

**POPERY  
AND  
PUSEYISM.**

# THE LIBRARY



252  
G 823

DEC 22 1959

# POPERY

AND

# PUSEYISM:

BEING TWO DISCOURSES

Prepared agreeable to a Resolution of the Synod of Pittsburgh of 1843; and preached before that Body, at Pittsburgh, September, 1844.

BY THE

*Lewis Warner*

REV. DOCTORS GREEN AND MAGILL.

---

PITTSBURGH:

PUBLISHED BY ORDER OF SYNOD.

LUKE LOOMIS, AGENT:

1844.

**Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1844, by**  
**LUKE LOOMIS, AGENT,**  
**In the Clerk's Office of the District Court of the United**  
**States in and for the Western District of Pennsylvania.**

252  
G823

THE

**RIGHT OF**  
**PRIVATE JUDGMENT:**  
**OR,**  
**FREEDOM OF INDIVIDUAL**  
**OPINION AND BELIEF.**

**A SERMON,**

Preached in the First Presbyterian Church, Pittsburgh,  
on the Evening of Friday, 20th Sept. 1844:

**BY L. W. GREEN,**

**PROFESSOR WESTERN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.**

---

**"I speak as unto wise men; judge ye what I say."  
1ST CORINTHIANS 10, 15.**

## THE RIGHT OF PRIVATE JUDGMENT.

---

IN every great conflict for the mastery of the world, which has deeply stirred the minds of men, and widely influenced the destiny of the race, the *real* combatants have been antagonist principles; and the mightiest leaders, in the great struggles of their age, have gathered the masses around them, and wielded them at pleasure—only as the representatives, or rather the living embodiments, of the principles they loved. In that general movement of the human mind, which signalized the sixteenth century—which revolutionized the whole intellectual, moral and social condition of mankind, and gave that new impulse to the progress of the race; of which our own civil and religious institutions are at once the noblest product and happiest exemplification—the opposing principles of the contending parties were boldly and broadly emblazoned on the hostile banners. On the one side, stood forth luminously there, in bright and glorious transparency—radiant with the mingled light of earth and heaven, and shedding its benignant influence on all human interests—that fundamental principle—the basis of all pure morality and all true religion—of

all personal independence, and all national freedom—“*The Right of Private Judgment*”—Freedom of Individual Belief—an open Bible—a Free Press—unfettered Liberty of Thought, of Inquiry, of Discussion—for every human being, of every sect and party—for the Layman as well as for the Priest; while on the other, was engraven in gloomy capitals upon a dark back-ground—faintly illumined by the fires of the Inquisition—this portentous dogma—the favorite principle of all Despots both in Church and State—“The Supreme Authority of the Church”—“Implicit Faith—Absolute Submission”—“that most pestilential error, Liberty of Conscience”—“that pest, of all others most to be dreaded, unbridled Liberty of Opinion”—“that worst and never sufficiently to be execrated and detested Liberty of the Press,”\* and “we forbid that any Layman shall ever be permitted in public or in private, to discuss the Catholic Faith; and whoever shall disregard this prohibition, let him be hung up in the halter of excommunication”—“*Laqueo Excommunicationis Innodetur.*”†

The simple annunciation of these opposing principles sufficiently indicates their origin, and bears along with it their own appropriate and ample commentary. The one, you perceive at once, is the language of Power: the other is the Claim of Right. The one is the Voice of the Priesthood—the other, the Remonstrance of the People. The one is the Echo of the Past, as it issues from those dark ages

\* Literal Extracts from the Pope's Bull of 1832.

† Quoted by Dens and Bishop Hughes from Pope Alexander IV.

of Priestly Domination, Sottish Ignorance and Ghostly Superstition. The other is the Living Voice of the awakening intelligence of Europe, as the night of centuries rolls away, and the morning of a new, and higher, and holier civilization beams upon their eyes. One is thundered from the Vatican; is muttered from the dungeons of the Inquisition; is enforced at the point of the Imperial Bayonet. The other is the loud shout of emancipated millions, as their fetters drop away—as they look around on this fair earth, and above, at this broad sky—and with mysterious wonder and delight, on the unsealed volume of Revelation—and in the consciousness of new-born vigor and newly-discovered rights—exclaim, all together, “Oh! no! It cannot be! We too are MEN; and God never made these free souls of ours to be the bondslaves of the Priesthood; the blind recipients of their dogmas, or the abject registers of their decrees!” It is the mighty outburst of those electric thoughts which had been gathering long, and blackening silently in the minds of men, and only waited for a fit conductor, to discharge their accumulated thunders on the high places of Idolatry and Sin, and startle those self-constituted Lords of the faith and the consciences of men, from their long and guilty dream of Universal Dominion. Here, then, is the great question for the country and for the age, the *question of questions*, for ourselves and our children, which, for the next fifty years, shall arouse the energies of the mightiest minds; in the light or the gloom of which, all inferior questions shall be swallowed up; before whose overwhelming

energy and absorbing interest, all minor interests shall be forgotten, and all the barriers of Sect and Party disappear; the only question, indeed, in which we all alike are interested: "Whether man—rational, immortal, accountable man, created in God's image and redeemed by the blood of His Son—does possess the right, and the duty too, to read, think, inquire, reason, judge, decide—freely and independently for himself—in all that concerns his present welfare and eternal destiny; or whether he has been, indeed, consigned, in God's mysterious wisdom, to Lords, spiritual and temporal, by right of immemorial succession and legitimate consecration, for the guardianship of his temporal and eternal interests?"

You perceive, then, that there is a great gulf between us—immeasurable—unfathomable—that the difference between these fundamental principles, thus arrayed in direct and undisguised antagonism, extends beyond any mere difference of individual doctrines or even of a whole class of doctrines, and reaches the very foundations of human opinion—the very basis of human belief itself. On the one side, it is "Absolute Authority;" on the other, "Rational Conviction." It goes far beyond the interpretation of any one passage, or any class of passages in God's word, and touches the very right to read and interpret that word at all. Nay, in the wide sweep of the broad and universal propositions, which they severally affirm, it overleaps the mere boundaries of theological discussion; stretches over the whole wide domain of human thought; cuts through and through the whole

of human interests and human destiny; reaches the very springs of moral agency and the foundation of human rights; and involves all that is dearest to the citizen and the freeman as well as to the Christian. It is to this wider aspect of the general subject that we propose to direct our inquiries this evening.

And here, on the very threshold of our argument, we are met by the same strange and almost ludicrous phenomenon, which reappears again and again in the history of human folly; where some stupendous absurdity is found to be, not only false, but suicidal; and denies itself in the very terms of its enunciation. Thus: the universal sceptic, who denies the reality of all truth, denies, at the same time, the truth of his own proposition; which, if true, is manifestly false, and only by being a falsehood, could possibly be true. The man who denies the reality of his own existence, denies, at the same time, the reality of the proposition which he utters. So that the very words of the assertion necessarily involve the denial of the thing asserted. Very similar is the condition of one who denies the right of private Judgment; the free exercise of man's rational and immortal powers, in their largest meaning and widest scope; and then attempts, by *reasoning*, to sustain the denial. For the very attempt to defend his proposition is a deliberate abandonment of the whole; an exercise of the very right he has just denied; an appeal to the Private Judgment he had rejected; a recognition of the tribunal he had denounced. He is forced to assert what he denies, and deny what he asserts; and

the larger the range of his inquiries, the vaster the accumulation of his knowledge, the more luminous the track of his mind, as he urges onward with gigantic energy this stupendous paradox, the more conclusive the refutation of himself. Magnificent reasoning, indeed, against the right of reasoning! Forcible appeals to our private judgment, to prove that no such appeal should be ever made; or if made, ever for a moment entertained! Plausible quotations, forsooth, from the Bible, which *he had read*, (else he quotes it as a parrot, without professing to ascertain its meaning,) to prove that you and I should never read it! Quotations from the Bible, to prove that it is not the rule of a Christian's faith, and therefore ought not to be quoted at all, as conclusive testimony in any argument. Powerful appeals to our own UNDERSTANDING and INTERPRETATION of the Bible, which he quotes, for the purpose of proving, that we have neither the power nor the right to understand or interpret the Bible for ourselves at all. It is as if some ingenious madman, endeavoring to persuade us that we have no power of vision, should hold a lighted flambeau near our eyes, and failing in his effort, should kindle a mighty conflagration, or prepare a brilliant display of fire-works, and delighted with the glare and splendor of the exhibition, should exclaim, in his maniac folly, "Surely now, at least, you are convinced—you *must all see* that you *cannot see!*" while to us, each vivid flash of light, and each mounting volume of flame, only called into more active exercise, and awakened to keener consciousness, the very faculty whose existence he

denies while proving it; and whose exercise he at the same moment both invites and forbids—stimulates and denounces. Whatever else may be doubtful, this at least is manifest. My very appearance amongst you, this evening, for the discussion of an important subject, acknowledges thus much: that you have the power to hear, and the right to exercise that power. But does it not equally acknowledge, that you have the power to investigate, and the right to judge? Surely it were the very mockery of reason, to say you have the right to hear, but not to understand; to investigate, but not to decide. Thus every step upon the field of reasoning abandons the ground of authority. Else reason were no more reason, and authority were no more authority.

This inextricable dilemma, in which they are thus involved—this indissoluble connection between the right to reason and the right to judge—the right to investigate, and the right to decide—the right to read, and to interpret what we read, has been distinctly recognized by the advocates of Absolute Authority. And hence, Free Discussion is not only discountenanced abroad, but even in this free land of ours, is visited with all the terrors of excommunication here; and all the horrors of eternal fire hereafter. In the year 1832, a petty Italian Despot, who unites in his own person all temporal and spiritual power, the present Pope Gregory XVI issued this papal Bull, to all his subjects throughout the world—including the United States—in which he selects as the objects of his especial denunciation, every principle which lies at the basis

of our Political and Social Institutions—the Freedom of the Press—Liberty of Opinion—and commends, with earnest eulogy, the union of Church and State, and the burning of heretical books, in this emphatic language: “Nor can the materials of error be otherwise destroyed than by the *Flames*, which consume the depraved elements of evil.”

This strange ebullition of folly and ignorance, singularly blended with fanatical insolence and malignity, was met with one universal burst of indignation and contempt. From Maine to Florida the nation was aroused—and through the Press—from the Pulpit—in the popular assembly—wherever men met for private intercourse or public consultation—the voice of an outraged public sentiment was heard—mingled with playful sarcasm and bitter derision. Some Catholic young men of New York, stung by the keen invectives of the Press—goaded by the perpetual jeers of their Protestant companions—perhaps, warmed by the fresh air of Freedom, that breathed all around them, and deluded with the belief, that in this free land, they too were free—resolved to establish a society for the investigation and discussion of religious truth—and thus to erect in the city of New York—before the eyes of all men—a living monument of the freedom which exists in the Catholic Church—and a refutation, through all coming time, of Protestant misrepresentations. In the Catholic Diary of Oct. 1st, 1836, appeared a notice of the formation and objects of this society: and a letter from Bishop HUGHES on the same subject, in the Truth Teller of the following week. Does this Chris-

tian Bishop hail with joy these first symptoms of awakening intelligence and inquiry amongst his people? Does he rejoice to find that the youth of his flock are turning their feet away from the play-house—the ball-room—the fashionable gaieties and frivolous amusements—the dark and terrible temptations of that crowded and luxurious city—and now, at length, are beginning to ponder those great and eternal themes, that alone deserve the highest energies of our immortal spirit, and elevate and purify and enlarge the soul, that comes into contact with them? Does he cheer them by his applauding voice? Does he “point the path to truth, and lead the way?” Far otherwise. He denounces the society with unmeasured severity—derides their generous love of knowledge—castigates the Editor, who had dared to approve their object, and prohibits absolutely all discussion, except to the Priesthood. Hear how a Bishop dares to speak in these United States, and in the nineteenth century:

“TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC DIARY :

“In the Catholic Diary of Saturday last, October 1st, I find a notice from you of a society, calling itself the New York Catholic Society, for the promotion of religious knowledge. Of the existence of that society, I was utterly ignorant, and feel surprised that you, WHO OUGHT TO KNOW BETTER, would think of encouraging and drawing public attention to such a society, without”—

Without what? Without a serious consideration of the consequences? Without a calm conviction of duty? Is there a Catholic freeman in this house,

B

who has escaped from the civil and ecclesiastical tyranny of Europe, and has hoped in this blessed land, to find an elysium of freedom—I ask him to answer, without what? “Without first ascertaining the sentiments of your ordinary” or Bishop. “The church in the most positive manner, prohibits all laymen from entering into dispute on points of religion with sectarians—“*Inhibemus,*” says Pope Alexander IV., “*ne unquam Laicæ Personæ liceat publice vel private de fide Catholica disputare; qui vero contradicerit, excommunicationis laqueo innodetur.*” “We forbid,” says Pope Alexander IV., “that any layman should ever be allowed in public or in private, to discuss the Catholic faith; and whosoever shall disregard this prohibition, let him be hung up in the halter of excommunication.” Had you recollected this sentence, I am sure you would be far from calling on the Catholic young men of this city to become members of a debating society on religious subjects, open to so many serious objections.

JOHN, Bishop of New York.”

And how was this letter received? Was not the American spirit aroused at last? Did not the hot blood boil in the veins of these American youth, at such insolent dictation? Never did scoured spaniel crouch and whine and fawn upon the foot, that spurned him—with more abject submission—than did these independent youth and this free press, bow before the will of this foreign emissary of a foreign Despot. And what is the magic influence, which thus, at the distance of 3000 miles, can silence the press and stifle the voices, and

even paralyze the free thoughts of American citizens? It is the old decree of a foreign monarch, long since dead and buried and rotten in his grave, and written in a language even, which has died out from among the languages of living men. But though the Pope may die—the Bull never dies. This lives on the same, unchanged, unchangeable, perpetuating from age to age, and from land to land, the same dark decrees of Arbitrary Power—still

“The same wild Bull  
Which Priests and Demagogues let loose  
To toss our Laws and Liberties in the air.”

