or presented a fee bill*"—this is the point at present.

Now, sir, my first difficulty is, that this statement, like about nine-tenths of your speech, is not what you delivered; but what on second thought, you chose to publish. Your original statement was, that you had never at any time, charged my father's heirs any thing at all; and this was stated in order to prove the blackness of my ingratitude, against one who had served me and mine, so long and so largely—without charge. That you really made that statement, let the following proof show:

MR. BRECKINRIDGE: We, whose names are hereunto affixed, have no hesitation in saying that we heard that part of Mr. Robert Wickliffe's Speech, which was delivered in the Court-house yard, in answer to you, on the 12th day of October, 1840, and we distinctly understood him to say that he had never put pen to paper to charge your father's heirs one cent for any legal service rendered by him.

ROBERT S. RUSSELL,
JAMES C. TODD,
D. M. CRAIG,
C. M. CLAY,

JAMES H. ALLEN,
THOS. S. REDD,
CHAS. McDOWELL,
BEN. WARFIELD,

April 12, 1841.

I understood him to say he had made no charge for services rendered to the family of Mr. Breckinridge as a lawyer. D. A. SAYRE.

It is for you, sir, to reconcile these statements. To me, it is of little consequence which you select to stand by, since both are false, as I will prove by yourself. Falstaff was accustomed to say, that he was not only witty himself, but the cause of wit in others; and I may, without a metaphor, say of your 38 page letter of Aug. 29, '32, that it is not only a repository of untruths, but also of the means of detecting your other untruths. See what is written on page 27: "When I was compelled to remind you, that it was necessary, that we should settle our accounts, you asked me to make it out. I told you that I had done so and handed it to your brother, J. C. Breckinridge; you replied that you had lost it or had never seen it; and sir you made this statement with my account in your possession as certainly as you live, for after you commenced your prosecutions against me, you admitted that you had the account I had given your brother, but only wanted to see if I would make out such another." Passing by the portion of this extract, which was only intended to give offence, and which needs no reply; we have here the most positive contradiction of Robert Wickliffe in 1832, against Robert Wickliffe in 1840. At the latter period he publishes to the world that he had "never asked or presented a fee bill" before January, 1829, when he argued the last suit; at the former, he asserts with insult, that he had made out and presented his account to my brother, before September, 1823, when he departed this life.—Pray, sir, do you know this distinguished witness, and can you tell us at which end of these seven or eight years, he is to be believed? But this is not all; for on the next preceding page of the letter (p. 26) the same disinterested gentleman, who asserted before hundreds of his neighbours in October, 1840, that he "had never put pen to paper to charge" my "father's heirs," not only abuses me roundly in August, 1832, for not having paid him his fees before, but charges me (falsely of course) with a design to plead the statute of limitations against him

—all which, he says he defeated, by notifying me that he would file a Bill in chancery! Nor is this all; for on the 32d page of the same letter, this honest gentleman actually sets forth items of cash received, on account of John Breckinridge's heirs credited by himself, viz: \$155, "Michael's hire for two years," and \$163,46, "cash received of H. Grubbs, in a judgment." The *dates* of these payments are suppressed. After all, however, it is a hard thing to hide the truth. If the *name* of the servant as well as the period of his hiring had been suppressed, I would have had no means of fixing the date of the payment. As it is, I can do it precisely. There was only one slave of the name of Michael, or as he was familiarly called *Mike*, belonging to my father's estate; and he was a man, in many respects remarkable, and was particularly associated with some of my boyish recollections. I remembered that this man, was one of the slaves assigned to my mother as part of her dower—and therefore as you had hired him from the estate of my father, it must have been before its division; whereupon I set to examining the accounts of those "incompetent" administrators, whom you condemn with so little ceremony. In a list furnished as part of the account of Robert C. Harrison, and so settled on the 30th June, 1812, by Richard Higgins, Elisha Meredith and John D. Young, Commissioners, are the following entries; under the year 1810, thus, '*Mike Mr. Wickliffe, £75;*' and under the year 1811, thus, "*Mike Mr. Wickliffe, \$80.*" In the letter of *this same Mr. Wickliffe*, of August 29, 1832, it stands thus, "*Michael's hire for two years, \$155.*" So, sir, it seems that you "*voluntarily took upon yourself the whole of the business of the late Mr. Breckinridge's estate*" [p. 8, *Speech of Nov. 9, 1840,*] from about the period of Michael's hiring. I leave it to the public to judge, whether it is more likely that this *unsolicited* beginning of services, labors, and advances, which have proved so onerous to you, was out of pure charity to us, or with an eye to \$155 "*for Michael's hire for two years,*" and to \$163,46 "*cash received of H. Grubbs in a judgment.*" As to the charges made against the cash admitted to have been received, they seem to be items mostly trumped up for the occasion; and are generally such, as if true, could have no place in an account with the estate, or heirs general of my father; for example, "\$150 cash paid to Davis, for Mercer, for J. C. Breckinridge; and again, "cash sent widow, \$35;" again, "cash paid in the suits of Logan and Martin \$100;" in all cases dates suppressed. This "cash sent widow," you admit (*on p. 29, bottom, letter 29th August, '32,*) was paid to the widow of my brother Cabell, not of my father; and in the same connexion say that these suits 'of Logan and Martin' were his suits and not my father's; and moreover you distinctly say of Martin's case, "*the costs all fell on me,*" and of Logan's case, "*I paid all the costs of the suit.*" And yet you charge against Breckinridge's estate, money said at one time to be paid out of your pocket, and at another said to be paid for J. C. Breckinridge; all the while saying your services were gratuitous!

With this fatal account you mix up the bond of Mr. Charles A. Wickliffe, late Governor of Kentucky, which is made the basis of a

charge of dishonesty against me, and which I now proceed to explain. In the case of *Breckinridge's administrators vs. Beall's administrators and others*, which has been fully explained, J. Lewis, as commissioner, sold portions of the mortgaged property on the 26th June, 1820, and again on the 2d of May, 1822. At the latter sale your brother, *Charles A. Wickliffe, Esq.*, became the purchaser of Lot No. 56, [in Bardstown, I suppose] at the price of \$265, and executed his bond with J. M. Wright, for that sum. At these sales your brother, as I have every reason to believe, acted for my father's heirs, who were always willing and ready to pay him for his services, as well as to acknowledge them. But it is also true, as I have always understood, that your brother was a good deal interested in the property mortgaged to us, and therefore we always thought that an act of friendship had been extended to him by our brother, in giving him a certain control over these sales. And in point of fact the matter was so managed, that while your brother, "in bidding to save his property, bought in a piece of the mortgaged property at about \$250," as you express it, [p. 5, letter of June 22, 1822] and did "save his property;" another purchaser under Beall, whose property was also covered by our mortgage, viz: Peter B. Ormsby, was saddled with the bulk of the debt, amounting before he finally paid it, if we believe your speech of November 9, 1840, p. 10, to "nearly ten thousand dollars," or if we believe your letter of June 22, 1832, "to about 7 or 8,000 dollars. You are well aware, that Ormsby was so outraged by the result of these proceedings at Bardstown and with having certain property he had purchased from Beall, and sold to Smiley, run up on him, that he refused utterly to pay his bonds; and when he was sued on them, went into chancery, in order to invalidate if he could, the original mortgage from Beall to my father, and thus escape what he considered the hardship if not the imposition, which had been practised on him, to save your brother's property. This is the very case already explained at large, which came up and was argued in January, 1829, as your "*last suit*" for us; and the whole difficulty arose out of transactions, connected with which your brother's bond had its origin.

After the death of my brother Cabell, these matters devolved on me, and in my arrangement of so much of them as relates to your brother Charles, you have said I acted every how basely. First, that the demand itself was "most iniquitous;" secondly, that its 'injustice' was fully explained to me—[both of which charges are contained in the foregoing extract;] thirdly, that the professional services of your brother in this business, were worth more than the amount of his bond; [letter June 22, '32, p. 5, 6:] fourthly, that the settling of the bond of your brother with you in the way of your fees, was a simple robbery of you—as you never intended to take the amount of him, [letter of August 29, 1832, p. 32.]

At this point, sir, be pleased to read the letters which follow. I have no copies of my letters to which the two first of these appear to be replies; but I hereby authorize Governor Wickliffe to hand the originals to you—or publish them, at his discretion.

WASHINGTON CITY, Dec. 6th, 1823.

Dear Sir:—Your letter under date of the 10th Nov., I have received. I did act as the quasi agent of my *friend*, your brother, in the business against the estate of Beall. A sale, or sales of property was made under the decree alluded to by you, a Report of which made by Gen. Lewis, commissioner, I gave your brother about twelve months, to be filed in the Fayette Circuit Court. Under the last sale by reference to the report, it will be seen that a tract of land was sold to Mr. Kelly for \$1001, he at first refused to give bond as required. Afterwards, your brother, or I did for him, compromised; by which means he transferred to him the benefit of the purchase in full of the demand for his bid, this was done by my advice; the land lies in Ohio county, and is worth three times 1001 dollars. Several persons are living upon it under purchase from Beall after the date of your father's mortgage. Your immediate attention ought to be given to this business. You had better see Mr. Jo. Allen, of Hardensburg, Breckinridge county, and take steps to evict the settlers.

You will find also by the Report that Gen. Thompson was a purchaser of a tract of land in Bath county; he failed to give bond. Your brother talked of proceeding against him, in the Fayette Court.

You will also find a bond of my own to the Commissioner for one lot. Which, upon my return home, and upon a Deed being made by order of the Court, I will settle.

I will not advise the quashing of the Beplevin bonds in Jefferson, &c. You will loose the debts if you do.

We are just carving out business; the hopes of the West, in relation to the Presidency, begin to brighten.

I am, with sentiments of friendship and regard,
Your ob'dt. servant,

R. J. Breckinridge.

C. A. WICKLIFFE.

WICKLAND, OCT. 1st, 1830.

Dear Sir:—Yours of the — ultimo was received, an *immediate* answer as requested by you was not given, owing to my absence at court.

I was surprised I can assure you, that I was so called upon to discharge a debt which I had considered settled by the understanding between us more than twelve months ago. *Robert Wickliffe was indebted to me, and I agreed with him to offset the amount.* It is a matter of no moment to me to whom the money is paid, except that I am not prepared now to settle it, not anticipating the payment in any other mode than as above. I expect to be in Frankfort the 2d week in October, when I hope to see you and R. Wickliffe, and have the subject arranged.

I am respectfully, your ob't. servant,

R. J. Breckinridge.

C. A. WICKLIFFE.

LEXINGTON, OCT. 28th, 1830.

Dear Sir:—I had expected to have seen you in this place, upon the subject of the note of mine, but am disappointed. If you will transfer the note to my brother, I will arrange it with him. By law and the terms of the note I am compelled to pay interest, but submit it to yourself to determine, whether in justice it ought to be exacted for the period the whole business was suspended by the bill of Ormsby against your father's heirs; during which time I never took possession or used the Lot, for I did not wish to subject myself to be sued by Beall, or to pay him rents, nor had I a deed made by which I could have protected my possession. Under these circumstances, equity and justice would seem to say, during the pendency of that suit I ought not to be charged with interest.

I have a claim for my services in superintending the sales and other business connected with this transaction equal to \$20, which I hope you will feel yourself authorized to allow by a credit on the note at its date. At all events, I hope to be able to settle this demand in the course of the spring, not sooner.

I am respectfully, your ob't. serv't,

R. J. Breckinridge.

C. A. WICKLIFFE.

These letters, put beyond all controversy, the perfect equity of the debt, even in the estimation of the debtor himself; they show precisely the relations of Governor Wickliffe to the case and to my brother; they establish the amount at which he valued his services, (\$20 instead of some hundreds,) and they prove that you owed him, instead of his owing you. That is, they prove all your charges, without exception—false.

You will observe the length of time between the dates of the first and last of these letters—nearly seven years. The intervening time was diligently occupied by us with Peter B. Ormsby, in bringing the principal debt and cause, in the whole transaction, to a close; which was effected on the 16th April, 1829, by the final decree of the Court of Appeals in our favor.

You will observe also, in the second of these letters, that there appears to have been a previous arrangement, a year before its date—that you were to take up this bond; and that as matters stood at the date of the letter, this arrangement seemed likely to fall through. On a previous page of this defence, you will see a clue to this difficulty. You were afraid to render an account lest it should not tally with one you had previously rendered to my brother before his death; and when at last you rendered it, and sent it to me through Judge [then Major] Woolley—there was a difficulty in settling it on account of your having mixed up the accounts of the heirs general, with one against one of the heirs individually, (the late Mrs. Porter, as I remember,) I as trustee, being responsible only for the former. Major Woolley withdrew the account to enable you to make this change; after which period, I have no recollection of the account's having been returned—nor can I since, on repeated search, find either it or your brother's bond. Amid these difficulties, I wrote to your brother; his second letter above, is the reply.

You will also observe a question of interest, stated in the third letter of your brother. On page 32 of your letter of August 29, 1832, you state his bond at \$250, and give us credit for that sum. But the bond was \$265, with interest from May 22, 1822, till paid—say till the spring of 1831, the earliest period at which it could be paid, as he says in the close of his third letter; that is nine years, equal to \$143,10, or a round sum of \$408, subject to his fee, whatever that might be. Whether this interest was really charged, I cannot say, having neither your account nor the bond; but that it ought to have been charged, seems to me very clear, since the delay of payment was the act and for the benefit of the debtor. If he chose to await the chances of Ormsby's success, it is surely most just that we should not be deprived of the benefit of his defeat. I cannot say, however, how this part of the matter was arranged. If you keep any books they should show. The only entry in my own day book, touching the whole subject of your fees, that I can at present find, during or since 1830, is in these words, viz: "1830, March 15, J. Breckinridge's estate, Dr. to cash paid Wickliffe and Woolley in part for fees in various suits; see their account when settled, \$55,00." This date and payment were anterior to any difficulty with you; my first No. of "*Hints on Slavery*," being published on the 9th of June, 1830; and the order in chan-

cery, in *Breckinridge's heirs vs. Lee's executors* against Owings for £1704, 14, 6, being made on the 7th April, 1830; and the county canvass for 1830, as you have repeatedly written and printed, not having commenced till I had *finished* my Nos. on Slavery. I take it, therefore, that this \$55, was in addition to your brother's bond, the supposed amount of your fees, in full, while you were yet in a good humor—and had not discovered, that in order to wrong my father's heirs, it was necessary to ruin me, seeing you could neither seduce nor befool me; and in order to open a wider row for yourself in pulic life, it was necessary to put me aside, seeing I could neither be coaxed nor bullied into the support of measures I did not approve.

Upon the whole, the proof is positive, 1. That your spoken and printed statements are wholly irreconcilable with each other. 2. That both are false; it is false that you made no charges at all, it is also false that you made none till 1829. 3. That instead of performing legal services gratuitously, you were paid some hundreds of dollars by my father's administrators, a portion of it as far back as 1810-11; again stated your account fully to the trustee of the estate, during or before 1823, and were probably paid by him; and again stated it with clamour and indecent threats of suit, and paid in full by me in 1830-1. 4. That instead of acting with great generosity in this matter, you have made public demands on our gratitude, which were utterly unfounded; have denied payments proved to have been made to you; and have trumped up fictitious and futile offsets to those acknowledged. 5. That the demand against your brother, instead of being most iniquitous, was most just—and so confessed by himself. 6. That your brother's services, however well intended, instead of being of the great value you attach to them, were valued by himself at a very moderate rate—and were the source of many and serious difficulties to us. 7. That instead of his being your debtor, or your *giving* him the amount of his bond to us, by which you say we treated him and you both unjustly—the truth is that you were his debtor, and it was in reality a favor to you, and not to your brother or to us, to allow you to take up his bond in the way of your fees. 8. That to all appearance your purpose was to get double the amount of this bond, under pretence of settling it; once by getting credit with your brother Charles for its amount, and once again by getting us not to oblige you to credit us with the amount of it, under the double pretext that you would in that case lose it, and that your brother's services were worth the whole; which was, to say the least, pretty keen. This is the simple truth on this part of the case; and it puts our relations to you, in a posture, at which we at least, have no occasion to blush.