Again: the Right of Private Judgment—the unfettered exercise of our rational faculties, on every question that concerns our temporal or eternal welfare—the right to think, reason, examine, weigh, judge, decide freely for ourselves, is involved in the very possession of these faculties. Just as the right to see, hear, move, breathe, is involved in the power to perform these several operations. For these powers are bestowed, either that they may be exercised or may lie dormant. If that they may be exercised, then the right is commensurate with the power, and the duty co-extensive with the right—so that he who interferes with either is guilty at once of cruel injustice towards man, and daring impiety against God—injustice to man, since he denies a right, which God has bestowed; and forbids a duty, which God enjoins—and impiety against God, since he thus thwarts, as far as human power can do it, the high designs of His Infinite Beneficence. The right to think includes the

whole process of thought; from the commencement to the close; from the first rude materials of thought, to the finished product; from the first simple facts, which constitute the elements of some subordinate proposition, to the remote and ultimate conclusion, which crowns the summit of some high fabric of reasoning. The simple right to think, therefore, includes all for which we contend; for surely, it were too absurd to acknowledge the right to think, and yet deny the right to reason, which is only consecutive thought; to admit the right to reason, and yet deny the right to decide—or draw conclusions, which is one of its component parts. Yet this ultimate conclusion of the mind, in view of all the premises, is our Private Judgment. Should any still question us concerning the source of this right, and the warrant to exercise it, our answer is brief and direct. We point him upward to God, and inward to the wonders of our own bosom; and tell him, the origin is *there*. The warrant is *here*. Suppose some one should seek to draw a veil over the outward eye of the body, as well as the inward vision of the soul, and shut out from our view, the beauties and glories of God's works, as well as the wonders of His word, and then deny our right to see them: what would be our reply? Would we go to the Digest of the Statutes? Would we point to some decision of our Courts? Would we invoke the testimony of the Fathers? Would we not tell him to his face, in language brief, bold and unanswerable too, "the **RIGHT** to see is included in the **POWER** to see; the God who gave us eyes, gave us the right to use

them. You demand our Bill of Rights: behold! there it is in the autograph of Heaven—written by the finger of the Almighty.” But surely if the structure of the eye, the beautiful and harmonious adaptation of all its parts to the purposes of vision, be God’s Charter of Rights for the exercise of vision, the argument is still more conclusive from the structure of the mind—by so much more conclusive, by how much its structure is more wonderful, its adaptations more various; its powers more transcendent; its dignity more exalted; its destiny, in all respects, unspeakably more glorious. Rightly considered indeed, this is the highest of all possible evidence. Were it thundered to us from the Heavens above; were it echoed back from the depths of the abyss; were it flashed upon us in the forked lightning; were it whispered to us by the winds of the evening; were it muttered in the midnight tempest; were it engraved on the mountain’s side; were it written in letters of living fire upon the broad canopy above us; were it blazed and pealed upon us in dazzling and deafening grandeur from the whole universe around, yet the evidence could not be half so direct, so intimate, so irresistible. For behold it is here—it is stamped upon our very existence; it is interwoven with all the elements of our being; it is imbedded in the constitution of our nature; it is a necessary part in every thought and feeling—nay, it would be presupposed in the very revelations designed to confirm it. Since all these wonders in the Heavens and on the Earth, however luminous or loud, could only convince us when understood, and only be

understood when interpreted aright—and this interpretation would be the exercise of Private Judgment—which throws us back at last on this, as an ultimate law of our nature, mingling with and presupposed in every mental operation, and thus rising both in its evidence and its importance, to the dignity of an intuitive principle or necessary truth.

Again: if this right of Private Judgment be not ours, then *no other* RIGHT existing, possible or conceivable, remains for man: for this is of all human rights, the clearest, the most intimate, the most indisputable—earlier than all others, independent of all others—upon which all beside are founded; and from which, as moral and logical corollaries, they do necessarily spring. The right of property is only a secondary right, resulting from the rights of labor; and this is but another name for our right to the exercise and the products of that material machinery of muscles, bones and sinews, which we call *our own and not ourselves*. Now it is curious to observe that our right of ownership in our bodies even, is not only secondary in relation to an anterior and far higher right; but is extremely transient, even when compared with our property in other things. The house, which is yours to-day, fifty years hence MAY still be yours—but the evanescent title, which you hold in that mass of matter, which constitutes your body, will long before have disappeared. Each particle will have sought some new and separate combination, and gone to mingle with the universe of things. The source and centre, then, of all human rights—whence all originate and whither all converge, is the immor-

tal soul of man, and union with this, has given to the body a participation of its rights. But surely the rights of the soul can mean nothing less than the untrammelled exercise of all its various powers. He, then, who strikes at this, not only wounds the first and dearest of human rights, but aims a death blow at the whole. He who surrenders this at the bidding of another, not only is prepared to surrender, but has in the very act surrendered every other right, and is traitor, with a four-fold treachery, to the God who bestowed these invaluable rights, and committed them as a precious deposit to his guardianship—to the country that guarantees them to him, all unworthy as he is—and the blood of our dead fathers so freely shed in their defence—to his own high powers and exalted destiny—to the present and future generations—to the whole race of man. For in this great battle of the world, he has not merely spiked the cannon confided to his care, but has turned its fire on the advancing columns of his friends. He has not only fled in unmanly cowardice from the post he was appointed to defend, but has betrayed it to the foe. He has abandoned not only the out-works, but the fortress of freedom itself, and received the enemy into the very heart of the citadel.

Here, then, is a new tyranny, such as the sun never shone upon before; a tyranny so subtle in its slow advances; so terrible in the awful mystery of its unfathomable resources, that in comparison with it, every other form of oppression, which the world hath witnessed, might well aspire to the name of perfect freedom. There was a time when

we could proudly boast, that "the mind is its own place." Amidst all the abounding tyranny and oppression in the world—the violence, the cruelty, the blood-shed, we have consoled ourselves with the thought, that there is even upon earth one spot secure from all invasion—which no human power can approach, no human scrutiny can penetrate, no tyranny of man can awe—which all the embattled powers of the globe, with their combined artillery, could never storm—but the Almighty himself hath shielded it against all human assaults, and barriered it around against all human intrusion, and veiled it from human espionage, and thrown it aloof from all outward collision, amidst the invisibilities of His own eternity—that He who throneth amidst those invisibilities, might there erect His awful throne, and there reveal His presence, and stretch over it the sceptre of His power, and utter his high commands, and make it a sanctuary for himself—and man, in the sacredness of that secure retreat, might be alone with God, where no human power could rush in between the soul and its Creator. This sanctuary is the human bosom; and secure amidst its impenetrable secrecies, the soul of man hath bid defiance to every other form of tyranny; hath smiled at the dungeon and the chains; hath exulted on the gibbet and at the stake; "seen death in all its forms, and scorned them all"—nay, the very dungeon, where the imprisoned patriot or Christian, hath been pinioned down with heavy chains to the cold, hard floor, has been converted into a temple for God's worship—and the flames, which consumed the martyr's body, have been a

chariot of fire to his ascending spirit, as he mounted aloft in rapture to the bosom of his God. But here is a dark and mysterious power, which enters this God-ordained and God-consecrated sanctuary, and profanes its sanctity—storms this last stronghold of human freedom—dashes down its battlements, drags forth its awful secrets at the Confessional, and throws over the immortal soul itself, its paralyzing and degrading fetters. Even the southern slave *may be* a freeman. You may brand his brow, but it is only skin deep—no deeper than his color, and cannot touch the soul. The chains that bind his brawny limbs, may leave the mind unfettered; and amidst all outward bondage, he may be the freeman, whom “Christ makes free”—but here is a tyranny, whose brand burns deep into the inmost soul; whose fetters bind the free thoughts as they rise, and reaching all the faculties, degrade and paralyze the whole. For the mind of man is a unit. You cannot degrade it in one respect and retain its dignity in another. The man who will crouch before a priest, will quail before a tyrant—and he who has surrendered his mental independence at the bidding of another, and wears the fetters on his soul—he who hath bowed down beneath the yoke of such a bondage, hath stooped to the depth of such ineffable degradation, has nothing left to lose, and is a fit instrument of the same fearful power to fasten the same ignominious fetters upon others.

But there are relations of far wider compass—far deeper significance, far loftier, holier, more solemn and more sacred interest, than all that can be

comprehended in the enumeration of political rights—relations that link us with the great universe of moral beings, and render us intelligent and accountable subjects of God's moral government, and by that unchanging and terrible connection which God hath established of all with all, the blow which is aimed at the rights of thought, strikes deeper—to the very springs of moral agency, and severs the bonds of all human obligation. For DUTY and RIGHT are correlative terms, and there can be no duty, without a correspondent right; (for surely I have a right to perform my duty.) But the right to perform a duty, involves by unavoidable consequence, all that is necessary to its intelligent and appropriate performance, the employment of all the means and the exercise of all the powers requisite to ascertain our duty—the knowledge of the relations, on which it is based; the scrutiny of the evidence by which it is sustained; of the authority by which it is enjoined; the motives, by which it is urged; the exercise, in fine, of all our rational powers, in their fullest meaning and largest scope; from the minutest induction of particular facts to the widest sweep of a lofty and comprehensive generalization. Now duty—moral obligation—is intensely individual—personal, presses directly on the conscience—lies between man and his God. It is mine, and cannot be transferred to another. No man can love God or his fellow man by proxy. But this moral obligation is itself the compound result of the relations we bear, and the faculties we possess adapted to those relations. Duty is ours only, because the relations and capabilities from

which it springs, are ours. Annihilate these relations, and obligation ceases: destroy these powers or suspend their exercise, and obligation is equally at an end. Transfer to another the exercise of these powers on my behalf, and you transfer along with them all the resulting obligations. In assuming to himself, the exercise for me of those rational powers, from which my moral obligation arises, he deliberately assumes my responsibilities and duties, and as far as his power extends, strips me at once of the dignity and responsibilities of a moral agent. Hence it is not by fortuitous connection, but by necessary sequence, that the power which claims to dictate our faith, claims likewise to pardon sin—that she, who suspends the exercise of Private Judgment, suspends likewise the exercise of individual conscience, and assumes to abrogate the most solemn obligations, even though confirmed by the awful sanctity of an oath. Hence that horrible union of devotion and crime; of piety and blood, so common in papal lands. Hence the Spanish assassin consecrates himself by attendance on high mass, for his deeds of blood. The Italian robber wears near his heart, the image of the Virgin. The courtesan of Naples worships with devout affection, her patron saint. For salvation, without the necessity of personal holiness, is a necessary counterpart to faith without the trouble of personal inquiry. Thus the subjugation of the intellect leads directly to the extinction of conscience. Stupendous absurdities naturally beget stupendous crimes: and the darkest secrets of the Confessional are but the necessary result of those

portentous dogmas, which first challenge our belief and then decline our scrutiny—first revolt our reason and then denounce our reason because it has been revolted—for the poison which hath palsied the brain, deadens the heart and stupifies the conscience; and the light of reason and of the moral sense are extinguished together.

Again, this right of Private Judgment, which is thus implied, and exercised in every act of reasoning, which is interwoven with the whole structure of our minds—which is the earliest and dearest of human rights, and the basis of all the rest, and indispensable to the existence of a moral agent—is distinctly recognized in that great charter of human equality and human rights, the BIBLE—is enjoined again and again, both by precept and example—nay, like the existence of God himself, is presupposed, as an admitted and necessary truth, upon every page of the sacred record. Peter, you know, according to the teaching of our adversaries, was the first Pope of Rome. Now, since the days of Peter, there have been many Popes of exceedingly various characters. Some of them, perhaps, pious and worthy men; others, by universal admission, prodigies of crime—monsters in human shape—impure, licentious, beastly, treacherous, steeped in sensuality and blood. Each of these Popes likewise in his day has issued his Bull or circular letters, for the instruction and warning of the faithful—from the first epistle general of Peter to the last encyclical letter of Pope Gregory XVI. beneath whose happy reign, we heretics are permitted as yet to breathe. These letters too are all

written in a dead language, and need to be translated into the vulgar tongue. Now is it not a singular fact, that all the letters of all the Popes, from the beginning to the present time—even the vilest of the vile, who have desolated nations by their ambition, and disgraced our nature by their crimes—all may be read by the people in their own mother tongue, until you come back to that great Apostle, who alone among them all wrote by divine inspiration—and from whom all derive their apostolic dignity and power? Is it not a curious circumstance that Protestants alone cherish with affection, and love to read the encyclical letters of Pope Peter, and are publishing them abroad by millions for the instruction of the world? But why are all men permitted thus to read the letters of the Popes? The question lies upon the surface—but the answer cuts deep into the vitals, and lays bare to the commonest observer, the very heart of this great controversy. Because they were written for the very purpose that they might be read—written for the instruction and warning of God's people—addressed to the faithful throughout the world; and even monkish stupidity has never yet ascended that pinnacle of folly as to propose that one should gravely write a letter for the benefit of mankind, send it abroad throughout the world, and then forbid mankind to read it. Now, precisely such letters are those of Peter the first Pope of Rome: the first and second epistles general, or circular letters of Peter, addressed not to the Bishops or Priesthood, but to the people, all the faithful scattered throughout Pontus, Cappadocia, &c. The same is true of

all the apostolic epistles to the different churches, Gallatians, Thessalonians, Corinthians, &c. They are addressed not to the Bishops, but to the people—and written in the language of the people, to whom they were addressed. St. Paul's epistle to the Romans too, was it not addressed to the whole church in Rome, to be read by every individual, in a language understood by every one who could read at all? Is it not a strange procedure then, that the very epistle which St. Paul wrote by divine inspiration for the benefit of the church at Rome, this Roman church is not permitted to read at all? Surely it is worse than folly to write me a letter which it is a sin for me to read. Is it not passing strange that the church of Rome is the only church on earth whose members dare not read the epistle to the Romans, and the church which is founded on St. Peter, the only one which forbids the letters of St. Peter?

The Bible is and has ever been emphatically the book of the people; designed for the people—addressed originally to the people, and adapted pre-eminently for their instruction. We have seen that this is true of the Epistles. It is manifest with equal evidence concerning every other portion of the Bible. The laws of Moses for instance (with a few exceptions) were designed to regulate the civil and ecclesiastical relations, and moral duties of the people; were addressed to them as a nation, in their own language; were read consecutively at the Synagogues, in the people's tongue; and an intimate acquaintance with the sacred history and sacred jurisprudence, was enjoined on

every Israelite, as his most incumbent duty. When the Prophets warned the people of God's coming wrath; rebuked them for their sin, or cheered them with the hope of "the glory hereafter to be revealed;" was it not in the people's language, in the people's ears, and to the people's understandings, that their inspired warnings and exhortations were addressed? And he, the last and greatest of all the Prophets, who closed in his own person, with stern and lofty dignity, that illustrious line of God-inspired instructors; the strange and gifted man that issued from the Wilderness of Judea, with his raiment of Camel's hair and leathern girdle, and with all, a Prophet's zeal and energy, denounced the corruptions of his day; was it not to the people that he came? Did not all Jerusalem, and Judea, and all the region round about Jordan, gather to his ministry; and when the Scribes and Pharisees, the teachers of the law and keepers of the consciences of the people, came—how did he salute them? "Oh, generation of vipers, who hath warned you to flee from the wrath to come?" The Miracles, the Parables, the Sermons—the divine instructions of our Saviour—were they not addressed directly to the people, in their own presence, and in their mother tongue? And when that Man of Sorrows once rejoiced, and poured forth his overflowing joy in language of gratitude to God, was not this the source of his grateful exultation, that the humblest of all his children could comprehend and enjoy the loftiest Revelations of his Love—"I thank thee, Oh Father, Lord of heaven and earth, because thou hast hid these things from the

wise and prudent, and revealed them unto babes!" Few of his words were addressed to the Priesthood of his day, and these were daggers. "Oh, generation of vipers," "Blind leaders of the blind," "Ye are of your father the devil," "Ye hypocrites! well did Isaiah prophesy of you," "Teaching for doctrines the commandments of men."

Suppose now that one of those devoted lovers of the Saviour, who had hung with wrapt attention on his lips—at the Sea of Galilee, or upon Mount Olivet—till each word of wisdom, as it fell burning on his heart, was engraven indelibly upon his memory, had been told that it was criminal to remember what it had been a duty and a blessedness to hear; and hearing, to love; and loving, it was impossible to forget? What would be his wonder? But suppose that he had transferred to paper, for the instruction of his children or his friends, the record of those glorious truths, whose living impression still glowed and beamed in joy upon his own bosom, would it not be absurd to say that it was criminal for them to read with the eye of the body; what it was right for him to contemplate with the eye of the understanding and by the light of memory? But behold we have the same instructions recorded by the pen of inspiration, and their perfect accuracy vouched by the infallibility of God himself; and does not that doctrine sink even beneath the dignity of contempt, which gravely teaches, that the very instructions which it was right for him to hear; and hearing, to love; and loving, to remember; and remembering, to record; it is criminal for us to read, when recorded by

Infinite Wisdom and vouched by Infinite Veracity. BUT WE SAID THE BIBLE IS ADAPTED TO THE PEOPLE, AS WELL AS DESIGNED FOR THEM, and we are bold to assert, that apart altogether from any question as to its inspiration, there is not in the whole circle of ancient or modern literature, a single work which can for a moment be compared with it, as a manual of popular instruction, as a book for the people, adapted alike to every period of life, and every condition of human society. Its simple narrative, its lofty poetry, its instructive history, its pathetic eloquence, its ingenious parables, its touching portraitures of nature and of human character, its pure morality, its exalted and spiritual religion, its majestic doctrines, so simple in their majesty, that like their divine and glorious author, who filleth immensity with his presence, and the heaven of heaven's cannot contain him, yet condescendeth to dwell in the bosom of the humble and contrite one, even so these wonderful revelations, though touching the loftiest themes, though comprehending all time and all eternity in their immense survey, though fitted to expand an archangel's bosom, and employ a seraph's tongue of fire, may hover in softened radiance around the head, and gently nestle with soothing tenderness in the heart of infancy itself! Who of us has not wept at the story of Joseph; who has not been elevated by the grandeur of Isaiah; who has not melted at the tenderness of David; and where is the heart so cold that it has never "burned within him as he talked with Jesus in the Evangelists?" The Bible! Why I have read it from my earliest childhood, and never

found that it had taught me one false principle of action, one single error in doctrine, or in morals. The Bible! I learned to read it on my mother's knee. It was bathed with my father's tears, and consecrated with a double sacredness, by his dying prayers; and when that sainted mother was just ready to depart, it lay upon her dying pillow, and cheered her dying hour, as she charged me to love the Bible we had read so often, and so fondly together. Go, then, thou dark Inquisitor! if go thou must, strike from my little library—the meagre collections of my youth—each noble and each honored name—Bacon, who enlarged the boundaries of human thought; Locke, who fathomed the mysteries of the human spirit; Galileo, who taught the motions of the Universe; and Milton, Patriot, Philosopher, Poet, Sage, with his glorious treatise on the rights of conscience and freedom of the Press; draw across them all, yes, all, the dark mark of *Papal Censorship*, but spare, O, spare my Bible! What should I do without my Bible? It was the instructor of my infancy, the guide of my youth, the companion and friend of my manhood, and shall it not be the solace of my declining age? And that poor Orphan Boy, who wanders homeless and fatherless in your streets, why rob him of his Bible? I never knew a boy that loved his Bible, who was not the better for it; who did not grow up to be a more upright man—a worthier citizen—a bolder freeman. Besides, is it not his birth-right?—the last possession which orphanage and poverty have left him. Did not his father or forefathers, as well as yours and

mine, fight this same battle in the great revolutionary struggle? Was it not for this above all other rights, for freedom of conscience, and liberty to read the Bible, that those venerable patriots shed their heart's blood of old? Was not this the very height and front of their indignant denunciation of British Tyranny, when on the 21st of October, 1774, in Congress assembled, in an address to the English nation, they charged on that Government the design to extend the "dominion of Canada, that their numbers, daily swelling with Catholic emigrants from Europe, may reduce this ancient, free, *Protestant Colony*, to a state of slavery, and to establish, in this country, a religion which has deluged your Island in blood, and dispersed impiety, bigotry, persecution, murder, and rebellion throughout every part of the world?" But why rob him of his Bible? Because the Popes and Cardinals of a foreign land, lodged in the palace of the Cæsars, and "arrayed in purple and fine linen," have issued their imperial decree, forbidding the Bible to their *vassals*? Because the thousands of their "Bonds-men born," drifted on the tide of foreign immigration, have left their country, but retained their principles, and dare not, even here, exercise the rights our fathers purchased for their children, and which we so freely, yet so vainly, proffer to them? And has it come to this already? That the large, free mind of this great nation can be contented within the narrow limits which priestly fanaticism, or despotic power, have prescribed to their most *abject menials*—the Catechism of the Diocese, "A Book of Arithmetic,"

“A Book of Moral Lessons”—replete with *Monkish* fables. Shall Italy be transported to these United States? Shall the same dark and bloody flag, which, more than three hundred years ago, was hung out from the Battlements of the Inquisition, and ever since has waved its gloomy folds in triumph over despotic Austria, down-trodden Italy, benighted Portugal and Spain, and semi-barbarous South America, blackening the earth with its shadow, and shutting out the blessed light of heaven, be planted here, upon the graves of our dead fathers? Why, their very bones might well rattle in their coffins, at such a profanation! The marble statues of our immortalized heroes might, without a Popish miracle, speak out from their stone bosoms, and even weep tears of blood, over their degenerate offspring. Oh, no, it cannot be! The Bible, depend upon it, lies near to the throbbing heart of this great nation. It is a sacred, tender place. Touch it not; I beseech, I entreat, I warn you, touch it not too roughly. The Bible is the basis of all our institutions; to banish it would be a revolution, not begun, but consummated; a revolution in the vital principles of our Government and our society. The very revolution predicted on the 21st of October, 1774, and by the very instrumentality which the gifted *seers* of that day foresaw in the distance, and with such prophetic sagacity announced. Then leave us our Bible; take what you will beside; if only the Bible be left, the nation may be free and happy still. Let foreign despotism pour in, by tens of thousands, upon our shores, and lead up in dense columns to our polls, her marshalled myrmi-

dons, her masses of vice and putrefaction, spared from the gallows, or vomited forth from the darkest, foulest alleys of her crowded and pestilential cities. Let some supple demagogue, borne into the highest office of our Government, upon the shoulders of a foreign Priesthood, guided by Italian chicanery, and paid with Austrian money from the *Leopold foundation*, worship the power that gave him political pre-eminence; let Jesuitical skill, in the heat of party collision, succeed, for a season, in arraying our free citizens, one against another; nay, let the fair fabric of this Government be overthrown, and our free Constitution be scattered to the winds: yet with an open Bible, and a *Free Press*, we will go forth amidst that benighted and corrupted population, and, by God's blessing, from the very ruins of *Liberty* and *Virtue*, will erect, once more, the noble edifice of our civil and religious institutions.

But again: The opposite principle leads necessarily to persecution. There can be no wrong without a correspondent right; nor can omnipotence itself guided by infinite wisdom, and urged on by boundless desire, devise any method by which it could violate a right, where there is no right existing to be violated. Hence, if I have not the right of Private Judgment, the absolute and unlimited right to reason, investigate and determine for myself, he who denies me the possession of this right and prohibits its exercise, does me no wrong; nay, if I have challenged for myself rights which are really another's, if I have assumed for my individual behoof, prerogatives which appropriately belong to the church for the common good, then am I an

usurper; and if the exercise of this assumed right is injurious at once to myself and to others, then upon every principle of moral and social obligation; in every view of the most enlarged and comprehensive philanthropy, the church and the state are not only authorized, but imperatively bound, at all hazards to the individual, and by all necessary penalties, to resist the usurpation, and to extirpate, if need be, the offender and the offence. Hence we can explain that otherwise strange and incredible contradiction, which meets us so often in the history of persecution, when the really amiable inquisitor weeps, as he hands over his victim to the gibbet or the rack; and our holy mother sometimes mingles tears with her curses upon her rebellious children. Persecution is with them a religious duty, and lies upon the conscience. Others may persecute from passion, she *must* from principle.

Hence too, that parallel phenomenon, that whenever through all time, an individual or a sect becomes tinctured, however slightly, with this portentous doctrine; from that very moment, and in that precise degree, begins the cry for blood. Thus the British Critic, the accredited organ of that non-descript sect, which originated recently in England and rejoices in the name of Dr. Pusey, that infinitesimal sub-division of the church, that fragment of a fragment of a fragment, whose ecclesiastical arithmetic, with such graceful modesty, proves it to be the whole church of Christ upon earth, that broad burlesque upon the page of history, that most ridiculous of all abortions from the womb of time, which has its head in England, its center of unity

at Rome, while its cloven feet are here, and as for the brains thereof, no human anatomy hath discovered their place as yet; that farce of farces, amidst the great world-epic and tragedy around us; that modern antique and mediaeval nineteenth century; with all the puerility of Rome, yet without her occasional grandeur, with more than all her audacity and insolence, yet without her courage or her power; the British critic, edited by the brother-in-law of Dr. Newman, the accredited organ of this most ludicrous of all the sects past, present or to come, and of all the successors of all the apostles, whose beatific presence blesses this happy land of ours—tells us as quietly now, and with as much relish too, as a tame tiger would lick the blood from off his paws, that he acknowledges a certain pleasure in the thought that innovators in religion (by which he means all who differ from himself) shall have to suffer for their opinions.

And now, had we no practical application of this principle, in the affairs of the world; no authoritative exposition of its deep and ominous significance; no bold avowal of its ultimate results, even in their most revolting form, by its ablest and most distinguished advocates; still our argument would be conclusive, and it were absurd to exclaim, "Where is the decree of a General Council or acknowledged Bull of a Pope, which teaches persecution as a doctrine of the Church?" for we have proven, that it is a necessary result from this admitted and fundamental doctrine; and surely we do not need a Bull of the Pope, or decree of a General Council, to enable us to see the connexion between the pre-

mises and the conclusion, in an argument—and even the strictest Churchman hath never yet contended, that the Holy Fathers, however infallible in faith, were infallible in logic. But, fortunately for our argument, though unfortunately for the welfare of the race, the conclusions we have drawn from this principle are established as legitimate results, by the authorized interpretation of the Roman Catholic Church, through all her organs; by the open avowal of her most distinguished writers; the public acts of her accredited agents; again and again by the Bulls of Popes and the decrees of General Councils. Passing by all more ancient authorities, I shall direct your attention only to two works of modern times, published, circulated, and read by the authority, and with the sanction of the most enlightened and liberal Prelates in Ireland, in the present century; one a Commentary on the New Testament, the other a standard author in Theology. The work which I hold in my hand is entitled, “The Moral and Dogmatic Theology of the Rev. and Most Learned Lord PETER DENS.” “Printed at Dublin, by Richard Coyne, Chapel street, Printer, and Bookseller to the Roman Catholic College, Maynooth. The second edition, dedicated to the Most Rev. Lord and Father in God, DANIEL MURRAY, Archbishop of Dublin and Primate of Ireland, and printed with his approbation.” We pass by, for the present, its ineffable pollution, its unfathomable depths of unimaginable filth. I do declare, that there are described in this book, pursued into the most loathsome details, dwelt upon with the most disgusting minuteness, forms, and

modes, and degrees of crime, which I had never heard of, or conceived before, and which, I verily believe, have no existence, except in the polluted imaginations which gloat over them, with such peculiar fondness, or in the deepest and darkest hells of the over-crowded population of European cities. And I offer publicly to any respectable married gentleman of middle age, Protestant or Catholic, who is able to read the Latin language, or who can bring a competent interpreter, that I will show him passages in this system of Moral Theology, so unapproachably, immeasurably, inexpressibly obscene, that he cannot read them, even in a foreign language, and in the presence of a male acquaintance, without a blush for the honor of his race; and his very eyes will turn away with intolerable nausea and disgust from the unfinished page. And if he shall think that my description has surpassed, or even equalled, or that any human description could more than indefinitely approximate the revolting and loathsome reality, then I am willing to be publicly denounced through life, as a maniac or a slanderer. This in passing. But I must hasten to the passages directly bearing on my subject. The first passage which I shall quote gives his views on the subject of toleration, and may be found on the 83d page, vol. 2d. Under the question, whether the rites of Infidels are to be tolerated, after disposing of the Jews, his second answer is in the following words: "The rites of other Infidels, such as Pagans and Heretics, are not in themselves to be tolerated, because they are

D

so evil, that no truth, nor advantage to the Church, can be derived therefrom."

On the 289 page (same vol.) is found the following language: "Heretics, schismatics, apostates and all other like baptized persons, are bound by the laws of the church, because by their baptism, they are made subjects of the church; nor are they released from her laws more than the rebel subjects of a lawful prince, are released from the laws of that prince." Upon the 88th and 89th pages of the same volume, we find a chapter, with the following title: "Concerning the Punishments of the Crime of Heresy." In answer to the question what are the punishments of the crime of Heresy, he replies, "Notorious heretics are infamous for this very cause itself, and are deprived of Christian burial." "Their temporal goods are for this very cause itself confiscated." "Finally they are also justly afflicted with other corporeal punishments, as exile, imprisonment," &c. But the question is put, "Are Heretics justly punished with death?" This, one might well suppose would bring his orthodoxy at least to a momentary pause. But no! Mother church is familiar with blood. He marches directly up, and boldly grapples with the question, in all its naked horrors, and proves that heretics should be put death from the testimony of St. Thomas, the authority of the Bible, and the decision of the Council of Constance. "St. Thomas answers affirmatively, (that is, that Heretics should be put to death) because falsifiers of the coin are justly punished with death, therefore, likewise Heretics should be put to death, who are falsifiers

of the *Faith*, and all experience being witness, grievously disturb the Republic. It is confirmed by the fact that God, under the old law, commanded false prophets to be slain; and Deut. chap. 17th, v.12th, it is decided that "whosoever shall be proud, unwilling to obey the authority of the Priest, let him die." The same thing is proven from the condemnation of the 14th Art. of John Huss, by the Council of Constance."

The next authority from which I propose to read a few extracts, is the Rhemish Testament, and you will permit me to introduce it with a few prefatory remarks. Concerning Den's Theology, there is no dispute. There it stands before the world, with the Arch Bishop's broad imprimatur, written in blood. Of this Rhemish Testament, there were published in Ireland two editions, one in 1813 and the other in 1818. On the title page of that of 1813 is found the name of the same John Coyne, to whom you have been already introduced, as authorized publisher for the Jesuit College at Maynooth, "by permission of his Grace Dr. Troy, Catholic Lord Primate of Ireland; and under the careful revision of the Rev. A. P. Walsh, Denmark, Hill, Dublin," and on the exterior title page, were the names of all the most distinguished Prelates of Ireland as its avowed and public patrons. This work, published in numbers, was circulated freely throughout Ireland, until some copies falling into the hands of English protestants, drew forth a severe and merited exposure, of its persecuting principles from the public press. It was then, and not till then, in the year 1817, that Dr. Troy dis-

claimed all connection with the publication, and denounced the principles therein avowed. This disavowal, of course, impugned the character of Coyne who publicly exposed the whole disgraceful procedure. I read from a letter dated Parliament street, Oct. 26th, 1817. "On Monday, the 13th instant, 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 apartment, when the very Rev. Dr. Hamill, your Grace's Vicargeneral, and the Rev. Mr. Kenney of Clengours 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 that 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 armed our enemies against us, and this at a time when we were seeking emancipation." Upon these remarks, I asked, "Did not your Grace approve and sanction the publication of a Bible by Mr. Macnamara, of Cork?" Your Grace replied, "I did." I then asked, "Did not your Grace depute the Rev. A. P. Walsh, of Denmark street, chapel, to revise, correct and approve for publication, in your Grace's name, the said Bible of Macnamara?" Your Grace answered, "I did." Then said I, "My lord, that is the Bible now in your hand." "I never authorized," replied your Grace, "the Rev. Mr. Walsh, to approve a

Bible with 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."