Let us pass now to another cluster of accusations. On p. 5, of your letter of August 29, 1832, you say: "Col. Morrison spoke to me to defend him in a suit brought by Lee's executors against him and Davis, executors of Nicholas, and your father's adm'rs. I did so, and finding that no effectual defence could be made, and that Mr. Clay had brought the suit wrong, I demurred to his *Decn.*, and had the suit dismissed. Mr. Clay thereafter sued your father's

"adm'rs only, and when I requested him to do so, he refused to sue "Nicolas's exec'rs. also." (See also p. 9, speech of Nov. 9, 1840.) It seems from this, that amongst your other claims upon our gratitude, one is that you prevented us, by some legal quibble, which as Col. Morrison's lawyer, you found occasion to employ, from paying, in 1808 or 9, one-third part of a just debt, which, if you had permitted us to pay it, would have cost us about \$2,000, for which we had a clear and perfect recourse to get it all back: and by this trick, you put us into a posture, in which we have been litigating up to this hour—have paid above \$7,400 as far back as ten years ago, and are now likely, if you can succeed against us, to lose every dollar of it, after more than thirty years of law suits. Being defeated in the joint action, Lee brought a separate one against us, to make us, for your sake, pay all, instead of one-third. When this suit was instituted, I am not able to say precisely. Many of the papers are missing, and after careful and repeated search, they seem to be lost; so counsel inform me. We find, however, that the suit was brought in Fayette, during or before 1811, in the name of *Lee's Executors vs. Breckinridge's Administrators*; that it was several times decided against us, and reversed in the Court of Appeals; and in March, 1823, was removed from Fayette to Woodford. In your letter of August 29, 1832, p. 18, you make two insinuations, which are characteristic of you: 1. That the case was lost in Woodford, on account of the improper "influence of J. J. Crittenden and others of the Lee family, in Woodford Circuit." 2. That for his own convenience, my brother Cabell, as you express it, "having, without consulting me, after he removed to Frankfort, consented to remove the suit from Lexington to Woodford." The reason for the removal, however, assigned on the record is, *that the presiding Judge in Fayette had been counsel in the case, and declined sitting*. In June, 1825, there was a verdict and judgment against us in Woodford; in June, 1827, the court of Appeals affirmed the whole; and in September following, the Woodford court entered final judgment against us. In reference to this case, and this stage of it, you speak as follows, in your speech of Nov. 9, 1840, p. 10 and 11:

The reverend gentleman told me that Mr. Price, the agent for Lee's executors, would coerce the payment immediately, by execution on his father's negroes or lands, unless he would give his own bond with John W. Hunt, John Brand, or myself, payable in twelve months, for the debt, and as he could not give either of these gentlemen, he had no reliance but myself. I had suffered severely by being surety, and had no money to pay the debt with if the gentleman failed. I did not believe that if he settled fairly with his father's estate he was worth any thing; but he was John Breckinridge's son, and the execution would fall immediately on the dower property in the hands of the widow. I knew the estate of the father, though greatly diminished, was still good, yet that I might have my property first sacrificed, and then have to wade through chancery for indemnity. Still, I joined the individual in a bond to the amount of the debt, under his solemn promise to push the suit against Ormsby, and to so arrange, as that the bond should be paid at maturity. Thus assured, I assisted that individual to prepare to meet the bond; but the year rolled round, and no money, except perhaps about one thousand dollars, was to be found; and Ormsby had enjoined the judgment against him, charging, in substance in his bill, that he was an under purchaser, &c.

Speaking of these same transactions, in your *letter of August 29, 1832, p. 27*, you use the following language: "*You never asked me what was my fee in the case, or to hand you my account of 23 years' standing. Nor have you, to this day, given me any evidence that my note, as your security, has been paid.*"

The suit referred to in this last extract, is the case of Ormsby, mentioned in the preceding one, and already much handled, as your "*last suit.*" In regard to your accounts, enough, I suppose you will agree, has been already said. And the security-ship spoken of in the two passages, is the same. For the rest, my defence is the same as continually heretofore, viz: that your statements are entirely destitute of truth; which I proceed to prove.

It is not true, that I ever told you Mr. Price would attempt to distress my father's estate; it is not true he ever did so; it is not true, as I verily believe, that he ever had any intention of doing so. So far otherwise is the truth, that Mr. Price, who knew me from a child, and who was to his death, my warm personal friend; never even put an execution into the hands of an officer, as the record shows;—never asked, never had security of any kind that I know of besides my naked, verbal promise, in addition to his judgment against my father's administrators; and after being at law with us from 1811 till 1827 and finally succeeding against us—he knew perfectly that the sole object of my father's administrators was to ascertain what ought to be done—and that it would then be done fairly and truly. Andrew F. Price was a man of tried honour and integrity; and a more signal proof, than the record in this case furnishes, that he confidently relied on me, as being both the one and the other, never existed. With a judgment against the large estate of my father—with the administrators aged, and, you assert, incompetent—he relied simply on my word, that he should receive seven or eight thousand dollars, more readily without, than by our legal process, as it then stood. He believed me—and I redeemed my word, in despite of intervening sickness, trials, and afflictions of no ordinary kind. Sir, what you bring against me, as ground for a calumny, is one of the proudest and most evident proofs of the uprightness of my life.

It is not true, that if execution had issued, it would have been against my mother's dower estate; the law, the state of the case, and the final judgment, all rendering the thing impossible; and if it were all true; my conduct under it would be only another evidence furnished by yourself against yourself, as my accuser. It is not true, that I was any more bound than all my co-heirs for this money, which was a judgment against the administrators; but several of these co-heirs were persons of immense wealth, and therefore the assertion that there was any difficulty about security, is altogether ridiculous. It is not true that I ever told you Mr. Hunt or Mr. Brand refused to go my security—nor is it true that they did so refuse; in regard to which, if you doubt, read their letters which follow. There is an error in the reference of Mr. Hunt, to Ormsby as the creditor instead of Lee; an error very naturally produced by your way of stating and jumbling up cases, when you wish to confuse a subject; but both the letters are *universal* in their terms.

LEXINGTON, FEB'Y 25th, 1841.

The Rev. ROBERT J. BRECKINRIDGE.

Dear Sir:—Your letter under cover of one from the Hon J. J. Crittenden, dated the 15th instant, received this morning. I have examined Mr. Wickliffe's speech, page 10, as referred to in your letter, in which he says that Mr. Price, agent for P. B. Ormsby, Esq., was willing to receive me with others as security for the debt due Mr. Ormsby; I have not the slightest recollection that you did apply in that or in any other case to become security for you.

Respectfully, your ob'dt. servant, JOHN W. HUNT.

LEXINGTON, 25th FEB'Y, 1841.

Rev. ROBT. J. BRECKINRIDGE.

Dear Sir:—Your favor of the 15th inst. was received by to-day's mail, calling my attention to the 10th page of Mr. Robert Wickliffe's second speech against you, where my name with others is mentioned; and stating that according to the best of your recollection you never asked me to unite with you as your security, in any case.

I answer you, my dear sir, that I was never asked by you to unite with you as security in any bond or note that I recollect of, nor do I believe you ever did so, or I should recollect it.

I am, dear sir, very respectfully,

Your ob'dt servant and friend,

JOHN BRAND.

But you say "*I joined the individual in a bond to the amount of the debt, &c.*" Was this a replevin bond? That cannot be; for no execution was ever in an officer's hand. Why should it be "*payable in twelve months,*" and why given to Mr. Price *individually*; when by both facts, he actually diminished his security; and in addition might have rendered himself liable for the debt? But still you joined in the bond; knowing all the while as you assert, that I was really a bankrupt, and worse still, a dishonest man; a man worth nothing if he settled fairly—and refusing to settle fairly! Really, sir, if this is all true, it reveals one of the most extraordinary and gratuitous procedures on record. But the truth is, no such thing ever took place. I have no recollection of any such bond; no body else, that I can find, of all those who acted for the Lee's, for Price, for us, or in the offices, know any thing about it; none of Price's receipts, say any thing of such a bond, nor does his account stated, covering the transaction, make any allusion to it. The allusions are frequent to the execution, (which he issued, and kept himself, to prevent the judgment from expiring;) but no hint of any bond. And, sir, to be plain, my firm belief is, that no such bond ever had an existence, except in your unfounded statements; and until some satisfactory proof to the contrary is produced, I shall feel obliged to presume, that as you have departed from the truth about every other item of this transaction, you have been consistent throughout.

In this state of case, you should not distress yourself too much, about this outstanding liability. But as you say, "nor have you till this day given me any evidence that my note as your security has been paid;" and I suppose, what you mean is that you have no evidence the amount recovered by Lee's executors has been paid them: in the hope of quieting your anxiety, I submit the following proof to you. I suppose, sir, you can hardly fail to consider it satisfactory; and in return for this quietus against your imaginary

bond, I hope you will try to remember that this large sum of money with much interest and costs, is the identical money which would have been paid to your old clients in 1831, but for you; the very money, which the estate you are enjoying should have paid to us above ten years ago.

I have this day examined the account and receipts of Andrew F. Price, (agent for Robert Alexander, surviving executor of John Lee,) of money received by said Price on account of the administrators of John Breckinridge, and find the following sums at the following times received for by Mr. Price, and stated by him to be endorsed on Executions, viz: 1828, January 7, \$1,000—May 21, \$361—September 30, \$1,000; 1829, February 4, \$1,624—May 11, \$21,13—July 13, \$3,300; 1830, February 23, \$69,00—April 27, \$47,20—October 23, \$16,86. This last receipt expresses on its face that it is "Supposed to be in full of an execution issued from the Woodford Circuit Court, in the name of Robert Alexander, Executor of John Lee, dec'd., against the administrators of John Breckinridge, dec'd;" and the full sum paid appears to be \$7,439,19, as stated by Mr. Price. These receipts are now in my possession to be filed, at the proper time, as exhibits in the Chancery suit depending in Fayette, in the name of Breckinridge's Adm'rs. vs. Lee's Executors and others; in which the recovery of this money is sought by the former.

Fayette County, August 13, 1841.

DAVID CASTLEMAN.

There is one remaining transaction, by which you have connected yourself with my father's estate—and the narrative of which you have interlarded with very indecent abuse of me; which I ought not to overlook. I quote a few passages. "I had discovered that "Mr. Breckinridge had a contract with J. Lewis, for one third of "what he could recover in a suit, Monson's heirs against Fisher, "Rice and others, for land near Nicholasville," (*speech Nov. 9, '40, p. 9.*) On the next page you mention this land again, in connexion with other claims, and the narrative proceeds thus: "A large "amount in value of them, as I was informed, was sold, and the "proceeds gambled off by the reverend gentleman, before the debt "of Lee's Executors fell upon his father's estate. (Here Mr. "Breckinridge demanded if Mr. Wickliffe asserted that to be a fact?) No, said Mr. Wickliffe, I only assert that I performed the "service, and that I was informed you had sold the lands and had "gambled off the money you had sold them for." Again, on page 14, you say, "Late in the session of 1828 I think a mutual friend "disclosed to me that he was ruining himself at Farro and other "games of chance." Again on page 20, "the gentleman has "spent thousands to learn Farro." Again on p. 23, recurring to the case of the land near Nicholasville, you say that except the case "of the gentleman with his aunt"—about which I incline to think you have heard enough—"that in Jessamine against Craig, Rice, "and others, were attended with as hard and cruel circumstances "as ever existed in the country. Men who risked their lives to make settlements and spent more than a quarter of a century in "improving their lands, were expelled from their homes, and the "gentleman, with the feeling of the lime stone, saw it unmoved, "sold the land and dissipated the price." Again, p. 40. "Yes "Presbyterians, has it come to this with your church, &c. that this "new recruit from the bar and gaming table, &c."

Now, sir, my first remark in regard to so much of these extracts as relates to the Jessamine land, is, that if any wrong was done in recovering it—you are guilty and I am not.—For the proceedings began as early as 1797, (several years before my birth)—and were all terminated before I had attained full age; and, as for yourself, you not only boast of the service you did us, in its recovery—but on pages 8 and 9, of your letter of August 29, 1832, there is a long account of your having actually *volunteered* your services for us in this case—and that in defiance of the efforts of Thomas Lewis, and the late Charles Humphreys, to hinder you. My second observation is that all you say about the hardship of this transaction rests wholly on your naked word; and that the character of my father who directed it till 1806, and that of my brother Cabell, who completed it while I was yet a minor, are, even by your own showing, clear and positive proof, that all you now say on this head is utterly untrue. In the third place I refer the public to *Maj. John H. Hanly*, of Jessamine, a man of as high character for justice and humanity, as any other, for the whole facts about this Jessamine land, and especially as it regards my connexion with it, which I will explain in a moment. Major Hanly purchased the interest of my father's heirs in the estate, and knows all about it. He has been good enough to send me a statement of the case, covering ten large pages. If you will learn the true history of the case from him, you will have another proof that no man can rely on any thing you say. My connexion with the business was of the simplest possible kind. After the death of my oldest brother, I found this estate, consisting of about three hundred and fifty acres, in the peaceable possession of the family. Major Hanly owned property adjoining it, and had rented this for several years. By certain family arrangements, the interest of two of the legal representatives of my father, was transferred to the rest of the family; I then purchased the interest of my brothers John and William—and the property thus belonged, as to three-fourths, to me individually, and as to one-fourth to my sister the late Mrs. Porter; whereupon we both sold to Maj. Hanly; I in person, and she by our brother William, as her attorney in fact; and to the purchaser I again appeal, that the entire doings of all our family—from 1797, till the last sale, were fair, open, simple, and beyond question, by an honest or reputable man. Your allegations, therefore, of my cruelty to "Craig, Rice and others," whose ruin you say "*I saw unmoved*," and with the knowledge of their injuries, inflicted by my father and brother, turned them out of doors; all this, first and last, is an unmitigated fabrication; as it regards me—destitute even of a pretext, as I had nothing on earth to do, either with the men or the business; and as it regards the honored dead—a slander, which I will allow you the grace to suppose, you will confess to be unfounded, so far as it relates to them.

As to what you say of the manner in which I disposed of the proceeds of this land—as well as your general charge against me as a gambler, and your low attempts to connect the charge with attacks upon me, as a member and a minister of the Presbyterian church; it can hardly be expected that I should make any formal

reply to such things from such a quarter. What I have done as a minister of the Gospel of God, may well form a part of that defence of my public conduct, which it may yet be my duty to write against you ; but every transaction of a private nature in regard to which you accuse me—took place as you well know, before I began to preach the gospel ; many of them indeed before I was born. Your attempts to injure me, as a minister, for defects of character or errors of conduct, manifested, while I made no profession of the religion of Jesus ; must be regarded by every just and candid man, as manifestations of a most depraved and malevolent disposition, even if you had truth on your side and were labouring under great provocation. But when you falsify and exaggerate without limit or restraint—when you do this as a persecutor—and do this against a servant of God who has borne much and in silence, and that for many years, to avoid you ; you cannot expect any thing else than the anger of God, and the abhorrence of all good men. Sir, I never professed to be any thing but a poor sinner ; and before the Lord, as I trust, called me into his kingdom—I was far more a sinner, than I hope I have been since. But that I was ever in any proper sense a gambler—or that I ever squandered my estate at play—is not only a most dreadful falsehood ; but it is notoriously the fact, that I was less edicted to this sin, than the mass of gentlemen of my time and condition in the West ; less so, than yourself, sir, and hundreds of other men, whose names you are not worthy to mention. The church which you hate almost as much as you do me, that church for whose sweet communion I have joyfully relinquished whatever hindered me of it ; is indeed, so far, worthy of your hate, that she has, far beyond my deserts trusted and honored me, and by the influence of her reflected confidence, far beyond my desires, made me an object of consideration amongst men.—I sought her ministry with one single aim ; to have space and opportunity to work for my master, during my brief and uncertain pilgrimage. What more I may have done for her, by God's grace—than her humblest son—was above my hopes ; what more she has bestowed upon me—beyond my deserts ; and I pray the Lord, as David did of old, that your cursings this day like the cursings of Shimei, may come in remembrance before him, as a ground of good unto me.

These constant attempts to wound me as a Christian, and disparage me as a minister, by reason of conduct and principles, true or false, charged against me, from my boyhood up ; have put you to some curious shifts, and seduced you into accusations, which if it were worth while, I could easily enough turn upon your own head with a frightful emphasis. Let us make one experiment as a sample, selecting the case paraded as most important by yourself. It occurs on the 23d and 24th pages of your speech. I quote so much of what you say, as will clearly exhibit your charges.

“ Never shall I forget my mortification when a man entered my room, in Frankfort, and asked me if I had heard the news ? I asked him what ? “ Why, Bob Breckinridge, last night, at the theatre, insulted Doctor Flournoy, in the presence of ladies, and the Doctor has challenged him, and he has refused to fight ; and the Doctor has posted him a coward all through town. Here is one of his adver-

tisements, which I have just pulled down in Weisiger's Bar-room." I read it, and for the first time, as I believe, saw in the gentleman's name, the long **J**. The wicked Doctor seemed to have made it double the common length, as much as to say, I don't care to disgrace him by the names his father gave him, but I wish to make my card especially apply to the name he has assumed, to make himself a great man and a counterfeit *bully*. "Where is Doctor Flournoy?" said I. "He has taken the street, waiting to catch Breckinridge," said he. "And where is Breckinridge?" "Safe soul, he is in that house where you see the door well shut. He is safe enough," said he, "the girls will protect him." "If that be the case, he had better compromise," said I. "So I think," said he. And so I learnt, thought this fiery *parson*. He was like, he said, his friend Thompson was, who thought prudence the better part of valor. I am really sorry to tell this upon this *Hot-spur* of a preacher; but when a *parson* hints at the days when he was a flint and trigger fowl, it is due to truth to let the world know that when he had a chance to fight, he raised his hack-feathers, and would not fight. * * * * Neither the gentleman nor any one else should mention a duel; and in *mercy* to him, tell him to strike out the long **J** which he has added to the name his father gave him, that his son may plead a misnomer to the Doctor's card, should it ever be thrown up to him."