Here then is the truth at last. The Bishop authorized the publication of these notes, not by himself, but by his agent. That is, you are arrested for murder, and protest that you are not guilty, but the instrument you employed. You give a false Bill of Lading, and assert it was not yourself who signed it, but your clerk—by your directions! Might you not better complete the climax of folly, by asserting that it was neither yourself nor your clerk, but the pen which wrote the signature. The motives too which dictated this tardy denunciation by the Archbishop, are sufficiently indicated in the conversation with Coyne; and yet more clearly and decisively expressed in the following language, uttered about the same time by O'Connell. Mr. O'Connell remarked, "He had recently been in England himself; and personal and accurate information, acquired upon the spot, enabled him to state, that if these notes were not denounced, the Member of Parliament who should be hardy enough to support Emancipation in the next session of Parliament, would run a very considerable risk of losing his seat in the House of Commons on the approaching election." But the most instructive, if not amusing, commentary on these indignant denunciations, is to be found in the fact, that at this very moment, a new edition was passing through the press, and issued under the same distinguished patronage, in

1818, the following year. But I will not detain you from the extracts. "The first text I shall read is a note on Matt. 13:29; [Lest perhaps.] The good must tolerate the evil, when it is so strong, that it cannot be redressed, without danger and disturbance of the whole church, and commit the matter to God's judgment in the latter day; otherwise, when ill men, be they heretics, or other malefactors, may be punished or suppressed without disturbance and hazard of the good, they may and ought by public authority, either temporal or spiritual, to be chastised or executed."

The next comment is on Luke 9:55. That is, the passage in which, when our Saviour had been refused assistance by the Samaritans, and James and John asked whether they should call down fire from heaven upon them, he turned and said: "Ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of." And here is the note on our Lord's rebuke, verse 55th: [He rebuked them.] "Not Justice, nor all rigorous punishment of sinners is here forbidden, nor Elias's act reprehended, nor the Church, nor Christian princes blamed for putting heretics to death, but that none of these should be done for desire of our particular revenge, or without discretion, and regard to their amendment, and example to others. Therefore, St. Peter used his power upon Ananias and Sapphira, when he struck them both down to death, for defrauding the Church."

The next is a note upon Luke 14:24. Verse 23, [Compel them.] "St. Augustine also referreth this compelling to the penal laws, which Catholic princes do justly use against heretics and schisma-

tics, proving that they who are, by their former profession in baptism, subject to the *Catholic Church*, and are departed from the same after sects, may and ought to be compelled into the unity and society of the *Universal Church*."

The next passage to which I would call your attention is a note on Acts of the Apostles, 25:11, in which St. Paul appeals to Cæsar. "If St. Paul, both to save himself from whipping and from death, sought by the Jews, doubted not to claim succour from the Roman laws, and to appeal to Cæsar, the prince of the Romans, not yet christened, how much more may we call for aid of Christian princes and their laws, for the punishment of heretics, and for the Church's defence against them."—*St. Aug.*, 50. The remaining passage is Rev. 12: 6. "The Protestants foolishly expound it of Rome, for that they put heretics to death, and allow of their punishment in other countries; but their blood 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." But why need I read farther? The whole book is steeped in gore; a perfect Alcedama; one broad blood blotch! so reeking with bloodshed and murder, that O'Connell found it necessary publicly to "denounce its damnable doctrines," (the Archbishop's hardest word for all this treachery and slaughter, is "uncharitable in sentiment,") and had a committee appointed to prepare a denunciation of those Notes. The committee met and adjourned; met again; promised to report; became extinct; dissolved; and no denun-

ciation! These Notes are circulated freely on the Continent; and as late, at least, as 1838, a new edition was published, with the recommendation of the Archbishop of Mechlin, assuring the pious reader that they contain nothing contrary to pure doctrine or sacred morals, as understood in the Catholic Church.

This, then, is the general, almost universal interpretation of the great Doctors of the Church, and it does not in the slightest degree affect the force of my argument to reply, that the Church has never authoritatively sanctioned those doctrines. She has sanctioned the doctrine from which all these necessarily flow, according to the concurrent testimony of her ablest writers, and the practical interpretation of the vast majority of her people. But to allow, is, with her, to sanction. Not to prohibit, is to adopt. Has she ever renounced them? She watches, with closest scrutiny, over all that concerns the doctrine, the morals, the ceremonies, and the discipline of the Church, in every quarter of the globe. With eagle eye she detects every variation from either; and the anathemas of Rome are ever ready to rebuke them. Yet here are two books—only *two*, out of one hundred similar—widely circulated amongst her people, recommended by her Bishops; nay, written by her own most orthodox and distinguished sons, (and thus, for all practical purposes, bearing the highest sanction of the Church); which openly and deliberately inculcate the most flagitious crimes, the darkest treachery, the cruellest massacres—as sacred duties to God and to the Church. Why are they not con-

demned—suppressed? Milton, Bacon, Addison, Locke, Robertson, Hallam—every name that has thrown a lustre over English literature—all that is loftiest in Poetry, profoundest in Philosophy, most instructive in History; nay, our good old English Bible itself, has been marked by the Inquisitors—loaded with the anathemas of Rome, and prohibited as unfit to be read. But here Murder is taught as a duty; Persecution is lauded as a virtue. The baptized sons of the church (sons—though wayward and rebellious) are to be butchered—nay, have been butchered—by thousands in the name of religion. Yet there is no voice of stern rebuke, or deep remonstrance, or mild entreaty from our holy mother. The Doctrine of Butchery circulates—the work of butchery goes on. But the Papal thunders slumber—the Papal Bull is dumb. In the light then of the evidence adduced already this evening, I do not hesitate to charge it upon Rome, that all the blood shed by this infernal principle, is upon her skirts. In the name of those murdered millions, I arraign her to-night before the grand inquest of the nations, and the bar of Eternal Justice, as guilty in the first degree—if not as principal, yet as accessory—as *particeps criminis*, in every case privy before the fact—privy after the fact, and throughout the whole, aiding and abetting by her counsel—shielding by her power and rewarding by her smiles.

But let us proceed to the practical interpretation of this dogma, in the history of the world. I shall not detain you with the horrible details. The broad, general facts are written in letters of blood and fire

upon the page of history, and can never be erased. There they stand, undenied and undeniable; nay, are not the living memorials of these persecutions scattered all over the world, as if Providence had designed that the testimony should be as universal as the crime was appalling; that every mountain might find a tongue, and every valley lift up its voice, and the whole creation cry aloud against this violation of the laws of nature and humanity? I doubt not there are present here, this evening, at least one hundred from among ourselves, who, either in their immediate or remoter ancestors, have suffered from these persecutions; murdered; driven from their homes; their goods confiscated; their houses burned over them at midnight; or in some other form made to suffer the terrible vengeance of this ruthless power. There is not a city in all Protestant Europe, where the exiled Hugonot may not, at this day, be found; and, in this land of ours, what a long and bright array of noble names might I not enumerate this evening,—the Hegers, the Grimkes, the Ramseys, of the South,—not to mention the representatives now living in our own city, of old Hugonot families, whose decapitated names still retain enough to indicate their noble origin, and at least remain a living and abiding type of the sufferings their families endured, when driven into long exile from the fair plains of their own beautiful France, by the savage cruelty of their ferocious persecutors. It hath been calculated that at least fifty millions of human beings have fallen victims to this relentless principle—fifteen hundred thousand Moors and two millions of Jews in Spain

alone. Strike from these numbers as you may, and enough remain to sicken the heart, and curdle the blood with horror. A *Catholic Historian* informs us that, in the Netherlands alone, in thirty-eight years, the number of those who were hanged, beheaded, burned, and buried alive for *Heresy*, was at least fifty thousand. The Abbe Condillac informs us that, on *St. Bartholomew's night*, seventy thousand were murdered in Paris, while other accounts increase the number to an hundred thousand; and, during the subsequent butcheries, it has been calculated that nine hundred thousand Protestants lost their lives in France, while it is well ascertained, that the Revocation of the *Edict of Nantz* expelled near one million from their homes, almost depopulated some of the most populous cities of Southern France, crippled her manufactures, filled whole regiments of foreign armies with her exiled subjects, and, by a righteous retribution, inflicted upon her national prosperity and power a blow from which she has never since recovered. The Spanish Inquisition, in a period of a little more than three hundred years, punished, in various ways,—imprisonment, torture, death,—from four hundred and fifty to five hundred thousand men. “But why charge upon the *doctrines* of the Church, or upon the *Church* herself, the cruelties inflicted by the civil government, or by the passions of the people, in these different lands?” Grant the truth of the proposition upon which this question is manifestly based, yet it does not in the slightest degree affect my argument. I am now inquiring into the practical effect of this principle upon all

who embrace it—the natural, spontaneous, universal interpretation, by the Priesthood and the People, where other causes do not interfere; and I summon, this night, as witnesses on my behalf, the tens of thousands employed in these persecutions, the millions of their nation who authorized and sustained them in it, the public authorities of the Church, who sanctioned by their approbation, and consecrated with their blessing, the ghosts of those murdered millions in their blood and gore— I summon *all* to testify, that this has been the prevalent, the practical interpretation of the doctrine.

But is not the Church involved directly? Let us see. The Massacre of St. Bartholomew!—a word in which all horrors meet and blend! When Mirabeau would awe down the aspirations of the Priesthood, and of the haughty Aristocracy with whom they were in league, and make the blood of his audience alternately boil with indignation and curdle with horror, he would shake that huge head of his, and fix his fiery eye, and point his uplifted finger to the very window of the Palace from which Charles IX. issued his infernal orders on that bloody night, and, in his deepest tones, would whisper, “St. Bartholomew!”

When the infuriated mob, in the French Revolution, gave in some small proportion to the Priesthood the same chalice of tears of blood which they had so often mingled to the brim for others, and vainly strove to rival for a season the demoniac cruelties which they for centuries had practised, they murmured darkly to each other as they passed, “Remember St. Bartholomew,” “They sang

last night the same Hymn which prepared the massacre of St. Bartholomew," "Remember, remember St. Bartholomew." All the furies of Hell seemed that night to hover over Paris; each several crime that hath stained the annals of our race, brought its own hue of blackness to heighten the accumulated horrors of the scene. Hypocrisy—Treachery—Falsehood—Perjury—Cowardice—Cruelty—Fratricide—Murder—Abused Friendship—Violated Confidence—Broken Oaths—Helpless and Confiding Innocence butchered at the Fireside and the Altar—every crime which God and man abhor—which Religion denounces and Nature shudders at—all were gathered into that single night, and over all was thrown the sanctity of Religion. They celebrated High Mass to prepare them for the work of death. The very bell that calls our childhood to the house of God for prayer on holy days, was tolled as a signal for the Butchery, and the cries of murdered thousands mingled with the voice of fanatic prayer and praise. And how was all this received at Rome? If Paris was drunk with Blood, Rome was still more drunken with Joy. The gray head of the old Admiral Coligny—one of the noblest and bravest men that ever fought for a cowardly and perjured Prince, or died for the rights of conscience—was embalmed in precious spices, and borne (like the head of John the Baptist, on a charger, to Herod and his chief men,) to the great World-Butcher at Rome. The messenger who bore the joyful tidings received a thousand crowns for his reward. The Pope and all his Cardinals

B

marched in solemn and devout procession to St. Mark, and sang *Te Deum* for the Butchery—

—“Called on God to bless  
 Damnations’s deeds and works of devilishness.”

Nay, the Pope had a triumphant medal struck, in memory of the event. On the one side was the Pope’s Head, with this inscription written in Latin, “Gregorius XIII. Pontifex Maximus;” and on the other, a Destroying Angel, with the Cross in one hand, and a Sword in the other, slaying the Protestants, and this inscription, “Hugonotorum Strages.” The Slaughter of the Hugonots! Oh, Gregory! Gregory! Thou thirteenth of the name!—why strike that medal to record thine infamy? Did you think it could ever be forgotten? Is it not engraven *here*, deep in the hearts of men? Is it not recorded *there*, high in the Archives of Heaven? Has not the Echo of it gone far and wide over the Earth, and its loud reverberations, as they roll down the waste of centuries, and gather fresh echos from each noble and manly bosom, have they not long since rung the Knell of Papal Supremacy and Papal Power?

But again: The Inquisition! “The cruelties of the Inquisition,” say the apologists of Rome, “have been greatly exaggerated, both as to their number and their enormity; nay, the very secrecy which veiled their proceedings renders it impossible to ascertain the truth of the charges against them.” This is surely the apology of the murderer, who, when arrested for numerous and diabolic deeds of blood, should acknowledge the fact of frequent bloodshed, yet charge the witnesses with perjury

because he did his work at midnight, and no eye but the eye of God had seen the numbers that he slew. But the apology, poor as it is, is not true. God is terrible in his Justice, and the eye which beholds the deeds of darkness, is united with an arm that can rend the veil of secrecy, and drag out hideous crimes to the gaze and the execration of mankind. The French troops twice broke into the dungeons of the Inquisition, and all that imagination had conceived or terror described, or credulity believed—or madness, in its wildest paroxysms, had darkly muttered—was equalled, if not surpassed, by the terrible reality. Four hundred persons were found confined in one, and among them forty females, imprisoned without even a charge of heresy, and for purposes which they shuddered to reveal. “But the *Spanish* Inquisition was not a *Roman* Institution, and the fault lies at the door of the cruel and bigotted civil governors of Spain.” For answer, we would simply inquire, “What was the Inquisition? Was it a civil or ecclesiastical institution? Did it arrest men for treason or for heresy? Who appointed its officers? Who authorized their proceedings? Who threw an impenetrable veil of secrecy over their darkest, bloodiest deeds, and lent to their persons and their office, that awful and mysterious sanction of Religion, which made men speak in whispers, as they approached; and when they heard, even in their most secret retirement, of some new arrest for heresy, made “the boldest hold his breath for a time.” Was it not the Pope? Who alone could visit their dungeons, arrest their sentences and punish their

crimes? The Pope. But, did he? No. The cries of the suffering victims came to Rome, and it was music to his ears; the smoke of burning hetacombs was wafted to the Palace of St. Peter, and was a sweet savor in his nostrils. It is the nature of all beasts of prey, that the sight or taste of blood converts desire into uncontrollable fury. So it was with Pope Paul the Third. He could no longer yield to the Spanish monks, the exclusive enjoyment of torture. He removed the Inquisition to Rome—proclaimed himself chief Inquisitor for all the world. He claimed a monopoly in blood—took out a patent right for murder—to do it at the shortest notice—on the slightest pretexts, in the most terrific forms, and after the Godliest fashion, with saintly processions and solemn sighs and groans, and all the imagery of terror; that thus the sufferings of the sinner here might be a lively and edifying type of the horrors of the damned. What shall we say of the persecuting civil government now? Behold, here it is at Rome, the centre of unity—where all civil and ecclesiastical power are happily united in the chair of St. Peter, and divine infallibility guides and harmonizes all. Was it not **HERE—in Rome**, that Galileo was arraigned—tried—convicted, and by a decision, in which brutal ignorance was blended with savage barbarity, condemned to the dungeons of the Inquisition? And for what? For teaching that men might murder their neighbors, on account of heresy? For any violation of faith or morals? No!—For daring to interpret God's works, as Luther did his word, and teaching that the Earth was not the centre of

the Universe, but revolves around the Sun! Here it is easy to perceive how the central error of the Papal System necessarily extends its influence over all earthly interests, and rears its gigantic form, clothed with terror and dripping with blood, directly in the pathway of all human improvement—of all free inquiry and independent action, in Science and Government, as well as in Religion.