If there be on earth a man, who should be dumb on the whole subject of duelling, that man is yourself. Above all men I ever knew, you are the one, that has been most frequently, most outrageously, most publicly—bullied and pushed to the wall; and now you deprive yourself by a formal avowal of principles favourable to personal combat, of your only excuse for covering before Col. Owings, General Bodley, John H. Morton, Col. James Johnson, John T. Mason, Sam'l Combs, S. M. Brown, George Shannon, John Rowan, and no body can tell how many more. Compromise a duel! Why sir, would it not have been better to have compromised on honorable terms, the duel in which your oldest son fell in your quarrel? Was it not better, far better, to compromise on honorable terms, even on the ground and with pistols in their hands, the duel in which your youngest son so lately risked his life in another of your quarrels? Was it not infinitely better, for your son-in-law, partly by reason of my own intervention, and that by your earnest solicitation—to pass by the public insults of J. G. Trotter, after your son had fallen by his hands—than to have shed his blood, or been slain by him, in what, (having studiously avoided it through life,) you are now pleased, when beyond the age of danger, to set forth as the proper duty of a gentleman? Sir, I must be allowed to express my abhorrence of your whole conduct in all this matter. If duels are to be fought—let every man fight his own. If men must be murdered, let every professor of the black art do his own killing. But for shame's sake, let us not pursue a line of conduct and advocate a set of principles, the combined effect of which is, to keep us safe, and bring ruin upon our friends. For myself, I thank God, I have no man's blood upon my conscience, I have slain no man, personally or by proxy; I have caused no man to be put to death, directly or indirectly. And strange as you may consider it, this reflection gives me more pleasure, than I should derive from the admission of all mankind, that I had more courage than Cæsar, Alexander, and Robert Wickliffe, combined. Yea sir, if it had been true, as you say, that Dr. Flournoy had frightened me nearly out of my wits; I would this day, a thousand

fold, prefer it should have been so, than to have sent him to hell—or been sent there by him. Pshaw, sir! it is the idlest of all employments, for a man who can smell gun-powder even farther than he can a flaw in his neighbor's land title; to attack the character of a minister of Jesus Christ—because forsooth, he once had a chance to shoot at a man and let a man shoot at him, and by the great mercy of God was kept from the folly and wickedness.

It is truly a great calamity to be destitute of personal courage; the more so as many weaknesses, and some great vices, are commonly found in close union with cowardice. The most common and injurious of these, are malice, falsehood and meanness. A brave man is commonly generous, true, and noble; and the eminent lack of these fine qualities, is a pretty sure mark of an irresolute and timid man. It would carry me too far to trace out these connections; and I forbear, as a thing needless, to make the personal application. In the case immediately before us, there are two distinct matters, viz: 1. The special facts alleged. 2. The general charge of cowardice. Now of both in their order.

In the month of December, 1821—nearly twenty years ago—I was in the theatre at Frankfort, with several female relatives; and, as it afterwards appeared, gave offence, without intending it, to the individual whose name is so freely used by you. He wrote me a polite note the next morning, (as I remember) asking an explanation; and I immediately gave him, what I intended should be, and what I thought ought to be, one entirely satisfactory. He, however, pursued the correspondence, writing me an answer, which I thought not respectful, and returned it. Upon this he sent me what I understood to be a challenge; but which having declined to receive his second letter, I of course refused to accept. Upon this, he published a placard against me, in the usual form. If the whole affair had ended here, it is clear enough, that a thousand reasons besides cowardice might have actuated my conduct, even if I had been a duelist; which, thank God, I never was. These reasons, according to the true scope of the murderous code of which you have become, something of the latest, an amateur expounder—will afford you practice in stating and classifying them; wherefore, I leave them to you. But the matter between Dr. Flournoy and myself, did not end with the publication of his card. I was very young and very violent; and though I thought it proper to refuse his challenge—I did not intend to let the publication pass; and upon its being issued, I proceeded to arm myself for a personal rencontre. Many persons know these facts. The late Thomas McClannahan, of Louisville, was my immediate friend; and the present Judge H. J. Thornton, of Alabama, procured me a pair of pistols after the publication was made. In this crisis the following mandamus was put into my hands:

Bro: ROBT. J. BRECKINRIDGE.

You are hereby notified to appear instanter before the Worshipful Master, Wardens and Brethren of Hiram Lodge, No. 4, at their Lodge room, then and there to answer to such charge as may be exhibited against you in relation

to an unfortunate difference said to exist between yourself and Bro: M. W. Flournoy.

Yrs. Fraternally,

Dec. 8rd, 1821.

JOHN MCKINNEY, Jr. G. M. G. L. Ky.

Mr. McKinney, as you know, is dead.

The statement of Judge Davis, of Lexington, and the official certificate of Mr. Swigert, which immediately follow, establish the genuineness of the foregoing mandamus and the authority by which it was issued.

I certify, that I have this day examined the foregoing mandate signed by John McKinney, jr. G. M. G. L. Ky., addressed to Robert J. Breckinridge, dated the 8rd December, 1821, and that it is wholly in the hand writing of said McKinney, being well acquainted with his writing.

Lexington, 16th July, 1841.

JAMES E. DAVIS.

As Grand Secretary of the Grand Lodge of Kentucky, I certify that John McKinney, Jun., was elected Most Worshipful Grand Master of the Grand Lodge of Kentucky, on Tuesday, the twenty-eighth day of August, A. D. 1821 A. L. 5821, and installed as such on Wednesday the 29th August, A. D. 1821 A. L. 5821, that he continued in the office aforesaid until the 29th of August, A. D. 1822 A. L. 5822.



IN TESTIMONY WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my name and affixed the seal of said Grand Lodge, this 23d day of July A. D. 1841, A. L. 5841.

PHILIP SWIGERT, G. Sec'y.

The result of the investigation thus enforced was a unanimous decision, by a very numerous body of gentlemen—all of them perhaps as well qualified as yourself to decide what is becoming in a brave and honorable man; 1. That my explanation to Dr. Flournoy, was sufficient, and should have been satisfactory: 2. That his placard ought to be withdrawn: 3. That there was no ground of quarrel, and we ought to be reconciled: 4. That a publication, under the authority and by a committee of the body should be made, stating these facts and the adjustment of the matter honorably to all parties. All which was done; as is, not only notorious, but as you yourself could not fail to know, when misrepresenting the transaction, from the most unworthy motives, after the original parties to it, had ceased for twenty years, to consider it of the least consequence. And you perfectly knew, that ever since the difficulty, and for thirty years before it, the Flournoy family and my own had been on terms of hereditary friendship. I think it proper to say, that I have not been able to communicate on this subject, with Dr. Flournoy, who I have lately understood, is residing in Missouri. It is also right to add, that except yourself, no human being has ever called either Dr. Flournoy or myself in question touching this matter—save only an unscrupulous fanatic in Petersburg, Va., by the name of *Shore*; the same who got some boys and negroes to unite with him in making a public bonfire of me, (as an abolitionist) in the shape of a book—for that which another man had written. You ought to seek his acquaintance; I am sure you would like him. And as to the 'man,' who you say entered your room, and held the dialogue which you repeat with verbal accuracy, after so long an interval; if you will give me his name, I have no doubt I can prove by him that no such dialogue ever occurred. I insist, however, that it shall be a living man; for in your hands,

the dead change their speech, as soon as they can no longer contradict you.

There is another matter here so low and so malevolent, that really I blush for you while I am obliged to expose you. "In mercy to him, tell him to strike out the long J which he has added to the *"name his father gave him,"* &c.—"I don't care to disgrace him" by the name his father gave him, but I wish to make my card "especially apply to the name he has assumed," &c. Such are your words; words, utterly incompatible with every sentiment that distinguishes a gentleman—and, just as such words so uttered, always should be—destitute of a particle of truth. Read what follows and then read again what you have written, if you can do it without hanging yourself:

MY SON:—The *Jefferson* in your name was added by your sainted Father, who also wrote the whole name as you find it in the family Bible. And moreover, you were so named at the particular request of Mr. Jefferson. *Lætitia Preston*, now Mrs. General Floyd of Virginia, was your Godmother, and no doubt remembers your baptism. James Marshall, your Godfather, (no relation of the Doctor's,) studied law with your father: he is now dead.

March 22d, 1841.

MARY H. BRECKINRIDGE.

I have in my possession and now before me, the old family Bible, containing, among others, this record in our Father's handwriting, to wit.

"Robert Jefferson Breckinridge, their seventh child, was born on Saturday, the 8th of March, 1800—was christened by Rev. James Moore, his sponsors Mr. James Marshall and Miss Lætitia Preston."

Louisville, March 22, 1841.

W. L. BRECKINRIDGE.

What there may be in the particular facts now spread before you, to justify the general charges predicated on them, I leave the public to decide; and at the same time presume there can be no difficulty in perceiving, how admirably the whole case proves, that I was in 1830, an adventurer in the pay of the British Government—and in 1833, the author of Judge Owsley's law, voted for by you. How far the general tenor of my life goes to confirm your construction of the difficulty with Dr. Flournoy in 1821, it does not become me to decide. Nor need I be solicitous about your opinions or representations in such a case. For it does appear to me, that one like you, whose insults are carefully heaped on those who he is sure will not chastise him; whose evil passions are so directed as to bring his friends and not himself into danger; and whose responsibilities are met by others and his duels fought by proxy; is not likely to be accounted a good witness, or a competent judge of what a true gentleman ought to do, or how he ought to feel. Simple brute courage which enables a man to face personal danger, is amongst the ordinary gifts of God to the human family. But there is another and far higher quality, rare in its bestowment, and never found but in union with firmness of will, integrity of purpose, and elevation of character; a lofty moral courage, prompting its possessor, at all risks to do what is right, and amid every danger to avouch what he does.

I knew a man once, who being thrown by divine providence on a foreign shore, found every element of society arrayed against his country, and all the fury of hereditary, national and political hate

lavished upon her sacred name.—Many of his countrymen had witnessed this before ; but not one had breasted the storm. This man, bowed down under the pressure of disease ; unsupported by human sympathy, except by the tender and courageous love of *one* heart ; strong in reliance upon God, and in fervent loyalty to his country ; met the boldest of these proud scorners and hurled upon the slanderers of his brethren and his home the indignant rebukes they had too long deserved. Sir, was this the act of one noted for constitutional timidity ?

I knew a man once, who had been called away from the land he loved too fondly, and from the distinguished pursuits of his earlier manhood, to dwell far away, and to give himself to humble but precious employments. One who hated him without a cause, took advantage of his absence, the death of his friends, and the violence of parties, to traduce him falsely as an enemy of the State, and the disturber of her peace ; and with these discussions were mixed up, some of the most vital questions of human right, and public prosperity. I was present when this man met his inveterate persecutor, face to face, before a vast assembly of those against whom he was accused of stirring up their slaves at home, and their enemies abroad. Armed ruffians had come to tear him down. And yet, calmly, boldly, did he encounter all the odds, and throw himself freely upon the truth of his cause, and the justice of his countrymen. You sir, were there. Think you that man, was in very deed a base poltroon ?

I knew a man once, who had offered to him a career of honourable ambition, which is seldom placed in reach of one so young. He had filled many, and they not mean stations ; and the trust of his fellow men was only the more manifested, as they the more tried him. All at once new questions arose ;—questions touching the sanctity of divine institutions,—the nature of the boundaries of human authority,—the grounds and defences of liberty itself. His views on these questions were thought not to be popular—their expression not to be timely. The same enemy of whom I have already spoken, availed himself of these difficulties, to increase the storm in order to overwhelm his victim. The threats of vindictive enemies, the entreaties of timid friends—the probability of personal loss, nothing moved him from his strong pleadings with his country, and earnest avowal of a faith, for love of which, he was ready to surrender without a murmur, all the prospects of his public life. He has lived to see many of his principles firmly settled as the policy of his native state ; and to hear himself denounced with unforgiving bitterness, as one constitutionally irresolute.

I knew a man once, who was closing a most furious party contest. His own election was certain—votes enough already polled to make it sure ; but one of his political friends was almost beaten ; the third day of the voting was hastening to a close ; the agitations of the people increasing every instant ; the most violent excitement raging over the community. Suddenly the storm burst ; a thousand men rushed furiously on each other, and seizing such weapons as their frenzy supplied, dealt murderous blows upon all who stood before them. Fire-arms were loudly called for and eagerly demand-

ed ; and the air was darkened by deadly missiles of every kind.—Some of the most distinguished citizens—some of the ministers of God's sanctuary, had tried in vain, at the hazard of their lives, to appease the tumult. At this dreadful moment, I saw the doors of the hall of Justice suddenly thrown open, and from them emerge two young men. They bore upon a staff a white flag, and rushing between the combatants, and into the thickest of the danger, they cried with loud voices — "*Shame, shame upon ye—ye are all brethren !*" The generous hearts of their countrymen melted under the intrepid appeal ; and they who a moment before sought each other's lives, literally rushed into each other's arms. Sir, I will name *one* of those young men ; it was the present *General John M. McCalla*, of Lexington. The other is willing to be forgotten. Was this the act of men who valued life too highly?—men cursed by nature, with her rarest and basest infirmities ?

But, sir, to drop all parable—the incidents of that election recall another circumstance, too peculiar to have escaped your recollection. It was the election of 1826, perhaps the most violent that ever occurred in the county, and the closest. Our hindmost candidate the present high Sheriff of the county, Mathus Flournoy, Esq., succeeded by only eleven votes, if I remember correctly, out of twenty-six or seven hundred polled.—You have taken great pains to assert that I was destitute of character and principle—that I had no weight or influence, and deserved none—and that it was chiefly under your wing and by virtue of your patronage, that I made some figure in early life—you yourself countenancing me, however, only on account of your veneration for my father's memory,—seeing I was personally altogether worthless ; and all that. (*See speech of Nov. 9, 1840, all over.*) Supposing that all this was true, what would you say, if I should produce proof, *that the most distinguished, and by far the greatest and most influential man, that ever lived in Fayette county*—after taking part in that terrible canvass of 1826—after doing his uttermost to stem the torrent—fairly gave up the contest as hopeless, and his cause as gone ;—and seeking me out in my obscurity and worthlessness, threw himself upon me as one of the men that could save the county, and besought me by every motive of patriotism and personal advantage, to give up every thing and rouse myself to an effort worthy of the occasion, and the danger ? Read the following letter, sir, if your nerves will bear it ; see its date, less than sixty days before the election of 1826 ; remember the struggle and the result ; then read what you have since published of me, and of those very times and incidents—and if you can, respect yourself afterwards.

INDORSEMENT, JUNE 11th, 1826.

My Dear Breckinridge :

I have returned home from Chilesburg, and from a circuit among the people, and can assure (you) that unless a change take place, the election is gone in this county. If the election were to-morrow, McCalla is ahead one hundred votes of any candidate that offers. You may rely on it that this is no fiction. He is attending two or three points every day, and wherever he goes addressing the people. I know your situation, and lament it ; but as certainly as death the election is lost by an overwhelming majority, unless Flournoy and yourself exert yourselves to the utmost. Payne and Rogers and McCalla are acting in concert and are every

where, that a dozen of persons are to be found and no human being on your side. I can in the town of Lexington and in the two districts already give the names of at least one hundred antireligion that have and will join (the) enemy, unless the current is checked while I have heard of not one solitary gain on our side. I shall address the people at Cross-Plains on Saturday next, when one or both, Flournoy and you should be present. For your own and your country's sake lose not a moment. If you cannot leave home a distance see all your neighbours and stir every friend you can and where you cannot attend send your friend. Consider this for your own eye.

Yours Truly,

R. WICKLIFFE.

The great extent to which this defence of my *personal* character against your vile slanders, has necessarily run, renders it impossible to unite with it, the defence of my *public* conduct. It is, therefore, not with a view of entering on the latter subject, that I invite your attention to several points in your attack upon my proceedings in Great Britain, 1836. It is only necessary to remind you at present, that in your speech of August 10, 1840, you endeavored to prove that the government and people of Great Britain, were attempting, on a settled plan, to compass the ruin of this country by means of an operation upon the slaves; that one part of the plan was to corrupt the churches of this country, on the subject of abolition, and that in particular the Presbyterians of Scotland were operating by missionaries, on the Presbyterians of this country; that Mr. Thompson and Miss Martineau, were two of these missionaries; that the late Judge Green and myself were amongst their earliest converts, and most efficient co-labourers; and that the act of the Kentucky Legislature of 1833, was one of the fruits of this mighty combination. In reply to all this, you will find in my speech of Oct. 12, 1840, p. 24-29, of first edition, this whole matter showed up in a light so simple, and your ridiculous ignorance and stupid malice exhibited so conclusively, as to render any notice of the nonsense and falsehoods you have advanced in reply to it, and in support of your original charges against myself, Judge Green, and our venerable church—unnecessary at the present moment. There is, however, some new matter, of a kind entirely personal, introduced into your discussion of the subject, in your speech of Nov. 9, 1840; which I have referred to above, as seeming to require a brief notice. This general subject is diluted over eight pages (p. 30-38) of your last speech: and mixed up with it are three charges against me, viz: 1. That after all, I myself and the Presbyterians of both countries, were really guilty, in the matter of my mission to Great Britain in 1836, which was substantially an abolition mission from our General Assembly to the Presbyterians of Britain; and in denying this I had lied. 2. That my controversy with Thompson, at Glasgow, was a vain, collusive, and miserable affair; utterly despicable as a defence of America. 3. That I was in fact more than willing, to take Thompson's side openly, if I had been well paid for it; and that I plainly hinted as much in the discussion itself. A word as to each of these, in their order.

As to the first charge, viz: Of deliberate falsehood in the matter of the relations of the Presbyterians of both countries, and of my mission, to the subject of Abolitionism. Besides referring again, to the incontestible and notorious facts, stated in the passage of

my speech of October 12, 1840, already cited; I will now simply add, that we have about one thousand five hundred preachers, and about one thousand nine hundred churches, in our connexion; these are the people who sent me, whom I represented abroad. And now, if you will find one of these ministers, or one of these churches, now in good standing in our connexion, who will deny my statements, or endorse yours, or who will not say that in this matter, it is you and not I, who have lied; why then, I will consider it proper to confute you further. But, while a hundred and fifty or two hundred thousand people—who ought to know—unanimously, repeatedly, and steadfastly hold to certain facts as true; it is an infinitely small thing, for a man who does not know, and who is a very bad witness even if he did, to say that he who contradicts him and agrees with all the rest, is a deliberate liar.