The length of our preceding remarks will require us to pass with great rapidity over that portion of our subject which still remains to be considered. We can not pause even to mention the various Papal Bulls, in which his Holiness has condescended to consign, with the most hideous curses, various obnoxious individuals to eternal torments. You all remember, that he has extended, again and again, (in the Bull, "*In Coenam Domini*," for instance, which is repeated publicly every year at Rome) the same awful execration against the whole Protestant World. He has pursued us with his curses to the remotest quarters of the Globe—as far as the reverberations of the Papal thunders reach. He has cursed us, in every article and particle of the man—most scientifically, most psychologically, most anatomically. In every limb of the body, and every faculty of the soul; in every bone, muscle, sinew, tendon, joint, ligament; in every nerve, vein, artery, gland, fibre, tissue; in every organ, and in every function of each organ; cursed us from the crown of the head to the sole of the foot; cursed us through time; and through all eternity cursed us; a curse so ferocious in the spirit which it breathes, so wildly terrible in its frantic

exaggerations, that even Grecian Tragedy, in the boldest efforts of creative genius, when she would pourtray human passion, stung to superhuman rage by the avenging furies, has nothing half so horrible. These Bulls of the Popes, when not rejected by the Church, are admitted to be the authorized exposition of her principles.

Of the Councils to which I might refer in confirmation of these views, I shall notice only the fourth Lateran Council, and that which met at Constance. Concerning both of these, it was admitted by Dr. Crotty, on oath before a committee of the House of Commons, that they had passed persecuting edicts. It is admitted, *on all hands*, that *at Constance* John Huss was tried and burned *for heresy*, and *this* in violation of the Emperor's safe conduct, or written imperial promise that he should not be injured. But say our Papal adversaries, "The Council only condemned him—it was the Emperor who burned him." Grant the truth of the apology, and to what does it amount? That the Emperor was executioner for the Council! It is the difference between the guilt of the Judge who unjustly condemns, and that of the Sheriff who executes the judgment! Did not the Council declare the safe conduct of the Emperor *void*? Void as to what? Surely as to the purpose for which it *was given*. And what was this purpose? Not to prevent an investigation of his doctrines; (it was to *insure this* that the safe conduct was given;) but to save his life. In declaring the safe conduct void, therefore they declared that his life must be taken. This simple reasoning from the acknow-

ledged facts, involves the Council in all the guilt of his murder. But we are not left to inference on this point. There is a subsequent decree of the same Council, in which they deliberately assume the whole guilt of that perfidious and cruel transaction, and brand every man as a heretic and traitor who disapproves any part of the procedure. It seems there was a murmur of indignation and horror through the crowd—and men whispered darkly to each other that the Emperor's safe conduct to John Huss had been basely violated. After reciting these facts, the Council proceed to say: "Yet the aforesaid John Huss, by his pertinacious opposition to the orthodox faith, had rendered himself incapable of any safe conduct or privilege; nor could any faith or promise be observed with him, by any law, natural, divine or human, in prejudice of the Catholic Faith: therefore, the aforesaid Holy Synod, by the tenor of these presents, declares that the aforesaid invincible Prince did what was lawful, and what became his royal majesty, respecting the said John Huss, notwithstanding the above mentioned safe conduct, and decrees and ordains for each and every true Christian, that hereafter no one shall detract or speak injuriously of the Sacred Council, or his royal majesty, concerning the transactions, in relation to the said John Huss. But whoever shall do to the contrary, let him be punished WITHOUT MERCY, as a favorer of heretical pravity, and guilty of treason."

We shall now give you the persecuting decrees of the fourth Lateran Council, not in the revolting language of the original, but as softened, palliated

and veiled over by the ingenious plausibility of Bishop England: "We now come," says his Grace, "to examine what are called the persecuting laws of our Church."

"In the year 1215, at the Council of Lateran, certain heresies were condemned by the first canon.

"In its third canon it excommunicates those heretics, and declares them to be separated from the body of the church. Then follows a direction, that the heretics so condemned are to be given up to the secular powers, or to their bailiffs, to be duly punished. This direction continues to require of all bishops and others having authority, to make due search within their several districts for those heretics, and if they will not be induced to retract their errors, desires that they should be delivered over to be punished. There is an injunction then to all temporal lords to cleanse their dominions by exterminating those heretics: and if they will not, within a year from having been so admonished by the church, cleanse their lands of *this heretical filth*, they shall be deprived if they have superior lords, and if they be superior lords and be negligent, it shall be the duty of the metropolitan and his provincial bishops to excommunicate them, and if any one of those lords paramount so excommunicated for this negligence shall continue during twelve months under the excommunication, the metropolitan shall certify the same to the pope, who, finding admonition useless, shall depose this prince, and absolve his subjects from their oaths of fealty, and deliver the territory over to Catholics, and who having exterminated the heretics shall remain in peaceable possession."

In defence of this barbarous edict, by which whole districts were consigned to fire and sword, for no other reason given, but the crime of heresy, his Grace urges, First, that the Council had no right, human or divine, to pass it. Strange absurdity, indeed! Why, this is the very charge we bring against it! Would it not have better suited his

purpose to prove that they had an undoubted right, and only erred in the mode of exercising it?

Secondly, That it was designed only to murder *these especial heretics*, and not extended unto all. But is not this the nature of every iniquitous decision, that it affects only those *whom it does affect*? Besides, do numbers affect principles? Has Right, political or moral, become a matter of arithmetical calculation? If Albigenes and Waldenses may be robbed and murdered for heresy, why not Arminians, Lutherans, Calvinists?

Thirdly, That this was a decision of the Laymen present, and not of the Infallible Council. Answer. First—It is a mere conjecture at best, and does not profess to rest on any historical basis. Second—It is contradicted by the Record, which gives it as a canon of the Council; as such, it is quoted by Bishop England himself; and this record, so slanderous, if false, has never been disclaimed or suppressed by the Roman Church; but, at the bar of public opinion, she hath suffered judgment to go against her, by default, upon documents which, according to this statement, are *forged*—and whether *forged* or genuine, need only to be authoritatively disclaimed. But, Fourth: He boldly asserts (with the approbation of Bishops Purcell and Hughes,) that, by whomsoever issued, the decree, in itself, is right. “I may, however, be permitted to say, that, in my opinion, the existence of civilized society required its enactment.” Look back, now, at the atrocious requirements of this decree, and then ask yourself, Where was this audacious avowal made? Was it in some remote cor-

ner of the land, where the light of knowledge seldom and slowly penetrates? Was it whispered under the seal of the Confessional? Was it muttered, under the influence of high excitement, in one of those armed forts, which they have manned with a foreign soldiery, in our own streets, to shoot our own citizens? No; it was uttered in the broad light of day, by one of the most distinguished Prelates of the Church, in the presence of the Senators and Representatives of these United States, in the Hall of Representatives assembled, and with the admiring applause of these faithful guardians of the public liberties.

And what is the pretext for this unparalleled atrocity, which thus, in the *nineteenth* century, endorses the darkest and bloodiest deeds of the Middle Ages—the wholesale butchery of defenceless thousands? The reason might almost excite a smile upon the cheek of terror. It is, that they were UNCOMMON HERETICS—*extremely heretical, indeed*—that they rejected marriage, as the Priests do themselves, and were Manicheans—one branch in fine, of that old Gnostic school, from whose eastern philosophy sprang the whole Monkish System, with its convents and nunneries, and half the follies which Popery has substituted for the Gospel. But the pretext, foolish as it is, is worse than foolish. It is absolutely false—false as the purpose for which it was invented is execrable.—There never lived, since the days of the Apostles—unless, perhaps, we may except our Puritan fathers—there never breathed upon the face of the earth, which they blessed with their presence—a

holier, purer, more religious race. They had the Bible in their memories, which they dared not keep in their houses—their very women and children refuted Bishops by quoting at pleasure from God's word—and I could recite this evening, for an hour in your hearing, whole passages from Catholic writers, attesting the spotless innocence of this butchered and then slandered people. But these have ever been the tactics of persecution—first, to murder and then to slander—to destroy one's goods, and then his character. The wolf, when he would devour the lamb, charged the latter with polluting the stream which he had himself defiled. The serpent, before he swallows his prey, covers over with his own filthy slime, the crushed limbs of the victim which he hath strangled with his folds. Nay, it is curious to remark, that the most enormous crimes ever hinted against these innocent followers of Christ, as a pretext for this wholesale butchery, are borrowed from the ancient accusations, made against the early Christians, by their heathen persecutors. "Those Christians are atheists and despisers of the gods," said the Priest—"And enemies of Cæsar," cried the magistrate. "In their midnight assemblies, are exhibited scenes of licentiousness, at which the day would blush"—exclaims one. "And in their hellish orgies, they devour young children, and swear horrid oaths as they drink their young blood," replies another. "Yes, and I saw it," swears a third. "Away with such men from the face of the earth," cry all together—"the good of society requires their destruction."

And now, "Watchman! what of the night?" Shall this doctrine of darkness once more overspread the globe? Shall this colossal tyranny once more tread down the nations beneath its ponderous footsteps, crushing the rights of conscience, stifling all freedom of inquiry, and bringing back "the reign of Night, and Night's daughter, Ignorance?" We answer, earnestly, solemnly, with deep conviction, with calm yet firm assurance, NO. In the name of Humanity and Religion; in the name of Outraged Reason and Violated Rights; in the name of our dead Fathers, and our unborn Children; in the name of God, our Creator, and of the whole Human Race, our brethren, we answer, NO. From the Heavens and from the Earth; from the distant Past; from the hopeful Present; from the depths of the unfathomable Future; from the graves of martyred millions; from every field where Freedom hath been cloven down, or Tyranny hath erected her trophies; where Religion has had her martyrs, or Bigotry hath offered up her victims, Old History lifts up her warning voice, and Prophecy utters her awful denunciations, and angelic voices mingle with the Jubilee of Earth, as the loud response comes sweeping over land and sea, like the roar of many waters—like the peal of ten thousand thunders—NO. "BABYLON THE GREAT IS FALLEN—FALLEN—FALLEN!"

True—there is a momentary revival—a terrible death-struggle. A violent rush of the accumulated blood from the convulsed heart to the remotest extremities. *It is the way of all Superstitions—they die hard.* The expiring lamp blazes up bright-

ly, in its socket, before it is extinguished forever. The dying giant lifts himself fiercely on his couch—looks wildly around in his fury—starts to his feet, brandishes once more his brawny limbs, and sinks down with a groan. *It was the energy of spasm, and not of healthy life.* The old heathen Superstition died *just so*; its hands red with Christian blood. A spasmodic revival after a long decline—*apparently* vigorous to the last. So well does the hectic of decay sometimes mimic the bloom of youth—and the mad energy of incurable disease and approaching dissolution, often surpass, for a season, the mightiest efforts of heroic courage and manly strength!

c

**PUSEYISM:**  
**ANOTHER FORM OF ANTICHRIST,**  
**SPRUNG FROM PRELACY.**

A SERMON

BEFORE THE SYNOD OF PITTSBURGH;

BY

**ALEX. T. MCGILL,**

Professor of Ecclesiastical History and Church Govern-  
ment in the Western Theological Seminary.

---

——“Even now are there many Antichrists.”—  
1 JOHN 2, 18.

# PUSEYISM.

---

**“They went out from us, but they were not of us.”—  
1 JOHN 2, 19.**

It is consolation to the Church of Jesus Christ, to be taught, in this text, that apostasy is no more than insincerity revealed—hypocrisy unmasked. Instead of leaving the remnant to tremble for the work of God itself, foreboding similar defection in themselves, and ultimate desolation to the whole kingdom of our Saviour, it only manifests the certainty, that rottenness will not always even visibly cohere to the body of Christ; that corruption and falsehood will, of their own intrinsic repulsion, secede, and go, like Judas, to their own place.

It becomes a duty for us, in such circumstances, not only to see that “the foundation of the Lord standeth sure,” but to examine rigidly and honestly those peculiarities in religion, on which apostates leaned with principal stress, before they fell away to Antichrist; that thus our senses may be exercised for a quicker discrimination of tendencies in the future, and for a better understanding of the spurious value of these same peculiarities.

The Church of England has been reckoned among the Churches of the Reformation, ever since the accession of Elizabeth, though, indeed, the strangest anomaly; having, in the language of a

renowned civilian, in her own communion, "A Calvinistic Creed, an Arminian Clergy, and a Popish Ritual." She was Protestant or Popish, at the first, according to the freakish policy of the Tudors. She was persecuting or parasitic next, according to the various fortune of the Stuarts. And if Bishop Short, her own recent and popular historian, says truly, she has not changed for the better, during the last two hundred years. "The kingdom has, for the last two hundred years, (says he) been making rapid strides in every species of improvement; and a corresponding alteration in the laws, on every subject, has taken place: during this period, nothing has been remedied in the Church." The Liturgy of this Church is the same, with scarcely any alteration, as when the Pope proposed to ratify it for England, if the Virgin Queen would only acknowledge him, instead of herself, as supreme apostolical head of the Anglican Church. And so little offensive was it to Rome, that only one hundred and ninety-two, out of nine thousand and four hundred Popish clergymen, of all grades, refused to subscribe and embrace it.

We might well suppose, therefore, that this Church could nurture in her bosom, some, at least, who are "not of us"—who are ready, as soon as "the times" will permit, to go out from the whole brotherhood of the reformed. Such men are, in fact, the Tractarians of Oxford, at the head of whom are Dr. PUSEY and Mr. NEWMAN. They have gone out from us, by the publication of "Tracts for the Times," as well as letters, sermons, treatises, in which they repudiate the doc-

trines of the Reformation; aim to "unprotestantize" the National Church; deny that other denominations have valid ordinances, or a legitimate ministry; and insist on returning to what they call the "development" of Christianity, "at the period of the great Councils of the Church"—a time, when the germ of every Popish corruption was planted, and before its abominable fruits were fully exhibited.

It is proposed to show briefly as possible,

I. That this System is Antichristian, or opposed entirely to Apostolical Christianity revived at the Reformation.

II. That it results from peculiarities which separate the Church of England from other Protestant Churches.

Brethren who have examined, with any attention, the subject before me, will appreciate the difficulty of exhibiting anything like a system, from the tedious, enigmatical and contradictory documents of Puseyism. To give it in the language of the Tracts, so as to be understood, is utterly impossible. The result of my examination must be given, for the most part, in my own words, pledging myself of course to be honest, and to give the true interpretation, if the writings, from which I draw the following representation, have any meaning at all.