As to the second charge. My first answer is that you are no judge of the quality of my defence of my brethren and my country at Glasgow; and that your condemnation of my conduct there, is evident proof, to my own mind, that I did about right. My second answer is, that all I said and did, on that occasion, has been extensively published both in Britain and America; and I have heard of no man in either country, whose opinion I value, condemning me; but I know that many thousands of good and wise men in both countries, approve of what I did; and I hope thousands more will read and judge for themselves, a volume on the whole subject of the coloured race, which I will publish as soon as I can get a little leisure. My third answer is contained in the following testimony from the pen of a distinguished American scholar and gentleman, who speaks from personal knowledge, and without prejudice.—“He (Prof. Tucker, of the University, of Va.) managed, however, I afterwards understood, to dispose of the questions propounded in a very summary manner, by presenting facts of so irrefragable a character and by sticking to them so tenaciously, as to confound and silence even Mr. Thompson himself, who is considered in England and Scotland, on such subjects ‘a hard nag to beat;’ for although he had been some months before, reduced literally to shreds and tatters and scattered in fragments to the winds of heaven

Like a limb from his country all bleeding and torn,

“by the Rev. Mr. Breckinridge, of Baltimore, &c. &c.” (*Rambles in Europe*, by Wm. GIBSON, M. D. Prof. Surgery, University of Penn., &c. p. 276.)

Now as to the third charge. The Congregational Union of England and Wales, had sent Drs. Read and Matheson, and the Baptist churches of England had sent Drs. Cox and Hobie to visit the churches of America; and besides a commission sent from the Congregationalists of New England, the General Assembly of the Presbyterian church in America, had sent Dr. Spring and myself to represent our communion, in the Congregational Union already mentioned. All these representatives from the churches of each nation to those of the other—had found it necessary to give their testimony in regard to the question of negro slavery in America; and they had unanimously delivered a testimony wholly inconsis-

ent with that of Geo. Thompson. Upon this state of fact I argued at Glasgow, that Thompson was discredited, and not to be believed; the more especially, as all the other persons were wholly disinterested, and their testimony official, while his was the prejudiced report, of a *hired and paid agent*, he being the only mau of the whole, who had handled money in the transaction. Now upon this, you say, that what I meant, was that I myself desired to be hired and paid by the abolitionists of Glasgow, (*see p 37 of your speech of November 9, 1840.*) and that I was really complaining, that they gave Thompson all the money. I should consider it, sir, an insult even to your understanding, to suppose that you either yourself believed, or that you expected any one else to believe, the base charge you have here made, under circumstances so plain against you, that the mere statement of them puts shame upon you. The truth is, that my connexion both with that mission to Europe, and with the subject of negro slavery, has been free from the sin of covetousness, at least. I was justly entitled to have my personal expenses to and from Europe and during so much of that mission as was devoted to public objects, paid by the General Assembly of my church; but I never received a farthing from that or any other quarter, towards defraying any portion of them. I was also entitled to have my salary in my particular congregation, continued during the year of my absence; as I was sent abroad by our ecclesiastical superiors; but I voluntarily relinquished to the congregation, the entire income. So also, on the other subject, which you have foolishly connected with this, the facts are of the same general character. Few men in America have laboured more than I have, with the pen, and from the rostrum and the pulpit, in opposition to the spirit and principles of modern abolitionism; in support of the claims and objects of the cause of African colonization; and in regard to the whole subject of the amelioration of the condition of the black race; but until this hour, I have never received one farthing in the way of compensation for any portion of these labours, covering a period of twenty years. And, sir, when impelled by a sense of public and personal duty, and encouraged and protected by the wise and noble constitution and laws of my native state, I determined many years ago to begin the work of gradual and voluntary emancipation, upon a settled and determinate plan; I beg you to remember, that in this, as in most other acts of my life, my conduct was wholly different from yours; *first*, in this, that the slaves, for whose freedom I provided, *were my own*; *secondly*, in this, that I did not attempt to secure to myself by a deed from my wife, twenty times, perhaps fifty times the value of the slaves emancipated, as the condition of their freedom; *thirdly*, in this, that I did not fill the public ear with vain and exaggerated boastings, sometimes of what I had done, and at others of my sorrow that I had done so much; when in reality, very little had been done to make any fuss about.

There are a number of pages of your speech (*viz*: from the bottom of the 17th to the top of the 23d,) devoted chiefly to several matters in which you, rather than myself, are concerned; and to

which, therefore, while I cannot properly pass them in silence, it is not necessary for me to devote much space. The first of these relates to the conviction and execution of *Moses*, (the slave of Joseph Rogers,) who was hung for rape, on the 13th of August, 1831. In your first speech of 1840, that of August 10th, p. 18, you attacked Mr. C. M. Clay, as you had long before attacked me, for exciting discussions in the county, of which you were yourself, in both cases, the real originator; and charge him by insinuation, and me openly, with publishing doctrines which lead to the commission of "murders, rapes, house breakings and other felonies." On the 36th page of the same speech you returned again to the same calumnies, and re-uttered them, with renewed insults and falsehoods. This, you will remember, was in the speech, in which you have solemnly and repeatedly avowed and endeavored to prove, there was nothing at which I could properly take offence. In my speech of October 12th, 1840, p. 15, in noticing these horrible accusations, I selected the crime of rape, and reminded you: 1. That you had yourself been the lawyer in 1831 of the slave *Moses*, (the only one I remembered as being arraigned for this crime). 2. That you had not only declared your conviction of his innocence, but had been so outrageous in your proceedings, that you narrowly escaped being *Lynched*. 3. That, on your own showing, in 1831, you were a slanderer in 1840, and your accusations against me, as unfounded as they were insulting. In your second speech of 1840, that of Nov. 9, *as printed*, you devote two pages on this subject [p. 17-19]; and although you publish in an appendix a certificate of the jailor of the county of Fayette, to establish the infamous charges of the first speech; yet in this speech, you not only plainly admit, that *Moses* was *innocent*, but write an argument, and pretend to repeat the main facts of the case, to prove that innocence. Now, so far as your charges against me are concerned—and so far as this case goes, which being the worst I could remember, was selected by me as a specimen case, to test those charges; I stand acquitted and you convicted, by your own statements. For if the man was innocent, I could not have been the author of his *guilt*; and you believing him innocent, are clearly a slanderer in abusing me for a matter which presupposes his guilt. Whether he was innocent or guilty, is not for me to say; nor do I know. If he was judicially murdered—being an innocent man—as you argue; that crime lies at the door of Judge Hickey, who tried him—and as I remember, was so perfectly convinced of his guilt, that he had *Bill*, the principal witness for the prisoner, openly whipped, for perjury under the statute; and at the door of Gen. Combs, who was so outraged by the crime that had been perpetrated, that he agreed to assist the prosecuting attorney—and subsequently as was understood, gave to the poor girl, whom you attempted to ruin by the testimony of the fellow *Bill*—the fee, which her neighbors had contributed, to engage his services; and at the door of the sworn jurymen, who as you say, wrongfully took away the life of an innocent man. This I know, and after a detailed conversation with Judge Hickey and Gen. Combs, reassert it, and refer the public to them; viz: that your conduct on the trial of *Moses*, was of such a character, to

the poor, virtuous, and unprotected white girl, who had been violated—that it required all the personal influence of her counsel, and the official intervention of the judge both publicly and privately, to save you from popular violence.

The next matter concerns your proceedings in regard to the Turnpike road leading from Lexington towards Richmond, by Mrs. Russel's estate, I believe; and the difficulties growing out of it. I shall not press this business. It was introduced at first by me, in my speech of October, 1840, in the heat of public discourse, without any previous intention of doing so; and the general allusion to it, and to the two subjects which follow, was retained in the printed report of the speech, simply that I might deal with you and the public, with perfect uprightness. The whole that is said in regard to the three subjects, occupies about five lines, on p. 27, of a speech of thirty-two pages. I say this, however, without the remotest idea that I have done you injustice; but rather under the impression, that you have done so many things so much worse than these, that it is hardly worth while to have any trouble about such as these. In regard to your transactions with this road company and with some individuals connected with it, however, I have been furnished with detailed information, part of it in writing, representing your conduct as a tissue of meanness, selfishness, and unfair dealing. And my understanding is, that besides embarrassing this public improvement in all possible ways, and that after being one of its projectors, you have prosecuted old personal and political friends with incensate bitterness, and are striving absolutely to dissolve the company; all to gratify your spite and penuriousness, in consequence of the refusal of the company, to allow you and your two or three hundred negroes, your famous buffaloes, and what not, to pass *toll free*, thro' the first gate on the road. You begin to plead privilege rather too soon sir; the family of "*Town-fork*" is not yet in the Herald's book. If I err in this general statement, you can easily correct me, by applying to your former co-labourers in this work; and especially to your old friend *General James Shelby*, who has shared the fate of nearly all who ever trusted you. The special reason you set up for claiming this privilege, is curious; and I notice it—the rather, as it leads us to one of the two remaining items. Mrs. Russel's estate is situated several miles from Lexington, eastward I think of the town; her residence, which you now occupy, on the opposite side of it; but as both these establishments constitute a part of *your farm*, you claim a free passage through the toll gate, under the usual clause in charters, where a gate divides a plantation; and you say, "*the Judge*," (what Judge?) has upon a bill and demurrer in chancery, sustained your claims. This may be good law; I know not. I only know that the whole town of Lexington, containing some six thousand and odd hundred people, and some odd dozens of farms besides, *were once* located directly between these portions of *your farm*. This leads me to say that when I reminded you (p. 27, speech of October 12, 1840,) of your passionate love of other people's land, and ventured to insinuate a slight surprise at the result of such proceedings as gave some lawyers one half the land of the plaintiff,

and all that of the defendant, a result I think not uncommon, however curious it may be ; I had no such idea as you attribute to me, of attacking the general principle of the laws of *Champerly*, for a long time prevalent in Ky.; but rather the general and notorious proceedings, which your enemies say, have marked your career in regard to the land litigation of Kentucky. And the people about Lexington are sadly in error, and have been very needlessly alarmed, if you have not been plotting a very considerable and important addition to this already remarkable *farm* of yours ; an addition, which by reason of some flaw in a chain of title from your wife's father, (Col. John Todd,) and by reason of certain deeds of settlement, from her to you, will go far towards uniting these remote portions of *that farm*, now covered, it would seem, in part by the town of Lexington. So that a dispute about a toll gate, may eventuate contingently, in your eating up a city : as a dispute between two sets of your clients, about the nature of a real security, resulted in your swallowing an Iron Works ; and as a dispute between other two sets of your clients (the Bank of the United States and Samuel Smith) about a plain case of debt, resulted in your licking up a stupendous estate in some of the easterly counties of the State.

I said in the short passage of my speech several times referred to, that you had plead the statute of limitations, as a bar, to the recovery of an account for materials furnished for the clothing of your slaves. I might have added, which I did not, that this detestable meanness was attempted to be practised against the near kinsman of your wife, one who had been before your marriage her confidential friend, a man who had lived for above forty years in the county, without a blot upon his name. Your notice of this matter is contained on the 20th and 21st pages of your speech, and the substance of your reply follows :

“ The gentleman next charged me with screening myself from paying a manufacturer or merchant, for clothes bought by me to clothe my negroes with. This I pronounce a falsehood. To my knowledge, I never was sued by a merchant or manufacturer in my life ; and although the merchants may sometimes think me slow pay, yet, before the reverend slanderer made the charge, I think I never was charged with defrauding a fellow creature,” &c.

Sir, I am well content to leave the question of your general character to the readers of these pages, and to the public around you. My present business is with the particular case ; and, as you could not fail to know when you penned these lines, they contain at the bar of conscience, a most deliberate and positive untruth. I the more particularly invite attention to it, as it reveals what you mean by truth, and shows how you are to be understood in your most positive assertions. The case has been particularly examined by counsel, and the facts stand thus : “ In the year 1838 one of Robert Wickliffe's overseers, by name Hersman, at Mr. Wickliffe's request, went to Oldham, Todd & Co., and got a quantity of materials for negro clothing, amounting in all to about \$300. The firm presented the account to Mr. Wickliffe who admitted its truth and promised to pay the same, at a more convenient time. He delayed, however, until a law suit was commenced against

"Hersman, the overseer. Upon the trial, which was a common count in *assumpsit*, for goods, wares, &c. Mr. Wickliffe filed two pleas, one that the defendant did not owe the debt, the other, that he had not assumed to pay the debt within twelve months next preceeding the institution of the suit, which was, in other words, the statute of limitation! Oldham, Todd & Co.'s counsel was preparing to handle Mr. Wickliffe without gloves, when he beckoned Oldham to him and told him, to withdraw the suit and he would pay him the money. These are the facts in the case." So writes to me a gentleman above all suspicion. I have personally conversed with one of the most respectable and intelligent men in your county—who was one of the jury in this case; who says he has no doubt a verdict would have been rendered for the plaintiffs, if the jury had been allowed to decide. I have also conversed with Robert S. Todd, Esq., in regard to it; and refer the public to him for the substantial accuracy of all I have said, and for a full account of your conduct in the premises. The case then stands thus: Your manager by your order purchases goods for your slaves; you promise payment, but there is a lack of proof of this; your manager is sued, and if the debt is recovered from him, he of course recovers it back from you, upon the testimony of Todd and Oldham. You as his lawyer nominally, but really as your own—plead the statute—get alarmed—and pay the debt; and then, coolly deny, not only the infamous plea, but even the suing itself! So it is; and so are the facts. There is a tradition, sir, in the Preston family, of which perhaps you may not have heard, that Col. William Preston the elder, the uncle of your first wife—held at the time of his death, in 1782, a bond of his brother-in-law, the late John Howard, your first wife's father, for £250, cash, which had been advanced by Col. Preston to Mr. Howard, at great inconvenience, and under the pressing necessities of the latter gentleman. The universal opinion in the whole connexion always was, that John Howard was a man of remarkable integrity; and so the collection of the debt was not pressed. But after many years had elapsed, the executors of Col. Preston, requested that the money might be paid; whereupon, somebody took upon him to say, the claim was stale, and the presumption of law, that it was paid; and so defeated the recovery of the money; thus at once wronging and insulting a family which you sir, take some pains to say, you have always greatly revered. Do you, sir, know who this individual was? If so, pray tell us; and then, if your mood is communicative, you may inform us also, what is the amount of the debt now, in conscience, due from Mr. Howard's to Col. Preston's estate; supposing it to amount to £250, on the 1st day of Jan., 1781, to have borne interest at 6 per cent. per annum ever since, and to have been compounded once every 16½ years? 2. What part of this money would fall upon your estate if these well beloved kindred of ours should come to a fair settlement with each other?

I think, sir, I have now gone over all that is worthy of special notice, or that needs any, in your outrageous publication; all, I mean, that relates to transactions and charges, that can be consid-

ered, more especially *personal*. It would have been beyond expression, more to my taste to have confined myself entirely to that portion of your attack, which relates to my public character; that portion which I have not even touched, in this paper. Whether I shall be spared to publish that, I knew not; whether I shall think it necessary, after proving *what you are*, to trouble myself any further, to disprove *what you say*, I shall not now determine. I must admit, however, that my *personal* character is far more precious to me, than my *public*; and upon this ground, I have felt free to meet your appeal to society in regard to things so entirely private. I have considered too, that in defending myself, I have necessarily revealed to mankind, the character and principles of a man, who has the heart and the position, to do incalculable mischief; and have thus conferred a lasting benefit on my generation. In relation to my public conduct, moreover, I have not allowed myself to forget, that if my career is already drawing near its close—as it seems to be the doom of my family, from father to son, to be cut off in the midst of life—I have really done so little that is worth remembering, so little in comparison with what I have meditated, that it is useless to be over anxious about any defence. And, if on the other hand, God shall spare me to serve my generation, in a manner and to an extent, bearing some tolerable proportion to my love for truth, for knowledge, and for liberty; then indeed, I may safely trust my works to defend me—and leave the task of my vindication, to those who shall enjoy blessings, in labouring for which, I was consumed. And after all, sir, it is a sweet and an abiding consolation to me, that the principles to which my life has been devoted, are in the truest sense imperishable. Even if it is my lot to form one of that great and forgotten multitude, whose hearts have been sanctuaries in their generations, of glorious but unpractised truth; I live and labour, and will die with the sustaining conviction, that my dust will be so many grains in the increasing, and finally all pervading habitation, which God is erecting to the glory of his name, and the happiness of human kind. And as I pass on, I perceive with clearness, and take new courage as the thought is settled in my heart, that all the enemies of this high and majestic progress, are doomed to labour without hope, to fall with the assurance of defeat, and to be remembered only as those whom God permitted to illustrate the folly, the perversity, and corruption of our kind. True liberty—just, real, and general; true protestantism, thorough, enlightened, and tolerant; true evangelical doctrine and practice, pure, ardent, zealous, elevated; these are the sacred objects, for lack of which, the great human family has pined so long, and suffered so deeply, and which God—though for our sins he defer it long—will at last bestow on our universal race. Glorious consummation! Blessed generation, that shall be permitted to rejoice in it!