1. Puseyism, then, we affirm, subverts the Doctrines of the Bible, the Ordinances of the Bible, and the Bible itself.

First, the Doctrines. The great doctrine of Apostolical and Reformed Christianity, which stands at the centre of revealed religion, and the

foundation of all our hope, is Justification by Faith. It is meaning of Scripture, which he who runs may read, and it was settled every where by the great reformers, that we are justified on account of a righteousness external to ourselves, seen and embraced by faith—the righteousness of Christ, fulfilled for us in the way of legal substitution, and freely imputed, wherever appropriating faith exists; so that we are regarded, by the Judge of all, as righteous forever beneath this robe. Following this act of justification, by which our relative state is changed, and always inseparably connected with it, though perfectly distinct, is sanctification, or a progressive purification of our nature, by the indwelling and abiding agency of the Holy Ghost; who sprinkles on our evil consciences the cleansing blood of Christ, and makes the peace, and love, and gratitude of the justified state, a perennial fountain of holy obedience.

But, to all this, Puseyism is antagonistic. The righteousness of another can, in no sense whatever, be made over to us. There is no legal substitution for sinners personally, and particularly; no transfer of liabilities or deserts to the one side or the other. Justification and sanctification are one and the same. We are justified only because we are sanctified—justified on account of something within ourselves, an inherent righteousness, implanted by the grace of God, for the sake of Christ, but yet as much our own as the soul is our own, though given by God our Maker, sustained and increased by our own good works, diminished by venial sins, destroyed by mortal sins.

“Christ’s cross,” says Mr. Newman, “does not justify by being gazed at in faith.” “Mr. Newman,” says the British Critic, “recoils, with something approaching to a positive antipathy, from the thought of a justification external to ourselves. He seems to derive but meagre satisfaction from the contemplation of what was done for us 1800 years ago.” And then, adds this late organ of Puseyism, “the plan of justification by faith, through grace, is radically and fundamentally monstrous, immoral, heretical and antichristian.”

When forced to admit, that the Scriptural sense of the term ‘justify’ is mere acquittal, opposed simply to condemnation in a legal sense; when challenged to explain even the proverb of Scripture, “He that justifieth the wicked, and he that condemneth the just, even they both are an abomination to the Lord;” how can it be abomination to justify the wicked, if “justify” means to be made righteous, or accepted on account of a real righteousness within—they tell us the Bible uses the term in a *prophetical* sense, not to signify what God now pronounces on the state of the believer, but what He will pronounce, after the inherent righteousness, on account of which he is justified, shall have been well tried. How grossly in contradiction to the declarations of the Bible! “He that believeth on him IS not condemned; but he that believeth not is condemned already.” “Therefore, being justified by faith, we have peace with God.” “Much more then, being NOW justified by his blood, we shall be saved from wrath through him.” “There is, therefore, NOW no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus.”

Thus you see, on this vital point, they have gone out from us, far as the heaven is wide. Yet they tell us theirs is a "middle way" between Romanism, on the one hand, and ultra Protestantism, on the other. Let us see how they differ from Rome.

The Council of Trent have settled, that a man is justified on account of inherent righteousness, which is a quality or habit of his own soul. But the Doctors of Oxford assert, that this inherent righteousness is not a quality of his own mind, but "a principle which includes qualities," "a spiritual or divine presence within," "a righteousness *within*, but not *in us*." Now, it is notorious, that the Tridentine Fathers considered, with much attention, this very distinction, having found it on the pages of the Schoolmen; and preferred the formula they adopted, not because it is different in reality, but because it is more explicitly opposed to Luther. The tenet of Oxford lies buried with saintship in the bosom of Rome. It was taught by Thomas Aquinas, and refused by the Council of Trent, only because it was too subtle and dubious in terms, to curse, with sufficient momentum, the doctrine published at Augsburg.

Again: this pretended middle way professes to differ from Rome, by rejecting the dogma of Trent, that "Inherent righteousness is the only formal cause of a sinner's justification." Mr. Newman says, there are *two* formal causes, proper and improper. The proper is Christ within us; and the improper is the sanctified nature resulting from this divine inhabitation. But how "Christ within us" can be distinguished from sanctification of the soul,

it would require the shade of St. Thomas himself to explain.

Again,—(for there are three points of difference, they say,)—Oxford Theologians use the term “imputation;” while Papists utterly reject it. But it is an etymological imputation, invented to deceive the Protestant, as *amputare* signifies to cut off; *imputare*, they maintain, signifies to insert in; so that their imputation, after all, is infusion or communication of righteousness, instead of transfer, in the way of legal reckoning. So that, on this point also, the only difference is, “that Wicked,” who has come with all deceivableness of unrighteousness, is more honest in terms than the Doctors of Oxford.

So much for Puseyism, as “a middle way” in the course of a sinner’s justification: after all no middle way, but an old side of the same road, which Rome has ceased to travel on, only because the ‘angelical’ and ‘irrefragable’ doctors who first laid it out, have left it so troublesome with cobwebs and thickets.

Before proceeding to another doctrine, let us pause here to survey a little the affinities of the system before us. The Pelagian finds his doctrine of grace, in the hypothesis of a “righteousness within us but not in us;” that is, a righteousness intrinsically our own, but given to us remotely through the merit of Christ: not reckoned ours according to law, as we say, when we speak of justification: not produced by the constant operation of his spirit within, as we say, when we speak of sanctification: but a righteousness distinct from

both, a kind of deposit within us, once for all, a gift from God, precisely similar to that of our rational souls, and the institutions of the gospel, the only kind of grace which Pelagius admitted.

The Quaker finds in Puseyism his doctrine of justification, expressed with as much distinctness, as on the pages of Barclay, Bennet and Penn. No righteousness external to us, nothing set to our account in the way of imputation; nor yet any work or quality of our own is admitted as the cause: but something *within* us, though not *in* us—"Christ within"—precisely what Puseyites mean, if they mean any thing, by the phrase, 'a divine presence' in the soul.

We might well suppose then, that the Socinianism of Hicks, which divides the Quakers; and the heresy of denying all reality in the history of a Christ *without* us, into which many of them have fallen; would soon be developed among these Romanising mystics of the English Church. What need is there for a Saviour out of ourselves, if we are pardoned, accepted and saved, on account of a "divine presence" within? Hence we find Puseyites already insisting, that the story of the cross should be held back from the people. Hence, we hear of Unitarians already passing over, from the icy orisons of their depopulated meeting-house. to the warm bosom of *the* Church—to the robes and rubrics, crosses and crotchets, of the only ancient and true apostolical succession. Give the Socinian permission to preach, without preaching a true and proper atonement, and he has no scruple what name or title be given to the Lord Jesus Christ. Justify

a man on account of what is in him, no matter what it is, or how it is put there, and there is scarcely any form of infidelity, short of atheism itself, that could not easily put on your religion. And who knows how far leading men in the Parliament of Great Britain have recognized this bottom affinity, in recently reversing the decision of England's Judges, and giving to Socinians the rich livings which evangelical forefathers left for the good of souls and the glory of their Saviour Christ?

This 'middle way' then, is in fact the highway of error; a medium where extremes the most errant and opposite are coming together — where the Schoolman, the Pelagian, the Quaker, the Socinian, as well as the Papist of Trent and the Churchman of Oxford can form 'a confederacy' against the very foundations of Christian faith and hope.

2. Closely connected with the subject of justification, is that of saving faith. This all important grace has no room in the system before us. There is no righteousness without us for it to apprehend. A body that can live on what is within itself, has no need of a hand to supply it with nutriment. The 'presence' or 'principle' infused, which is made the cause of justification in Puseyism, is not itself a quality or grace, but something that includes qualities or graces. Of course, it includes faith; which is therefore the fruit of justification, rather than the means or the instrument. We believe, because we are saved, not in order to be saved: and is not this the faith of the Universalist?

Faith has two stages in Puseyism; one before, the other after baptism. Before baptism, it is

E

merely preparation of the soul for this ordinance; and without an actual participation of the ordinance is of no benefit. "Faith brings us to baptism," says Dr. Pusey, "by baptism God saves us." "By faith we desire to be healed, by baptism he healeth us."\*

Before baptism it is dead; "it has no moral excellence," says Mr. Newman; it is mere assent of the mind to the facts of the Gospel; the same which Devils have, only, that it is willing to be baptized! Yet he calls it "a divine supernatural faith," because it rests on the testimony of the Church, which is a divine supernatural deponent.

It has no life, no power, no moral excellence, till it is baptized; then it lives and becomes the instrument of justification. But how? What dignity will Puseyites allow this patriarchal and illustrious grace, when once it is quickened, if before its christening, it is dead as that which Devils have? Why, it becomes a representative of the laver in which it was vivified! It is the instrument of justification, by indicating in its exercise, to ourselves and the world, that we are justified and do possess the grace infused by baptism. Thus, the instrument is merely an index; and inward grace is made the sign of an outward symbol. Strange perversion of Scripture and common sense!

Well, if this be all the office of justifying faith, to represent its own life-giving baptism, is it alone in this office; is it even in this humble sense, the *sole* instrument of justification? No: it is only fore-

---

\* Pusey's Views of Baptism, pp. 49, 69, 70.

most among others, which have the same function, all other graces, and especially hope and charity.

But if faith be no more than the exponent of justifying baptism, and not even alone in that performance, is it a durable grace; will they allow this lowly existence of a once sublime efficiency, to persevere till the final salvation of the soul shall be attained? No: it is but a representative, and perishes of course along with that which it represents.

The grace infused by baptism may be lost; and consequently, whatever merely betokens the possession may be also lost.

Here, however, comes the dilemma. Baptism can be administered only once, and if the justification it confers may be lost by post-baptismal sin, what shall be the remedy for such sin? Faith is dead, and the fountain from which its life must flow is sealed forever. What then becomes of the millions in the church of Rome, and church of England, who go on to sin with no moderate profligacy, as if their baptismal regeneration were either an empty figment, or an adamant security?

3. This brings us to the Puseyite *Repentance*—a baptism of tears; “the severity of the ancient medicine,” as Dr. Pusey calls it; mortification of the body and anguish of the spirit; penance hard, and sharp, and costly, as ever was enjoined by Pope, or practised by Ascetic; and yet, whether availing or unavailing, they cannot tell. “There are but two periods of absolute cleansing,” says Dr. Pusey, “baptism and the day of judgment: and as the church has no second baptism to give, so, in the case of the sinner supposed, she cannot pronounce

him altogether free from his past sins; she therefore teaches him continually to repent, that so his sins *may* be blotted out, though she has no commission to tell him absolutely that they *are*.”\*

How happier far the papist is who finds a *sacrament* in his penance; one which answers all the purpose of baptism repeated; one that is all instinct with justifying grace, when the priest absolves and at the worst a burning purgatory takes away. Some of the Tractarians would have the Eucharist restore again the forfeited grace of Baptism, thus going beyond Rome herself in the perversion of this ordinance, by making it a converting ordinance. But the majority, with Pusey, prefer to leave the repenting backslider, from the day of his first mortal sin after baptism, till the day of judgment, to sorrow, bitter, dark and dubious; as if no daysman had ever laid his hand on both parties; no fountain had ever been opened “to the house of David and the inhabitants of Jerusalem.”

But, we apprehend, the myriads of English Christians will not long be left, by the mighty abettors of an easy and agreeable religion, to lie in the valley of Achor, without a door of hope. Their penance will soon be indued with regenerating efficacy. And this must be in the Romish way of making another sacrament, whose symbols are penance here and purgatory hereafter. No evangelical repentance can have a place in that system, which forbids all looking forth to Jesus “whom we have pierced;” which turns salvation through his blood

---

\* Pusey's Letter to Bishop of Oxford, page 69.

into a mystic charm ; and the brightest promise of pardon into a dark and agonizing doubt.

4. That true repentance is precluded by this system, is evident still farther, from the diminished evil of sin which it maintains. "Baptism restores what Adam lost," seems to be a postulate in all their dissertations on sin. Now, baptism infuses a "principle," or "presence," or "righteousness within us, but not in us," or whatever it may be called, which is *supernatural*. Consequently, what Adam lost was supernatural. The image of God, consisting in knowledge, and righteousness, and true holiness, so far as it was stamped on his *nature*, remains unbroken and uninjured. Original sin has deprived us of no more than a glory and felicity which were extraneous to man; and which he could afford to lose, without impairing his original integrity. We remain after the fall, what we were before the fall; with nothing ruined in our native constitution; nothing lost, but a kind of celestial endowment, or transcendent faculty, which was given to direct the propensities of our nature aright. We are now just as God made us, save only the want of a supernatural bridle to guide and adorn us. This additament is restored by baptism; sustained and increased by our own good works, diminished by venial sins, destroyed by mortal sins; but whether sustained, diminished, or destroyed, it leaves the constitution of our nature as it came from the hands of God, in all its pristine strength and beauty. This, if they mean anything, must be meant by their misty exposition of original sin. We need not stop to prove that all this is the rankest Pelagianism, ex-

causing the evil of sin, and making God himself its author.

From these leading points, without proceeding farther, we may discover that the whole ground of truth is radically poisoned—that this system is entirely antichristian; and where it differs, is worse than Popery for consolation and consistency.

Yet after all, we have exhibited only the better side of our subject; we have not glanced at "*New School*" Puseyism; for we must observe, that this enormous apostacy is now distinguished within, by high and low, new and old school. Since 1841, there has been a "tendency to Romanism," which astonishes and alarms Tractarians themselves.—They were not prepared, it seems, for the entire sweep of the "Church principles," they were so anxious to awaken and conserve. They were too dull to perceive, or too infatuated to fear, the ultimate suicide which every system of error, when pushed to extremes, is sure to perpetrate. The original object of the Tracts, we are told, was to fortify the Anglican church against popery, as well as dissent.\* But now, *the Church* is censured, disparaged, almost refused the honor of being a church at all; and popery more perhaps than the Pope himself would like to own to it, is advocated in the van of "this great movement."

The capital doctrine of these forward or New School Puseyites, is that of "development," borrowed from the Popish writers, Mohler and De Maistré. Ancient Christianity, with all its dark-

---

\* See Palmer's "Narrative of Events," &c.

ness, and doubtfulness, and multitudinous interpolation, having failed to warrant half the corruptions of modern Rome, her sagacious defenders have recently shifted the ground with amazing adventure, and launched a theory which turns "Catholic antiquity" into a child, libraries of the Vatican into play things, and Baronius, Bellarmine and Bossuet into fools. This theory makes primitive Christianity a germ, "without form or comeliness," valuable only for its capability of development, and actually developed by degrees, through the great Councils of the Church, till mediæval ages exhibited the full expansion; when Papal supremacy, transubstantiation, purgatory, indulgencies, the worship of images, the virgin and the saints, etc. stood forth in all their luxuriant glory. Thus, the silence of antiquity is no longer appalling; the lies with which its ghostly regions had been peopled, are no longer required; the successive artifices of "unwritten tradition," "reserve," etc. with which Rome was wont to bolster her enormities, are exploded; and one bold simplification is made to justify all that she has been, is, or will be.

Why this "development" should stop at the middle ages, or at any age, and any form of expansion; why it should be confined to lineal succession in the church, and not to human reason also, as the Rationalists contend—why it should repudiate the "germ" of *Natural Theology*, and reject the Oriental emanations of the Brahman, which make Polytheism to be the necessary development of Monotheism, we cannot tell; and they give no answer. This novel theory has seized the front of

**Puseyism**: the British Critic has raved to death with it; and even Mr. Newman, we are told in a "Narrative" issuing from Oxford, is ominously prating about "practical application," "inference," "expansion," "detailed statement," etc. which knowing conservatives in the ranks suspect to mean this Popish "development." We shall not pursue this fragment of our "fragmentary" subject; because our task, at this time, is not to discuss the forms of infidelity; and because we might do injustice to "the more part" of Tractarians themselves. We shall confine ourselves to their own *orthodox* development of "church principles."