Sir, you and I will soon be in our graves. It therefore behoves us to have an eye to that world to which we hasten, and that account we have to render in. My difficulties with you began after I made a profession of the Christian faith—and your hatred and violence towards me, have apparently increased in proportion as I have tried, by God's grace, to set my face more and more resolutely

towards heaven. I can say, with a good conscience before God and man—that in this whole matter, from beginning to end, I have earnestly endeavored so to act, as that I could approve my conduct in the hour of death, and that God would approve it in the day of judgment. In this temper, I have sincerely aimed to keep my heart and mind, during six months, that I was engaged in collecting and arranging the facts and proofs herein contained, and more particularly during the period I have occupied in writing out the defence itself. God has not allowed me to escape this duty. It has been one, I would have avoided, if he had permitted me. I have performed it with a clear and deliberate conviction that he required it at my hands, and that he will accomplish his designs by it. You say of me, in mockery, (*Speech of Nov. 9, 1840, p. 24,*) "He is a *praying parson*. I should like to have heard his prayer, &c. * * What prayer did he put up to the throne of grace and mercy for me?" Willingly shall you hear it. Reverently, and repeatedly have I bowed my spirit in the dread presence of the eternal majesty, and cried unto him—

Oh! thou Infinite Source of being and of blessedness, who amidst the inaccessible light and glory in which thou dwellest, dost condescend to regard the low estate of thy sinful and erring children in their tene-ment of clay; I humble myself before thine awful majesty, and adore thee as my deliverer from all thine enemies and mine. Infinite rectitude is the essence of thy moral perfections—and in the image thereof didst thou create, at first, our fallen race. Oh! let not thy poor servant be overborne by unrighteousness and swallowed up in the snares, which the most false, the most pitiless, of those who hate him without a cause, has contrived against him. Thou hast said, oh infinite King, "vengeance is mine"—and because thou hast thus spoken, I have not dared to assume thy high prerogative. But thou hast added in words of terror to the oppressor and the persecutor—"I will reply." Do thou, oh! glorious Lord, give if it please thee unto these words a sense of mercy, and repay the wrongs and injuries cruelly heaped upon thy servant, by bringing to godly repentance and the acknowledgement of his sins, this enemy of all righteousness. But if thou hast allowed him to be judicially blinded—and hast given him over to strong delusion to believe lies—do thou, oh! merciful Redeemer, who hast in thy hands the hearts of all men, so turn them, that he shall no longer be able to poison them by his wickedness, to the damage of thy cause, to the hurt of his country, and to the evil of thy children. And so shall all men know, that thou, God, reignest, and that thou art a God who keepest covenant and showest mercy—a God under the shadow of whose almighty presence, the humblest of thy servants are safe! Amen.

With one suggestion more, I close. I know you well enough to be aware, that you are capable of any denial and any statement, that will serve your turn. I have therefore to say that I have provided against such a contingency by placing in the hands of my friend ROBERT S. TODD, Esq., of Lexington, the original letters, and exhibits, to which I have referred in this communication, so far as they could by possibility be called in question. You, sir, I will not recognise in any manner; nor will I trust these papers in your hands. But, any respectable person on your behalf can have access

to them; and any gentleman, whose curiosity prompts him to examine them, is invited to do so.

ROBERT J. BRECKINRIDGE,
Cabell's Dale, near Lexington, Aug. 20, 1841.

NOTE.—I have ascertained, as this defence has been passing through the press, that several of the most important points in it, might have been presented with additional force, clearness and evidence, if I had thought it worth while, to have pushed my examinations further while preparing it. In regard to one, and that a very important matter, the additional information I have received is so remarkable—its exhibition of the character and conduct of Mr. Wickliffe so decisive—and its confirmation of the truth of my statements and the fairness of my estimate of him so conclusive; that I have thought it my duty to refer to it, briefly, here.

The reader cannot fail to remember what a figure the "*last suit*" of Mr. Wickliffe cuts, both in this defence, and in the speech to which it is a reply.—That famous service before which he charged us nothing; by performing which he filled my pockets with money, and rescued my father's memory from obloquy; in agreeing to attempt which, he yielded to my tears and entreaties; in order to enable him to perfect which he "arranged with Senators" and with the Court of Appeals; in discharging which he risked his life; and after his super human efforts in which "*last professional service for the family*" he says, "*God knows when at night I retired exhausted and prostrate from the court room, I felt as if it was doubtful whether I should ever enter the court house again.*"—(*Speech of Nov. 9, 1840, p. 11-12.*) Is it within the bounds of human belief, that this service was never performed at all—that in truth, he did not argue the cause at all! Yet such is the naked fact!! Not only did he fabricate every incident, connected with the trial of the case—but his account of his argument in it, is a sheer romance; and all his risk of life, and terrible exhaustion and prostration, in his last and greatest professional effort for us—never had an existence, except in his deranged imagination, and the fathomless abyss of his printed falsehoods!!

I will not trust myself to speak of this horrible and enormous baseness, farther than to say, that Mr. Wickliffe has proved himself to be even more profligate and abandoned than I had supposed he was.

The proof on which I assert that he did not argue the case at all, is the distinct recollection of every person connected with the case, with whom I have conversed in regard to this fact; and especially of the Hon. GEO. ROBERTSON, Chief Justice of Ky., who presided on the trial of the cause; and RICHARD H. CHINN, Esq. who closed the argument for us—it having been opened on our side, by Judge WOOLLEY, whose personal relations to Mr. Wickliffe have prevented me from mentioning the subject to him.

I demand of a just and enlightened people, whether they are not bound by the clearest and highest obligations, to consider and treat a man like this, as being either a stark madman, or a public and common slanderer? R. J. B.

CAMP-MEETING AT PISGAH, WOODFORD COUNTY, KY.

Woodford County Ky., Oct. 6th, 1841.

REV. ROBT J. BRECKINRIDGE, D. D.

Dear Brother:—Our Camp-Meeting was terminated on the afternoon of Monday the 4th of Oct., after a continuance of twelve days; but the blessed results of it will never terminate while redeemed souls shall live to praise the name of their redeeming God. It was indeed an occasion of the right hand of God—a day of the power of God's grace, in which many a joyful and willing subject was made to his gracious and peaceful reign.

You requested me to write you a specific and detailed account of this meeting immediately after its termination. In compliance

with your request and my promise, I now undertake to furnish you such account.

Our church, (Pisgah,) as you know, (for there you spent many of your youthful days, and there you were licensed to preach the gospel.) is situated upon a beautiful eminence, or rising ground, and is surrounded by a dense, and luxuriant grove of tall and majestic forest trees—the natural growth of the country. The shrubbery or undergrowth, as it is called, has been cleared out or destroyed by the cattle, leaving the ground naked in the thickest parts of the grove, and beautifully carpeted with grass where the forest is less dense. The tall forest trees present the appearance of so many huge columns supporting the dense roof of foliage at a great height from the ground. If there are spots on earth where angels and spirits from other worlds would delight to meet and hold converse with man, this would seem to be one of them. In the midst of this enchanting grove, a beautiful site was selected, on rather a declining piece of ground.—The highest part of the ground towards the east, and a gradual declivity towards the west. The tents, twenty-one in number, all white, forming three sides of an oblong hollow square, with the eastern end open. The stand was erected in the lower or western end of the square, and within thirty feet of the tents forming the western line of the encampment. The rows of tents on the right and left of the stand extending in parallel lines some hundred and fifty feet from the row that closed the west end of the oblong square. The seats were arranged in three tiers extending from within twelve feet of the front of the stand as far east as the tents—a double tier of seats immediately fronting the stand and an aisle on each side, separating them from the two side tiers of seats: and then twenty feet space between the outer tiers of seats and the rows of tents,—seats were also prepared on either side of the stand, and immediately in the rear,—all together, sufficient to accommodate about two thousand persons. The stand or pulpit being on the lower side of the inclined plane, and fronting the east, and the ground before you gradually rising for a considerable distance, gave to it the appearance of an elevated floor in a large church, and thus the vast audience was prominently in view of the stand. Our meeting being just at the time of the autumnal equinox, for several days before, and on the day the meeting was commenced, we were interrupted by rain, but on Friday, the 24th of Sept., which was the second day, the weather became more settled, and the congregations increased until the sabbath, when it was supposed that there were between three and four thousand persons present. Our present church edifice, erected in 1812, of stone, now neatly repaired, stands within 150 yards of the encampment. When the weather was such as to render it uncomfortable at the stand, the services were conducted in the house, which was crowded morning, noon and night, with most solemn and attentive audiences. During the services, the stillness of death pervaded the entire assembly.

There were a considerable number of ministerial brethren in attendance at different times during the meeting, although not a very large number at any one time. The neighboring brethren all at-

tended on the week-days, but returned to their respective charges on the sabbath. The brethren who attended besides yourself, (and I exceedingly regreted that your engagements were such as to render your leaving necessary,) were, N. H. Hall, N. L. Rice, Wm. L. Breckinridge, J. H. Logan, Wm. R. Preston, John G. Simeral, R. Davidson, J. D. Mathews, John F. Coons, J. K. Burch, J. J. Bullock, G. W. McElroy, C. Stuart, Wm. Y. Allen, of Texas, J. Lyle, Dr. J. Fishback, J. C. Harrison, and father Harris, all of whom preached except two or three who came to the meeting too feeble in health to do so—but rendered valuable service in conversing with the serious. It would be useless to give you a detail of the time when, and the texts from which each of the brethren preached, during the meeting. It is sufficient to say, that the doctrines of grace as contained in our Confession of Faith, were clearly and faithfully preached. There was no effort to fritter down the offensive doctrines of the cross to make them palatable to the viciated taste of the carnal mind. The gospel was plainly and fearlessly presented. The brethren did not shun to declare the whole counsel of God. All attempts to render the Bible agreeable to the taste of unconverted men, is but an attempt to convert the truth of God into error. Man must be converted to the truth and not the truth to carnal man. The preaching at the commencement was mainly to Christians to encourage and stimulate them, to importunate, united and believing prayer to God for his blessing to accompany the preaching of the word, and to make “it accomplish that whereunto it was sent.” Christians were greatly revived and unusually engaged in prayer. They seemed to feel that no presentation of the gospel, however clear or powerful, could convert men. Their trust was not in an arm of flesh—but in God, who alone can make a willing people in the day of his power.

The doctrines preached, were,—the total depravity of man by nature,—original sin and the consequent alienation of heart and life of all men from God.—The vicarious atonement of Christ—the imputation of our guilt to him, and his assumption of our legal liabilities and his perfect satisfaction to the divine law, in behalf of all who believe.—The absolute necessity of the Holy Spirit’s influence to renew our corrupt nature into the image of God.—The nature and necessity of repentance towards God and faith towards our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ,—God’s sovereignty, and man’s dependence upon God, and his entire impotency of himself to make the first motion towards gospel obedience.—The nature, necessity, and evidences of conversion. In short, all the distinctive doctrines of grace, were given great prominence in the preaching of the gospel on this occasion. God, in a very remarkable manner, owned and blessed his own truth, and vindicated it from the reproaches attempted to be heaped upon it, by characterizing it as a *dead orthodoxy*. He made it spirit and life, to the rejoicing hearts of many, on this occasion.

You, I presume, desire not so much these details as the *results* of this deeply solemn and interesting meeting. The sacrament of the Lord’s supper was administered on the sabbath after you left, (it being the first sabbath of Oct.,) when more than three-fourths of

the lower part of the house was occupied by communicants. A goodly number were from neighboring churches. There were to be seen the husband long separated on these solemn occasions from the partner of his bosom, joyfully seated by her side—children by their parents—neighbors by their neighbors, for the first time together, to commemorate the dying love of their Redeemer. All hearts seemed attuned to sing,

“The fellowship of kindred minds,”
“Is like to that above.”

The house was filled till not a spot was left unoccupied by some attentive listener to the melting story of Calvary: The galleries, which consist of a deep end gallery and a long but narrower gallery on either side of the pulpit, extending the entire length of the house, one half of which is devoted to the colored people, were so crowded as to give the appearance of the side and end walls of the house being lined with human beings. The stillness of death reigned through this whole solemn assembly, as if eager to catch every sound of the speaker's voice. Every eye was fixed upon the man of God, as he arose in the sacred desk. Every countenance was serious. The deepest interest was manifested, and the most profound attention was given through the whole service. The house being not sufficiently capacious to accommodate more than half the persons who attended, there was, notwithstanding the inclemency of the day, preaching at the stand at the same hour.

The meeting, from the commencement to its termination, which continued, with unabated interest for twelve days, was characterized by order, decorum, and solemnity. Many Christians came to the meeting opposed to camp-meetings—many more came doubting as to their propriety, and still others came, fearing, yet hoping for the best—all returned satisfied, that there was no reason why a camp-meeting might not be as orderly as any other large meeting. We had no guard—no police, but we acted upon the common-sense principle, that the surest way to prevent disorder, is to treat every one as though no such thing was expected. There is no surer way of encouraging disorder, than by making arrangements to prevent it, thereby creating the impression that it is expected.

There were some thirty-five sermons preached during the occasion, and a number of addresses and exhortations made. The order of the camp was, to rise at 5 o'clock in the morning, at the ringing of the bell.—Sun-rise prayer meeting—family worship in the tents immediately after—enquiry meeting at half-past 8 o'clock—prayer meeting at 9—preaching from 10 to 1, two sermons—interval of religious exercises for dinner—preaching at 3, P. M., and at 7, in the evening. This order was strictly adhered to, until the number of enquirers became so large as to require more time than had been allowed to this interesting part of the exercises. The 10 o'clock sermon was then dispensed with, and the enquiry meeting continued longer.

The result was, that fifty-five white persons were, upon examination, received into the church. Nine of this number were dismissed to join neighboring churches. There are several indulging a hope who will join churches of other denominations. A number still

deeply serious, among whom are 18 or 20 colored persons. Of the 55 who were received into the church, 15 were male heads of families—the great mass of whom are men of influence. A goodly number were young men and ladies. The Lord has done great things for us as a church, whereof we are glad, and for which we praise his name. From the venerable man of sixty years, down through all the intermediate stages of life, to the youth of fourteen years, were seen standing up together in the house of God, and publicly consecrating themselves to his service. There were seen among the enquirers, the venerable grand-father—the daughter and grand-daughter, all together asking what they must do to be saved. O, it was a scene at which angels might have wept tears of joy. There is joy in the presence of the angels over one sinner that repenteth.

The work of grace seemed deep and thorough. The converts seemed to be deeply convinced of the *guilt* and *odiousness* of sin as committed against God. The fear of punishment appeared to enter very little into their feelings. They had generally very clear views of the plan of salvation, through a crucified Redeemer, and seemed cordially to approve and confidently to trust God's plan of saving guilty man, and to discard all reliance upon any works of their own. O, my dear brother, I have no language with which I can adequately express my gratitude to the great Head of the church for the wonders of grace he has wrought in our midst. Could you but look upon the many bright faces, beaming with joy, which when you left us, were covered with gloom and sadness, indicating the deep and bitter workings of God's Spirit within their awakened hearts, it would fill your heart with joy and gladness. I trust others who are seeking the Saviour sorrowing, may soon find him gracious and precious to them, as he is to all them that believe.

And now my dear brother, you will suffer me in behalf of our session, and church, and these dear friends of us both, some of whom were the companions of your boyhood, who are now rejoicing in the hope of the glory of God, you will, I say, suffer me on my own—the church's—and their behalf, to express our gratitude to you, both for the suggestion which led to our holding this camp-meeting, and also for the service you rendered us, in preaching the gospel on that occasion as well as previous to the camp-meeting. May God reward you for it, by the increased graces and consolations of his Spirit in your own heart, and by a glorious revival of pure religion among the people of your charge.

It is perfectly clear to my mind, that some more efficient method than the ordinary preaching of the gospel in our churches, must be adopted, to bring the means of grace—the precious gospel, into contact with the great mass of the people. If some more efficient and extraordinary efforts be not made, our churches will die out, and this beautiful and unparalleled region be given over to the enemies of God, and the corrupters of his religion. I know no means better calculated to arrest public attention to the subject of religion, and to bring the gospel to bear upon large masses of our fellow-citizens, than a well conducted camp-meeting. All that is necessary to render such a meeting orderly, is, for a number of the most respectable and influential families in a neighborhood, and from

neighboring churches, to move on the ground with their tents, and commence religious exercises. Some of the great advantages of this mode of conducting religious worship, are, Christians are brought into close union with each other—their minds are less occupied with ordinary worldly cares—they are more entirely given to prayer and the various services of religion—they thus, all, by the blessing of God, “become in one accord in one place”—there is more agreement in prayer to God, in the name of Christ, for blessings agreeable to his will—the means of grace are thus brought, for a number of days together, to bear upon the minds of Christians, and of sinners. The Saviour, you remember, did not deem it disorderly, to continue the crowds together, that followed him for his instructions for a number of days, even when they had nothing to eat, for so long a time. Some of his most stupendous miracles were wrought to feed the hungry multitudes that continued with him until they were faint for the want of food. How much longer these crowds attracted by the instructions and miracles of the Saviour, continued together, when they came better prepared, we know not. It surely cannot be amiss for God’s ministers and people to attract the multitudes of perishing immortals together, and to feed them that they may have the gospel preached to them, when the Saviour did the same. He could have preached to the people in the synagogues, if he had chosen, but preferred some more extraordinary and effective method, to bring the truth before the minds of large masses of the people. The apostles, too, seized every opportunity where crowds were drawn together by whatever motive, to preach the gospel to them. The feast of tabernacles among the Jews, was nothing more nor less than a camp-meeting, designed and held for the worship of God and the services of religion. It must have been a scene of solemn grandeur, to have beheld the tribes of this remarkable people, repairing from all parts of the sacred land to Jerusalem once a year, to observe the feast of tabernacles.—The hills around Jerusalem were literally white with the tents of the thousands of devout Jews, assembled there to worship the God of their fathers. The day of Pentecost, by some great stickler for order, might be deemed a very disorderly meeting. And God selected that day because of the vast concourse assembled at Jerusalem, as the time best suited to give the first mighty impulse to his kingdom, after the Saviour’s ascension to glory. If the Gospel, by the grace of God, is to win its widening triumphs over this fallen world, and to bring all hearts into the obedience of faith, Christian ministers and men, must take the field, and by all fair and efficient means, impress the great truths and principles of the Bible upon the popular mind.

How camp-meetings would succeed on your side of the mountains, I know not—the church-going habits of your people may render such extraordinary meetings unnecessary, but among a people like ours, some such method is absolutely indispensable to the triumph of religion, and the extension of the church. I have written you hastily, and I fear, have taxed your patience, with so long a letter.

My kind regards to your dear family.

Your affectionate brother in Christ,

JACOB F. PRICE.

[Continued from page 446.]

MOLINISM.

No. XI.

XIX. *The doctrinal errors of the Jesuits, the source of gross immoralities.*

NOTHING, scarcely, is more common among unconverted men, than a low estimate of the importance of religious doctrines. Yet a moment's reflection ought to satisfy an intelligent mind, that nothing is more important. Doctrines, are religious principles. Experience teaches, that men *habitually* act according to their principles. They may deviate from them occasionally, it is true, but when they do so, they act inconsistently; yet in considering the conduct of an artful man, whose principles are known, we must be careful not to account as a matter of course, every apparent discordance between his acts and his principles, an inconsistency of conduct. It may have an occult connexion with the actor's principles, which the casual observer does not discover. It would be still more unwise to account such deviations of conduct, evidence of the goodness of principles, the tendency of which, when judged of by their effects upon masses, is seen and felt to be bad.

Besides, if God has revealed to men, certain religious doctrines, it cannot be a matter of indifference, whether men receive those doctrines or some other, which they suppose may answer the same purpose—or whether they receive God's truth, just as he has made it known, or in an altered form. The connection between religious truth and its effect, is not only *specific*, but as natural, perhaps we should say as necessary or indissoluble, as it is between physical principles and their effects or operations.

We may as well substitute for the laws of the natural world, principles of our own imagination, and anticipate for them the effect of the true; as expect the effect which God designs to produce by his revealed doctrines, to follow from doctrines of human invention; and that man, or minister, or church, who expects to cure the spiritual diseases of men except in the way and by the means, and through the truth which God has appointed for that end, acts not less absurdly than the physician who knowingly attributes to one medicine, properties and effects which belong not to it, but to another. In this manner we may account for the spiritual death, which is seen to pervade those churches which deny or discard the essential doctrines of grace, or which have extensively nullified their effect, by engrafting upon them the doctrines and commandments of men. And in the papal church, where the principle of authority is pervading and absolute, it is easy to see that the work of reformation, humanly speaking, is almost if not quite hopeless: for while the spirit of carnal and worldly politics controls the Court of Rome, it will not and cannot see the things of God, which are discernable only by the spiritual mind; and the principle of authority, or of submission to the decisions of that see, so long as it is admitted, effectually shuts out the truth of God, from its due operation on the mind and the heart, while it transmits and enforces

as the truth of God, the imaginations of unsanctified human nature. Every religious community is liable to err from the truth. It is to be expected that the teachers of religion in every communion will have a powerful influence upon the great mass of its members, and history teaches, that heresies, have generally originated, with ministers of commanding influence. But where the Bible itself is allowed a free circulation and is recognized by both the masters and the disciples, as an authority to which both may with equal right appeal, and to which both are equally bound to bow, it has a correcting and controlling influence, which, if it does not save the church itself from apostacy, will deliver, by the blessing of God, and by the power of the Holy Spirit exerted through the truth, many of the members from the common delusion and ruin. But, to allow the Bible a direct and immediate influence upon the minds of men, is subversive of that principle of authority which binds the papal communion to the see of Rome, and hence it is, that the denial of the Scriptures to the laity is but a corollary to the principle of authority; as this latter principle is put a corollary to the principle of infallibility, which is perhaps the most monstrous of all the doctrines of that church.—But we are getting away from the particular subject of this essay, which is the doctrinal errors of the Jesuits, and the influence which those errors have upon their system of Christian morals. These may be treated under the three following heads, viz :

(1.) The nature of true righteousness or of that piety which ought to animate our conduct.

(2.) The rule of our duties in general.

(3.) The rule of each duty in particular, both in relation to God and in relation to our neighbour.

On all these points, the Jesuits teach pernicious errors which may be traced to their principles upon the doctrines of grace. Upon the first head, the Jesuits have grossly erred, in respect to the origin of all true righteousness. And with this error is connected another, which consists in mistaking the nature of righteousness. So that they take for righteousness, that which is in fact unrighteousness in the sight of God: in other words, they mistake the requirements of God, and substitute for them things entirely different. The scriptures teach that God is the author of righteousness—that to Him alone must we look in order to obtain it—that we can derive it only from the rich treasures of his mercy. The Jesuits confess, indeed, that God gives aid or help, that is, grace to man, in order that he may be just, but then they also teach, that the aid which he gives, is common both to the just and the unjust. But righteousness is that which distinguishes the just from the unjust, and consequently, the grace which God gives is not righteousness, or rather, the gift of God does not confer righteousness. On the contrary, they teach that it is the consent which the recipient of grace gives, by which he makes a good use of grace, which makes him righteous. They also teach that the determination of the will in yielding consent to the influences of God's grace, comes solely from the man himself; and that the man is always so far master of himself, that he may yield his consent with the same ease as he can move his hand or

forbear to move it—or to raise a weight which is within the compass of his strength, or let it alone;—and this is what they call the *power of equilibrium*. If we follow these principles out, they lead to the result that a man has actually, and in point of fact in his own will, the source of righteousness, and that he can draw from it whenever he pleases to do so.

This error upon the origin of righteousness naturally leads to a corresponding error on the nature of righteousness; for as soon as one believes, that the will of man is able to produce that which constitutes righteousness, and that his will has in respect to this matter a power of equilibrium, he will mistake for righteousness that which the will of man can produce with this facility. A child who should be taught to believe that copper is gold, would practically commit that mistake in the concerns of his life, and the difficulty of correcting his error would be proportionate to the respect which he has for his teacher; and if we may suppose him fully persuaded that his teacher is infallible, he would persist in his error, though every man of science should pronounce his gold to be copper.—The inevitable effect then, of this error, with respect to the origin of true righteousness, is to make the subjects of it judge of the nature of righteousness by the visible effects of the human will. Now we see that the will of man may, to a certain extent, reform the outward conduct, and produce in the mind, certain religious thoughts—some superficial resolutions which may have an exterior relation to what the law commands, but the will of a man is very far from having a power of equilibrium over his desires and inclinations; and this every man experimentally perceives. Hence an ungodly man, who has adopted this opinion of the Jesuits, naturally concludes that righteousness does not consist in a change of his desires and inclinations, and that in order to be truly righteous in the sight of God, it is sufficient to conform his outward conduct to the law of God; or at most, to produce certain thoughts in his mind, which have in reality no effect whatever on his heart,—and this opinion the Jesuits have maintained.*

* Many illustrations of the demoralizing effect of this doctrine might be given from their writings. Take the following:

Sanchez (book 1, of his Moral Works, chap. 2, page 9, col. 2, No. 34,) teaches thus: "The voluntary pleasure which one takes in a thing *considered under a condition*, which without the condition would be a mortal sin, but not with the condition, is not unlawful. *Ut gaudium voluptatis de concubitu, si esset uxor.*" And at page 8, col. 2, No. 24, the same author says, "*Nec peccaret desiderans accedere ad aliquam, si esset sua uxor, et desideraret esse suam. Nec religiosus aut conjugatus desiderans uxorem ducere, si ille à voto, ille a conjugio liber esset.*"

Fallucius, another Jesuit, in his moral questions, (tom. 2, tr. 21, chap. 8, numb. 296, page 35, col. 2, edit d'Anvers, and page 19, col. 1, edition of Col.,) has these words: "*Quando conditio tollit malitiam ab actu; ut cognoscerem Titiam si esset uxor, tunc potest absque peccato desiderari res ex objecto mortalium sub tali conditione si liceret.*"

Paul Laiman, another Jesuit, in his Moral Theology, (book 1, tract 3, chap. 6, page 30, col. 2, No. 12,) says, "*Conjux mortaliter non peccat si de maritali copula, absente conjuge, cogitans, rem cogitatam voluntate approbet sive de ea gaudeat. . . . Quod idem Sanchez lib. 1, moral c. 2, No. 33, et Fallucius loco citato, extendunt ad omnem, voluptatis affectionem etiam simplicis complacentiæ conceptæ ex cogitatione concubitus cum muliere, si uxor esset.*"

For more on this subject, see Hexaples, vi. Col., art. ii., §. 1, pa. 285, et seq.

The Jesuits, then, in the first place, inculcate low ideas of the nature of righteousness—so low as to be altogether inconsistent with it. They teach that it is the work of man, in such a sense, that it is not properly the work of God in man. They teach that it is compatible with a disposition of soul which makes a man obey the law simply through fear. Hence flow a multitude of other errors. According to their doctrine, it is not necessary for a man to refer all his actions to the will of God; and when he does so refer them, it is not necessary that he should be moved to do it by love to God. It is sufficient to make his actions good, that they have an outward conformity to the law of God. The first commandment, according to their view, does not bind men to fulfil all the other commandments of God by the motive of the love of God—it only binds men not to hate God, as one of their body (Anthony Sirmond) has maintained. This individual affected to admire the goodness of God in not requiring us to love him, being content that we should not hate him!! Others have advanced the same sentiment.—(See the first Instruction Pastorale of the Bishop of Rhodes, 15 March, 1722, and the 10th Provincial Letter.)

In pursuance of such principles, the Jesuits exalt very much the exterior of religion—they propose as infallible ways of salvation certain practices and devotions, to which a man may become very much addicted without any change of heart. All these things depend solely on man,—he can practice them if he pleases. But every one knows that it is not easy for a man to awaken the sense of love to God in his heart, or the spirit of true devotion in the performance of religious worship, whatever be the form or the place in which it is rendered, and accordingly, the Jesuits do not embrace these, in the number of duties. (See the 9th Provincial Letter.) For example, they teach that it is sufficient to be present at the celebration of mass, without more; and this opinion accords well with the practice of the Roman church, of celebrating mass in an unknown tongue, and parts of it in a voice which cannot be heard by the people.

The relative duties of men to each other are measured by the same rule. It is sufficient, in their view, to fulfil them externally. For example, to abstain from maltreating an enemy, while sentiments of aversion and even hatred are cherished in the heart. The reason is evident, according to the principles of the Jesuits. It is this, the man feels and knows full well, that he cannot change his will or reform his inclinations, though he can acquit himself of an exterior act, if such only is prescribed as his duty. Now their doctrine is, that a thing which *is not fully and entirely in the power of a man*, is not necessary to make him righteous in the sight of God, because he must have the power to make himself righteous, although in truth there is no righteousness, and can be none, when the will and the desires of the heart are not conformed and subject to the will of God.

In short, all agree that a man has not always power to reform his interior—or change his affections—or, to use their own phraseology, he has not a power of equilibrium in this respect. This is an experimental truth. The Molinists are obliged to admit it as

well as others, but they derive a different conclusion from the fact. It is in truth, a proof of man's weakness, and of his need of extraordinary aid to fulfil his duties. But the Molinists on the contrary, conclude, that the reformation of the inner man, or a change of his affections is not a duty

This conclusion of the Molinists, so different from that of all orthodox Christians, is accounted for in this way; they combined an experimental truth with a principle peculiar to themselves and the Pelagians, viz., the weakness of man, arising from his depravity of nature, with the Pelagian notion that a man has always the power of equilibrium to perform his duties; and instead of deriving their rules of duty from God's word, and from the hope of his all powerful grace, they curtail duty and obligation by the deceptive and oblique rule of the corruption of nature. Hence it is, that their casuists often give no other reasons for their decisions than the *infirmity of nature*; the *precepts*, they say, *do not impose so painful an obligation—the yoke of the children of Adam would be too heavy, &c.*

The doctrine of *pure nature* is another device for evading the precept, "whatsoever ye do, do all to the glory of God." The principle which has just been discussed, saps the foundation, by destroying, if we may so say, the very soul of this duty; but the distinction between the two states, *natural* and *supernatural*, accomplishes the object in a different way. It limits a man's duty in *respect to its extent*. "There are (they say) an infinite number of actions in life which do not belong to the supernatural order, and which of course the man who performs them is not obliged to refer to a supernatural end. The former doctrine, therefore, tends to the belief that a man is not bound to be a Christian except *externally*, while the doctrine touching the state of pure nature, tends to the belief that a man may sometimes, (rather often may we not say,) lay aside the *Christian Character altogether*.—(See the *Remonstrance of the Jesuits to the Bishop of Auxerre, published in 1726.*)

[To be continued.]

INDULGENCIA PLENARIA.

Translated from the DESPERTADOR *of Rio de Janeiro, of April 8, 1841.*

D. MANUEL do Monte Rodrigues de Araujo, by the mercy of God and of the Holy Apostolic See, bishop of Rio de Janeiro, of the Council of His Majesty, the Emperor, and his chief chaplain, etc.

To the Church of Rio de Janeiro, grace and peace from God the Father, and from the Lord Jesus Christ.

It was not possible, my dear children, that the day, the most solemn which religion recognizes, that in which is commemorated the greatest of mysteries, is professed that truth which serves as the foundation of all the other truths of our faith, and from which arises all our hopes, the day in which Jesus Christ rising from among the dead, by his own power, gave the most incontestible

proof of his divinity, confirmed all the truths which he had taught, and left us a sure pledge of immortality ; it was not possible that this day should pass without being signalized by some special favor from the Holy Church, in behalf of her children. *Favorable days, days of salvation*, are those which are to terminate ; and after those holy exercises with which in these days we prepare, having celebrated our *paschoa*, by the participation of the Lamb of God who takes away the sins of the world, will there be an opportunity most propitious for to be offered to us, a favor which permits us to satisfy the divine justice every thing we owe it for our sins? Most certainly. Seeing this grace, my dear children, that to you was confided, is that which we announce to you to-day in the words of the Apostle to the Corinthians : *Dispensatio mihi credita est.*

In virtue of apostolic letters, from which we are charged, on the 11th of the current month, the day of the *paschoa*, which is *the festivity the most excellent, and by which the dignity of all the other solemnities is consecrated in the church of God*, as those letters say : after the *pontifical* of this day, which we shall celebrate in the cathedral and imperial chapel of this court, we shall give the solemn blessing with plenary indulgence.

Several times, my dear children, we have already spoken to you of the utility of the indulgences : we are so weak and prone to evil, we violate so often the law of God, and hence we contract an immense debt towards his immutable justice, and so light are the penances which we make, that only the supply of the merits of the Redeemer and of his saints, or an indulgence plenary, it would not be able to inspire us with confidence that we have given to God a satisfaction worthy. These considerations are enough for those who, loving their soul, seek those eternal benefits which it is destined to enjoy ; while the body, and all this phantasy of honors, riches, pleasures and pastimes shall end, and disappear forever. We hope, therefore, that as in times past, you will profit yourselves of that which is now offered to you, resorting to the solemnity of the day and to the place designated, that you may participate in the grace which is announced to you : we ask you that *you will not deprive yourselves of the advantages of a happy day* ; we exhort you ; *save your souls !*

And that this notice may come to all, the Rev'd priests will publish this our pastoral, in the accustomed form. Episcopal Palace of the Canceilao, 2 April, 1841, etc.

MANUEL, *Bishop and Chief Chaplain.*

L. S.

[For the Baltimore Literary and Religious Magazine.]

P A P A L S U P R E M A C Y .

Is the Pope of Rome, the successor of St. Peter? and is he therefore, the supreme spiritual ruler of the catholic visible church? These are questions of vital importance, and deserve the serious consideration of every one interested in the church of Jesus Christ. If they are to be answered in the affirmative, then all the Protestant portion of the church, is guilty of schism, and is living in direct and positive rebellion against the King of Zion. But if they are answered in the negative, then Protestants are not only not guilty of schism, but the Pope is a usurper and antichrist.

The papal arguments on this subject are generally known, but to all their conclusions we beg leave to record three exceptions. I. It is not and cannot be proved that Peter was literally meant as the rock upon which our Saviour would build his church. II. It cannot be proved that Peter ever was Bishop of Rome. III. Of course the bishops of Rome are not and cannot be the successors of Peter; and consequently have not the right of the primacy.

I. It is not and cannot be proved that when the Saviour said, "Thou art Peter, and upon this rock will I build my church," he intended that Peter was literally, specially and alone the rock or foundation of his church.

In the first place, the declaration of our Saviour is susceptible of another and much more probable meaning than the one they give to it. Peter had just made a confession of his faith, by which for himself and the rest of the apostles, he acknowledged the supreme divinity of his Master. The *truth*, therefore, which Peter had confessed, was the rock, and the only rock upon which the Lord Jesus could found his church. His own divinity is the only foundation against which the gates of hell shall not prevail.

But at all events, if they will not admit this interpretation, another may be given which will suit their purpose no better. It may mean Peter and his successors wherever found: but all bishops are as much the successors of Peter as the bishop of Rome, consequently their interpretation fails.