II. Puseyism subverts the *Ordinances* of the Bible.

First, the ordinance of Preaching. "It may be necessary," says Tract 85, "in a weak and languishing state, but to say the least, Scripture has never much recommended it as a way of doing good." Were we to admit, that the claimants of 'Apostolical Succession' are capable of exercising the great commission from Christ; and that a derivation of it from individual men, instead of assemblies, derivation through a channel, filled with all the corruption, usurpation and accident of apostate Rome, does not forfeit all authority to preach in the name of Jesus; we have other ground for confidently averring, that Puseyism dishonors and discards the ordinance of preaching. It is done by their policy of "Reserve," according to which "the whole counsel of God" is not to be declared by his ministers; the glorious and glad announcement of the Gospel, for which alone it is "tidings

of great joy," viz: that atonement has been made by an all sufficient Saviour, is to be suppressed, or uttered only at the close of a sainted career; we are not to be 'sanctified by the truth, as the Scriptures declare, but sanctified before we can know it without hurt to the soul.

"The atonement," says Mr. Newman, "is a great secret, the knowledge of which can only be obtained by obedience, as the crown and end of holiness of life."

In Tract 87, we read the following sentences on the subject. "To set the atonement in prominence before the hearers is unscriptural, uncatholic, unreal—to which this system is opposed, in tone and spirit, in tendencies and effects, in principles and practices." "We are to preach repentance, as John the Baptist did, alluding to the atonement only secretly, obscurely and probably only to a few chosen and favored disciples, to whom it must have been a dark saying."

Again, connected with this policy of "reserve," is another, which they call "economy;" according to which they even repudiate John the Baptist, their favorite model. He proclaimed, "the axe is laid unto the root of the trees;" they teach the root is not to be assailed at all; but spared, however wild and rank it may be, for the graft of Christianity. Mr. Newman says, "He (the missionary) will seek some points in the existing superstitions, as the basis of his own instructions, instead of indiscriminately condemning and discarding the whole assemblage of heathen practices and opinions. And while he strenuously opposes all that is idolatrous, criminal

and profane in their creed, he will profess to be leading them on to perfection, and recovering and purifying, rather than reversing the essential principles of their belief.\*

This "economy" is the boasted science of the Jesuits; and it is even ancient, we may admit, in justice and gratification to Puseyites of the old school. Both Clement of Alexandria, and Chrysostom, commend it; but in plainer terms than Mr. Newman uses. They call it "deceit" and "fraud," with which it is right to cheat the souls of men, when we would heal them; just as a physician may lie with propriety, in order to persuade a reluctant patient to take his medicine.

But most of all, preaching is subverted and superseded by the *opus operatum*, or intrinsic efficacy, of the Sacraments. The words that we speak are not spirit and life, according to this system; we are not begotten again by the word of truth; it is not the pleasure of God to save men by the foolishness of preaching. "Baptism saves us," says Dr. Pusey. Baptism and the Eucharist are all sufficient, if every minister should officiate dumb, as the "dogs" denounced by the prophet Isaiah.

2. But how, again, are these Sacraments treated by Puseyism—for it boasts of raising and magnifying these hallowed institutions. Not to urge the manifest certainty, that God abominates the making of any institution more magnificent or efficacious than he has made it himself—how have they advanced the Sacraments, when they have brought

---

\* History of Arians, page 9.

them to a level with the charms of a conjuror, and made them effectual without regard to fitness, either in him who administers, or in them to whom they are administered? If the sacraments are not signs and seals merely, then activity of mind and heart in enjoying them is useless; and they are as good for a man when he is sleeping, as when he is waking; dying as living; heathen as Christian: and strangely "sublime," indeed, must be a mystery, which operates like cerate or a cataplasin! But this is not all. The ordinance of baptism is not only destroyed, by superseding faith and the Word and Spirit of God, and by being transmuted from a sign which enlivenes and comforts the soul, to a dead mystery that lulls alike concern and intelligence; it is destroyed by severing its connection, with any sign or seal of the Old Testament dispensation, and thus leaving the church without a guide to its right application, as to the subjects; without illustration of its true symbolical nature; and without apprehension of the whole body of Christ, to which it introduces us as sympathizing members. Puseyites reject all identity of baptism and circumcision; deny that there was even a church, or a covenant before baptism was instituted; assert that all ordinances of old were but shadows; and that the Deluge and the Red Sea were sacraments, as much as circumcision and the passover.

Of course, as baptism is the only means of conferring justification, all who died before it was instituted, died unjustified and unsaved. "Regeneration," (with which justification is always con-

founded,) says Mr. Newman, "is a gift of the Spirit, not promised except under the Gospel."\* Abraham is excepted from the world in wickedness, just as Elijah was excepted from the world in death—by an extraordinary dispensation. All others—worthies—men after God's own heart—clouds of witnesses—heritage of God—all went down unjustified, like Korah and his company, to tremble in perdition, or slumber in the Limbus Patrum of the papists; till the soul of a crucified Redeemer went down, at his death, to liberate his fathers after the flesh from their prison-house!

The Scriptures have called circumcision a 'sign;' and this is all the crime for which 'holy men of old' are thus atrociously doomed. A 'sign and seal' is no sacrament; and without a sacrament, there is no salvation. Hear what baptism is from Dr. Pusey, and then cease to wonder, that he should deny so 'beggarly' an ordinance as circumcision the honor of being its predecessor—"So superabounding and awful a grace tabernacled in them, (that are baptized,) that no other words describe it more nearly, than to call it an Angel's nature"—"a divine presence in the soul, abiding, abundant and efficacious."—"It gives a depth to our Christian experience, an actualness to our union to Christ, an overwhelmingness to the dignity conferred on human nature, a substantiality to the indwelling of Christ." †

This is the glory of our religion, that belongs only and all to the baptized—to Simon Magus,

\* Newman's Lectures, page 237.

† Views of Holy Baptism, page 16.

Voltaire, Rousseau, Byron, Cesar Borgia, and many of the most flagitious monsters, that ever lived to blot our nature and to curse the world: while Noah, Moses, David, Samuel and the Prophets, and millions besides, who "wrought righteousness," "died in faith," perished; unless some slender chance in the "uncovenanted mercies of God" has happened to save them!

3. As to the Sacrament of the Supper, it is extremely difficult to set forth, in few words, the doctrine of Pusey and his brethren. They profess to reject Transubstantiation; and yet they dwell with singular emphasis and reiteration on the "divine presence" in the emblems. The *absurdity* of transubstantiation is not the cause of its rejection: its unfathomable mockery of sense and reason, is scarcely touched with any reprehension: it is only the inutility of the sacrifice, which Romanism professes to make in the mass. "In Romanism, the sacrament becomes little else than a sacrifice; it is rather something which we offer to God, than something which God confers on us. Thus an unspeakable grace of God is rejected, while man identifies his lowly and unworthy offering, with that stupendous sacrifice, which was sufficient to redeem the whole universe." Such is the objection of a Puseyite who is now distinguished as the most orthodox and conservative of all the Tractarians;\* and let us hear him in another passage, from his "Narrative," published avowedly for the purpose of convincing the world, that himself, Dr.

---

\* Rev. Wm. Palmer, M. A., of Worcester College, Oxford.

Pusey, and others of the moderate sort, are only the true defenders "of church principles." "Nor can any words be too high, when we speak of that regenerating grace, which in holy baptism transforms the child of Adam's sin into the child of God.—And this divine life, thus implanted in the soul, is, we believe, sustained and nourished by innumerable graces and dispensations of the Holy Spirit; but *more especially* in the sacrament of the holy communion, in which, by a mystery beyond human comprehension, the blessed Jesus himself becomes the true nourishment and food of our souls, condescending to *enter our earthly tabernacles*, that He may make us partakers of Himself, and afford to our *flesh* a pledge of immortality." This is a specimen, in the best Tractarian style, of dissertation on the Lord's Supper. The sermon of Dr. Pusey, on this subject, is well known, and accessible to all. But we need not detain any longer, at the ambiguous tenet of "the real presence" in Puseyism; it is enough that their doctrine of justification itself destroys the precious ordinance of the Supper. "Do this in remembrance of me," is the capital appointment; which at once evinces its true nature, and fixes its firm institution. But here, there is no remembrance of Christ, no going out of the soul to Him and the remembrance of Him, no recital of His life, no commemoration of His death; no Gethsemane, no Calvary, no historical reminiscence of any kind, at this feast upon a sacrifice; nothing which celebrates, or rehearses, or shows forth; but altogether the mystic participation of a cross or Christ within us. "Justifica-

tion," says Pusey, "consists in God's inward presence"—a doctrine which he says again, "buries self in the absorbing vision of a present, an indwelling God."\*

### III. Puseyism subverts the *Bible* itself.

Its full sufficiency as a rule of faith is denied. Mr. Newman says:—"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 Scriptures," says Tract 85, "it is evident, are not the Rule of Faith. The doctrine or message of the gospel is but indirectly presented in the Scriptures, and in an obscure and concealed manner."

Its full sufficiency as a rule of practice is denied. "But it may be urged," says Tract 45, "that we Protestants believe the Scriptures to contain the whole rule of duty. Certainly not: they constitute a rule of faith, not a rule of *practice*; a rule of doctrine, not a rule of *conduct* or *discipline*."

The paramount authority of Scripture is denied. "Catholic tradition is a divine informer in religious things; it is the unwritten word. These two things (the Bible and tradition) form together a united rule of faith,"† says Mr. Newman. "The unwritten word of God demands of us the same respect which his written word does," says Mr. Keble.‡

The rule of just interpretation is denied. The sacred volume is not permitted to interpret itself,

\* Letter to Bishop of Oxford, page 42.

† Newman's Lecture on Romanism.

‡ Keble's Sermons.

as any other document must be; much less, is it left to explanation by the spirit of God to each reader's mind. "Catholic tradition," says Mr. Newman, "is the authoritative teacher." "Tradition is infallible," says Mr. Keble. "The true creed is the Catholic interpretation of Scripture."

The very evidences on which the Bible demands our belief are repudiated. The reason of a believer's faith in the Scriptures is the impress of divinity on the page itself; God's own authority, beaming immediately from its lines on his soul. Puseyism would thrust in another witness, between faith and its very Author. The church only can assure the soul that it is the word of God. Not a ray of celestial light can enter the mind, unless her magic lantern, handed down through a long line of Apostles, Popes, and English Bishops, should in some way cast a blink of attestation on the dark and spiritless volume. Then, indeed, it becomes a light, but the light of an index, which points him back again to darkness—back to a font of baptism for the life of his soul—back to the oracles of a carnal priesthood for instruction, whose most luminous dogma is, that the clearest light of the Bible should be enfolded in mystery, or reserved from the path of the just, till they are on the verge of perfect day.

But if *internal* evidences are thus swept away, are not the *external* evidences permitted to stand, demonstrating the genuineness and authenticity of the sacred books; courting the investigation of all learning; challenging the scrutiny of all unbelief; building out of every fabric, and every wreck of human events, on the lowest and broadest princi-

ples of human belief, an edifice of truth, ever rising, and ever standing firmer than the granite basis of the everlasting mountains? No; Puseyism rejects them all. Much as she boasts of history, she will have no historical evidence of Christianity. Much as she glories to unravel all that is intricate, and ascertain all that is good and true, in ages that are past, she disdains the defence of religion by impartial criticism, and points a scorning infidelity also to the church, the unexplained and unexplainable deposition of the church—a church, gray with the imbecilities of human ignorance mitred and installed for centuries—a church, that would have stifled human learning at its resurrection; that would have stained her vesture with the blood of scholars, as well as saints—a church, that, when infidelity did rise, in its might and rage, over modern Europe, threw off the mask to hail the destroyer, or fell before it, as chaff before the wind of the wilderness.

Paley is denounced, as well as Luther and Calvin. "Nature," says Tract 85, "gives sentence against the habit of inquiry." "Happiness," says the British Critic, "is attached to a confiding, unreasoning faith." "Implicit belief is our duty. Let us maintain before we have proved." "Protestants dispense with the church, by basing the genuineness and authenticity of the Scriptures on history and criticism." "The Romanist cannot fail to think it a great defect in the English Church, that she has no authoritative voice of her own, and cannot put forth the Bible in the name of the English Church, and therefore is driven to make

the Bible stand by itself, by a cumbrous apparatus of evidences." \*

Such is an imperfect sketch of Puseyism; even in its moderation essentially hostile to the doctrines, the ordinances, and the evidence of Christianity. We have said nothing of its coarse and virulent abuse of the Reformation; we might have consumed your time with quotations like the following, from Froude:—"Really, I hate the Reformation and the Reformers more and more;" and this from Palmer, the champion of Old School Puseyism:—"It is necessary to reject entirely, and to anathematize the principles of Protestantism, as being that of a heresy, with all its forms, its sects, and its denominations."

To crown the Antichristian character of this system, we should mark its fear and hatred of any examination. "To so great a length has this evil proceeded, (investigation of 'church principles,') that beardless youth and young women discuss, without scruple, the most solemn and difficult subjects of controversy; and presume to censure the church, to condemn her existing system; to canvass and to blame the conduct and principles of those who sit in the chair of the Apostles!" † Against all investigation by us Dissenters, *the Church* is thus advised:—"It may be that these strangers to this church speak truly, on some of the disputed points; but however this may be, I cannot but think it highly derogatory to the dignity of truth, to receive the aid of such auxiliaries." ‡

\* British Critic, No. 64.

† "Narrative," &c., by Palmer. ‡ *Ib.*

Even against British Christians, within the pale of the Apostolic Succession ; against Politicians, Prelates, Journals, &c., it is threatened to unchurch the English Church herself, unless they desist from opposition to the Tractarians. " To some, perhaps, it seems doubtful, whether that church can be indeed a Catholic Church, when she permits truth to be so violently assailed and oppressed." The most ruthless attacks on Dissenters, and Anglican Professors themselves, are every where fenced off with sanctimonious deprecation of controversy, and every thing that would " disturb the heart, and disqualify it from the higher pursuits of religion."

We shall now trespass on your time but little, in discussing the SECOND part of our subject—that Puseyism is the result of peculiarities, which separate the Church of England from other churches of the Reformation. This, I am aware, is delicate ground. Evangelical Episcopalians, many of whom adorn the Protestant name, part with us here, and perhaps think it unkind to affront them with such a position. But they are sufficiently generous, I hope, to allow me, under such an appointment as called me to this task, to be faithful to the subject, according to my own conscientious conviction.