But that their interpretation is wrong and ours right, we have the judgment of the early fathers. Clement, and Polycarp, and Ignatious, though writing on the subject of ecclesiastical polity, do not mention the text at all, or if they do, they do not consider as giving the supremacy to the Roman Pontiff. For proof, see Epis. Clem., all Corinth, 1, §. 1. Ibid. §. 40-44. Epis. Ignat., all Ephes. §. 2, 5, 6, 20. Epis. ad Magnes, §. 3, 6. Epis. Polycarp, all Philip. §. 5. Justin Martyr, in the middle of the second century, quotes and explains the text, and says, Christ bestowed upon Simon the name of Peter, because by the revelation of his heavenly Father, he confessed him to be the Son of God. Dial. cum Tryphe, p. 225. Irenaeus cites the text, but gives no interpretation of it. He indeed speaks something of the necessity of every church agreeing with the Roman church, on account of its more potent principality; but this is the way in which the Romanists translate

his words, and by so doing, they maim the passage. He is speaking of the best method of obtaining the truth. This he says, can best be done by the neighboring churches resorting to Rome, to examine the autographs of Paul's Epistles, &c. This "resorting" the Romanists render agreeing. The original word is "convenire." Iren. adv. Haer. lib. iii., c. 3, §. 2. Cyprian and Tertullian, with some others, take the text to prove that Peter only, or individually, is meant; but they do not cite it as warranting the supremacy of the Roman Bishop. Chrysostom gives it the same interpretation we have done. Homil. lxix. in Pet. Apost. et Eliam. Praph. oper. vol. p. 856. Athanasius, Cyril, of Jerusalem, Jerome and Augustine, give the interpretation we have adopted. Athan. lenu. Ep. Christ. oper. p. 519, 529. Cyril. Catech. vi., p. 54, xi. 93. Aug. Expos. in Evang. Johon. Tract. cxxiv. oper. vol. ix. p. 206. Thus we think it is evident, that from this text the papacy can derive no support. We pass on, therefore, to the second exception.

II. It is not and cannot be proved that Peter ever was Bishop of Rome.

If this could be done, it would appear from the line of bishops preserved by ecclesiastical writers: but this it does not. According to Irenaeus, Paul and Peter conjointly founded the church at Rome. But that either of them was Bishop, he virtually denies, for he makes Linus the first bishop. Euseb. Hist. Eccles. lib. iii. c. 24, lib. v. c. 5, 6. Here, then, is evidence that Peter never was, or at least not the first, Bishop of Rome.

But it further strikes my mind, that Peter never was a Bishop, in any manner, or of any place, in the sense which they would give to that word. Were this so, it ought certainly to appear from the history of his apostolic life.

Had he been Bishop, in their sense, *i. e.* the head of the church, or vicar of Christ, instead of taking the tedious method, of appointing an apostle in the room of Judas, by lot, he would at once in virtue of his supreme authority have filled that vacancy in the Apostolic College. But his not doing this, is proof positive that he did not consider himself vested with such power. The next incident of Peter's life, recorded, is in his speech on the day of Pentecost. But there can be no argument drawn from this to prove his primacy.

We have again a convincing proof that he was not the head of the Apostles, in the fact, that when Samaria "received the word," and it had come to the knowledge of the apostles, instead of his sending them, they sent him and John to that city. This would have been a fine stretch of power, on the part of the apostles, if Peter had been their head and ruler. Nothing like primacy on his part shows itself here.

Again, when Peter went and preached to Cornelius, and baptized him, we find that his conduct was complained of, and he was arraigned before the church judicature for it. Does he at this time assert his pontifical authority, and silence the judicature by his frown? No, he meekly submits to the investigation. And gives, as his only reason, that the Gentiles had received the Holy Ghost as well as they, and that he could not resist God.

Moreover, the conduct of Peter at the Synod of Jerusalem, gives no evidence that he had any superior authority: He was not even moderator of the meeting. James filled this place, and it was he that finally closed the business by a vote of the apostles and elders, and the church sends off Paul and Barnabas to Antioch. In this transaction, if there were any supreme authority, it certainly was not exercised by Peter but by James.—Acts xv. 4—31.

After this circumstance, the Acts of the Apostles are silent with regard to Peter, but occupy their details in giving the history of Paul. Certainly the superior Bishop ought to have had greater attention paid to him than this. Moreover, Paul, in all his epistles, gives not the least intimation of this supremacy; but he gives the most decided evidence, that he esteemed himself equal to Peter; and expressly declares that at Antioch he withstood him to the face, because he was to be blamed.—Gal. i. 11—24; ii. 1—16.

Again, if we look at the epistles of the other apostles, we shall find them equally silent on this subject.

Finally, the apostle Peter himself, never intimates any thing of it, but addresses the officers of the churches to whom he wrote, as their equal. Now we would naturally suppose, that even if all the other apostles were silent on this subject, yet Peter himself would not be; if indeed he had been vested with such authority. He dare not be. But in neither of his epistles does he say any thing about it. The conclusion, therefore, must be evident to every mind, that Peter had no such authority.

III. We are now brought to our third exception, which is, that if it be true, that Peter was not the rock on which the church was built; and if there is no evidence that he ever was Bishop of Rome, or any other place, in their sense of the word, then the Roman pontiffs are not and cannot be his successors—and consequently have no right to universal primacy. Accordingly, we find that from the first, there was no such thing as a supreme ruling bishop. Although the office of Provincial or Diocesan Bishop was soon introduced, yet it was not admitted by any, that the Bishop of Rome, was possessed alone, of the power of regulating all ecclesiastical affairs, throughout the world.

The Roman Bishops, however, soon began to claim a superiority; as the instances of Victor, in the second, and Stephen in the third centuries, prove. And as ignorance and moral darkness gathered around the church, they rose in their claims of power and lordly titles, until they arrived at the highest pitch of presumption, in claiming the homage of kings, and the right to wield the civil as well as the ecclesiastical sword. In the third century, Firmilian accounts Stephen, Bishop of Rome, a second Judas, and calls him an "arrogant and presumptuous fool."

But I need not dwell longer on this subject. Nothing can appear clearer to an unprejudiced mind, than that popery is a novelty, unknown to the Scriptures and apostolic history. D. N.

[For the Baltimore Literary and Religious Magazine.]

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

PART SECOND.

Ecclesiastical Boards accordant with the Standards of the Presbyterian Church, and therefore Constitutional.

SUFFICIENT has been said in order to expose the untenableness of the ground taken against our ecclesiastical organizations. Every reasonable mind will revolt against their destruction until some better system, free from the objections urged against the present, can be devised. Every such mind will conclude that since our benevolent operations must be sustained and carried forward, the existing agency must be maintained, unless it can be shown that those operations can be carried on by other means, and with increased energy and zeal. Our argument, therefore, might be here closed. But we are willing to meet the objections against our existing system, face to face, and sure we are, they will be found invalid, or altogether inapplicable.

What, then, is the real object of attack on the one hand, and of defence on the other? Let our objector answer. "We do not," he says, (p. 146,) "object to this system" of ecclesiastical organizations, "on account of any slight or accidental evils which wisdom and experience may remove without affecting the essential elements of the system itself. Such evils or rather abuses exist. They are to be found in those regulations by which honorary membership is purchased for money, an enormity similar to the sin of Simon Magus, for which he met the rebuke of the apostle; in their tendency to perpetuate themselves; and in the very partial amount of real investigation to which their proceedings are ever subjected. These are objections to the present plan on which our Boards are organized, but they lie not so much against the system itself as against partial and accidental abuses. The objections which have influenced our minds are radical and fundamental. We believe that the system in its essential principles is directly subversive of the Constitution of our church, unknown to the word of God, and unsupported by any arguments of expediency or necessity which can commend it to the understanding of a Christian man."

So also in his introduction, the writer speaks of "this system of measures which certainly has no surer foundations than that of prescription;" while in his conclusion he says, "we can have no reason to expect the assistance of the Lord, when we have trampled his institutions in the dust."

That, therefore, against which objections are now raised, and which we undertake to defend, is not our present ecclesiastical organizations in all their details, but only in their essential principles or elements. We do not, therefore, say that every part of our present system ought to be, or that it is necessary, it should be

retained. The regulation by which honorary membership is purchased for money, may be safely abolished. To this we should not object. The tendency of our boards to perpetuate themselves, may be checked by any reasonable regulations. Their proceedings may be made the subject of a closer investigation until every one shall be abundantly satisfied. The boards and their committees may be merged into a single body—responsible directly to the Assembly—and in every respect subject to its control. And if there be any other evils, or defects in the present system, we are abundantly willing that they should be rectified. None of these things constitute the subject of our present controversy. We demand for our ecclesiastical agency no powers inconsistent with the supremacy of the Assembly or the spirit of our standards. The single question is whether for carrying on her missionary and other operations; the Assembly may scripturally and constitutionally appoint any body to whom shall be entrusted the management of these various operations during the intervals which elapse between the yearly sessions of that judicatory. This is the single question. That the Assembly has such power, is the only point for which we contend, and it is as plainly the principle against which the objector utters such a withering condemnation. That the Assembly has such authority he denies—and we affirm;—“whatever, therefore,” he says, “is not done by elders and ministers, assembled in some one of the courts above mentioned, is not done by them as *Presbyterians*. It is only in these courts that we recognize the church as an organized body. Here, and here alone, do we find Presbyterianism. Now we maintain that the system of boards gives us a set of officers and a set of ecclesiastical courts entirely different from those of the constitution.”—(See p. 147.)

The evils, abuses, or defects attributed to our existing boards, but which are separable from them—are not therefore to be considered in the present argument. These are fair matters for a separate discussion. But the propriety and necessity of boards or committees of any kind for the management of the various benevolent operations in which the church is engaged, with power to carry into execution any plans which it is competent for her to undertake—this, we repeat, is the question before us. We are thus earnest in calling attention to this point, which is so clearly laid down by the objector himself, because in a subsequent part of his discussion, he argues against our organization on the ground that the boards as distinct from the committees, are unnecessary. This question is, however, very different from the general principle, and one which is to be decided on very different grounds.

Such an agency, call it either a board or a committee, as he maintains, is “directly subversive of the form of government embodied in the constitution of our own church.” “These courts (i. e. Sessions, Presbyteries, Synods, and the General Assembly) are treated in our constitution as abundantly adequate to meet all the exigencies of the church, and to do all that God requires her to do in her ecclesiastical capacity.” It is, therefore, argued that since these agencies or boards are neither Sessions, Presbyteries, Synods,

or General Assembly, the Assembly in appointing them transcends the powers given to it by the constitution.

Now in contrariety to this, we affirm that such boards, agencies, or committees, with such powers, and for such ends, are necessary to carry out the purposes for which the Assembly itself was organized, and are therefore constitutional; and that some such agency is contemplated by our standards, and is, therefore, to be considered as in unquestionable accordance with them.

We lay it down as an universal principle that the imposition of any duty implies the correspondent right to use such means as are necessary to its discharge. Where any constitution, civil or sacred, requires from its officers the discharge of any functions, or the attainment of certain ends, it at the same time gives the power necessary to carry such provisions into effect. This principle has been admitted in our political controversies by the strictest sect of our most rigid constructionists. Upon this principle our church also, acted in her late crisis, and with its certain propriety must all her famous acts and the present reformation of the church stand or fall. Now our church courts, and especially the General Assembly, are, as is admitted, under certain obligation to secure those important ends which are contemplated by our several benevolent operations. They are most assuredly bound to the utmost of their ability and in the very best manner possible, to provide for the education of young men for the work of the ministry—for the instruction of the people generally—and for sending the gospel where it is not enjoyed, as well in our country as in foreign lands.—(See Form of Gov. ch. xviii.) Such, then, being the duty imposed upon the General Assembly in particular, as the organ of the church, that body is necessarily empowered to order all the details of her plan of operations guided and restrained by the general principles of the Constitution. But as the General Assembly remains in session but for a very short period, and the necessity for continuous direction, supervision and assistance continues during the whole year, it is most obvious that either these operations must be wholly abandoned, which would be on the supposition sinful, or else some board, committee or agency must be entrusted with their management under a responsibility to that body. And as the supply of funds constitutes only one object for which such a body is necessary, and a general superintendence and controul are still more necessary and important, this body must be entrusted not only with the power of disbursing funds, but also with the power to carry into execution all the plans of the Assembly, and with the entire management of its various operations. Now whatever may be found in the constitution of our several boards which can be shown to be unnecessary for these ends, for any such features in their organization we do not contend. They are fairly open to discussion, and may be retained or abandoned as shall be thought most conducive to the peace and prosperity of the church. But to dissolve our several boards, and to limit the power of direct controul over the various benevolent operations of the church, in all their details, to the single periods of the sessions of any ecclesiastical judicatory, is at once and utterly to destroy them. It is to render their maintenance

an impossibility. And since their vigorous prosecution is imperatively required, the argument which leads to such conclusions must be fallacious, and our boards in their essential and radical principles must be constitutional.

This reasonable conclusion is forced upon us not only by the consideration of those necessary ends for whose attainment the Assembly and our other judicatories are held responsible, but also by certain provisions which are expressly contained in our written standards. The power to organize such boards for the better accomplishment of required duties, is implied in the very constitution of the General Assembly. The Assembly is to "constitute the bond of union, peace, correspondence, and mutual confidence among all our churches," and this it does by organizations for the wise conduct of those benevolent operations in which all the churches are equally interested. The Assembly is "to superintend the concerns of the whole church" and "to promote CHARITY, truth, holiness, through all the churches under their care"—and this it does by such plans of benevolence as will best cultivate these Christian graces, and open up to them the freest, the sweetest and the most economical channels for the communication of their gifts. The organization of such boards or agencies is in so many words, referred to the Assembly in our Form of Government, and in the chapter "of missions" (xviii). In this chapter, every needy congregation is taught that it is proper for it to look to the General Assembly, for such assistance as it can afford, to enable that congregation to enjoy the frequent administration of the word and ordinances. But to meet all such claims—to examine into them—to provide the men and the means—and to do this effectually and throughout the year, the Assembly must devise some plan by which she can discharge these all-important duties. And thus will that body be necessarily required to organize some board in all essential principles equivalent to the present Board of Domestic Missions, nor is it possible to meet the wants of the case without such a standing body.

Further. It is here taught that "the General Assembly may of their own knowledge, send missionaries to ANY PART (or to any country) to plant churches or to supply vacancies, and for this purpose," &c.—*See Form of Gov.*

Now in this provision of our book, there is given to the Assembly, as will be at once apparent, all the powers requisite for the formation of a distinct agency for the management of its foreign missions. For the field being the world, and the obligation being limited only by the ability of the church, there is evidently no assignable boundaries to the extent of our missionary operations. There may be under the care of the Assembly, hundreds of churches and ministers in various parts of the world. And how, in the name of common sense, is the Assembly, during one brief session, to provide for all the interests involved in such operations for a whole year. The very statement of the case makes palpably demonstrative the constitutional power here given to that body for the organization of a board, appointed by itself for the effectual oversight and management of such extensive operations.

This is made further evident by the concluding declaration of this chapter of our constitution, which applies generally to Presbyteries, Synods, or the Assembly. It is competent to any of these bodies to send missionaries, "provided always," &c.—*See Form of Government.*

It is thus determined that our missionary operations shall be sustained by the body conducting them, which is here required to make every provision necessary not only for their support, but also for that more generous recompence which is implied in the word reward. The Assembly, therefore, is thus obligated to provide for all the wants of all her missionaries and missions. But this it cannot do by its own direct agency, or during its own sessions. As, however, "qui facit per alium facit per se," the Assembly can appoint a board to whom it can entrust the supervision of this work, which is nothing more nor less than our Board of Foreign Missions, in its essential principles. That board, however, implies great labour and responsibility. It requires the continual and toilsome efforts of most trust-worthy and pious men—and since the church is equally bound to bear the expense necessary to secure the result as that which is involved in the result itself, so is it most just and reasonable that the Assembly should "provide for the support and reward" of its own agents (call them secretaries or any thing else) "in the performance of this service."

The same reasoning applies with equal force to the other branches of that benevolent enterprize which it is the sacred duty of the church to carry on with ever increasing energy.

That it is competent for the Assembly to organize such an agency, may be further argued from the admissions made by our objectors themselves. "The temporary agency of a pastor for a specific purpose," says the author of the *Calm Discussion*, "we acknowledge to be Scriptural." Now suppose the necessity involved in that specific purpose to continue and to press its claims with increasing weight upon that minister—and upon the church. Suppose those claims are entitled to be heard and attended to by the authority of Christ's commission given to the church. What, we ask, is the church to do? Is she not bound to continue such appointments so long as God in his providence presents to her the same wants to be supplied, and the same necessity to be met? If such an appointment for such benevolent ends, when the demand for it is temporary, is Scriptural, then assuredly a similar appointment, when the demand for it is permanent, cannot be unscriptural. The church has a certain duty to discharge, and she must therefore see that it is discharged. And if it is in any case scriptural and proper to appoint pastors to certain fields of labour as most suitable for its successful cultivation, then it is as plainly scriptural to continue such appointments until the work is done. And as in the present state of our country and the world, the work to be done, is beyond the utmost capacity of our church, and requires incessant labour, there must necessarily be those in office whose duty it is to labour continually in it.

Again, this writer tells us that the funds raised for these benevolent operations, "could either be transmitted by mercantile agents

of the Presbytery, or by a central committee! of the Assembly, consisting of business men, charged only with executive duties and not entrusted with discretionary power." He has also given us a scheme of his own for the accomplishment of these ends which we have already examined. Now here the principle for which we contend, is certainly admitted. It is granted that some agency is necessary. It is granted that that agency must be distinct from the Assembly,—and it is granted that the Assembly may and of right ought to institute such an agency. But while he would confine it to the management of funds merely, we would extend it to the far more important and moral interests involved in these glorious enterprises, of Christian charity. While he would make it a committee of finance, we would clothe them with spiritual and moral responsibilities becoming the work for whose prosperity they are needed. While he would invent a new class of officers, called deacons of Presbyteries, and deacons of Synods, and Deacons of the Assembly, and combine these into new bodies and assign to them extra constitutional duties; we would construct such important bodies out of constitutional materials, and select ministers and elders who are by divine right spiritual governors and overseers of the interests of the church—to whom the powers necessary for such a management of these operations are given by our Constitution—who are fit and proper members of our ecclesiastical courts—and to whom, therefore, such weighty responsibilities may be fitly given.

I will now notice as briefly as possible the several objections urged by this writer, against the Presbyterian character of our existing boards.

And, first, it is said they "give us a set of officers and a set of ecclesiastical courts entirely different from those of our constitution." Now to say nothing of the inappropriateness of such an allegation in the mouth of one whose proposed substitute implies the creation of "a new set of officers, and a new set of courts," we deny the truth of the representation. Our corresponding secretaries—our general agents—and the members of our several boards are not new officers. They are not inducted into any new office. They are not clothed with any new character. They receive no new commission, nor any repeated ordination. They are the ministers and elders of our churches. They are chosen as such, and because they are such. Because they are officers of the church, they are placed in responsible situations by the church, and called upon to manage the most important operations which are conducted by the church. Neither do they cease to be elders or ministers by becoming officially related to our Boards. On the contrary, while the elders are still at their several posts—the ministers are expected and required, in the furtherance of their duties, to preach with frequency. They are most properly called ministers, since they serve the church and the cause of Christ by furthering their highest interests. It is hazardous nothing to declare that the ministers who have occupied these responsible situations, have fulfilled the work of the ministry in the proclamation of the ever blessed gospel and the edification of the churches—as effectually, as they could have done in any particular change, or as is done by our ministers gen-

erally. Besides, the objection would apply equally to all ministers who are professors in our colleges or theological seminaries,—at any rate, since it proves too much, and is founded on the mistaken supposition that when removed from a ministerial charge, such officers are removed from ministerial employment, or to some other work, than the work and duties of the church which she is under obligation to discharge—it proves nothing at all, and must be thrown aside.

But it is also objected that such boards are new ecclesiastical courts which come “in direct and unavoidable collision with the authority of the courts acknowledged by our standards.” Now by an ecclesiastical court, I understand “an assembly of those who have the original and inherent power or authority of executing laws and distributing justice according to the constitution, and “in general, to order whatever pertains to the spiritual welfare of the churches under their care.”* But as thus defined, our several boards are not ecclesiastical courts, but merely agencies for those courts already established. They neither claim nor possess original and inherent powers. They do not pretend by virtue of any such authority to execute laws and distribute justice. Nor do they assume any such prerogative as the ordering of whatever pertains to the spiritual welfare of the churches. These boards have no such powers whatever. They have no original, inherent or independent existence at all. They are the offspring of our highest ecclesiastical court—created by it—responsible to it—existing only at its will—performing only its work—and restrained in every thing by the code of by laws sanctioned by that body. And as they have no original authority, so neither have they any final powers. Their business is unfinished until it receives the imprimatur of the Assembly, by which it *must* be reviewed, and by which it *may* be reversed or altered. They are merely the agents—the hands—the organs of the body, and by which it wields its own power. Such an agency our standards recognize and our objector allows. In short, these boards, reviewed in their essential principle, are precisely what the writer defines to be committees. They “are appointed for two purposes, to prepare and arrange business for the body which appoints them, and to execute specific trusts by the order and direction of that body to which they are responsible.” They every year submit to the Assembly plans for future operation—and the record of their transactions according to the trust reposed in them during the year preceding. Our boards, therefore, are just such committees. They are and they ought to be no more, nor do we ask for them any greater power. That the board and the committee are now separate, is a feature in their organization which might be easily changed, and their identification with this definition of a committee be made as perfect in form as it is in fact.

But, says our author, “the possession and exercise of power distinguish a court.” But this clearly is not the case. This cannot be the definition of a court. These attributes may characterize a thousand things besides a court. They are descriptive of all Committees appointed either by our Presbyteries, Synods, or Assem-

* See an Ecclesiastical Catechism of the Presbyterian Church, chapter iv.

bly—and of our Boards of Directors.—A court must have original and inherent authority appertaining to the laws of the society, and which are administered by it. And therefore are we forced to the conclusion that our boards are committees of a peculiar organization, and for objects of permanent necessity, and that they are not ecclesiastical courts.

It is objected further, that “these institutions have the whole matter of preaching the gospel to the destitute and ignorant at home and abroad, entrusted to their charge”—“in other words, the power and jurisdiction granted by the constitution to the Presbyteries are vested by the Assembly in its own creatures.”

That our boards may not possess some powers which ought not to be committed to them, we do not affirm. If they do, let them be deprived of them, and at once reduced to constitutional limits. But that this representation is entirely visionary, we are perfectly assured. Our objector himself allows that our boards do not lay any claim to many of the chiefest branches of ecclesiastical jurisdiction. He allows that they cannot ordain—and that they cannot institute actual process for crime or heresy. But they are authorized “to *appoint* all missionaries and agents, and to designate their fields of labour.” Most certainly this is the very work which they are designed to do, in trust for the Assembly, and responsible to it. But let it be observed, these boards (we speak now of the missionary boards) have nothing whatever to do with such individual until they are already tried, licensed or ordained by their respective Presbyteries. From the hands of these Presbyteries are they received by the boards, and unless so commissioned and authenticated, neither of the boards could receive them at all. Let it also be observed that when thus presented to them, our boards only *appoint*—they do not examine, license, or ordain as do our ecclesiastical courts. They *appoint* them as already ministers, and not in order to their becoming ministers. And this *appointment* of the boards refers merely to their field of labour, and not at all to their qualifications for the work of the ministry. The Assembly contemplating these numerous missions, requires its boards, in its name and by its authority, to act for it in this important matter. In this there is no infraction whatever of the rights of Presbyteries. Their authority remains undiminished. The boards can receive no man until the Presbytery has sealed his fitness by the impress of its solemn consecration, and in designating individuals so commissioned to their fields of labour, these boards only comply with the wishes of every Presbytery, through their common organ, the General Assembly. But should any Presbytery commence a mission of its own, it is at perfect liberty to select its field, and to appoint its men in entire independence upon either of these boards. As to domestic missions, each Presbytery may superintend its own field, and while acting through the Board, have the most perfect controul of its entire management. And as it regards the foreign field, it is to be remarked that this field, lying beyond the limits of any Presbytery, cannot of course, be under their jurisdiction. It is hence incumbent upon the Board, on behalf of the church, to take the oversight thereof, until a sufficient number of missionaries have been sent out to constitute a Presbytery. In this event, that distant territory

is assigned to the newly erected Presbytery, and comes under its ecclesiastical jurisdiction.

Equally inapplicable is the objection that our Boards interfere with the parity of the clergy, and invest their officers with a controul over their brethren, and a power in the church just as real and just as dangerous as that of a prelate!! That undue influence may be exerted by the officers of our boards, we grant, that is, their trust may be abused for their own personal aggrandizement. But would this influence be lessened by the appointment of benches or boards of deacons, and financial dictators under the style of treasurers, with unlimited controul of the funds? Or would it be in any great measure removed, were this work to be conducted through the year, as it must be by some body or other, by a commission of the Assembly, instead of a board of the Assembly? Let, then, this power be guarded and restrained in every possible and proper manner, but let not an evil which is incidental, be made a sufficient ground for the abandonment of a most necessary office. It is perfectly idle to frighten us with the imaginary picture of new orders in these ecclesiastical functionaries. They are and can be no other than simple ministers or elders, nor is any individual subjected to their personal authority, or excluded from the privilege of presenting any symptoms of arbitrary conduct for the reprobation of the General Assembly.

It is further objected that by the organization of these boards for the management of these benevolent operations, the church ceases to conduct them in her appropriate character as required by her divine Head. But is not our church represented in her General Assembly? Does she not empower this body to conduct these operations? Does she not now in fact, leave their entire management and supervision to its legislative wisdom, in dependence upon the separate co-operation of all the churches, Presbyteries and Synods within her bounds? And is it not plainly impossiblẽ for the Assembly, or for all our courts together, to enter into all the details involved in the management of these operations, during their annual and brief sessions? But still they must be attended to, and by the Assembly in its appropriate character. The Assembly, therefore, appoints an agency to attend to these matters during its adjournment, and to report in full at its next sessions. This appointment is annually renewed—the reports heard—and all needful directions given. These agencies or boards acting for the Assembly—and under its authority—and for the accomplishment of its work, which could not otherwise possibly be done, are properly in the eyes of the constitution and of reason, the church, by her Assembly fulfilling the trust committed to her by her glorious Head.

Our ecclesiastical boards are, therefore, necessary to carry out the provisions of the constitution—they contravene no principle or law of our standards.—Being the creatures of the Assembly, and dependent upon its yearly appointments, and subject to its entire control, they may be in every thing conformed to the wishes of the church, and are, therefore to be regarded as eminently Presbyterian in their character, and worthy of the most entire confidence, and the most zealous support of every one who loves the church of his fathers—the true model of primitive and apostolic Christianity.

[To be continued.]

NECROLOGY.—GEORGE CARSON.

DIED, in Warsaw, Sumpter Co., Alabama, on the 19th of August, 1841, GEORGE CARSON, merchant, of the city of Baltimore.

His disease was congestive fever—and his last sickness was only of four days' duration. He died in the midst of comparative strangers; and almost without warning,—for his disease was not considered dangerous, until a few hours before his dissolution, and then its violence had entirely prostrated him.

He was born at Armagh, in the north of Ireland, about the year 1789. His father, *Mr. Samuel Carson*, was a Surgeon and Apothecary; and was a man so much respected and beloved, that on the occasion of his emigration to America, the principal people of Armagh, to the number of nearly a hundred—voluntarily presented to him, a written token of their affection and respect—and of their great regret at losing him from amongst them. We have this interesting document before us,—it is dated, *Apl. 20, 1803*. The maternal ancestors of *George Carson*, were of the name of *Harrison*; and were persons of great worth. We had seen an old instrument dated in 1752, conferring the freedom of the city of Glasgow, in Scotland, on "*James Harrison, Merchant in Ardmaugh*,"—who was his grandfather. He was brought to this country in 1803, with his parents and the other members of his family—the descendents of whom are scattered over our wide country—and have continued to receive the covenanted blessings of the seed of God's people.

He was raised a merchant; and after living in several parts of the country—finally established himself in Baltimore—where after the usual vicissitudes and trials of that laborious and uncertain calling, he had succeeded in establishing a high reputation, and accumulating a handsome competency. But the terrible events of 1837—in the commercial world, prostrated him, along with thousands of others; and bad debts and the depreciation of property, swept away the earnings of his life.

At the age of fifty, with a large family, an embarrassed business and slender means; he set himself, with a vigorous spirit, and a stout and honest heart—to retrieve his affairs. And if his life had been spared—he would have done it. But in his second visit to the fatal climate which cut him down—he fell struggling in the calling to which God had appointed him.

He lived in Baltimore nearly twenty years—having settled in this city in 1822; and no man ever had more the confidence of all who knew him. Full of honour, candour, gentleness, and all kindly emotions—he was a man utterly without reproach.

He was raised in the Christian faith, a Presbyterian. In the year 1824, he united himself with the church under the care of the *Rev'd John M. Duncan*, of Baltimore. In the subsequent difficulties between Mr. Duncan and the Presbyterian church—he took the part, (along with a number of the leading members of the congregation served by that gentleman,) of orthodox and evangelical doctrine; and remaining attached to the Presbyterian church,

under the General Assembly—became a member of the Second Presbyterian Church of Baltimore, then under the pastoral care of the late *Rev'd John Breckinridge, D. D.* He was elected a Ruling Elder of that congregation, in the year 1831; and served God and his generation in this office, with singular zeal, fidelity, and acceptableness—till he rested from his labours. The estimation in which he was held by the church, will be manifest from the document which we publish below.

He married a daughter of the late *Rev'd Dr. Knox*, with whom he lived in uninterrupted happiness—and who, with a large family of orphan children—survives him.

The writer of these lines, knew *George Carson*, intimately, for about nine years. And he can truly say, he never knew a man in whose character and principles he had more confidence. He was altogether a child of God. And full surely do we expect, if ever we are admitted to the shining company around the throne; to be re-united with this beloved man, who in this vale of tears, has so often and so largely helped our weaknesses—so tenderly and so firmly upheld us in every trying occasion—and so nobly and steadfastly urged us forward in all good enterprizes. We thank God for having given us such a friend; and feel one more tie broken from earth, by his removal.

At a regular monthly meeting of the Session of the Second P. Church, on Tuesday, the 7th of Sept., 1841—our stated pastor being still absent, performing the last offices of friendship to his deceased brother, our former beloved pastor, *John Wilson* was called to act as moderator, and *R. J. Cross* appointed clerk.

The following preamble and resolution were submitted.

On receiving the account of the death of the *Rev'd Dr. John Breckinridge*, this Session, in joint meeting, with their brethren of the Boards of Deacons and Trustees of this church, did endeavour to give expression to their feelings of deep regret and sincere sympathy, on account of the sad bereavement—which expression it is the desire of this meeting may be recorded among the proceedings of this Session.

Our tears have scarcely been permitted to dry, until they are again bidden to flow, for another heart-rending affliction, which comes home to this Session with peculiar interest and force.—*GEORGE CARSON*, one of the Elders of this church, a brother beloved in the Lord, a devoted and active Christian, is no more.—He has been cut down in the prime of life, far from home, and at a distance from her, who of all others, could best have soothed his last moments—and whose parting embrace would have mitigated the pang of dissolution.

In the death of this dearly beloved brother, this church has sustained a heavy loss.—In all the duties of his official station, he took an active and a zealous part—and that with so much meekness, as to endear him greatly to every member of the congregation. His labours in the Sunday School, and his services in the social meeting, will long be remembered with a melancholy tenderness.—But, alas! we shall see his face no more—and for this we mourn.

But blessed be God, we are not called to mourn, as those who have no hope. We rejoice to believe, that through the merits of his blessed Saviour, he is gone to join the society of the general assembly and church of the first born in heaven, and that he is now, with the four and twenty elders, whom John saw standing before the throne of God and of the Lamb clothed in white, with palms of victory in their hands—and singing hallelujahs for evermore.

Resolved, That in the death of *George Carson*, this Session has lost an active, intelligent, and beloved member;—this congregation, a worthy, conscientious and upright office-bearer;—the Sabbath School, a devoted teacher and superintendent;—and society, a useful citizen and an honest man: and that while we bow with

humble submission to the Divine will, as Christians; we would, at the same time, mingle our tears, as *men*, with his bereaved widow and orphan children—fervently beseeching Almighty God to support and comfort them under this sore trial, and to fulfil to them His gracious promises made to the widow and the fatherless.

Resolved, That the members of this Session will long cherish the remembrance of their deceased brother, and hold his many virtues, in their tenderest recollections; and as a token of their respect, they desire that these proceedings be entered in the Session Book—that they be read from the pulpit on the morning of next Sunday—and that a copy be furnished to the afflicted widow.

The following extract from the last letter we ever received from him—is a fair exhibition of the man. It was written in consequence of our having expressed fears that the personal risk he ran was too great—considering the value of his life—to his family and the church of God. Would to God we had been more urgent, or more successful in our appeal.

JUNE, 1841.

I feel a desire to say to you before I leave, that this effort of mine in the south—so far as I can know myself, I am urged to by a desire to pay my debts. It required some profitable effort to accomplish it, and could see no opening here to make such a one. I have had some canvassing of the matter in my own mind, I have viewed the privileges which, in the goodness of God, he permits me and my family to enjoy here. Nor has he left me ignorant of the danger of leaving such, in the pursuit of any earthly gain to a place where such cannot be had. I have been trying to see the way the finger of God's providence points for me; I have asked his aid that I might see clearly, and his strength to help me to keep in it.—'Tis not his will to give me clear views yet; I sometimes think I may be running ahead of his providence instead of following.—Yet circumstances keep urging all the time to go on.—When I first thought of going, there were many difficulties in the way, and to my mind for a time, insurmountable; yet, these were cleared away one by one. So have I found it since I came home; new difficulties have arisen, and new ways have been opened up for me to go. I am led to believe that the Lord calls me to a new field of labour.—I have been a cumberer and sluggard in his garden here.—I ask your prayers, and the prayers of God's people for me, that grace and strength may be given for the trials and duties he has for me to bear, or to do.

Your friend and brother,

GEO. CARSON.

☞ THE patrons of this work, would confer a favor on its proprietors, which would be gratefully remembered—if they would make an effort to extend its circulation, and inform us of the result, before we print our number for January, 1842. They might also thus promote the cause of the Master, and the good of a guilty world.

Those subscribers who owe us for subscription—will never regret it—if they will immediately remit the money to us—and thus enable us to pay those we owe. We take the risk of the mail, and receive at par all funds current—any where. The post-masters will frank their letters.

Any who may intend to discontinue—should do so before the next number is issued; they should also pay up all arrearages, and frank their letters. It is bad enough to lose our patrons, without having to pay for the unpleasant information.

Those who never have paid any thing, and never intend to do so, will get a receipt in full by applying for it.—This has no reference to those to whom we send the work without order; nor to those who pay us, many times over, in matter for its pages.

We bless the Lord for the circumstances of mercy in which we close the labours of the year; which has been one of unusual labour, trial, and sorrow, to us. We also offer our grateful acknowledgments to the numerous and generous friends, who have so long borne with us, and so kindly stood by us. 