The proposition now before us is true, according to the best evidence of facts and intentions which the case will admit, viz., the declarations of Tractarians themselves. Whatever Puseyism now is, or yet may be, its authors, confessedly wise and gifted, pious and learned, without superiors in the English Church, declare, with one voice, that it was undertaken for her benefit alone ; for the dis-

play and vindication of her true principles before the world. Listen to one who has been active and conspicuous from the beginning of "the movement" till the present time, and who is now the great apologist and pamphleteer of Oxford Divinity, Rev. William Palmer, M. A. Referring to "suggestions" and circulars, which he himself had written and disseminated, and which mainly gave birth to the Tractarian movement, he says, in his recent "Narrative:"—"In those documents, which were received with favor by the great body of the clergy, we expressed our disapprobation of 'alterations in the doctrine and discipline of the Church,' our resolution 'to maintain, pure and inviolate, the doctrines, the services, and the discipline of the Church.' We asserted 'our devoted adherence to the Apostolical doctrine and polity of the Church,' and 'our deep-rooted attachment to the Liturgy, in which she has embodied, in the language of ancient piety, the orthodox and primitive faith.' Our attachment, therefore, to the Church of England is unquestionable. Our combination was for the purpose of resisting Latitudinarian attempts against the established doctrine and discipline, and of defending the principles of the Church. \* \* \*

And from all that passed, I have no hesitation in saying, that, had there been any suspicion of a tendency to Romanism, our combination would have been impossible."—*p.* 29. "There was no dishonesty on our part—no wish to promote Romanism—no want of charity towards any of her members—no design, except that of seeing *all the*

*principles of the English Church in full and active operation.*”—p. 95.

He considers it impossible, in the very nature of “Church principles,” that any within her pale should have had a deceitful purpose of going to Rome, at the beginning of their movement. “No: I will not believe that such disgraceful and detestable treachery and hypocrisy can exist in any one who has ever partaken of sacramental privileges in the Church of England.”—p. 75.

These explicit declarations, which we are bound to believe, by all the rules of charity and justice, are established by facts well known in England. The Tractarian movement commenced in 1833, a time when “the Church, in England and Ireland, seemed destined to immediate desolation and ruin.” The repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts in 1828—the measure of Roman Catholic Emancipation in 1829—the Revolution at Paris in 1830—the Reform Bill in 1831—the Abolition of ten Bishoprics in Ireland—the liberal publications of Isaac Taylor—the Erastian publications of Lord Henley and Dr. Burton—all these are expressly detailed, as the causes of the Puseyite Association. It first met in the Summer of 1833, in the Common Room of Oriel College, and consisted then of Messrs. Newman, Froude, Keble, Perceval, and Palmer. The only theme of discussion was the dangers that threatened the Church of England, from the causes just enumerated. The only variance of sentiment was on the union between Church and State; but this, of course, would be a slight

dispute at Oxford; and the following were agreed on, as the "Objects of the Association:"

"1. To maintain pure and inviolate the doctrines, the services and the discipline of the church; that is, to withstand all change, which involves the denial and suppression of doctrine, a departure from primitive practice in religious offices, or innovation upon the Apostolical prerogatives, orders and commission of bishops, priests and deacons.

2. To afford Churchmen an opportunity of exchanging their sentiments, and co-operating together on a large scale."

This formulary was not kept in a corner: it was extensively made known. A memorial to the Archbishop of Canterbury, for the same "object," to the same purport, and drawn by the same hand, (Palmer's,) was sent through all England; and arrived at his grace, with the signatures of nearly 7,000 clergy. 230,000 laymen followed with their address. Even the elections were excited with the cause of the church. The Commons were flooded with memorials—King William himself was taken with novel enthusiasm; and on the anniversary of his birth, in May, 1834, the old Monarch made a speech to the assembled Prelates of the kingdom, by far the most eloquent of his life. "My Lords, you have a right to require of me, to be resolute in defence of the Church. \* \* I am from the deepest conviction attached to the pure Protestant faith; which this Church, of which I am the temporal Head, is the human means of diffusing and preserving in this land, \* \* \* the Church of England and Ireland, it is my fixed

purpose, determination and resolution to maintain.  
 \* \* \* The threats of those who are enemies of the Church, make it the more necessary for those who feel their duty to that Church to speak out.”<sup>a</sup> This speech was soon followed by the elevation of a conservative ministry, forced upon the King in a great measure by the movements of the country; which this zealous association of ecclesiastics at Oxford mainly occasioned.\*

Thus we see, that Puseyism, instead of being concocted, as many suppose, by a junto of Jesuits in disguise, was cradled on the foam of a nation's excitement. It was in unison with this outburst of national loyalty, which they themselves had stirred for the Church, that these Reverend agitators commenced the publication of the Tracts. And who does not see, in all these circumstances, the strongest possible guaranty, that the principles of *the Church* would be carried out by such men, to their fair development, full proportion and legitimate consequence? Whatever Tractarianism is, or may be, we are persuaded, that the peculiarities of the Church of England, more than the writers, are responsible for its production. If Popery comes on them, in despite of all the cautions of such a crisis, and all the patriotic fervor which the perils of “Catholic Emancipation” produced, we must believe that Popery is not far off from the Anglical system—that the only true explanation of such a strange result is, that the English Church, when fully rigged, and stretched to the breeze, is borne

---

\* See the Narratives of both Percival and Palmer.

to the Tiber, in spite of all the cries and wishes of the crew themselves in opposition to the course.

We Presbyterians, however, are not surprised. We do not arrogate superior sagacity, nor claim a penetration beyond that of our neighbors; but the most stupid bystanders can often see, at a glance, the cause and cure of perplexities, which confound the wise and mighty, more and more, as they continue to flounder, and to despise our counsels.

1. We think it not strange that Puseyism comes on the Church of England, because there is ample *room* for it in the bosom of Prelacy. Here, the bond of union is the arm of power; a carnal policy, more than the force of truth and love. Here, a primary object is to make some ministers lords over others; in the language of the "Objects of Association" quoted already, to maintain "the Apostolical prerogatives, order and commission of bishops, priests and deacons." What, on the face of it, could be a more Antichristian affront to the capital injunction of equality, given emphatically by the *only* King and *Head* of the Church, visible or invisible—"YE KNOW THAT THEY WHICH ARE ACCOUNTED TO RULE AMONG THE GENTILES, EXERCISE LORDSHIP OVER THEM; AND THEIR GREAT ONES EXERCISE AUTHORITY UPON THEM. BUT SO SHALL IT NOT BE WITH YOU; BUT WHOSOEVER WILL BE GREAT AMONG YOU SHALL BE YOUR MINISTER, AND WHOSOEVER AMONG YOU WILL BE THE CHIEFEST SHALL BE SERVANT OF ALL?" The mischief of this "lordship" in the Christian Church, is not only that it elevates man above his brother, and between his brother and the Saviour; hiding from eye and

conscience the immediate authority of Christ ; but also, that it supersedes the only bond of union which God has given to the Church—truth. Never did he design his Church to be one, without striving together, with one heart and one mind for the faith of the Gospel. Any other oneness, such as the Pope or a modern Bishop coerces, is a curse to her—is, in every age, and by inevitable tendency, prolific of rottenness and death.

No matter how you build the form of prelacy—how you modify, and check, and denominate, the man who is uplifted to superintend the lowly and coequal bishops of Apostolic Christianity; truth is dethroned by his elevation, deprived of prerogative, disparaged in her efficacy, permitted, with indifference on the aspect of the Church, to dwell or to depart ; and of course, there is provided, within the folds of unity herself, a secure retreat for damnable heresies.

“I hold the doctrines of Rome,” says Mr. Ward in his ‘Ideal ;’ “I have declared this for three years past : yet I have received no Episcopal censure ; and I am still a Fellow of Balliol College, and a clergyman of the Church of England.”

2. We think Puseyism is the natural result of claiming Apostolical Succession. This “Laudian” claim begins, by making another sacrament—one of its own, one that is replete with absurdity and abomination—the *sacrament of orders*, in ordination ; that is, a communication, by ceremonious contact, of some mysterious capability or virtue, which one man has, and another has not—a capability derived through a line of individuals, that

reaches back to Peter and Paul, as they say; individuals, however graceless and brainless, however unholy in heart and life, however unable, with head or tongue, to spell the great commission itself.

We see how certainly this false sacrament eventually stamps with its type all other sacraments; how it changes their nature, from being signs only, to being "*opus operatum*;" things of intrinsic virtue and mystic application; things of salvation, without regard to a living faith, a crucified Saviour, or a heartfelt obedience. If we had not another impeachment to bring against the arrogance of this claim; the foolish pride it inflates, the remorseless bigotry it induces, the absurd superiority of means over the end, age, and accident, and pedigree over all the evidences of fruitful holiness which the Bible proposes—if none of these things could be charged against it, the fact, that it turns all religion into sacrament,—such sacrament as Rome inculcates,—is enough to fix on this silly arrogance all the corruptions of Puseyism.

3. Liturgical forms tend themselves to introduce a religion of form. Stereotype the heart's devotion, and any Church will soon become a shell. Let the warmest emotions of the soul be accustomed and obliged to vent themselves in forms made ready by others, and forms will ultimately become every thing in religion. If men must look to the Church for their prayers, will they not look to the Church for their regeneration also—prayer being the very breath of spiritual life? Let the Church thrust in her hand between the soul and its Maker, in this intimate communion of prayer, and there is no

communion too close and sacred for her interference; no ordinance too holy for transformation at her hands. As well might she presume to interpret Scripture for the private judgment of every member, transmute bread and wine into the real presence of Christ, and lay all manner of will-worship and carnal observance on the shoulders of men; as venture to chain "*the spirit of grace and supplication,*" and bind to her forms, at every altar, alike, the noble aspirations of heavenly birth, and the heartless genuflexions of fashionable hypocrisy.

Nor is this all: she is led, at length, to make little difference between the true and the seeming. She is prone, in the weakness of her nature, like any literal mother, to indulge even the froward, if only they love, revere, and practise her forms; and so to widen the "narrow way," that all may inherit life eternal, who observe, with due formality, her beautiful Liturgy. Thus she goes from forms of prayer to salvation in the sacraments.

Without charging on the Book of Common Prayer the doctrine of baptismal regeneration, which Puseyites glory to discover on its pages—or the disparagement of preaching, which results necessarily from the length of other services—or the Popish notion of a sacrament, which lurks in the rite of confirmation, by the efficacious hands of a prelate alone: without insisting that revivals of religion are stifled, prayer meetings precluded, and catholic union of every kind, with other denominations, for benevolent objects, is prevented by this "petrified wisdom of the age of Elizabeth;" without urging our own conviction of these defects,

when so many pious Episcopalians deny or disown them, we insist that it is the natural consequence of Liturgical forms themselves, to bring on any Church, sooner or later, a religion of sacraments; and that, if many excellent Christians are not yet misled, by a perversion of religion so radical, it is because the power of divine grace, and the influence of evangelical dissenters, have thus far counteracted the genius of Prelacy, and the natural effect of her forms.

In conclusion, my brethren, we may learn even from this imperfect discussion, how vast the responsibilities of the Presbyterian Church, with her thrice vindicated doctrines, and her simple Apostolical forms. Her Constitution, we can say without vaunting, is the only complete antagonism under heaven to the divinity of Oxford; and, if true to herself, she is destined to be pre-eminently the witness of God against this revival of scholastic Christianity. Permit me, then, to make three suggestions, among many which crowd at the close of this subject.

First. Let us discriminate those who are "not of us," as far as we can, before they go out from us entirely, throwing off the mask, and leaving us embarrassed, if not injured, by the arms of a spurious charity, which, perhaps, we have thrown out too long already. Let us "try them which say they are apostles, and are not." Let us refuse to acknowledge the advocates of Apostolic Succession as ministers of Christ, and no longer take the attitude, shameful, debasing, and regardless of our great commission from the Head—the attitude of

owning, with Christian caresses, this man and that to be authorized of God, when he spurns our ordination as empty and void. Not that we should retaliate; the office we hold is too noble for this; and indeed there has not yet been harm enough inflicted, by the silly presumption, to provoke a revenge. But the value of truth, the honor of Christ, the integrity of his mystical body, demand of us to consider that the Bishop, Priest, or Deacon, who puts the worth of doctrine and godliness beneath that of an outward rite, and gives the perpetual presence of Christ, only to a titled line of individual men; and denies that millions of Protestant Christendom, who "fear God and work righteousness," can be saved, in covenant mercy, because they are not Episcopally blessed, does maintain a *heresy*, that forfeits all right to exercise the ministerial office. Why should we not rank along with the rejection of Christ's divine nature, and the rejection of His human nature, the rejection of His *mystical* nature, as the Scriptures reveal and define it? As well might the heretic deny, that His literal body is extant at the right hand of power, as that His spiritual body is extant, according to the testimony of the Bible, in all those who bear the fruits of holiness.

Again, let us rightly value Presbytery, as the ordinance of God. Let us not aim, as many do, at the overthrow of prelacy, or other obnoxious form, by sinking the "*divine right*" of any and every form of government in the church. While we cheerfully admit, that the form is of secondary importance; let us never agree that it is indifferent,

or a matter of mere expediency, to be moulded by circumstances of convenience among men. Let us not impeach the wisdom of our glorious Founder so much, as to concede for a moment that He would give us "wisdom better than rubies," without giving along with the priceless jewel a durable casket—that He would give a Gospel, to be kept in purity and preached to every creature, without any 'form for 'the pillar and ground;' on which it must be emblazoned: or that He would leave the outward form of a kingdom, which shall break in pieces all other kingdoms, and *never be moved*, to be shaped and changed, by the fashion of these transitory and subservient institutions of men: especially when all experience demonstrates the necessary influence of forms on principles. Governments, whether civil or ecclesiastical, mould the people in character and sentiment. Despotism in the state does not more certainly enfeeble, debase, annihilate all that is noble in human nature; than popery or prelacy in the church enfeebles, debases, annihilates what is great, and true, and holy, in the Christian religion. Let us prize more highly than ever our free, scriptural, covenanted and blood-bought model; and teach it more than ever "to the generation following;" at home, and by the way side, in the Sabbath School, in the Bible class, in the pulpit; and thus hand down inviolably the only true *palladium* of civil and religious liberty ever sent from Heaven.

Lastly, and chiefly, let us give in all our ministrations the utmost prominence to the doctrine of Justification by Faith. Here, we have seen, is the central point, the strong hold. Here, Popery and

Puseyism mine the foundation. Baffled here, their innumerable inventions to beguile our nature, and destroy the soul, are baseless and harmless. Brethren, let us preach Christ, in all the simple and sublime historical verity of his cross; a real Saviour within us indeed the hope of glory, but without us, more than within us; a substitute and surety; legally and immediately and personally ours, the moment we have faith; a Saviour infinitely better than a sacrament; a sprinkling of his precious blood, infinitely better than an ocean of tears, to bathe our penance; imputation of his righteousness, infinitely better, for justification before God, than all the refinement of a "divine presence" within; and the coarseness of "hard lodging, uneasy garments, laborious postures of prayer, journeys on foot, and sufferance of cold" \* without.

Let us never forget, nor cease to utter fondly, the watchwords of our persecuted Fathers; as they fled to the darkest glens and bleakest mountain tops, before the cruel dragooning, with which Prelacy made out her argument, when she began to claim Apostolical Succession among Protestant Bishops. "For Christ's crown and covenant," let us be ready to endure all things; "looking to Jesus," "going out to Him," who was slain "in the law, room, and stead of his people."

---

\* Tract 66.

252

G823

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

wils  
252 G823

Green, Lewis Warner, 1806-1863.

Popery and Puseyism : being two discours



3 1951 002 298 511 0

Minnesota Library Access Center



9 ZA R10 D15 S06 TA Z